

SCORPIO BULKERS INC.
Form 20-F
March 02, 2018
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, 2017

OR

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

For the transition period from _____ to _____

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 _____

Commission file number: 001-36231

SCORPIO BULKERS INC.

(Exact name of Registrant as specified in its charter)

(Translation of Registrant's name into English)

Republic of the Marshall Islands

(Jurisdiction of incorporation or organization)

9, Boulevard Charles III Monaco 98000

(Address of principal executive offices)

Mr. Emanuele Lauro

377-9798-5715

info@scorpiobulkers.com

9, Boulevard Charles III Monaco 98000

(Name, Telephone, E-mail and/or Facsimile, 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 \$0.01 per share	New York Stock Exchange
--	-------------------------

7.50% Senior Notes due 2019	New York Stock Exchange
-----------------------------	-------------------------

Securities registered or to be registered pursuant to section 12(g) of the Act.

NONE

(Title of class)

Securities for which there is a reporting obligation pursuant to Section 15(d) of the Act.

NONE

(Title of class)

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.

As of December 31, 2017, there were 74,902,364 outstanding shares of common stock, par value \$0.01 per share.

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

Note – Checking the box above will not relieve any registrant required to file reports pursuant to Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 from their obligations under those Sections.

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 period that the registrant was required to file such reports), and (2) has been subject to such filing 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 the definitions of "large accelerated filer" and "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 by the international Accounting Standards Board

Other

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>PART I</u>		1
<u>ITEM 1.</u>	<u>IDENTITY OF DIRECTORS, SENIOR MANAGEMENT AND ADVISERS</u>	1
<u>ITEM 2.</u>	<u>OFFER STATISTICS AND EXPECTED TIMETABLE</u>	1
<u>ITEM 3.</u>	<u>KEY INFORMATION</u>	1
<u>ITEM 4.</u>	<u>INFORMATION ON THE COMPANY</u>	19
<u>ITEM 4A.</u>	<u>UNRESOLVED STAFF COMMENTS</u>	49
<u>ITEM 5.</u>	<u>OPERATING AND FINANCIAL REVIEW AND PROSPECTS</u>	49
<u>ITEM 6.</u>	<u>DIRECTORS, SENIOR MANAGEMENT AND EMPLOYEES</u>	70
<u>ITEM 7.</u>	<u>MAJOR SHAREHOLDERS AND RELATED PARTY TRANSACTIONS</u>	75
<u>ITEM 8.</u>	<u>FINANCIAL INFORMATION</u>	78
<u>ITEM 9.</u>	<u>OFFER AND THE LISTING</u>	80
<u>ITEM 10.</u>	<u>ADDITIONAL INFORMATION</u>	81
<u>ITEM 11.</u>	<u>QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE DISCLOSURES ABOUT MARKET RISK</u>	88
<u>ITEM 12.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION OF SECURITIES OTHER THAN EQUITY SECURITIES</u>	89
<u>PART II</u>		89
<u>ITEM 13.</u>	<u>DEFAULTS, DIVIDEND ARREARAGES AND DELINQUENCIES</u>	89
<u>ITEM 14.</u>	<u>MATERIAL MODIFICATIONS TO THE RIGHTS OF SECURITY HOLDERS AND USE OF PROCEEDS</u>	89
<u>ITEM 15.</u>	<u>CONTROLS AND PROCEDURES</u>	89
<u>ITEM 16A.</u>	<u>AUDIT COMMITTEE FINANCIAL EXPERT</u>	90
<u>ITEM 16B.</u>	<u>CODE OF ETHICS</u>	90
<u>ITEM 16C.</u>	<u>PRINCIPAL ACCOUNTING FEES AND SERVICES</u>	91
<u>ITEM 16D.</u>	<u>EXEMPTIONS FROM LISTING STANDARDS FOR AUDIT COMMITTEES</u>	91
<u>ITEM 16E.</u>	<u>PURCHASES OF EQUITY SECURITIES BY THE ISSUER AND AFFILIATED PURCHASERS</u>	91
<u>ITEM 16F.</u>	<u>CHANGE IN REGISTRANT'S CERTIFYING ACCOUNTANT</u>	92
<u>ITEM 16G.</u>	<u>CORPORATE GOVERNANCE</u>	92
<u>ITEM 16H.</u>	<u>MINE SAFETY DISCLOSURE</u>	92
<u>PART III</u>		92
<u>ITEM 17.</u>	<u>FINANCIAL STATEMENTS</u>	92
<u>ITEM 18.</u>	<u>FINANCIAL STATEMENTS</u>	93
<u>ITEM 19.</u>	<u>EXHIBITS</u>	94

Table of Contents

CAUTIONARY STATEMENT REGARDING FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENTS

Scorpio Bulkers Inc. desires to take advantage of the safe harbor provisions of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 and is including this cautionary statement in connection therewith. This document and any other written or oral statements made by the Company or on its behalf may include forward-looking statements, which reflect its current views with respect to future events and financial performance. The Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 provides safe harbor protections for forward-looking statements in order to encourage companies to provide prospective information about their business. Forward-looking statements include statements concerning plans, objectives, goals, strategies, future events or performance, and underlying assumptions and other statements, which are other than statements of historical facts. This document includes assumptions, expectations, projections, intentions and beliefs about future events. These statements are intended as “forward-looking statements.” We caution that assumptions, expectations, projections, intentions and beliefs about future events may and often do vary from actual results and the differences can be material. When used in this document, the words “believe,” “expect,” “anticipate,” “estimate,” “intend,” “plan,” “targets,” “projects,” “likely,” “will,” “would,” “could” and similar expressions or phrases may identify forward-looking statements.

All statements in this document that are not statements of historical fact are forward-looking statements.

Forward-looking statements include, but are not limited to, such matters as:

- our future operating or financial results;
 - statements about planned, pending or recent acquisitions, business strategy and expected capital spending or operating expenses, including drydocking, surveys, upgrades and insurance costs;
 - the strength of world economies;
 - the stability of Europe and the Euro;
 - fluctuations in interest rates and foreign exchange rates;
 - changes in the supply of drybulk vessels, including when caused by new newbuilding vessel orders or changes to or terminations of existing orders, and vessel scrapping levels;
 - general drybulk shipping market conditions, including fluctuations in charter hire rates and vessel values;
 - changes in demand in the drybulk shipping industry, including the market for our vessels;
 - changes in the value of our existing vessels;
 - changes in our operating expenses, including bunker prices, drydocking and insurance costs;
 - compliance with, and our liabilities under, governmental, tax environmental and safety laws and regulations;
 - changes in governmental rules and regulations or actions taken by regulatory authorities;
 - potential liability from pending or future litigation;
 - general domestic and international political conditions;
 - potential disruption of shipping routes due to accidents or political events;
 - our ability to procure or have access to financing, our liquidity and the adequacy of cash flows for our operations;
 - our continued borrowing availability under our debt agreements and compliance with the covenants contained therein;
 - our ability to successfully employ our drybulk vessels;
 - our ability to fund future capital expenditures and investments in the construction, acquisition and refurbishment of our vessels (including the amount and nature thereof and the timing of completion thereof, the delivery and commencement of operations dates, expected downtime and lost revenue);
 - risks associated with vessel construction;
-

Table of Contents

- potential exposure or loss from investment in derivative instruments;
- potential conflicts of interest involving members of our board and senior management and our significant shareholders;
- our expectations regarding the availability of vessel acquisitions and our ability to complete acquisition transactions planned;
- vessel breakdowns and instances of off-hire; and
- drybulk shipping market trends, charter rates and factors affecting supply and demand.

We have based these statements on assumptions and analyses formed by applying our experience and perception of historical trends, current conditions, expected future developments and other factors we believe are appropriate in the circumstances. All future written and verbal forward-looking statements attributable to us or any person acting on our behalf are expressly qualified in their entirety by the cautionary statements contained in or referred to in this section. We undertake no obligation, and specifically decline any obligation, except as required by law, to publicly update or revise any forward-looking statements, whether as a result of new information, future events or otherwise. In light of these risks, uncertainties and assumptions, the forward-looking events discussed in this annual report might not occur. See “Item 3. Key Information—D. Risk Factors” for a more complete discussion of these risks and uncertainties and for other risks and uncertainties. These factors and the other risk factors described in this annual report are not necessarily all of the important factors that could cause actual results or developments to differ materially from those expressed in any of our forward-looking statements. Other unknown or unpredictable factors also could harm our results. Consequently, there can be no assurance that actual results or developments anticipated by us will be realized or, even if substantially realized, that they will have the expected consequences to, or effects on, us. Given these uncertainties, prospective investors are cautioned not to place undue reliance on such forward-looking statements.

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

Unless otherwise indicated, references to “Scorpio Bulkera,” the “Company,” “we,” “our,” “us” or similar terms refer to the registrant, Scorpio Bulkera Inc., and its subsidiaries, except where the context otherwise requires. We use the term deadweight tons, or dwt, expressed in metric tons, each of which is equivalent to 1,000 kilograms, in describing the size of our vessels.

On December 31, 2015, we effected a one-for-twelve reverse stock split. All share and per share information throughout this annual report has been retroactively adjusted to reflect the reverse stock split. The par value was not adjusted as a result of the reverse stock split.

A. Selected Financial Data

The selected Consolidated Statement of Operations data and the Consolidated Balance Sheet data presented for the years ended December 31, 2017, 2016, 2015 and 2014 and for the period from March 20, 2013 (date of inception) to December 31, 2013, are derived from our audited consolidated financial statements. Such selected financial data should be read in connection with the consolidated financial statements contained in this report.

	For the Year Ended December 31,				Period from March 20, 2013 (date of inception) to December 31, 2013
	2017	2016	2015	2014	
Dollars in thousands, except per share data					
Consolidated Statement of Operations Data:					
Total vessel revenue	\$162,205	\$78,402	\$62,521	\$48,987	\$ —
Total operating expenses	187,777	179,133	554,130	166,475	5,505
Operating loss	(25,572)	(100,731)	(491,609)	(117,488)	(5,505)
Total other (loss) income	(34,154)	(24,104)	(19,180)	923	(802)
Net loss	\$(59,726)	\$(124,835)	\$(510,789)	\$(116,565)	\$(6,307)
Basic weighted average shares outstanding	71,794	56,174	21,410	11,466	3,327
Diluted weighted average shares outstanding	71,794	56,174	21,410	11,466	3,327
Basic loss per share	\$(0.83)	\$(2.22)	\$(23.86)	\$(10.17)	\$(1.90)
Diluted loss per share	\$(0.83)	\$(2.22)	\$(23.86)	\$(10.17)	\$(1.90)

Table of Contents

	As of December 31,				Period from March 20, 2013 (date of inception) to December 31, 2013
Dollars in thousands	2017	2016	2015	2014	2013
Consolidated Balance Sheet Data:					
Cash and cash equivalents	\$68,535	\$101,734	\$200,300	\$272,673	\$733,896
Assets held for sale	—	—	172,888	43,781	—
Vessels, net	1,534,782	2,234,081	764,454	66,633	—
Vessels under construction	6,710	180,000	288,282	866,844	371,692
Total assets	1,643,410	1,547,157	1,473,093	1,321,024	1,105,684
Current liabilities (including current portion of bank loans)	58,590	24,550	124,577	20,265	1,472
Bank loans, net	576,967	493,793	342,314	29,549	—
Financing obligation	17,747	—	—	—	—
Senior Notes, net	72,726	72,199	71,671	71,222	—
Total liabilities	726,030	590,542	538,562	121,036	1,472
Shareholders' equity	917,380	956,615	934,561	1,199,988	1,104,212

B. Capitalization and Indebtedness

Not applicable.

C. Reasons for the Offer and Use of Proceeds

Not applicable.

D. Risk Factors

The following risks relate principally to the industry in which we operate and our business in general. Other risks relate principally to the securities market and ownership of our securities, including our common shares and our 7.50% Senior Notes due 2019, which we refer to as our Senior Notes. The occurrence of any of the events described in this section could significantly and negatively affect our business, financial condition, operating results or cash available for the payment of dividends on our common shares and interest on our Senior Notes, or the trading price of our securities.

INDUSTRY SPECIFIC RISK FACTORS

Charter hire rates for drybulk vessels are volatile, which has in the past and may in the future adversely affect our earnings, revenue and profitability and our ability to comply with our loan covenants.

The drybulk shipping industry is cyclical with high volatility in charter hire rates and profitability. The degree of charter hire rate volatility among different types of drybulk vessels has varied widely, and in recent years charter hire rates for drybulk vessels have declined significantly from historically high levels. In the past, time charter and spot market charter rates for drybulk carriers have declined below operating costs of vessels. The Baltic Dry Index, or the BDI, a daily average of charter rates for key drybulk routes published by the Baltic Exchange Limited, which has long been viewed as the main benchmark to monitor the movements of the drybulk vessel charter market and the performance of the entire drybulk shipping market, declined from a high of 11,793 on May 20, 2008 to a low of 290 on February 10, 2016, which represents a decline of 98%. In 2017, the BDI ranged from a low of 685 on February 14, 2017, to a high of 1,743 on December 12, 2017. As of February 8, 2018, the BDI was 1,106.

Table of Contents

Fluctuations in charter rates result from changes in the supply of and demand for vessel capacity and changes in the supply of and demand for the major commodities carried by water internationally. Because the factors affecting the supply of and demand for vessels are outside of our control and are unpredictable, the nature, timing, direction and degree of changes in industry conditions are also unpredictable. Since we primarily charter our vessels in the spot market we are exposed to the cyclical and volatility of the spot market. Spot market charterhire rates may fluctuate significantly based upon available charters and the supply of and demand for seaborne shipping capacity, and we may be unable to keep our vessels fully employed in these short-term markets. Alternatively, charter rates available in the spot market may be insufficient to enable our vessels to operate profitably. A significant decrease in charter rates would affect asset values and adversely affect our profitability, cash flows and ability to pay dividends on our common shares, and interest on our Senior Notes. Furthermore, a significant decrease in charter rates would cause asset values to decline, and we may have to record an impairment charge in our consolidated financial statements which could adversely affect our financial results.

Factors that influence demand for drybulk vessel capacity include:

- supply of and demand for energy resources, commodities and industrial products;
- changes in the exploration or production of energy resources, commodities, consumer and industrial products;
- the location of regional and global production and manufacturing facilities;
- the location of consuming regions for energy resources, commodities, consumer and industrial products;
- the globalization of production and manufacturing;
- global and regional economic and political conditions, including armed conflicts and terrorist activities, embargoes and strikes;
- natural disasters;
- disruptions and developments in international trade;
- changes in seaborne and other transportation patterns, including the distance cargo is transported by sea;
- environmental and other regulatory developments;
- currency exchange rates; and
- weather.

Factors that influence the supply of drybulk vessel capacity include:

- the number of newbuilding orders and deliveries, including slippage in deliveries;
- the number of shipyards and ability of shipyards to deliver vessels;
- port and canal congestion;
- the scrapping rate of older vessels;
- speed of vessel operation;
- vessel casualties; and
- the number of vessels that are out of service, namely those that are laid-up, drydocked, awaiting repairs or otherwise not available for hire.

In addition to the prevailing and anticipated freight rates, factors that affect the rate of newbuilding, scrapping and laying-up include newbuilding prices, secondhand vessel values in relation to scrap prices, costs of bunkers and other operating costs, costs associated with classification society surveys, normal maintenance and insurance coverage costs, the efficiency and age profile of the existing drybulk fleet in the market and government and industry regulation of maritime transportation practices, particularly environmental protection laws and regulations. These factors influencing the supply of and demand for shipping capacity are outside of our control, and we may not be able to correctly assess the nature, timing and degree of changes in industry conditions.

We anticipate that the future demand for our drybulk vessels will be dependent upon economic growth in the world's economies, including China and India, seasonal and regional changes in demand, changes in the capacity of the global drybulk fleet and the sources and supply of drybulk cargo to be transported by sea. Adverse economic, political, social or other developments could have a material adverse effect on our business and operating results.

Global economic conditions may continue to negatively impact the drybulk shipping industry.

In the global economy, operating businesses have recently faced tightening credit, weakening demand for goods and services, weak international liquidity conditions, and declining markets. In particular, lower demand for drybulk

cargoes as well as diminished trade credit available for the delivery of such cargoes have led to decreased demand for drybulk carriers, creating downward pressure on charter rates and vessel values. The relatively weak global economic conditions have and may continue to have a number of adverse consequences for drybulk and other shipping sectors, including, among other things:

3

Table of Contents

low charter rates, particularly for vessels employed on short-term time charters or in the spot market;
decreases in the market value of drybulk vessels and limited second-hand market for the sale of vessels;
limited financing for vessels;
widespread loan covenant defaults; and
declaration of bankruptcy by certain vessel operators, vessel owners, shipyards and charterers.

The occurrence of one or more of these events could have a material adverse effect on our business, results of operations, cash flows and financial condition.

If economic conditions throughout the world decline, in particular in China and the rest of the Asia-Pacific region, this could negatively affect our results of operations, financial condition, cash flows and ability to obtain financing, and may adversely affect the market price of our common shares.

Negative trends in the global economy that emerged in 2008 continue to adversely affect global economic conditions. The credit markets in the United States and Europe have experienced contraction, deleveraging and reduced liquidity since the financial crisis in 2008, and the U.S. federal and state governments and European authorities have implemented or are considering a broad variety of governmental action and/or new regulation of the financial markets and may implement additional regulations in the future. Securities and futures markets and the credit markets are subject to comprehensive statutes, regulations and other requirements. The Securities and Exchange Commission, or 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.

As a result of any renewed concerns about the stability of financial markets generally and the solvency of counterparties specifically, the cost of obtaining money from the credit markets may increase as lenders have increased interest rates, enacted tighter lending standards, refused to refinance existing debt at all or on terms similar to current debt and reduced, and in some cases, ceased to provide funding to borrowers. Due to these factors, we cannot be certain that financing will be available to the extent required, or that we will be able to refinance our credit facilities, on acceptable terms or at all. If financing or refinancing is not available when needed, or is available only on unfavorable terms, we may be unable to meet our obligations as they come due or we may be unable to enhance our existing business, complete the acquisition of our newbuildings and additional vessel acquisitions or otherwise take advantage of business opportunities as they arise.

We face risks attendant to changes in economic environments, changes in interest rates, and instability in the banking and securities markets around the world, among other factors. Major market disruptions may adversely affect our business or impair our ability to borrow amounts under credit facilities or any future financial arrangements.

Economic slowdown in the Asia Pacific region, particularly in China, may have a materially adverse effect on us, as we anticipate a significant number of the port calls made by our vessels will continue to involve the loading or discharging of drybulk commodities in ports in the Asia Pacific region. Before the global economic financial crisis that began in 2008, China had one of the world's fastest growing economies in terms of GDP, which had a significant impact on shipping demand. The growth rate of China's GDP is estimated to be approximately 6.8% for the year ended December 31, 2017, which is 0.1% higher than the growth rate for the year ended December 31, 2016, China's slowest growth rate for the previous five years, and continues to remain below pre-2008 levels. Our business, financial condition and results of operations, ability to pay dividends, as well as our future prospects, will likely be materially and adversely affected by an economic downturn in China or other countries in the Asia Pacific region.

The fair market values of our vessels have declined and may decline further, which could cause us to breach certain financial covenants in our credit facilities, or result in an impairment charge, and we may incur a loss if we sell vessels following a decline in their market value.

The fair market values of drybulk vessels, including our vessels, have generally experienced high volatility and have declined in recent years. The fair market value of our vessels may continue to fluctuate depending on a number of factors, including:

prevailing level of charter rates;
general economic and market conditions affecting the shipping industry;
types, sizes and ages of vessels;
supply of and demand for vessels;

- other modes of transportation;
- cost of newbuildings;
- governmental or other regulations;
- the need to upgrade vessels as a result of charterer requirements, technological advances in vessel design or equipment or otherwise;

4

Table of Contents

technological advances; and

competition from other shipping companies and other modes of transportation.

If the fair market values of our vessels decline further, we may not be in compliance with certain covenants contained in our secured credit facilities, which may result in an event of default. In such circumstances, we may not be able to refinance our debt or obtain additional financing. If we are not able to comply with the covenants in our secured credit facilities, and are unable to remedy the relevant breach, our lenders could accelerate our debt and foreclose on our fleet. In addition, if we sell one or more of our vessels at a time when vessel prices have fallen, the sale may be less than the vessel's carrying value on our consolidated 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 such acquisitions may increase and this could adversely affect our business, results of operations, cash flow and financial condition.

A reduction in charter rates and other market deterioration may require us to record impairment charges related to our long-lived assets (our vessels) and such charges may be large and have a material impact on our consolidated financial statements.

At December 31, 2017, we had vessels and vessels under construction of \$1.5 billion in total on our consolidated balance sheet, representing 168% of our shareholders' equity. Additionally, as of December 31, 2017, we had \$18.8 million of remaining installment payments due on our existing construction contract.

Our vessels are assessed if an event occurs or circumstances change that would more likely than not reduce the fair value of our vessels and vessels under construction below their carrying value. During 2017, we determined there were no changes in circumstances or events that indicated that the carrying amount of our vessels or vessel under construction may not be recoverable and therefore, an assessment of impairment was not performed. However, if our charter rates decline, we may be required to record impairment charges on our vessels and vessels under construction, which would require us to write down the carrying value of these assets to their fair value. Since vessels and vessels under construction comprise a substantial portion of our balance sheet, such charges could have a material impact on our consolidated financial statements.

We are subject to complex laws and regulations, including environmental regulations that can adversely affect the cost, manner or feasibility of doing business.

Our operations are subject to numerous international, national, state and local laws, regulations, treaties and conventions in force in international waters and the jurisdictions in which our vessels operate or are registered, which can significantly affect the ownership and operation of our vessels. These laws and regulations include, but are not limited to, the U.S. Oil Pollution Act of 1990, or OPA, the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, or CERCLA, the U.S. Clean Air Act, the U.S. Clean Water Act, or the CWA, and the U.S. Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002, or the MTSA, and regulations of the International Maritime Organization, or IMO, including the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships of 1973 (as from time to time amended and generally referred to as MARPOL) including the designation of Emission Control Areas, or ECAs, thereunder, the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea of 1974 (as from time to time amended and generally referred to as SOLAS), the International Convention on Civil Liability for Bunker Oil Pollution Damage, and the International Convention on Load Lines of 1966 (as from time to time amended), or the LL Convention.

Compliance with such laws, regulations and standards, where applicable, may require installation of costly equipment or implementation of operational changes and may affect the resale value or useful lives of our vessels. These costs could have a material adverse effect on our business, results of operations, cash flows and financial condition. A failure to comply with applicable laws and regulations may result in administrative and civil penalties, criminal sanctions or the suspension or termination of our operations. Because such conventions, laws, and regulations are often revised, we cannot predict the ultimate cost of complying with them or the impact thereof on the resale prices or useful lives of our vessels. Additional conventions, laws and regulations may be adopted which could limit our ability to do business or increase the cost of our doing business and which may materially adversely affect our operations.

For example, the International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships' Ballast Water and Sediments, or the BWM Convention, adopted by the UN International Maritime Organization in February 2004, calls for the phased introduction of mandatory reducing living organism limits in ballast water over time (as discussed further below). In

order to comply with these living organism limits, vessel owners may have to install expensive ballast water treatment systems or make port facility disposal arrangements and modify existing vessels to accommodate those systems. The BWM Convention entered into force on September 8, 2017 and while we believe that our vessels have been fitted with systems that comply with the standards, we cannot be assured that these systems will be approved by the regulatory bodies of every jurisdiction in which we may wish to conduct our business. If they are not approved it could have an adverse material impact on our business, financial condition, and results of operations depending on the available ballast water treatment systems and the extent to which existing vessels must be modified to accommodate such systems.

Table of Contents

Environmental laws often impose strict liability for remediation of spills and releases of oil and hazardous substances, which could subject us to liability without regard to whether we were negligent or at fault. Under OPA, for example, owners, operators and bareboat charterers are jointly and severally strictly liable for the discharge of oil within the 200-mile exclusive economic zone around the United States.

We are required by various governmental and quasi-governmental agencies to obtain certain permits, licenses, and certificates with respect to our operations, and satisfy insurance and financial responsibility requirements for potential oil (including marine fuel) spills and other pollution incidents. Although we have insurance to cover certain environmental risks, there can be no assurance that such insurance will be sufficient to cover all such risks or that any claims will not have a material adverse effect on our business, results of operations, cash flows, financial condition, and our ability to pay dividends in the future, on our common shares, and interest on our Senior Notes.

An over-supply of drybulk carrier capacity may prolong or further depress the current low charter rates, which may limit our ability to operate our drybulk carriers profitably.

The supply of drybulk vessels has increased significantly since the beginning of 2006. According to SSY, as of December 2017, newbuilding orders have been placed for approximately 10.1% of the existing fleet capacity. Vessel supply growth has been outpacing vessel demand growth over the past few years causing downward pressure on charter rates. Until the new supply is fully absorbed by the market, charter rates may continue to be under pressure due to vessel supply in the near to medium term.

World events could affect our results of operations and financial condition.

Past terrorist attacks, as well as the threat of future terrorist attacks around the world, continue to cause uncertainty in the world's financial markets and may affect our business, operating results and financial condition. Continuing conflicts and recent developments in Russia, North Korea, the Middle East, including Iran, Iraq, Syria, Egypt and North Africa, and the presence of U.S. or other armed forces in the Middle East, may lead to additional acts of terrorism and armed conflict around the world, which may contribute to further economic instability in the global financial markets. These uncertainties could also adversely affect our ability to obtain additional financing on terms acceptable to us or at all. In the past, political conflicts have also resulted in attacks on vessels, mining of waterways and other efforts to disrupt international shipping, particularly in the Arabian Gulf region. Acts of terrorism and piracy have also affected vessels trading in regions such as the South China Sea, the Gulf of Aden off the coast of Somalia and West Africa. Any of these occurrences could have a material adverse impact on our operating results, revenues and costs.

Acts of piracy on ocean-going vessels have had and may continue to have an adverse effect on our business.

Acts of piracy have historically affected ocean-going vessels trading in regions of the world such as the South China Sea, the Indian Ocean and in the Gulf of Aden off the coast of Somalia. Sea piracy incidents continue to occur with drybulk vessels particularly vulnerable to such attacks. If these piracy attacks result in regions in which our vessels are deployed being characterized as "war risk" zones by insurers or Joint War Committee "war and strikes" listed areas, premiums payable for such coverage could increase significantly and such insurance coverage may be more difficult to obtain. In addition, crew costs, including due to employing onboard security guards, could increase in such circumstances. Furthermore, 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 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, any detention hijacking as a result of an act of piracy against our vessels, or an increase in cost, or unavailability, of insurance for our vessels, could have a material adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Our vessels may call on ports located in countries that are subject to restrictions imposed by the U.S. or other governments, which could adversely affect our reputation and the market for our common shares.

Although we do not expect that our vessels will call on ports located in countries subject to sanctions and embargoes imposed by the U.S. government and other authorities or countries identified by the U.S. government or other authorities as state sponsors of terrorism, such as Iran, Sudan and Syria, from time to time on charterers' instructions, our vessels may call on ports located in such countries in the future. The U.S. sanctions and embargo laws and

regulations vary in their application, as they do not all apply to the same covered persons or proscribe the same activities, and such sanctions and embargo laws and regulations may be amended or strengthened over time. In 2010, the U.S. enacted the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions Accountability and Divestment Act, or CISADA, which amended the Iran Sanctions Act. Among other things, CISADA introduced limits on the ability of companies and persons to do business or trade with Iran when such activities relate to the investment, supply or export of refined petroleum or petroleum products. In 2012, President Obama signed Executive Order 13608 which prohibits foreign

Table of Contents

persons from violating or attempting to violate, or causing a violation of any sanctions in effect against Iran or facilitating any deceptive transactions for or on behalf of any person subject to U.S. sanctions. Any persons found to be in violation of Executive Order 13608 will be deemed a foreign sanctions evader and will be banned from all contacts with the United States, including conducting business in U.S. dollars. Also in 2012, President Obama signed into law the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012, or the Iran Threat Reduction Act, which created new sanctions and strengthened existing sanctions. Among other things, the Iran Threat Reduction Act intensifies existing sanctions regarding the provision of goods, services, infrastructure or technology to Iran's petroleum or petrochemical sector. The Iran Threat Reduction Act also includes a provision requiring the President of the United States to impose five or more sanctions from Section 6(a) of the Iran Sanctions Act, as amended, on a person the President determines is a controlling beneficial owner of, or otherwise owns, operates, or controls or insures a vessel that was used to transport crude oil from Iran to another country and (1) if the person is a controlling beneficial owner of the vessel, the person had actual knowledge the vessel was so used or (2) if the person otherwise owns, operates, or controls, or insures the vessel, the person knew or should have known the vessel was so used. Such a person could be subject to a variety of sanctions, including exclusion from U.S. capital markets, exclusion from financial transactions subject to U.S. jurisdiction, and exclusion of that person's vessels from U.S. ports for up to two years.

On July 14, 2015, the P5+1 and the European Union announced that they reached a landmark agreement with Iran titled the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action Regarding the Islamic Republic of Iran's Nuclear Program, or the JCPOA, which is intended to significantly restrict Iran's ability to develop and produce nuclear weapons for 10 years while simultaneously easing sanctions directed toward non-U.S. persons for conduct involving Iran, but taking place outside of U.S. jurisdiction and that does not involve U.S. persons.

On January 16, 2016, which we refer to as Implementation Day, the United States joined the European Union and the United Nations in suspending a significant number of their nuclear-related sanctions on Iran following an announcement by the International Atomic Energy Agency, or the IAEA, that Iran had satisfied its respective obligations under the JCPOA. These sanctions have not actually been repealed or permanently terminated at this time. Rather, the U.S. government has implemented changes to the sanctions regime by: (1) issuing waivers of certain statutory sanctions provisions; (2) committing to refrain from exercising certain discretionary sanctions authorities; (3) removing certain individuals and entities from the sanctions lists of the Office of Foreign Assets Control, or OFAC; and (4) revoking certain Executive Orders and specified sections of Executive Orders. These sanctions will not be permanently "lifted" until the earlier of October 18, 2023, which we refer to as Transition Day, or upon a report from the IAEA stating that all nuclear material in Iran is being used for peaceful activities.

OFAC acted several times in 2017 to add Iranian individuals and entities to its list of Specially Designated Nationals whose assets are blocked and with whom U.S. persons are generally prohibited from dealing. In addition, on January 13, 2017, OFAC announced an amendment to the Sudanese Sanctions Regulations, or SSR, to authorize all transactions prohibited by the SSR and Executive Orders 13067 and 13412, and to unblock certain property in which the Government of Sudan has an interest. On July 11, 2017, President Trump issued Executive Order 13804, extending until October 12, 2017, a review by the U.S. government of criteria for the revocation of certain sanctions on Sudan and the Government of Sudan. On October 6, 2017, the U.S. Department of State announced the revocation of sections 1 and 2 of Executive Order 13067 and all of Executive Order 13412, effective October 12, 2017. As such, effective October 12, 2017, U.S. persons are no longer prohibited from engaging in transactions that were previously prohibited under the SSR, including engaging in transactions with Sudan and the Government of Sudan.

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. Any such violation could result in fines or other penalties and could severely impact our ability to access U.S. capital markets and conduct our business, and could result in some investors deciding, or being required, to divest their interest, or not to invest, in us. In addition, certain institutional investors may have investment policies or restrictions that prevent them from holding securities of companies that have contracts with countries identified by the U.S. government as state sponsors of terrorism. The determination by these investors not to invest in, or to divest from, our securities may adversely affect

the price at which our securities trade. Moreover, our charterers may 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. In addition, our reputation and the market for our securities may be adversely affected if we engage in certain other activities, such as entering into charters with individuals or entities in countries subject to U.S. sanctions and embargo laws that are not controlled by the governments of those countries, or engaging in operations associated with those countries pursuant to contracts with third parties that are unrelated to those countries or entities controlled by their governments. Investor perception of the value of our securities may be adversely affected by the consequences of war, the effects of terrorism, civil unrest and governmental actions in these and surrounding countries.

Table of Contents

Our operating results will be subject to seasonal fluctuations, which could affect our operating results.

We operate our vessels in markets that have historically exhibited seasonal variations in demand and, as a result, in charter hire rates. This seasonality may result in volatility in our operating results to the extent that we enter into new charter agreements or renew existing agreements during a time when charter rates are weaker or we operate our vessels on the spot market or index based time charters, which may result in quarter-to-quarter volatility in our operating results. The drybulk sector is typically stronger in the fall and winter months in anticipation of increased consumption of coal and other raw materials in the northern hemisphere. The celebration of Chinese New Year in the first quarter of each year, also results in lower volumes of seaborne trade into China during this period. In addition, unpredictable weather patterns in these months tend to disrupt vessel scheduling and supplies of certain commodities. As a result, our revenues from our drybulk carriers may be weaker during the fiscal quarters ended June 30 and September 30, and, conversely, our revenues from our drybulk carriers may be stronger in fiscal quarters ended December 31 and March 31.

We are subject to international safety regulations and requirements imposed by our classification societies and the failure to comply with these regulations and requirements may subject us to increased liability, may adversely affect our insurance coverage and may result in a denial of access to, or detention in, certain ports.

The operation of our vessels is affected by the requirements set forth in the International Management Code for the Safe Operation of Ships and for Pollution Prevention, or the ISM Code. The ISM Code requires ship owners, ship managers 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 operation of vessels and describing procedures for dealing with emergencies. In addition, vessel classification societies impose significant safety and other requirements on our vessels.

The failure of a shipowner or bareboat charterer to comply with the ISM Code may subject it to increased liability, may invalidate existing insurance or decrease available insurance coverage for the affected vessels and may result in a denial of access to, or detention in, certain ports. Each of our vessels is, or will be when delivered to us, ISM Code-certified. However, if we are subject to increased liability for non-compliance or if our insurance coverage is adversely impacted as a result of non-compliance, it may negatively affect our ability to pay dividends on our common shares and interest on our Senior Notes. If any of our vessels are denied access to, or are detained in, certain ports as a result of non-compliance with the ISM Code, our revenues may be adversely impacted.

In addition, 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 the Safety of Life at Sea Convention. The cost of maintaining our vessels’ classifications may be substantial. If any vessel does not maintain its class or fails any annual, intermediate or special survey, the vessel will be unable to trade between ports and will be unemployable and uninsurable, which could negatively impact our results of operations and financial condition.

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 inspection and related procedures in countries of origin and destination and trans-shipment points. Inspection procedures may result in the seizure of contents of our vessels, delays in the loading, offloading, trans-shipment or delivery of cargo, and the levying of customs duties, fines or other penalties against us.

It is possible that changes to inspection procedures could impose additional financial and legal obligations on us. Changes to inspection procedures could also impose additional costs and obligations on our customers and may, in certain cases, render the shipment of certain types of cargo uneconomical or impractical. Any such changes or developments may have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Table of Contents

Rising fuel, or bunker, prices may adversely affect our profits.

Since we primarily employ our vessels in the spot market or in spot market-oriented pools, we expect that fuel, or bunkers, will be typically the largest expense in our shipping operations for our vessels. While we believe that we will experience a competitive advantage as a result of increased bunker prices due to the greater fuel efficiency of our vessels compared to the average global fleet, changes in the price of fuel 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 and gas, actions by the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries, or OPEC, and other oil and gas producers, war and unrest in oil producing countries and regions, regional production patterns and environmental concerns. Further, fuel may become much more expensive in the future, which may reduce our profitability and the competitiveness of our business compared to other forms of transportation.

We operate drybulk vessels worldwide and as a result, our business has inherent operational risks, which may reduce our revenue or increase our expenses, and we may not be adequately covered by insurance.

The international shipping industry is an inherently risky business involving global operations. Our vessels and their cargoes are at risk of being damaged or lost because of events such as marine disasters, bad weather, mechanical failures, human error, environmental accidents, war, terrorism, piracy and other circumstances or events. In addition, transporting cargoes across a wide variety of international jurisdictions creates a risk of business interruptions due to political circumstances in foreign countries, hostilities, labor strikes and boycotts, the potential for changes in tax rates or policies, and the potential for government expropriation of our vessels. Any of these events may result in loss of revenues, increased costs and decreased cash flows to our customers, which could impair their ability to make payments to us under our charters.

Furthermore, the operation of certain vessel types, such as drybulk carriers, has certain unique risks. With a drybulk carrier, the cargo itself and its interaction with the vessel can be an operational risk. By their nature, drybulk cargoes are often heavy, dense, easily shifted, and react badly to water exposure. In addition, drybulk carriers are often subjected to battering treatment during unloading operations with grabs, jackhammers (to pry encrusted cargoes out of the hold) and small bulldozers. This treatment may cause damage to the vessel. Vessels damaged due to treatment during unloading procedures may be more susceptible to breach at sea. Hull breaches in drybulk carriers may lead to the flooding of the vessels' holds. If a drybulk carrier suffers flooding in its forward holds, the bulk cargo may become so dense and waterlogged that its pressure may buckle the vessel's bulkheads, leading to the loss of a vessel. If we are unable to adequately maintain our vessels, we may be unable to prevent these events. Any of these circumstances or events may have a material adverse effect on our business, results of operations, cash flows, financial condition and ability to pay dividends on our common shares and interest on our Senior Notes. In addition, the loss of any of our vessels could harm our reputation as a safe and reliable vessel owner and operator.

In the event of a casualty to a vessel or other catastrophic event, we will rely on our insurance to pay the insured value of the vessel or the damages incurred. We procure insurance for the vessels in our fleet against those risks that we believe the shipping industry commonly insures against. These insurances include marine hull and machinery insurance, protection and indemnity insurance, which include pollution risks and crew insurances, and war risk insurance. Currently, the amount of coverage for liability for pollution, spillage and leakage available to us on commercially reasonable terms through protection and indemnity associations and providers of excess coverage is \$1.0 billion per vessel per occurrence.

We have procured hull and machinery insurance, protection and indemnity insurance, which includes environmental damage and pollution insurance coverage, and war risk insurance for our fleet. We do not maintain for our vessels insurance against loss of hire, which covers business interruptions that result from the loss of use of a vessel. We cannot assure you that we will be adequately insured against any or all risks, or that we will be able to obtain adequate insurance coverage for our fleet in the future. For example, in the past more stringent environmental regulations have led to increased costs for, and in the future may result in the lack of availability of, insurance against risks of environmental damage or pollution. Additionally, our insurers may not pay particular claims, or may default on claims they are required to pay. Our insurance policies may contain deductibles for which we will be responsible and limitations and exclusions which may increase our costs or lower our revenue. Moreover, insurers may default on claims they are required to pay. Any significant loss or liability for which we are not insured could have a material

adverse effect on our financial condition.

Maritime claimants could arrest or attach one or more of our vessels, which could interrupt our cash flows.

Crew members, suppliers of goods and services to a vessel, shippers of cargo, lenders, and other parties may be entitled to a maritime lien against a vessel for unsatisfied debts, claims or damages. In many jurisdictions, a maritime lien holder may enforce its lien by arresting or attaching a vessel through foreclosure proceedings. The arrest or attachment of one or more of our vessels could interrupt our cash flows and require us to pay large sums of money to have the arrest or attachment lifted. In addition, in some jurisdictions, such as South Africa, under the “sister ship” theory of liability, a claimant may arrest both the vessel that is

Table of Contents

subject to the claimant's maritime lien and any "associated" vessel, which is any vessel owned or controlled by the same owner. Claimants could attempt to assert "sister ship" liability against one vessel in our fleet for claims relating to another of our vessels.

Governments could requisition our vessels during a period of war or emergency, which could negatively impact our business, financial condition, results of operations, and available cash.

A government could requisition one or more of our vessels for title or for hire. Requisition for title occurs when a government takes control of a vessel and becomes its owner, while requisition for hire occurs when a government takes control of a vessel and effectively becomes its charterer at dictated charter rates. Generally, requisitions occur during periods of war or emergency, although governments may elect to requisition vessels in other circumstances. Although we would be entitled to compensation in the event of a requisition of one or more of our vessels, the amount and timing of payment would be uncertain. Government requisition of one or more of our vessels may negatively impact our revenues.

Failure to comply with the U.S. Foreign Corrupt Practices Act could result in fines, criminal penalties, contract terminations and an adverse effect on our business.

We operate in a number of countries throughout the world, including countries known to have a reputation for corruption. We are committed to doing business in accordance with applicable anti-corruption laws and have adopted a code of business conduct and ethics which is consistent and in full compliance with the U.S. Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977, or the FCPA. We are subject, however, to the risk that we, our affiliated entities or our or their respective officers, directors, employees and agents may take actions determined to be in violation of such anti-corruption laws, including the FCPA. Any such violation could result in substantial fines, sanctions, civil and/or criminal penalties and curtailment of operations in certain jurisdictions, and might adversely affect our business, results of operations or financial condition. In addition, actual or alleged violations could damage our reputation and ability to do business. Furthermore, detecting, investigating, and resolving actual or alleged violations is expensive and can consume significant time and attention of our senior management.

COMPANY SPECIFIC RISK FACTORS

We cannot assure you that our available liquidity will be sufficient to meet our ongoing capital and operating needs. We are exposed to the cyclicity and volatility of spot market charterhire rates, which have fluctuated, and may continue to fluctuate, significantly based upon available charters and the supply of and demand for seaborne shipping capacity. If charter rates available in the spot market are insufficient to enable our vessels to operate profitably it could adversely affect our available liquidity, profitability, cash flows, and financial results. Furthermore, a prolonged period of depressed charter rates or a significant decrease in charter rates may negatively impact our liquidity position and may cause our vessel values to decline, which could, among other things, affect our ability to comply with the financial covenants in our loan agreements. Please see "The fair market values of our vessels have declined and may decline further, which could limit the amount of funds that we can borrow, cause us to breach certain financial covenants in our credit facilities, or result in an impairment charge, and we may incur a loss if we sell vessels following a decline in their market value" and "We are leveraged, which could significantly limit our ability to execute our business strategy, and we may be unable to comply with our covenants in our credit facilities that impose operating and financial restrictions on us, which could result in a default under the terms of these agreements." Newbuilding projects are subject to risks that could cause delays, cost overruns or cancellation of our newbuilding contracts.

As of the date of this annual report, we are party to a shipbuilding contract with an established shipyard in China for the construction of one Kamsarmax newbuilding vessel for an aggregate purchase price of \$25.5 million, of which \$18.8 million remains to be paid. This vessel is expected to be delivered in the middle of 2018. Construction projects are subject to risks of delay or cost overruns inherent in any large construction project from numerous factors, including shortages of equipment, materials or skilled labor, unscheduled delays in the delivery of ordered materials and equipment or shipyard construction, failure of equipment to meet quality and/or performance standards, financial or operating difficulties experienced by equipment vendors or the shipyard, unanticipated actual or purported change orders, inability to obtain required permits or approvals, unanticipated cost increases between order and delivery, design or engineering changes and work stoppages and other labor disputes, adverse weather conditions or any other

events of force majeure. Significant cost overruns or delays could adversely affect our financial position, results of operations and cash flows. Additionally, failure to complete a project on time may result in the delay of revenue from that vessel.

In addition, in the event the shipyard does not perform under its contract and we are unable to enforce the refund guarantee with a third party bank for any reason, we may lose all or part of our investment, which would have an adverse effect on our results of operations, financial condition and cash flows.

Table of Contents

We are subject to certain risks with respect to our counterparties on contracts, and failure of such counterparties to meet their obligations could cause us to suffer losses or negatively impact our results of operations and cash flows. We have entered, and may enter, into various contracts, including pooling arrangements, time charters, spot voyage charters, bareboat charters, shipbuilding contracts, credit facilities and other agreements. Such agreements subject us to counterparty risks. The ability and willingness of each of our counterparties to perform its obligations under a contract with us will depend on a number of factors that are beyond our control and may include, among other things, general economic conditions, the condition of the maritime and offshore industries, the overall financial condition of the counterparty, and various expenses. Should a counterparty fail to honor its obligations under agreements with us, we could sustain significant losses which could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition, results of operations and cash flows.

In addition, in depressed market conditions, our charterers may no longer need a vessel that is then under charter or may be able to obtain a comparable vessel at lower rates. As a result, charterers may seek to renegotiate the terms of their existing charter agreements or avoid their obligations under those contracts. If our charterers fail to meet their obligations to us or attempt to renegotiate our charter agreements, it may be difficult to secure substitute employment for such vessel, and any new charter arrangements we secure in the spot market or on time charters may be at lower rates given currently depressed drybulk carrier charter rate levels. As a result, we could sustain significant losses which could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition, results of operations and cash flows, as well as our ability to pay dividends on our common shares and interest on our Senior Notes, and comply with covenants in our credit facilities.

We are, and expect to continue to be, dependent on spot market-oriented pools and spot charters and currently low spot charter rates, or any further decrease in spot charter rates in the future will result in significant operating losses. All of our vessels are employed in the Scorpio Kamsarmax Pool or the Scorpio Ultramax Pool, which we refer to together as the Scorpio Group Pools. During the year ended December 31, 2017, we earned 42% and 58% of our revenue from the Scorpio Kamsarmax Pool and the Scorpio Ultramax Pool, respectively. The Scorpio Group Pools in which our vessels operate are spot market-oriented commercial pools managed by our commercial manager, which are exposed to fluctuations in spot market charter rates. The spot charter market may fluctuate significantly based upon drybulk carrier supply and demand. The successful operation of our vessels in the competitive spot charter market, including within the Scorpio Group Pools, depends on, 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. The spot market is very volatile, and, there have been periods when spot charter rates have declined below the operating cost of vessels. If future spot charter rates decline we may be unable to operate our vessels trading in the spot market profitably, meet our obligations, including payments on indebtedness, or pay dividends in the future. Furthermore, as charter rates for spot charters are fixed for a single voyage which 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.

Our ability to renew expiring charters or obtain new charters will depend on the prevailing market conditions at the time. If we are not able to obtain new charters in direct continuation with previous charters or for our newbuilding vessels upon their delivery to us, or if new charters are entered into at charter rates substantially below the existing charter rates or on terms otherwise less favorable compared to previous charter terms, our revenues and profitability could be adversely affected.

We cannot assure you that our board of directors will continue to declare dividends.

Our board of directors declared our first quarterly cash dividend on our common shares on October 23, 2017. However, we cannot assure you that we will continue to declare dividends in the future. The declaration and payment of dividends, if any, will always be subject to the discretion of our board of directors, restrictions contained in our credit facilities and the requirements of Marshall Islands law. The timing and amount of any dividends declared will depend on, among other things, our earnings, financial condition and cash requirements and availability, our ability to obtain debt and equity financing on acceptable terms as contemplated by our growth strategy, the terms of our outstanding indebtedness and the ability of our subsidiaries to distribute funds to us. The international drybulk shipping industry is highly volatile, and we cannot predict with certainty the amount of cash, if any, that will be

available for distribution as dividends in any period. Also, there may be a high degree of variability from period to period in the amount of cash that is available for the payment of dividends.

We may incur expenses or liabilities or be subject to other circumstances in the future that reduce or eliminate the amount of cash that we have available for distribution as dividends, including as a result of the risks described herein. Our growth strategy contemplates that we will finance our acquisitions of additional vessels through debt financings or the net proceeds of future equity issuances on terms acceptable to us. If financing is not available to us on acceptable terms, our board of directors may determine to finance or refinance acquisitions with cash from operations, which would reduce the amount of any cash available for the payment of dividends.

Table of Contents

In general, under the terms of our credit facilities, we are not permitted to pay dividends if there is a default or a breach of a loan covenant. Please see “Item 5. Operating and Financial Review and Prospects-B. Liquidity and Capital Resources” for more information relating to restrictions on our ability to pay dividends under the terms of our credit facilities.

The Republic of Marshall Islands laws generally prohibit the payment of dividends other than from surplus (retained earnings and the excess of consideration received for the sale of shares above the par value of the shares) or while a company is insolvent or would be rendered insolvent by the payment of such a dividend. We may not have sufficient surplus in the future to pay dividends and our subsidiaries may not have sufficient funds or surplus to make distributions to us. We can give no assurance that we will continue to declare dividends on our common shares in the future.

We may have difficulty managing our planned growth properly.

Our operating fleet of 56 vessels consists of 55 wholly-owned or finance leased drybulk vessels (including 18 Kamsarmax vessels and 37 Ultramax vessels), which were delivered to us beginning in 2015, and one time chartered-in Ultramax vessel. In addition, one Kamsarmax vessel is being constructed at Jiangsu New Yangzijiang Shipbuilding Co Ltd in China and is expected to be delivered to us in the middle of 2018. One of our principal strategies is to continue to grow by expanding our operations, and we may, in the future, increase the size of our fleet through timely and selective acquisitions. Our future growth will primarily depend upon a number of factors, some of which may not be within our control. These factors include our ability to:

- identify suitable drybulk carriers, including newbuilding slots at shipyards and/or shipping companies for acquisitions at attractive prices;
- obtain required financing for our existing and new operations;
- identify businesses engaged in managing, operating or owning drybulk carriers for acquisitions or joint ventures;
- integrate any acquired drybulk carriers or businesses successfully with our existing operations, including obtaining any approvals and qualifications necessary to operate vessels that we acquire;
- hire, train and retain qualified personnel and crew to manage and operate our growing business and fleet;
- identify additional new markets;
- enhance our customer base; and
- improve our operating, financial and accounting systems and controls.

Our failure to effectively identify, acquire, develop and integrate any drybulk carriers or businesses, or our inability to effectively manage the size of our fleet, could adversely affect our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Furthermore, the number of employees that perform services for us and our current operating and financial systems may not be adequate as we expand the size of our fleet in the drybulk sector, and we may not be able to effectively hire more employees or adequately improve those systems. In addition, if we further expand our fleet, we will need to recruit suitable additional seafarers and shore side administrative and management personnel. We cannot guarantee that we will be able to hire suitable employees as we expand our fleet. If we or our crewing agent encounters business or financial difficulties, we may not be able to adequately staff our vessels. If we are unable to grow our financial and operating systems or to recruit suitable employees as we expand our fleet, our financial performance may be adversely affected and, among other things, the amount of cash available for distribution as dividends to our shareholders may be reduced. Finally, acquisitions may require additional equity issuances, which may dilute our common shareholders if issued at lower prices than the price at which they acquired their shares, or debt issuances (with amortization payments), both of which could lower our available cash. If any such events occur, our financial condition may be adversely affected.

Growing any business by acquisition presents numerous risks such as undisclosed liabilities and obligations, difficulty in obtaining additional qualified personnel and managing relationships with customers and suppliers and integrating newly acquired operations into existing infrastructures. The expansion of our fleet may impose significant additional responsibilities on our management and staff, and the management and staff of our commercial and technical managers, and may necessitate that we, and they, increase the number of personnel. We cannot give any assurance that we will be successful in executing our growth plans or that we will not incur significant expenses and losses in

connection with our future growth.

12

Table of Contents

Operating secondhand vessels exposes us to increased operating costs which may adversely affect our earnings and, as our fleet ages, the risks associated with older vessels could adversely affect our ability to obtain profitable charters. We have and may continue to acquire and operate secondhand vessels. While we typically inspect secondhand vessels prior to acquisition, this does not provide us with the same knowledge about their condition that we would have had if these vessels had been built for and operated exclusively by us. Generally, purchasers of secondhand vessels do not receive the benefit of warranties from the builders for the secondhand vessels that they acquire. A secondhand vessel may have conditions or defects that we were not aware of when we bought the vessel and which may require us to incur costly repairs to the vessel. These repairs may require us to put a vessel into drydock, which would reduce our operating days.

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. 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.

The aging of our fleet may result in increased operating costs in the future, which could adversely affect our earnings. In general, the cost of maintaining a vessel in good operating condition increases with the age of the vessel. As our vessels age typically they will become less fuel-efficient and more costly to maintain than more recently constructed vessels due to improvements in engine technology. Cargo insurance rates increase with the age of a vessel, making older vessels less desirable to charterers. Governmental regulations and safety or other equipment standards related to the age of vessels may also require expenditures for alterations or the addition of new equipment to our vessels and may restrict the type of activities in which our 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.

Technological innovation could reduce our charter hire income and the value of our vessels.

The charter hire rates and the value and operational life of a vessel are determined by a number of factors including the vessel's efficiency, operational flexibility and physical life. Efficiency includes speed, fuel economy and the ability to load and discharge cargo quickly. Flexibility includes the ability to enter harbors, utilize related docking facilities and pass through canals and straits. The length of a vessel's physical life is related to its original design and construction, its maintenance and the impact of the stress of operations. If new drybulk carriers are built that are more efficient or more flexible or have longer physical lives than our vessels, competition from these more technologically advanced vessels could adversely affect the amount of charterhire payments we receive for our vessels once their initial charters expire and the resale value of our vessels could significantly decrease. As a result, our business, results of operations, cash flows and financial condition could be adversely affected.

In the highly competitive international shipping industry, we may not be able to compete for charters with new entrants or established companies with greater resources, and as a result, we may be unable to employ our vessels profitably.

Our vessels are employed in a highly competitive market that is capital intensive and highly fragmented. Competition arises primarily from other vessel owners, some of whom have substantially greater resources than we do.

Competition for the transportation of drybulk cargo by sea is intense and depends on price, location, size, age, condition and the acceptability of the vessel and its operators to the charterers. Due in part to the highly fragmented market, competitors with greater resources could enter the drybulk shipping industry and operate larger fleets through consolidations or acquisitions and may be able to offer lower charter rates and higher quality vessels than we are able to offer. If we are unable to successfully compete with other drybulk shipping companies, our results of operations would be adversely impacted.

We may be subject to litigation that, if not resolved in our favor and not sufficiently insured against, could have a material adverse effect on us.

We may be, from time to time, involved in various litigation matters. These matters may include, among other things, contract disputes, personal injury claims, environmental claims or proceedings, asbestos and other toxic tort claims, employment matters, governmental claims for taxes or duties, and other litigation that arises in the ordinary course of our business. Although we intend to defend these matters vigorously, we cannot predict with certainty the outcome or

effect of any claim or other litigation matter, and the ultimate outcome of any litigation or the potential costs to resolve them may have a material adverse effect on us. Insurance may not be applicable or sufficient in all cases and/or insurers may not remain solvent which may have a material adverse effect on our financial condition.

Table of Contents

We are a holding company, and we depend on the ability of our subsidiaries to distribute funds to us in order to satisfy our financial obligations and to make dividend payments.

We are a holding company and our subsidiaries conduct all of our operations and own all of our operating assets. We have no significant assets other than the equity interests in our subsidiaries. As a result, our ability to satisfy our financial obligations and to pay dividends to our shareholders depends on our subsidiaries and their ability to distribute funds to us. If we are unable to obtain funds from our subsidiaries, our board of directors may exercise its discretion not to declare dividends.

Our costs of operating as a public company are significant, and our management is required to devote substantial time to complying with public company regulations. We cannot assure you that our internal controls and procedures over financial reporting will be sufficient.

We are subject to the reporting requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, or the Exchange Act, and the other rules and regulations of the SEC, including the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, or the Sarbanes-Oxley Act, and as such, we will have significant legal, accounting and other expenses. These reporting obligations impose various requirements on public companies, including changes in corporate governance practices, and these requirements may continue to evolve. We and our management personnel, and other personnel, if any, need to devote a substantial amount of time to comply with these requirements. Moreover, these rules and regulations increase our legal and financial compliance costs and make some activities more time-consuming and costly.

The Sarbanes-Oxley Act requires, among other things, that we maintain and periodically evaluate our internal control over financial reporting and disclosure controls and procedures. In particular, we need to perform system and process evaluation and testing of our internal control over financial reporting to allow management and our independent registered public accounting firm to report on the effectiveness of our internal control over financial reporting, as required by Section 404 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act. If we have a material weakness in our internal controls over financial reporting, we may not detect errors on a timely basis and our financial statements may be materially misstated. We dedicate a significant amount of time and resources and incur substantial accounting expenses to ensure compliance with these regulatory requirements. We will continue to evaluate areas such as corporate governance, corporate control, internal audit, disclosure controls and procedures and financial reporting and accounting systems. We will make changes in any of these and other areas, including our internal control over financial reporting, which we believe are necessary. However, these and other measures we may take may not be sufficient to allow us to satisfy our obligations as a public company on a timely and reliable basis.

Because we are organized under the laws of the Marshall Islands, it may be difficult to serve us with legal process or enforce judgments against us, our directors or our management.

We are organized under the laws of the Marshall Islands, and substantially all of our assets are located outside of the United States. In addition, the majority of our directors and officers are non-residents of the United States, and all or a substantial portion of the assets of these non-residents are located outside the United States. As a result, it may be difficult or impossible for someone to bring an action against us or against these individuals in the United States if they believe that their 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 them from enforcing a judgment against our assets or the assets of our directors or officers.

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 we conduct operations in countries around the world. Consequently, in the event of any bankruptcy, insolvency, liquidation, dissolution, reorganization or similar proceeding involving us or any of our subsidiaries, bankruptcy laws other than those of the United States could apply. If we become a debtor under U.S. bankruptcy law, 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 U.S. bankruptcy court would be entitled to, or accept, jurisdiction over such a bankruptcy case, or that courts in other countries that have jurisdiction over us and our operations would recognize a U.S. bankruptcy court's jurisdiction if any other bankruptcy court would determine it had jurisdiction.

We may have to pay tax on U.S. source income, which would reduce our earnings and cash flow.

Under the U.S. Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended, or the Code, 50% of the gross shipping income of a vessel owning or chartering corporation, such as ourselves and our subsidiaries, that is attributable to transportation that begins or ends, but that does not both begin and end, in the United States is characterized as U.S. source shipping income and such income is

14

Table of Contents

subject to a 4% U.S. federal income tax without allowance for any deductions, unless that corporation qualifies for exemption from tax under Section 883 of the Code and the Treasury regulations promulgated thereunder.

We believe that we qualify for this statutory exemption for our 2017 taxable year and we expect to so qualify for our subsequent taxable years. However, there are factual circumstances beyond our control that could cause us to lose the benefit of this tax exemption and thereby cause us to become subject to U.S. federal income tax on our U.S. source shipping income. For example, there is a risk that we could no longer qualify for exemption under Section 883 of the Code for a particular taxable year if “non-qualified” shareholders with a five percent or greater interest in our stock were, in combination with each other, to own 50% or more of the outstanding shares of our stock on more than half the days during the taxable year. Due to the factual nature of the issues involved, we can give no assurances on our tax-exempt status or that of any of our subsidiaries.

If we are not entitled to this exemption under Section 883 of the Code for any taxable year, we would be subject for such taxable year to a 4% U.S. federal income tax on our U.S. source shipping income on a gross basis. The imposition of this taxation could have a negative effect on our business and would result in decreased earnings and cash available for distribution to our shareholders and to pay amounts due on our Senior Notes.

U.S. tax authorities could treat us as a “passive foreign investment company,” which could have adverse U.S. federal income tax consequences to our U.S. shareholders.

A foreign corporation will be treated as a “passive foreign investment company,” or PFIC, for U.S. federal income tax purposes if either (1) at least 75% of its gross income for any taxable year consists of certain types of “passive income” or (2) at least 50% of the average value of the corporation’s assets produce or are held for the production of those types of “passive income,” including cash. 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 which 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 to third parties does not constitute “passive income.” U.S. shareholders of a PFIC are 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.

For our 2017 taxable year and subsequent taxable years, whether we will be treated as a PFIC will depend upon the nature and extent of our operations. In this regard, we intend to treat the gross income we derive or are deemed to derive from our time chartering activities as services income, rather than rental income. Accordingly, we believe that our income from our time chartering activities does not constitute “passive income,” and the assets that we own and operate in connection with the production of that income do not constitute passive assets. There is, however, no direct legal authority under the PFIC rules addressing our method of operation. Accordingly, no assurance can be given that the United States Internal Revenue Service, or IRS, or a court of law will accept our position, and there is a risk that the IRS or a court of law could determine that we are a PFIC. Moreover, no assurance can be given that we would not constitute a PFIC for any taxable year if there were to be changes in the nature and extent of our operations.

If we were treated as a PFIC for any taxable year, our U.S. shareholders may face adverse U.S. federal income tax consequences and information reporting obligations. Under the PFIC rules, unless those shareholders made an election available under the Code (which election could itself have adverse consequences for such shareholders), such shareholders would be liable to pay U.S. federal income tax upon excess distributions and upon any gain from the disposition of our common shares at the then prevailing income tax rates applicable to ordinary income plus interest as if the excess distribution or gain had been recognized ratably over the shareholder’s holding period of our common shares. See “Item 10. Additional Information - E. Taxation - U.S. Federal Income Tax Considerations - U.S. Federal Income Taxation of U.S. Holders - Passive Foreign Investment Company Status and Significant Tax Consequences” for a more comprehensive discussion of the U.S. federal income tax consequences to U.S. holders of our common shares if we are or were to be treated as a PFIC.

Risks Related to Our Relationship with the Scorpio Group and its Affiliates

We are dependent on our managers and their ability to hire and retain key personnel, and there may be conflicts of interest between us and our managers that may not be resolved in our favor.

Our success depends to a significant extent upon the abilities and efforts of our technical manager, Scorpio Ship Management S.A.M., or SSM, our commercial manager, Scorpio Commercial Management, or SCM, and our management team and upon our and our managers' ability to hire and retain key members of our and their management teams, respectively. The loss of any of these individuals could adversely affect our business prospects and financial condition. Difficulty in hiring and retaining personnel could adversely affect our results of operations. We do not maintain "key man" life insurance on any of our officers.

Table of Contents

Our technical and commercial managers are affiliates of the Scorpio Group, which is owned and controlled by the Lolli-Ghetti family, of which our founder, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Mr. Emanuele Lauro, and our Vice President, Mr. Filippo Lauro, are members. Conflicts of interest may arise between us, on the one hand, and our commercial and technical managers, on the other hand. These conflicts may arise in connection with the chartering, purchase, sale and operation of the vessels in our fleet versus vessels managed by other companies affiliated with our commercial or technical managers. In particular, as of the date of this annual report, our commercial and technical managers, which are operated by entities affiliated with Messrs. Lauro, provide commercial and technical management services to approximately 184 and 137 vessels, respectively, in addition to vessels in our fleet, and our commercial and technical managers may operate additional vessels that will compete with our vessels in the future. Such conflicts may have an adverse effect on our results of operations. In addition, certain members of the Scorpio Group may benefit from economies of scale, all of which may not be passed along to us.

Our Chief Executive Officer, President, Chief Operating Officer, Chief Financial Officer, Vice President and Secretary do not devote all of their time to our business, which may hinder our ability to operate successfully. Our Chief Executive Officer, President, Chief Operating Officer, Chief Financial Officer, Vice President and Secretary participate in business activities not associated with us, including serving as members of the management team of Scorpio Tankers Inc. (NYSE: STNG), or Scorpio Tankers, and are not required to work full-time on our affairs. We expect that each of our executive officers will continue to devote a substantial portion of their business time to the management of the Company. Additionally, our Chief Executive Officer, President, Chief Operating Officer, Vice President and Secretary serve in similar positions in other entities within the Scorpio Group. As a result, such executive officers may devote less time to us than if they were not engaged in other business activities and may owe fiduciary duties to both our shareholders as well as shareholders of other companies which they may be affiliated with, including Scorpio Tankers and Scorpio Group companies. This may create conflicts of interest in matters involving or affecting us and our customers and it is not certain that any of these conflicts of interest will be resolved in our favor. This could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition, results of operations and cash flows.

Our commercial and technical managers are each privately held companies and there is little or no publicly available information about them.

Our vessels are commercially managed by SCM and technically managed by SSM. SCM's and SSM's ability to render management services will depend in part on their own financial strength. Circumstances beyond our control could impair our commercial manager's or technical manager's financial strength, and because each is a privately held company, information about the financial strength of our commercial manager and technical manager is not available. As a result, we and our shareholders might have little advance warning of financial or other problems affecting our commercial manager or technical manager even though their financial or other problems could have a material adverse effect on us.

RISKS RELATED TO OUR INDEBTEDNESS

Servicing our current or future indebtedness limits funds available for other purposes and if we cannot service our debt, we may lose our vessels.

Borrowing under our credit facilities requires us to dedicate a part of our cash flow from operations to paying interest on our indebtedness under such facilities. These payments limit funds available for working capital, capital expenditures and other purposes, including further equity or debt financing in the future. Amounts borrowed under our credit facilities bear interest at variable rates. Increases in prevailing rates could increase the amounts that we would have to pay to our lenders, even though the outstanding principal amount remains the same, and our net income and cash flows would decrease. We expect our earnings and cash flow to vary from year to year due to the cyclical nature of the drybulk carrier industry. If we do not generate or reserve enough cash flow from operations to satisfy our debt obligations, we may have to undertake alternative financing plans, such as:

- seeking to raise additional capital;
- refinancing or restructuring our debt;
- selling drybulk carriers; or
- reducing or delaying capital investments.

However, these alternative financing plans, if necessary, may not be sufficient to allow us to meet our debt obligations. If we are unable to meet our debt obligations or if some other default occurs under our credit facilities, our lenders could elect to declare that debt, together with accrued interest and fees, to be immediately due and payable and proceed against the collateral vessels securing that debt.

Table of Contents

We are exposed to volatility in the London Interbank Offered Rate, or LIBOR, and have entered into derivative contracts, which can result in higher than market interest rates and charges against our income.

The loans under our secured credit facilities are generally advanced at a floating rate based on LIBOR, which has been stable, but was volatile in prior years, which can affect the amount of interest payable on our debt, and which, in turn, could have an adverse effect on our earnings and cash flow. In addition, although in recent years LIBOR has been at relatively low levels, LIBOR increased during 2016 and 2017 and may continue to rise in the future as the current low interest rate environment comes to an end. Our financial condition could be materially adversely affected despite entering into interest rate hedging arrangements to hedge our exposure to the interest rates applicable to our credit facilities. Moreover, our hedging strategies may not be effective and we may incur substantial losses.

We have entered, and may enter, into derivative contracts to hedge our overall exposure to interest rate risk exposure. Entering into swaps and derivatives transactions is inherently risky and presents various possibilities for incurring significant expenses. The derivatives strategies that we employ, and may employ, may not be successful or effective, and we could, as a result, incur substantial additional interest costs. Please see “Item 11. Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk - Interest Rate Risk.”

We may be adversely affected by the introduction of new accounting rules for leasing.

In early 2016, the U.S. accounting standard-setting board (the Financial Accounting Standards Board, or the FASB) issued new accounting guidance that would require lessees to record most leases on their balance sheets as lease assets and liabilities. Entities would still classify leases, but classification would be based on different criteria and would serve a different purpose than it does today. Lease classification would determine how entities recognize lease-related revenue and expense, as well as what lessors record on the balance sheet. Classification would be based on the portion of the economic benefits of the underlying asset expected to be consumed by the lessee over the lease term. Once adopted, the proposals would be expected generally to have the effect of bringing most off-balance sheet leases onto a lessee’s balance sheet as liabilities, which would also change the income and expense recognition patterns of those items. Financial statement metrics, including non-GAAP financial measures, such as leverage and capital ratios, as well as EBITDA and Adjusted EBITDA, may also be affected, even when cash flow and business activity have not changed. This may in turn affect covenant calculations under various contracts (such as loan agreements) unless the affected contracts are modified. The new standard will become effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2018, including interim periods within those fiscal years.

We are leveraged, which could significantly limit our ability to execute our business strategy and we may be unable to comply with our covenants in our credit facilities that impose operating and financial restrictions on us, which could result in a default under the terms of these agreements.

As of December 31, 2017, we had \$730.6 million of outstanding indebtedness under our credit facilities, financing obligation and debt securities.

Our credit facilities impose operating and financial restrictions on us, that limit our ability, or the ability of our subsidiaries party thereto, to:

- pay dividends and make capital expenditures if we do not repay amounts drawn under our credit facilities or if there is another default under our credit facilities;
- incur additional indebtedness, including the issuance of guarantees;
- create liens on our assets;
- change the flag, class or management of our vessels or terminate or materially amend the management agreement relating to each vessel;
- sell our vessels;
- merge or consolidate with, or transfer all or substantially all our assets to, another person; and/or
- enter into a new line of business.

Therefore, we may need to seek permission from our lenders in order to engage in some corporate actions. Our lenders’ interests may be different from ours and we may not be able to obtain our lenders’ permission when needed. This may limit our ability to pay dividends on our common shares and interest on our Senior Notes, finance our future operations or capital requirements, make acquisitions or pursue business opportunities.

In addition, our secured credit facilities require us to maintain specified financial ratios and satisfy financial covenants, including ratios and covenants based on the market value of the vessels in our fleet. Should our charter rates or vessel values materially decline in the future, we may seek to obtain waivers or amendments from our lenders with respect to such financial

Table of Contents

ratios and covenants, or we may be required to take action to reduce our debt or to act in a manner contrary to our business objectives to meet any such financial ratios and satisfy any such financial covenants. In 2016, we amended our credit facilities to reduce the minimum liquidity, interest coverage ratio and loan-to-value ratio covenants, as well as to amend the definition of net worth used in the leverage and net worth covenants. There can be no assurances that our lenders will grant any waivers or additional amendments in the future.

Events beyond our control, including changes in the economic and business conditions in the shipping markets in which we operate, may affect our ability to comply with these covenants. We cannot assure you that we will meet these ratios or satisfy these covenants or that our lenders will waive any failure to do so or amend these requirements. A breach of any of the covenants in, or our inability to maintain the required financial ratios under, our credit facilities would prevent us from borrowing additional money under our credit facilities and could result in a default under our credit facilities. If a default occurs under our credit facilities, the lenders could elect to declare the outstanding debt, together with accrued interest and other fees, to be immediately due and payable and foreclose on the collateral securing that debt, which could constitute all or substantially all of our assets. Moreover, in connection with any waivers or amendments to our credit facilities that we may obtain, our lenders may impose additional operating and financial restrictions on us or modify the terms of our existing credit facilities. These restrictions may further restrict our ability to, among other things, pay dividends, repurchase our common shares, make capital expenditures, or incur additional indebtedness.

Furthermore, our debt agreements contain cross-default provisions that may be triggered if we default under the terms of any one of our financing agreements. In the event of default by us under one of our debt agreements, the lenders under our other debt agreements could determine that we are in default under such other financing agreements. Such cross defaults could result in the acceleration of the maturity of such debt under these agreements and the lenders thereunder may foreclose upon any collateral securing that debt, including our vessels, even if we were to subsequently cure such default. In the event of such acceleration or foreclosure, we might not have sufficient funds or other assets to satisfy all of our obligations, which would have a material adverse effect on our business, results of operations and financial condition.

Please see “Item 5. Operating Financial Review and Prospects-B. Liquidity and Capital Resources-Credit Facilities, Finance Lease and Unsecured Notes.”

RISKS RELATING TO OUR COMMON SHARES

We are incorporated in the Marshall Islands, which does not have a well-developed body of corporate law.

Our corporate affairs are governed by our amended and restated articles of incorporation and bylaws and by the Marshall Islands Business Corporations Act, or 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 Marshall Islands interpreting the BCA. The rights and fiduciary responsibilities of directors under the laws 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 the United States. The rights of shareholders of companies incorporated in the Marshall Islands may differ from the rights of shareholders of companies incorporated in the United States. While the BCA provides that it is to be interpreted according to the laws of the State of Delaware and other states with substantially similar legislative provisions, there have been few, if any, court cases interpreting the BCA in the Marshall Islands and we cannot predict whether Marshall Islands courts would reach the same conclusions as U.S. courts. Thus, you may have more difficulty in protecting your interests in the face of actions by the management, directors or controlling shareholders than would shareholders of a corporation incorporated in a U.S. jurisdiction which has developed a relatively more substantial body of case law.

The market price of our common shares has fluctuated widely and may fluctuate widely in the future, or there may be no continuing public market for you to resell our common shares.

The market price of our common shares has fluctuated widely since our common shares began trading on the NYSE in December 2013, and may continue to do so as a result of many factors such as actual or anticipated fluctuations in our quarterly and annual results and those of other public companies in our industry, mergers and strategic alliances in the shipping industry, market conditions in the shipping industry, particularly the drybulk sector, changes in government regulation, shortfalls in our operating results from levels forecast by securities analysts, announcements concerning us

or our competitors and the general state of the securities market. Further, there may be no continuing active or liquid public market for our common shares.

If the market price of our common shares falls below \$5.00 per share, under NYSE rules, our shareholders will not be able to use such shares as collateral for borrowing in margin accounts. This inability to continue to use our common shares as collateral may lead to sales of such shares creating downward pressure on and increased volatility in the market price of our common shares.

Table of Contents

The shipping industry has been highly unpredictable and volatile. The market for common shares in this industry may be equally volatile. Therefore, we cannot assure you that you will be able to sell any of our common shares you may have purchased at a price greater than or equal to its original purchase price, or that you will be able to sell them at all. Future sales of our common shares could cause the market price of our common shares to decline.

Our amended and restated articles of incorporation authorize us to issue 112.5 million common shares, of which we have issued approximately 76.4 million common shares as of December 31, 2017. Sales of a substantial number of common shares in the public market, or the perception that these sales could occur, may depress the market price for our common shares. These sales could also impair our ability to raise additional capital through the sale of our equity securities in the future. We intend to issue additional common shares in the future. Our shareholders may incur dilution from any future equity offering and upon the issuance of additional common shares upon the exercise of options we grant to certain of our executive officers, or upon the issuance of additional common shares pursuant to our equity incentive plan.

Anti-takeover provisions in our organizational documents could have the effect of discouraging, delaying or preventing a merger or acquisition, or could make it difficult for our shareholders to replace or remove our current board of directors, which could adversely affect the market price of our common shares.

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

- authorizing our board of directors to issue “blank check” preferred stock without shareholder approval;
- providing for a classified board of directors with staggered, three-year terms;
- establishing certain advance notice requirements for nominations for election to our board of directors or for proposing matters that can be acted on by shareholders at shareholder meetings;
- prohibiting cumulative voting in the election of directors;
- limiting the persons who may call special meetings of shareholders;
- authorizing the removal of directors only for cause and only upon the affirmative vote of the holders of a majority of the outstanding common shares entitled to vote for the directors; and
- establishing super majority voting provisions with respect to amendments to certain provisions of our amended and restated articles of incorporation and bylaws.

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

ITEM 4. INFORMATION ON THE COMPANY

A. History and Development of the Company

Scorpio Bulkiers Inc. is an international shipping company that was incorporated in the Republic of the Marshall Islands pursuant to the BCA on March 20, 2013. In December 2013, we completed our underwritten initial public offering of 2,608,333 common shares at \$117.00 per share, and in January 2014, the underwriters in the initial public offering exercised their option to purchase an additional 391,250 common shares. In February 2014, we completed our offer to exchange unregistered common shares that were previously issued in Norwegian equity private placements (other than the common shares owned by affiliates of us) for common shares that were registered under the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, or the Securities Act, which we refer to as the Exchange Offer. Upon completion of the Exchange Offer, holders of 7,980,565 unregistered common shares validly tendered their shares in exchange for such registered common shares, representing a participation rate of 99.7%. On July 31, 2014, we delisted from the Norwegian Over-the-Counter List, or Norwegian OTC List. Our common shares are listed for trading on the New York Stock Exchange, or NYSE, under the symbol “SALT.”

Our principal executive offices are located at 9, Boulevard Charles III, Monaco 98000 and our telephone number at that location is +377-9798-5715.

B. Business Overview

We are an international shipping company that owns and operates the latest generation of newbuilding drybulk carriers with fuel-efficient specifications and carrying capacities of greater than 30,000 dwt. All of our owned vessels have carrying

19

Table of Contents

capacities of greater than 60,000 dwt. Our vessels transport a broad range of major and minor bulk commodities, including ores, coal, grains, and fertilizers, along worldwide shipping routes, and are employed primarily in the spot market or in spot market-oriented pools of similarly sized vessels. As of the date of this annual report, our operating fleet of 56 vessels consisted of 55 wholly-owned or finance leased drybulk vessels and one chartered-in drybulk vessel, which we refer to collectively as our “Operating Fleet” (see below table for details). We also have a contract for the construction of one newbuilding drybulk vessel, which is expected to be delivered to us in the middle of 2018 (see below table for details). Upon delivery of this vessel, our owned and financed leased fleet is expected to have a total carrying capacity of approximately 3.9 million dwt.

Our Fleet

The following tables set forth certain summary information regarding our Operating Fleet and vessel under construction as of the date of this annual report:

Operating Fleet**Owned and Finance Leased fleet**

Vessel Name	Year Built	DWT
Kamsarmax Vessels		
SBI Samba	2015	84,000
SBI Rumba	2015	84,000
SBI Capoeira	2015	82,000
SBI Electra	2015	82,000
SBI Carioca	2015	82,000
SBI Conga	2015	82,000
SBI Flamenco	2015	82,000
SBI Bolero	2015	82,000
SBI Sousta	2016	82,000
SBI Rock	2016	82,000
SBI Lambada	2016	82,000
SBI Reggae	2016	82,000
SBI Zumba	2016	82,000
SBI Macarena	2016	82,000
SBI Parapara	2017	82,000
SBI Mazurka	2017	82,000
SBI Swing	2017	82,000
SBI Jive	2017	82,000
Total Kamsarmax		1,480,000
Ultramax Vessels		
SBI Antares	2015	61,000
SBI Athena	2015	64,000
SBI Bravo	2015	61,000
SBI Leo	2015	61,000
SBI Echo	2015	61,000
SBI Lyra	2015	61,000
SBI Tango	2015	61,000
SBI Maia	2015	61,000
SBI Hydra	2015	61,000
SBI Subaru	2015	61,000
SBI Pegasus	2015	64,000
SBI Ursa	2015	61,000
SBI Thalia	2015	64,000
SBI Cronos	2015	61,000

SBI Orion	2015	64,000
SBI Achilles	2016	61,000
SBI Hercules	2016	64,000

20

Table of Contents

Vessel Name	Year Built	DWT
SBI Perseus	2016	64,000
SBI Hermes	2016	61,000
SBI Zeus	2016	60,200
SBI Hera	2016	60,200
SBI Hyperion	2016	61,000
SBI Tethys	2016	61,000
SBI Phoebe	2016	64,000
SBI Poseidon	2016	60,200
SBI Apollo	2016	60,200
SBI Samson	2017	64,000
SBI Phoenix	2017	64,000
SBI Gemini	2015	64,000
SBI Libra	2017	64,000
SBI Puma	2014	64,000
SBI Jaguar	2014	64,000
SBI Cougar	2015	64,000
SBI Aries	2015	64,000
SBI Taurus	2015	64,000
SBI Pisces	2016	64,000
SBI Virgo	2017	64,000
Total Ultramax		2,307,800
Aggregate Owned and Financed Leased DWT		3,787,800

Time chartered-in vessel

Vessel Type	Year Built	DWT	Where Built	Daily Base Rate	Earliest Expiry
Ultramax	2017	62,100	Japan	\$10,125	30-Sep-19 ⁽¹⁾
Aggregate Time Chartered-in DWT		62,100			

⁽¹⁾ This vessel has been time chartered-in for 22 to 24 months at the Company's option at \$10,125 per day. The Company has the option to extend this time charter for one year at \$10,885 per day.

In addition, we have a profit and loss sharing agreement in place for a Panamax vessel that we previously chartered in, pursuant to which we have agreed to split all the vessel's profits and losses for a two-year period that expires in the first quarter of 2019.

Vessel Under Construction

Kamsarmax Vessel

Vessel Name	Expected Delivery	DWT	Shipyard
Hull 2215 - TBN SBI Lynx	Q2-18	82,000	Jiangsu Yangzijiang Shipbuilding Co. Ltd.
Total Newbuilding DWT		82,000	

Employment of Our Fleet

We typically operate our vessels in spot market-oriented commercial pools, in the spot market or, under certain circumstances, on time charters.

Spot Market-Oriented Commercial Pools

To increase vessel utilization and thereby revenues, we participate in commercial pools with other shipowners with similar modern, well-maintained vessels. By operating a large number of vessels as an integrated transportation

system, commercial pools

21

Table of Contents

offer customers greater flexibility and a higher level of service while achieving scheduling efficiencies. Pools employ experienced commercial managers and operators who have close working relationships with customers and brokers, while technical management is performed by each shipowner. The managers of the pools negotiate charters with customers primarily in the spot market but may also arrange time charter agreements. The size and scope of these pools enable them to enhance vessel utilization rates for pool vessels by securing backhaul voyages, which is when cargo is transported on the return leg of a journey, and contracts of affreightment, or COAs, thus generating higher effective time charter equivalent, or TCE, revenues than otherwise might be obtainable in the spot market, while providing a higher level of service offerings to customers.

As of the date of this annual report, all of the vessels in our Operating Fleet are employed in one of the Scorpio Group Pools, which are spot market-oriented commercial pools managed by our commercial manager, which exposes us to fluctuations in spot market charter rates. In addition, we expect that the drybulk vessel that is currently under construction will be employed in a Scorpio Group Pool following its delivery to us. Our vessels participate in the Scorpio Group Pools under the same contractual terms and conditions as the third party vessels in the pool. Each pool aggregates the revenues and expenses of all of the pool participants and distributes the net earnings calculated on (i) the number of pool points for the vessel, which are based on vessel attributes such as cargo carrying capacity, fuel consumption, and construction characteristics, and (ii) the number of days the vessel operated in the period. SCM, a Monaco corporation controlled by the Lolli-Ghetti family of which our co-founder, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer is a member, as is our Vice President, is responsible for the administration of the pool and the commercial management of the participating vessels, including marketing the pool, negotiating charters, including voyage charters, short duration time charters and COAs, conducting pool operations, including the distribution of pool cash earnings, and managing bunker (fuel oil) purchases, port charges and administrative services for the vessels. SCM, as operator of the Scorpio Group Pools, charges \$300 a day for each vessel, whether owned by us or chartered-in, plus a 1.75% commission on the gross revenues per charter fixture. See “-Management of our Business” below.

The pool participants remain responsible for all other costs including the financing, insurance, manning and technical management of their vessels. The earnings of all of the vessels are aggregated and divided according to the relative performance capabilities of the vessel and the actual earning days each vessel is available.

Spot Market

A spot market voyage charter is generally a contract to carry a specific cargo from a load port to a discharge port for an agreed freight per ton of cargo or a specified total amount. Under spot market voyage charters, we pay specific voyage expenses such as port, canal and bunker costs. Spot charter rates are volatile and fluctuate on a seasonal and year-to-year basis.

Fluctuations derive from imbalances in the availability of cargoes for shipment and the number of vessels available at any given time to transport these cargoes. Vessels operating in the spot market generate revenue that is less predictable than those under time charters, but may enable us to capture increased profit margins during periods of improvements in drybulk vessel charter rates. Downturns in the drybulk industry would result in a reduction in profit margins.

Time Charters

Time charters give us a fixed and stable cash flow for a known period of time. Time charters also mitigate in part the volatility and seasonality of the spot market business, which is generally weaker in the second and third quarters of the year. We opportunistically employ vessels under time charter contracts. We may also enter into time charter contracts with profit sharing agreements, which enable us to benefit when the spot market rates increase.

Management of Our Business

On September 29, 2016, we agreed to amend our master agreement, or the Master Agreement, with SCM and SSM, and our administrative services agreement, or the Administrative Services Agreement, with Scorpio Services Holding Limited, or SSH, under a deed of amendment, or the Deed of Amendment. Pursuant to the terms of the Deed of Amendment, on December 9, 2016, we entered into definitive documentation to memorialize the agreed amendments to the Master Agreement, or the Amended and Restated Master Agreement. The Amended and Restated Master Agreement and the Administrative Services Agreement as amended by the Deed of Amendment, or the Amended Administrative Services Agreement, are effective as from September 29, 2016.

Pursuant to the Amended and Restated Master Agreement, effective beginning on the fifth day within any 20 trading day period that the closing price of our common shares on the NYSE is equal to or greater than \$5.00, the commission payable for commercial management would be reinstated to 1.75% of all monies earned by a vessel from 1%. As of close of trading on the NYSE on November 18, 2016, the condition was met and the commission payable for commercial management was reinstated to 1.75% of all monies earned by a vessel, effective November 19, 2016.

Table of Contents

In December 2017, we agreed to amend the Amended and Restated Master Agreement to amend and restate the technical management agreement thereunder subject to bank consents being obtained (where required), which were subsequently obtained. On February 22, 2018, we entered into definitive documentation to memorialize the agreed amendments to the Amended and Restated Master Agreement under a deed of amendment, or the Amendment Agreement. The Amended and Restated Master Agreement as amended by the Amendment Agreement, or the Revised Master Agreement, is effective as from January 1, 2018.

Pursuant to the Revised Master Agreement, the fixed annual technical management fee was reduced from \$200,000 to \$160,000, and certain services previously provided as part of the fixed fee are now itemized. The aggregate cost, including the costs that are now itemized, for the services provided under the technical management agreement do not materially differ from the annual management fee charged prior to the amendment.

Set forth below is a description of the other material terms of the Revised Master Agreement and the Amended Administrative Services Agreement. Please also see Note 14, Related Party Transactions, to the Consolidated Financial Statements included herein for additional information.

Commercial and Technical Management - Revised Master Agreement

Our vessels are commercially managed by SCM and technically managed by SSM pursuant to the Revised Master Agreement, which may be terminated by either party upon 24 months' notice, unless terminated earlier in accordance with the provisions of the Revised Master Agreement. In the event of the sale of one or more vessels, a notice period of three months' and a payment equal to three months of management fees will apply, provided that the termination does not amount to a change of control, including a sale of substantially all vessels, in which case a payment equal to 24 months of management fees will apply. SCM and SSM are companies affiliated with us. The vessel we charter-in is also commercially managed by SCM. We expect that additional vessels that we may charter-in or acquire in the future, and the drybulk vessel that is expected to be delivered to us during the middle of 2018, will also be managed under the Revised Master Agreement or on substantially similar terms as the Revised Master Agreement.

SCM's services include securing employment for our vessels in the spot market or on time charters. SCM also manages the Scorpio Group Pools in which our vessels are employed. For commercial management of any of our vessels that does not operate in one of these pools, we pay SCM a daily fee of \$300 per vessel, plus a 1.75% commission on the gross revenues per charter fixture. The Scorpio Group Pool participants, including us and third-party owners, are each expected to pay SCM a pool management fee of \$300 per vessel per day, plus a 1.75% commission on the gross revenues per charter fixture.

SSM's services include providing technical support, such as arranging the hiring of qualified officers and crew, supervising the maintenance and performance of vessels, purchasing supplies, spare parts and new equipment, arranging and supervising drydocking and repairs, and monitoring regulatory and classification society compliance and customer standards. We pay SSM an annual fee of \$160,000 plus charges for certain itemized services per vessel to provide technical management services for each of our owned vessels. In addition, representatives of SSM, including certain subcontractors, provide us with construction supervisory services while our vessels are being constructed in shipyards. For these services, we compensate SSM for its direct expenses, which can vary between \$200,000 and \$500,000 per vessel. Please see "Item 7. Major Shareholders and Related Party Transactions—B. Related Party Transactions—Commercial and Technical Management Agreements" for additional information.

Amended Administrative Services Agreement

In 2016, we entered into the Amended Administrative Services Agreement with SSH for the provision of administrative staff, office space and accounting, legal compliance, financial and information technology services. SSH is a company affiliated with us. The services provided to us by SSH may be sub-contracted to other entities within the Scorpio Group. Pursuant to the Amended Administrative Services Agreement, we reimburse SSH for the reasonable direct or indirect expenses it incurs in providing us with the administrative services described above. SSH also arranges vessel sales and purchases for us. We previously paid SSH a fee, payable in the Company's common shares, for arranging vessel acquisitions, including newbuildings. The amount of common shares payable was determined by dividing \$250,000 by the market value of our common shares based on the volume weighted average price of our common shares over the 30 trading day period immediately preceding the contract date of a definitive agreement to acquire any vessel. As of the date of this annual report, we issued an aggregate of 180,716

common shares to SSH in connection with the deliveries of newbuilding vessels. In November 2014, SSH agreed to waive its fee on vessel acquisitions contracted after November 20, 2014, for so long as the closing price of our common shares remained below a specified threshold. Effective September 29, 2016, pursuant to the terms of the Amended Administrative Services Agreement, we agreed with SSH to eliminate this fee on all future acquisitions.

Table of Contents

In addition, SSH has agreed with us not to own any drybulk carriers greater than 30,000 dwt for so long as the Amended Administrative Services Agreement is in full force and effect. This agreement may be terminated by SSH upon 12 months' notice or by us with 24 months' notice.

Recent and Other Developments

Vessel Acquisitions and Associated New Credit Facilities

During the fourth quarter of 2017, we acquired six Chinese built Ultramax dry bulk vessels for \$142.5 million in the aggregate (\$135.1 million in cash and \$7.4 million in stock). Three of the vessels were built in 2015, one was built in 2016, and two were built in 2017.

These acquisitions were funded in part by a senior secured credit facility for up to \$85.5 million, or the \$85.5 Million Credit Facility. The facility has a maturity date of February 15, 2023 and bears interest at LIBOR plus a margin of 2.85%. This facility is secured by, among other things, a first preferred mortgage on the six Ultramax vessels and guaranteed by each vessel owning subsidiary.

During the fourth quarter of 2017, we also acquired three Chinese built Ultramax dry bulk vessels for \$64.5 million in the aggregate (\$51.6 million in cash and \$12.9 million in stock). Two of the vessels were built in 2014 and one was built in 2015.

These acquisitions were funded in part by a senior secured credit facility for up to \$38.7 million, or the \$38.7 Million Credit Facility. The facility has a maturity date of December 13, 2022 and bears interest at LIBOR plus a margin of 2.85%. This facility is secured by, among other things, a first preferred mortgage on the three Ultramax vessels and guaranteed by each vessel owning subsidiary.

During the fourth quarter of 2017, we also entered into an agreement to purchase one Kamsarmax dry bulk vessel for \$25.5 million, of which \$18.8 million remains unpaid at December 31, 2017. The Kamsarmax bulk carrier is a resale unit that is expected to be delivered to us from Jiangsu New Yangzijiang Shipbuilding Co Ltd in China in the middle of 2018.

During the fourth quarter of 2017, we entered into a financing transaction regarding one of our Kamsarmax vessels with unaffiliated third parties involving the sale and leaseback of the SBI Rumba, a 2015 Japanese built Kamsarmax dry bulk vessel, for consideration of approximately \$19.6 million, or the \$19.6 Million Lease Financing. As part of the transaction, we have agreed to make monthly payments of \$164,250 under a nine and a half year bareboat charter agreement with the buyers, which we have the option to extend for a further six months. The cost of the financing is equivalent to an implied fixed interest rate of 4.23% for 10 years. The agreement also provides us with options to repurchase the vessel beginning on the fifth anniversary of the sale and until the end of the agreement.

For additional information regarding our credit facilities and other debt arrangements, please see "Item 5. Operating and Financial Review and Prospects—B. Liquidity and Capital Resources—Credit Facilities, Finance Lease and Unsecured Notes."

Share Repurchase Program

In September 2017, our board of directors authorized the repurchase of up to \$50.0 million of our common stock in open market or privately negotiated transactions. We repurchased approximately 1.5 million shares of our common stock pursuant to this share repurchase program in the fourth quarter of 2017 at a cost of approximately \$11.0 million, or at an average cost of \$7.51 per share, which was funded from our available cash resources. As of the date of this annual report, approximately \$39.0 million of the \$50.0 million authorized remains available. The specific timing and amounts of the repurchases will be in the sole discretion of management and may vary based on market conditions and other factors, but we are not obligated under the terms of the program to repurchase any of our common stock. The authorization has no expiration date.

Dividend

During the fourth quarter of 2017, our Board of Directors declared and we paid a quarterly cash dividend of \$0.02 per common share, totaling approximately \$1.5 million.

On February 5, 2018, our Board of Directors declared a quarterly cash dividend of \$0.02 per common share, payable on or about March 15, 2018, to shareholders of record as of February 15, 2018.

Our Customers

Table of Contents

We believe that developing strong relationships with the end users of our services allow us to better satisfy their needs with appropriate and capable vessels. All of our vessels are employed in Scorpio Group Pools, which are spot market-oriented commercial pools managed by our commercial manager, SCM. A prospective charterer's financial condition, creditworthiness, reliability and track record are important factors in negotiating our vessels' employment, which SCM evaluates on our behalf. We earned 42% and 58% of our revenue from the Scorpio Kamsarmax Pool and the Scorpio Ultramax Pool, respectively, during the year ended December 31, 2017, 40% and 60% of our revenue (including commissions from SCM) from the Scorpio Kamsarmax Pool and the Scorpio Ultramax Pool, respectively, during the year ended December 31, 2016, and 41%, 43%, and 8% of our revenue (including commissions from SCM) from the Scorpio Kamsarmax Pool, the Scorpio Ultramax Pool and the Scorpio Capesize Pool, respectively, during the year ended December 31, 2015.

Seasonality

We operate our vessels in markets that 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 drybulk carrier market is typically stronger in the fall and winter months in anticipation of increased consumption of coal and other raw materials in the northern hemisphere during the winter months. In addition, unpredictable weather patterns in these months may disrupt vessel scheduling and supplies of certain commodities. As a result, revenues of drybulk carrier operators in general have historically been weaker during the fiscal quarters ended June 30 and September 30, and, conversely, been stronger in fiscal quarters ended December 31 and March 31. This seasonality may materially affect our operating results and cash available for the payment of dividends.

Competition

We operate in markets that are highly competitive and based primarily on supply and demand. We compete for charters on the basis of price, vessel location, size, age and condition of the vessel, as well as on our reputation and that of our commercial manager. We compete primarily with other independent and state-owned drybulk vessel-owners. Our competitors may have more resources than us and may operate vessels that are newer, and therefore more attractive to charterers, than our vessels. Ownership of drybulk vessels is highly fragmented and is divided among publicly listed companies, state-controlled owners and private shipowners.

Industry and Market Conditions

The Drybulk Shipping Industry

Except as otherwise indicated, the statistical information and industry and market data contained in this section is based on or derived from statistical information and industry and market data collated and prepared by SSY Consultancy & Research Ltd ("SSY"). The data is based on SSY's review of such statistical information and market data available at the time (including internal surveys and sources, independent financial information, independent external industry publications, reports or other publicly available information). Due to the incomplete nature of the statistical information and market data available, SSY has had to make some estimates where necessary when preparing the data. The data is subject to change and may differ from similar assessments obtained from other analysts of shipping markets. Whilst reasonable care has been taken in the preparation of the data, SSY has not undertaken any independent verification of the information and market data obtained from published sources.

Industry Overview

Drybulk shipping mainly comprises the shipment of minerals, such as iron ore and coal, other industrial raw materials and various agricultural products. Of these, the major cargoes are iron ore, coal and grain. The remaining minor bulk cargoes include steel products, bauxite/alumina, nickel ore, cement, petroleum coke, forest products, fertilizers and non-grain agricultural products, such as sugar.

Charterers in the drybulk shipping industry range from cargo owners (such as mining companies and grain houses) to end-users (such as steel producers and power utilities) and also include a number of different trading companies and ship operators.

Total international seaborne drybulk trade is estimated to have reached a new annual record of approximately 4.52 billion tonnes in 2017. This represents an increase of an estimated 3.6% from the 2016 level and an estimated 20.1% from the 2012 level, which was marginally below the compound annual average growth rate, or CAGR, for the period 2012 to 2017. With the exception of 2009 when the global economy was in recession, seaborne drybulk trade has

recorded positive annual growth in every year since 1998. While the 2017 trade estimates set out in the table below will be subject to revision, as final trade statistics become available, SSY's current estimates indicate the biggest annual rise in seaborne trade volumes since 2014, albeit that this growth was unevenly distributed between the various dry bulk cargo types.

25

Table of Contents

World Seaborne Drybulk Trade

(million tonnes)

Cargo/Year	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2012-17 % Growth	CAGR
Major Bulks	2,611	2,824	2,998	2,992	3,083	3,185	22%	4%
Iron Ore	1,138	1,256	1,391	1,414	1,482	1,530	35%	6%
Coal	1,120	1,199	1,184	1,128	1,127	1,148	3%	1%
Grains	353	369	423	450	475	507	44%	8%
Minor Bulks	1,155	1,214	1,233	1,254	1,280	1,336	16%	3%
Total	3,766	4,038	4,230	4,245	4,363	4,521	20%	4%

Totals may not add due to rounding

Cargo Types

Iron ore: The key raw material for steelmaking, iron ore trade surged on the back of unprecedented Chinese import demand to be the single largest seaborne drybulk cargo, with annual volumes expanding more than three-fold since 2000 to an estimated 1,530 million tonnes, or Mt, in 2017. Last year saw the sequence of annual increases extended to 16 years with volumes up by an estimated 3.2% from 2016 and 34.5% from 2012. This was slower than the corresponding growth in world steel production, which rose by an estimated 5.3% in 2017 with increases in most of the main steel producing regions. In addition to China which, as described elsewhere in this section, has become the dominant importer accounting for over two-thirds of seaborne imports in 2017, the main import markets for iron ore are Japan, Western Europe and South Korea. Exports are dominated by Australia and Brazil, which together accounted for an estimated 82% of the seaborne market in 2017 with a large majority of their cargoes carried by Capesize vessels given the favorable unit economies. This market share has increased from 74% in 2012, mainly due to the introduction of additional Australian export capacity, with both countries recording new annual export records in 2017. Other iron ore exporters include Canada, India, South Africa and West Africa.

Coal: At an estimated 1,148 million tonnes in 2017, global seaborne coal trade increased by an estimated 1.9% from its 2016 level and represented the first year of positive annual growth since 2013. This compared with a CAGR of 1% for the entire five-year period from 2012 to 2017. Coal trade is comprised of two main categories: (1) steam coal (which is chiefly used for electricity generation, but also by industrial users, such as the cement industry) and (2) coking coal (a key input for blast furnace steelmaking). Both categories have experienced lower trade volumes since 2013, but steam coal trade is estimated to have rebounded to a three year high in 2017.

Although the import market for coal was historically dominated by import demand from Japan and Western Europe, the last decade has seen China and India emerge as key importers of both categories of coal. The leading exporter of coking coal is Australia, followed by the United States and Canada. Indonesia is the largest exporter of steam coal, ahead of Australia, the former Soviet Union, Colombia, South Africa and the United States.

Between 2005 and 2013, China transformed from a major steam coal exporting nation to the single largest importer, representing the strength of the country's domestic demand for power generation. However, imports represent a very small share (i.e. less than 10%) of coal consumption in China (which is the world's largest coal producer) and, as a result, imports have been subject to major fluctuations in response to changes in domestic market conditions. For example, in 2014 China recorded a sharp annual decline in steam coal imports, against the background of an oversupplied domestic coal market and government intervention to restrict imports. The rate of decline quickened in 2015, reducing the country's steam coal imports to a six-year low, before the downward trend was reversed in 2016 with both coking and steam coal imports increasing, mainly as a result of government-driven cuts in domestic coal production. Further Chinese government interventions aimed at managing the domestic coal market in 2017 contributed to some significant monthly variations in import volumes, but the combined annual total for coking and steam coal imports is estimated to be the highest since 2014.

India remained the single largest coal importer in 2017, even though its annual volumes have struggled to generate any growth since 2014, mainly due to rising domestic coal production. Japan, South Korea and Taiwan, together with Western Europe, remain major import markets, while South East Asia and Latin America have grown in importance as coal import generators. Although investments in new port facilities enabled the participation of Capesize vessels in

the Asia-led coal trade growth during the period from 2010 to 2013, it has chiefly benefitted demand for Panamax and Handymax vessels.

Table of Contents

Grains: Seaborne grain trade is comprised of wheat, coarse grains (corn, barley, oats, rye and sorghum) and soybeans/meal, which together totaled an estimated new record of 507 Mt in 2017, according to preliminary trade data. This was up by an estimated 6.9% from 2016 and compares with a CAGR of 7.5% for the period from 2012 to 2017, which is the highest of the major bulk cargoes. In addition, the grain trades remain an important source of freight market volatility due to both the seasonality of export flows and year-on-year variations in crop surpluses and deficits.

Soy is the largest of the three main categories of grain trade with Brazil, the United States and Argentina the leading export countries. The principal markets are in Europe and Far East Asia with China being the world's single largest soybean importer. Shipments are dominated by Panamax and Handymax vessels. Wheat and coarse grains are also primarily carried by mid-size vessels with the United States, Canada, Russia, Ukraine, Argentina, Brazil, Australia and the European Union the main exporting regions. In addition to Far East Asia and Europe, the Middle East, Africa and Latin America are all significant import markets.

Minor Bulks: A diversity of cargo types are covered under this heading with different sets of demand drivers. Nevertheless, together at approximately 1.34 billion tonnes per annum these trades represent a major source of employment for the smaller Handysize and Handymax vessels.

In recent years the pattern of minor bulk trade has been altered by government restrictions on the export of key industrial ores in South East Asia. This was led by an Indonesian ban on the export of unprocessed mineral ores beginning in January 2014, which reduced the country's combined exports of bauxite and nickel ore from 121 Mt in 2013 to zero in 2015 and 2016. Bauxite trade did benefit from a sharp increase in exports from Malaysia in 2015, but in early 2016 the Malaysian government announced a temporary suspension of domestic bauxite mining, which was subsequently extended until the end of 2017. This turned the focus of importers in China (the world's biggest bauxite market) to longer haul supplies, particularly from West Africa (where fronthaul cargoes are now predominantly carried by Capesize vessels). Since the beginning of 2017 the Indonesian government has moved to partially relax its ban on unprocessed mineral ore exports with limited volumes beginning to emerge onto the international market. However, uncertainties continue to surround the availability of South East Asian mineral ores with, for example, the government of the Philippines reported to be considering a ban on its nickel ore exports.

Despite these constraints, total minor bulk trade is estimated to have achieved a new annual record in 2017. The estimated CAGR for minor bulk trade volumes for the period from 2012 to 2017 was 3%.

Demand for Drybulk Shipping

Drybulk trade is a function of levels of (a) economic activity, (b) the industrialization/urbanization of developing countries, (c) population growth (plus changes in dietary habits) and (d) regional shifts in cargo supply/demand balances, which can occur, for example, due to the development of new export/import capacity or depletion/development of mineral reserves. The distances shipped chiefly reflect regional commodity surpluses and deficits. Generally, the more concentrated the sources of cargo supply, the greater the average distance shipped. Ship demand is determined by the overall volumes of cargo moved and the distance that these are shipped, or tonne-mile demand, as well as changes in vessel efficiency. These changes may be caused by such factors as (1) vessel speed (which will change in response to movements in fuel costs and freight market earnings); (2) port delays (which have been a common occurrence in the last 15 years as inland and port logistics in several key export areas struggled to meet surging global demand) and (3) laden to ballast ratios, or how much time vessels spend sailing empty on re-positioning voyages. Ballasting has also been on the increase over the last 10 to 15 years due to the widening imbalance in cargo flows between the Atlantic and Pacific Basins.

World seaborne drybulk trade followed a steady underlying upward trend during the 1980s and 1990s. CAGR in the major drybulk cargoes over this period was an estimated 2.5%, before accelerating sharply to 6.3% during the period from 2000 to 2009 and being sustained at an estimated 5.3% between 2010 and 2017.

The growth in drybulk trade volumes since 2000 has been primarily due to the rapid industrialization and urbanization of China. From approximately 130 Mt in 2000, Chinese drybulk imports have increased more than thirteen-fold, as illustrated in the chart below. Such an expansion was facilitated by investments in new mining and port facilities in key exporting areas around the world in response to Chinese-driven rises in commodity prices from 2004 to 2011.

The table below provides a more detailed comparison of China's drybulk imports from 2012 to 2017, which shows a new annual record last year with customs data indicating an increase in aggregate volumes of 122.0 Mt in 2017 to approximately 1,735 Mt. All of the major cargo types contributed to this growth, including new annual records for imports of iron ore, soybeans and several minor bulk cargoes (such as manganese ore and logs).

27

Table of Contents

Iron ore has been the leading source of growth in Chinese drybulk imports over the last five years. The 330 Mt increase in iron ore imports between 2012 and 2017 reflects not only increases in domestic steel production (and, therefore, iron ore consumption) to meet the needs of an industrializing and urbanizing economy, as well as exports of steel products, but also the substitution of higher-quality imported iron ore for lower-quality domestic supplies and increases in port stocks. Consequently, iron ore imports have grown more rapidly than Chinese steel production over the last five years and now account for a large majority of Chinese iron ore consumption.

Growth in China's iron ore trades has mainly been to the benefit of Capesize vessels, hauling cargoes from West Australia and Brazil. Australia and Indonesia are the primary sources of Chinese coal imports, while in the grain trades increased Chinese demand for soybeans from Latin America and the United States has boosted tonne-mile demand for Panamax and Supramax vessels.

Bauxite (the main raw material for the aluminum industry) was the single largest category of minor bulk cargo imported by China in 2017, at 68.8 Mt, which was 32% above the annual total in 2016 and the second highest year on record. This growth was dominated by Guinea, which overtook Australia as the biggest bauxite supplier to China. There was some resumption in imports from Indonesia, which had been the leading source of Chinese bauxite imports prior to 2014, but volumes remained modest by historical standards and are estimated to have accounted for less than 2% of last year's annual total. Chinese buyers of nickel ore have had greater difficulty in finding alternatives to lost Indonesian supplies with total annual nickel ore imports falling from 71.2 Mt in 2013 to 31.9 Mt in 2016, before a partial rebound to 35.0 Mt in 2017.

Chinese Drybulk Imports (Million Tonnes)

	2012	2016	2017	CAGR
Iron Ore	745.5	1,024.7	1,075.4	+8%
Coal*	288.0	255.7	271.1	(1)%
Bauxite/Alumina	45.1	55.1	71.6	+10%
Grains	72.4	105.1	121.2	+11%
Other**	180.4	172.1	195.4	+2%
Total of above	1,331.4	1,612.7	1,734.7	+5%

* Includes lignite, which is excluded from SSSY's estimates for seaborne coal trade and categorized as a minor bulk.

** Includes mineral ores (such as nickel), pulp/wood chip/logs and petroleum coke.

Source: Chinese Customs

Outside of China, most of the additional growth in drybulk cargo import demand during the past five years has been generated by other Asian economies. For example, and despite setbacks since 2014, Indian coal imports in 2017 were estimated to be more than 35 Mt higher than their corresponding level in 2012, reflecting the strength of demand from electricity generators and the cement and steel industries. Although India has added several Capesize coal import terminals in recent years, a majority of the coal cargoes arriving in the country are shipped by Supramax, Panamax and Kamsarmax vessels. More established Asian import markets, such as Japan and South Korea, have also contributed to the region's import growth with their combined imports of coal and iron ore increasing by 34 Mt between 2012 and 2017.

In contrast, European mineral imports have staged only a partial recovery from their cyclical lows in 2009 and have remained below their 2007 totals, partly due to slow economic growth in the Eurozone, but also policy driven changes in the region's energy mix away from coal. Consequently, Far East Asia's share of world seaborne major bulk imports is estimated to have climbed above 78% from approximately 60% in the middle of the last decade and 53% to 54% in 2000.

As a result, the fastest drybulk trade growth has been seen within the Pacific Basin, which has been supplemented by increases in front-haul trade from the Atlantic to the Pacific (chiefly iron ore on Capesize vessels and grains on Panamax and Supramax).

Table of Contents

Drybulk Global Fleet

The cargoes outlined above are predominantly carried by drybulk carriers of more than 10,000 dwt. Drybulk carriers are single-decked ships that transport dry cargoes in “bulk” form, that is loose within cargo holds, rather than in bags, crates or on pallets.

As of the end of December 2017, the total fleet of 10,000+ dwt drybulk carriers numbered approximately 10,688 vessels of 807.2 million deadweight tonnes, or Mdw.

Table of Contents

This fleet is divided into four principal size segments: Handysize (10,000-39,999 dwt), Handymax (40,000-64,999 dwt), Panamax (65,000-99,999 dwt) and Capesize (100,000+dwt). Aside from size, the main distinction between drybulk vessel types is whether they are geared (that is, equipped with cranes for loading/discharge) or gearless. The main characteristics of these four vessel types are summarized below, while the table below summarizes the current structure of the fleet by age and size. It shows that in terms of deadweight capacity, the Capesize sector is the largest with 40.2% of the end-of-December 2017 total, followed by Panamaxes at 25.0%, Handymaxes at 23.7% and Handysizes at 11.2%.

Handysize (10,000-39,999 dwt): These ships carry the widest range of cargoes of any drybulk size segment and are the most dependent on the minor bulks for employment. They are usually equipped with cargo-handling gear (cranes or derricks) and are widely used on routes to and from draft-restricted ports that (a) cannot receive larger ships and (b) often lack their own land-based cargo-handling equipment. Many such loading or discharge facilities are located in the developing nations. Due to the limited economies of scale that these vessels offer, compared to larger tonnage vessels, many of these ships are extensively employed on intra-regional, shorter-haul trades. Special designs of ship are associated with the carriage of such cargoes as steel products and logs, or open-hatch and log-fitted vessels; while some variants also exist in terms of cargo-handling equipment, such as grab-fitted tonnage possessing scoops that facilitate unloading of certain cargo types.

Handymax (40,000-64,999 dwt): This segment of the drybulk carrier fleet contains three distinct sub-categories - the traditional Handymax size (40,000-49,999 dwt), the Supramax size (50,000-59,999 dwt) and the Ultramax size (60,000-64,999 dwt). There are some Ultramax newbuilding designs of above 65,000 dwt, but as these are much fewer in number than existing gearless vessels of 65-69.9 kdwt, they currently fall in SSY's Panamax size range. Despite their increased size, these vessels retain a high degree of trading flexibility as their cargo gear enables them to load and/or discharge at ports with limited facilities. They are more widely deployed on longer-haul routes than are Handysizes (due to the greater scale economies that they offer). Whereas the traditional Handymax types have gained market share from the sub-40,000 dwt fleet of Handysizes over the past 20 years, the new generation of Supramax and Ultramax vessels are also competing for business on Panamax routes.

Panamax (65,000-99,999 dwt): The strict definition of a Panamax bulk carrier is a ship able to transit the Panama Canal fully laden. However, in recent years this definition has become blurred as (1) only a minority of the vessels in this size range pass through the Panama Canal in any 12-month period and (2) the opening of an additional trade lane with a new set of locks in mid-2016 expanded the Panama Canal's dimensions to enable the transit of ships of maximum beam, or extreme vessel breadth, of 49 meters, maximum length overall, or LOA, of 366 meters and maximum draft of 15.2 meters tropical fresh water, or TFW. This compares with the pre-existing, and still operational, locks which can accommodate ships to a maximum of 32.3 meters beam, 294.1 meters LOA and 12 meters TFW draft. For these reasons SSY's fleet definition stretches from 65,000 to 99,999 dwt, encompassing three main sub-types: traditional Panamaxes (70,000-79,999 dwt), Kamsarmaxes (82,000-83,000 dwt, which prior to the enlargement were the largest bulk carrier to transit the Panama Canal fully laden) and post-Panamaxes (85,000-99,999 dwt). The base load demand for these vessel types is provided by coal and grain cargoes, although they also participate in a number of other trades (including iron ore, bauxite and fertilizers). Only a small minority of vessels in this size range are equipped with cargo gear as most of the ports served have well developed cargo loading or discharge terminals.

Capesize (100,000+ dwt): These ships are almost exclusively deployed in the iron ore and coal trades, which benefit most from their scale economies, but over the past two years have also participated in the bauxite trades from West Africa. There are three main sub-types: small Capes (100,000-119,999 dwt), standard Capes (160,000-209,999 dwt, which are mainly concentrated between 170,000 dwt and 180,000 dwt, but also include Newcastlemaxes of 200,000-209,999 dwt) and Very Large Ore Carriers (220,000 dwt and above). In recent years the average size of these Very Large Ore Carriers has been increasing, through the serial ordering of 400,000 dwt and 325,000 dwt designs.

Drybulk Carrier Fleet by Size/Age (Million Dwt):

As of December 31, 2017

Built/Dwt	10-39,999	40-64,999	65-99,999	100,000+	Total
Pre-1993	4.5	3.6	2.5	4.2	14.8
1993-97	6.5	9.6	8.4	15.5	40.0
1998-02	7.3	14.2	22.7	13.9	58.1
2003-07	8.9	23.2	30.0	42.3	104.3
2008-12	37.6	77.0	76.4	155.7	346.6
2013-17	25.4	63.4	61.7	92.8	243.3
Total Fleet	90.2	191.0	201.6	324.3	807.2
Average Age	10 Yrs	8 Yrs	8 Yrs	7 Yrs	8 Yrs

Table of Contents

Totals may not add due to rounding

Ownership

Unlike other specialist areas of the world shipping fleet, ownership in the drybulk segment is highly fragmented, with SSY's database showing approximately 2,000 different owners. The largest 50 owners account for approximately 34% of the fleet in terms of deadweight carrying capacity, but this includes a large number of Chinese-flagged vessels that will trade on domestic as well as international routes.

While such analysis will tend to understate levels of market concentration, due to the operation of vessel pools and chartered in fleets, the drybulk segment is sufficiently competitive to ensure that vessel spot market earnings are extremely responsive to fluctuations in the supply/demand balance globally and regionally.

Supply of Drybulk Shipping

The supply of drybulk carriers is fundamentally determined by the delivery of new vessels from the world's shipbuilding industry and the removal of older vessels, mainly through demolition.

Newbuilding deliveries not only reflect the demand from ship owners for new tonnage, but also available shipyard capacity. Following a sharp upswing in demand for new vessels in all of the main sectors of the commercial shipping industry during the last decade, and an accompanying rise in shipbuilding prices to record levels in 2007 to 2008, there was a massive China-led expansion in world shipbuilding capacity. In the case of the drybulk sector, annual newbuilding deliveries surged from 24.4 Mdwton in 2008 (and an average of 19.1 Mdwton per annum. between 2000 and 2007, inclusive) to 44.3 Mdwton in 2009, 79.7 Mdwton in 2010 and a peak of 100.0 Mdwton in 2012.

The resulting impact on freight market balances and vessel earnings, as described elsewhere in this section, led to sharply-reduced levels of drybulk carrier ordering in 2011 and 2012, which led to a slower pace of newbuilding deliveries in 2013 at an estimated 61.6 Mdwton followed by a further slowdown to 47.7 Mdwton in 2014.

There was an increase in drybulk carrier newbuilding investments during 2013, which continued into 2014 and reversed the downward trend in the newbuilding orderbook. These orders were focused on new, more fuel-efficient ship designs, for which shipyard descriptions offer significantly lower fuel consumption compared with existing vessels through a combination of new technology main engines and refinements of hull forms.

The rising costs of bunker fuels between 2004 and 2012 are illustrated in the chart below, which is based on the 58,238 dwt Supramax vessel specifications used by the Baltic Exchange in constructing its daily Supramax Index. Using estimated bunker prices in Singapore, SSY's calculations assume that at a speed of 14.0 knots the vessel consumes 33 tonnes of 380 centiStokes, or cst, fuel oil per day laden and 32 tonnes per day in ballast. This shows an increase at sea, at full speed, from approximately \$5,600 per day in 2004 to approximately \$21,700 per day in 2012. Reflecting the general decline in world oil prices, annual average bunker fuel costs for SSY's Supramax example fell from approximately \$18,200 per day in 2014 to approximately \$7,500 per day in 2016. A partial rebound in global oil prices from the lows of early 2016 lifted estimated Supramax bunkering costs to an average of approximately \$10,600 per day in 2017 and by December last year daily bunkering costs had risen above \$12,000 per day. However, SSY stresses that (1) there is a wide variance in individual vessel fuel consumptions, even within the same size segments, and (2) as described earlier in this section, vessels have been operating at slower speeds in order to lower their daily fuel consumption and costs.

Reflecting the increased ordering of more fuel-efficient vessels, there was a small net rise in drybulk carrier newbuilding deliveries in 2015 to 48.7 Mdwton, but the downward trend resumed in 2016 and the annual newbuilding delivery total in 2017 of 38.3 Mdwton was the lowest since 2008.

After a sharp reduction in new drybulk carrier ordering in 2015 and 2016, in response to the deterioration in freight market conditions, there was some revival in the contracting of new vessels in 2017 as vessel earnings firmed. At an estimated 81.7 Mdwton, the total tonnage on order at the end of December 2017 represented approximately 10.1% of the existing fleet, compared with 9.8% at the end of December 2016. The latter was the lowest end-year share since 2002 and compared with an estimated 15.7% as of the end of 2015 and year-end highs of 56.1% in 2007, 57.3% in 2009 and 67.6% in 2008, as illustrated in the chart below.

The table below summarizes the confirmed drybulk carrier orderbook as of the end of December 2017, by vessel size and scheduled year of delivery. These delivery dates can be subject to delay with, for example, 2017 deliveries an estimated 28%

31

Table of Contents

below the scheduled total as of January 1, 2017. This compared with a corresponding average rate of slippage from scheduled delivery dates in the previous five years of approximately 35.2%.

Drybulk Carrier Newbuilding Orderbook by Size Range (Million Dwt): As of December 31, 2017

Delivery	10-39,999	40-64,999	65-99,999	100,000+	Total
2018	3.6	6.8	7.5	15.2	33.1
2019	1.9	3.3	6.2	17.5	28.8
2020	0.5	0.9	3.4	7.7	12.5
2021+	0	0	0.2	7.1	7.3
Total	6.0	11.0	17.2	47.5	81.7
% of Fleet	6.6%	5.8%	8.5%	14.6%	10.1%

Totals may not add due to rounding

Table of Contents

Typically drybulk carriers are scrapped between the ages of 25 and 30 years, but the removal of vessels of 20-24 years is common during periods of freight market weakness, and there have also been examples of scrapping of 15-19 year-old vessels (especially in the larger-sized vessels). In 2017, the average age of Handysize vessels scrapped was 30 years, whereas for Handymax, Panamax and Capesize vessels it was 22 years. However, demolition is not simply a function of the fleet's age profile. Several factors will influence an owner's decision on whether to scrap older vessels, notably (1) actual and anticipated returns from the charter market, (2) the relative running costs of the vessel, (3) prospective expenditure at classification society surveys (which, as well as general costs of repair and maintenance can be impacted by new regulations, such as the International Maritime Organization's convention on Ballast Water Management, where effective implementation for existing vessels is now scheduled to enter force in September 2019) and (4) the second-hand re-sale value (that is, whether it provides a premium to scrap). For much of the period from 2000 to 2009, returns from the drybulk charter markets supported continued investment in vessel life extension, and scrapping volumes fell to minimal levels. This, however, ensured an accumulation of older tonnage in the fleet and, as a result, demolition proved extremely responsive to a deterioration in freight market conditions. For instance, deletions from the drybulk fleet rose from 3.6 MdwT in 2008 to 14.7 MdwT in 2009 and reached a new annual record of 35.4 MdwT in 2012. Over the last five years, scrapping volumes have remained very reactive to changes in vessel earnings with, for example, deletions dropping to a 7-year low of 14.0 MdwT in 2017 from approximately 30.0 MdwT per annum in both 2015 and 2016.

As the chart below illustrates, historically high levels of ship demolition contributed to a marked slowdown in the rate of drybulk carrier net fleet growth in 2015 and 2016 with the estimated 2.3% rise in 2016 representing the lowest annual percentage increase since the 1990s. There was some re-acceleration in fleet supply growth in 2017 with an estimated net rise in total drybulk tonnage of 3.1% between January 1 and December 31. However, this remained well below the rapid rates of expansion over the five year period from 2009 to 2013 when the total drybulk fleet grew at an annual average of 11.3% per annum.

Demolition has also contributed to the uneven development of drybulk carrier fleet supply over the past five years. In particular, the removal of elderly Handysize vessels, combined with the relatively modest newbuilding program in this sector compared with the other sizes, ensured that the 10,000-39,999 dwt Handysize fleet grew at an estimated CAGR of 1.3% between 2012 and 2017, compared with 5.2% for 40,000-64,999 dwt Handymaxes, 4.2% for 65,000-99,999 dwt Panamaxs and 3.1% for 100,000+ dwt Capes. Since the end of 2012, the Handysize sector's share of total dwt capacity has fallen from an estimated 12.5% to 11.2% as of the end of December 2017. By contrast, the same period saw an increased share of the fleet accounted for by 40,000-64,999 dwt Handymaxes, rising from 22.0% to 23.7%, and 65,000-99,999 dwt Panamaxs, from 24.3% to 25.0%, while the 100,000+ dwt Capesize sector recorded a net decline, from 41.2% to 40.2%.

Despite the demolition of recent years, there remained approximately 14.8 MdwT of ships aged 25 years or older in the drybulk carrier fleet as of the end of December 2017, with an additional 40.0 MdwT aged 20 to 24 years and 58.1 MdwT aged 15

Table of Contents

to 19 years. The highest concentration of vessels 20+ years old was in the Handysize sector, accounting for 12.2% of dwt capacity in this size range as of the end of December 2017, compared with 6.9% of Handymaxes, 5.4% of Panamaxs and 6.1% of Capesizes.

Charter Market & Freight Rates

The chartering of drybulk vessels can take several different forms, the most typical of which are summarized below.

(a) Single voyage (“spot”) charter

This involves the hire of a vessel for just one stipulated voyage, carrying a designated quantity of a named commodity. For most such charters, an individual ship is specified that will carry out the voyage to be undertaken. The terms of the agreement between the charterer and vessel owner usually define the port (or ports) of cargo loading and discharge, the dates between which the cargo is to be loaded, and the cargo-handling terms. The vessel owner will receive from the charterer a mutually agreed-upon payment (normally quoted as a US\$ per ton freight rate). In return, the ship owner pays all voyage expenses (such as the costs of fuel consumed on the voyage, plus port expenses), all operating costs (such as insurance and crewing of the vessel), and capital expenses (such as the servicing of any mortgage debt on the ship).

(b) Contract of affreightment, or COA

Under a COA, the vessel owner and charterer agree to terms for the carriage of a designated volume of a given commodity on a specified route (or routes), with such shipments being carried out on a regular basis. The agreement does not normally identify an individual ship that will be used to fulfill its terms, but includes more general specifications on the vessels to be used (such as maximum age). Under the terms of a COA, freight is normally paid on a mutually agreed-upon US\$ per ton basis, with the vessel owner then meeting all voyage, operating and capital costs incurred in the execution of such a charter.

(c) Time charter

Under a time charter, the charterer takes the ship on hire for either (1) a trip between designated delivery and re-delivery positions or (2) for a designated period (for example, 12 months). The freight rate agreed upon between the ship owner and charterer is in terms of a daily hire rate (in US dollars), rather than as a US\$ per ton figure. For longer term period charters, this may escalate at a rate mutually agreed upon between vessel owner and charterer. Under the terms of such charters, the vessel owner meets the ship’s operating and capital costs, with the charterer paying all variable voyage expenses (mainly fuel costs, plus port and canal dues). In addition, and unless otherwise stipulated in the charter agreement, the period charterer is able to trade the vessel to and from whichever loading and discharge ports that it may choose, carrying whichever cargoes they prefer.

(d) Bareboat charter

Table of Contents

Under a bareboat charter, the vessel owner effectively relinquishes control of its ship to the charterer (usually for a period of several years). The ship owner receives an agreed-upon level of remuneration (which may again escalate at a mutually agreed-upon rate) for the duration of the charter, and remains responsible for the vessel's capital costs. In return, the charterer assumes total control of the vessel, thereby becoming responsible for operating the ship and meeting all costs of such operation (such as crewing, repairs and maintenance), as well as the direct voyage expenses incurred (such as fuel costs and port expenses) when it is trading.

Freight Rates

Freight rates are determined by the balance of tonnage demand and tonnage supply. Primarily as the result of record newbuilding deliveries, fleet utilization rates have dropped sharply from the peak levels of 2007, as illustrated by movements in key freight market indicators.

Given the diversity of routes and cargoes traded by the drybulk fleet, freight market measures tend to focus on average worldwide spot earnings (expressed in US\$ per day). The most recognized of these measures are published on a daily basis by the Baltic Exchange in London. In addition to global averages for standard designs of Handysize (28,000 dwt), Supramax (58,328 dwt), Panamax (74,000 dwt) and Capesize (180,000 dwt) vessels, together with a number of component routes, the Baltic Exchange also publishes a daily composite Index for the entire drybulk market (the BDI or Baltic Exchange Dry Index).

From its all-time high of almost 12,000 points in May 2008, just prior to the global financial crisis, the BDI fell to below 700 points in December of the same year. After partial recovery in 2009, negative pressure on freight markets returned under the weight of sustained fleet supply growth. At 920 points in 2012, the BDI's annual average was a 26-year low. A combination of sharply reduced fleet supply, generally slower vessel speeds and new peaks for dry bulk trade lifted the 2013 annual average of the BDI to 1,206 points. Yet, despite continued spot market volatility, the corresponding 2014 level slipped to 1,105 points and spot market weakness intensified in 2015, chiefly due to a sharp slowdown in drybulk trade growth, with the BDI's annual average falling to 718 points. This was followed by new daily (290 points) and monthly (307 points) lows in February 2016, when weak global steel production, disruptions to cargo availability and lower bunker prices, together with negative seasonal factors, all contributed to the further weakening in the freight market.

From these record lows, the BDI did rebound to an average of 994 points in the fourth quarter of 2016, but this could not prevent 2016 from recording the BDI's lowest annual average since its inception in 1985 at 673 points. However, 2017 did see the first rise in the BDI's annual average for four years, to 1,145 points, and at 1,509 points the fourth quarter average was the highest quarterly average since the fourth quarter of 2013. Volatility remained a feature of drybulk spot markets in 2017 with the BDI fluctuating between a low of 685 points and a high of 1,743 points.

The first of the charts below traces developments in representative 12-month charter rates for the four main vessel sizes from January 2002 to the end of December 2017, encompassing the all-time highs in vessel earnings and the subsequent slump in rates. The second chart looks in more detail at developments since the beginning of 2012. It shows the Capesize-led rebound from mid-2013 to the first quarter of 2014 and subsequent slide to the depressed levels in the first quarter of 2016 before a partial revival during the second half of 2016 and the further increases observed in 2017, which saw period rates rise to their highest levels since 2014. These assessments are based on existing modern (that is, under 10 years of age) vessels. Within these individual size ranges, period rates will vary according to such factors as vessel age, size, fuel consumption and yard of build.

Although both charts show the extent to which vessel earnings in the different size ranges move broadly in tandem, they also highlight that the sharpness of market rises and falls vary in degree. Those size groups that carry the narrowest range of cargoes, or those employed on the least number of routes, tend to experience the greatest variations in charter rates. Hence, in the drybulk shipping sector, earnings of Capesizes have been prone to fluctuate to a far greater degree than those of smaller vessels (with their greater trading versatility, assisted by the cargo gear on these vessel types).

Table of Contents

Asset Values

In addition to the global balance between the demand for new vessels and available shipbuilding capacity, newbuilding prices are also influenced by changes in vessel construction costs, due to such factors as movements in steel plate prices or exchange rates against the U.S. dollar in key shipbuilding nations (principally China, Japan and South Korea).

Panamax bulk carrier newbuilding prices in Japan peaked at \$56.0 million in the third quarter of 2008 and subsequently fell to \$29.0 million in the final quarter of 2012. By the end of 2013 Japanese prices had climbed to a 38-month high of \$35.0 million, chiefly as the result of recovering newbuilding demand, and remained at similar levels through much of 2014. However, prices entered a downward trend in 2015 which continued into 2016 and, by the final quarter of last year, Japanese Panamax

Table of Contents

newbuilding prices reached their lowest level since 2003 at an estimated \$23.5 million. During 2017 there was a partial rebound in Japanese prices to an estimated \$26.5 million at the end of December 2017.

Second-hand values are primarily shaped by actual and anticipated earnings, newbuilding replacement costs (which are relevant for modern vessels) and residual scrap value (more relevant for older units). To an extent, prices are also influenced by the availability and cost of ship financing, as this will help to determine whether investors are able to realize their demand for new or second-hand vessels.

The charts below compare the development of representative newbuilding, five-year old and ten-year old second-hand prices for Handysize, Handymax, Panamax and Capesize vessels since 2002. Individual vessel prices vary according to such factors as specific size, age, cargo gear, yard of build and fuel consumption. Following the pattern of the charter markets, prices peaked between mid-2007 and mid-2008. Such was the shortage of shipbuilding capacity during that period, with a lengthening lead time between contracting and delivery, that demand for existing vessels with prompt delivery briefly created the unusual situation where second-hand vessels were priced at a premium to newbuildings.

Consequently, the percentage decline in second-hand prices between 2008 and 2012 was more severe than for newbuildings. Prices showed a firmer trend from the beginning of 2013 to March 2014, when five-year old values rose by an average of approximately 50%, led by a 60-70% increase in Capesize prices. The onset of generally weaker spot and period charter rates began to erode second-hand values during the latter months of 2014, and downward pressure intensified during 2015 and into 2016, sharply reducing prices. By the end of February 2016, Panamax five-year old prices of approximately \$11.0 million were at their lowest since the 1980s. However, from these lows, second-hand prices have shown a significant improvement, with Panamax five-year old values reaching approximately \$14.0 million at the end of 2016 and approximately \$20.5 million in December 2017. There were similar percentage rises in Supramax five-year old prices over the same period, while Capesize and Handysize values are estimated to have shown smaller, but still substantial, percentage increases.

Table of Contents

38

Table of Contents

Environmental and Other Regulations

Government regulation significantly affects the ownership and operation of our fleet. We are subject to international conventions and treaties and national, state and local laws and regulations relating to safety and health and environmental protection in force in the countries in which our vessels may operate or are registered. These regulations include requirements relating to the storage, handling, emission, transportation and discharge of hazardous and non-hazardous materials, and the remediation of contamination and liability for damage to natural resources. Compliance with such laws, regulations and other requirements may entail significant expense, including vessel modifications and implementation of certain operating procedures.

A variety of government, quasi-governmental and private organizations subject our vessels to both scheduled and unscheduled inspections. These entities include the local port authorities (applicable national authorities such as the United States Coast Guard, or USCG, harbor master or equivalent), classification societies; flag state administrations (countries of registry) and charterers, particularly terminal operators. Certain of these entities require us to obtain permits, licenses, certificates and other authorizations for the operation of our vessels. Failure to maintain necessary documents or approvals could require us to incur substantial costs or result in the operation of one or more of our vessels being temporarily off-hire.

We believe that the heightened level of environmental and quality concerns among insurance underwriters, regulators and charterers is leading to greater inspection and safety requirements on all vessels and may accelerate the scrapping of older vessels throughout the industry. Increasing environmental regulations have created a demand for vessels that conform to stricter environmental standards. We are required to maintain operating standards for all of our vessels that emphasize operational safety, quality maintenance, continuous training of our officers and crews and compliance with United States and international regulations. We believe that the operation of our vessels will be in compliance with applicable environmental laws and regulations and that our vessels will have all material permits licenses, certificates or other authorizations necessary for the conduct of our operations. However, because such laws and regulations frequently change and may impose increasingly stricter requirements, we cannot predict the ultimate cost of complying with these requirements, or the impact of these requirements on the resale value or useful lives of our vessels. In addition, a future serious marine incident that causes significant adverse environmental impact, such as the 2010 BP plc Deepwater Horizon oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico, could result in additional legislation or regulations that could negatively affect our profitability.

International Maritime Organization

The International Maritime Organization, the United Nations agency for maritime safety and the prevention of pollution by ships, or the IMO, has adopted the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973, as modified by

Table of Contents

the related Protocol of 1978 and updated through various amendments, which we refer to collectively as MARPOL. MARPOL entered into force on October 2, 1983. It has been adopted by over 150 nations, including many of the jurisdictions in which our vessels operate.

MARPOL is broken into six Annexes, each of which regulates a different source of pollution. Annex I relates to oil leakage or spilling; Annexes II and III relate to harmful substances carried, in bulk, in liquid or packaged form, respectively; Annexes IV and V relate to sewage and garbage management, respectively; and Annex VI, which was separately adopted by the IMO, relates to air pollution by ship emissions, including greenhouse gases.

In 2012, the IMO's Marine Environment Protection Committee, or MEPC, adopted by resolution amendments to the international code for the construction and equipment of ships carrying dangerous chemicals in bulk, or the IBC Code. The provisions of the IBC Code are mandatory under MARPOL and SOLAS. These amendments pertain to revised international certificates of fitness for the carriage of dangerous chemicals in bulk and identifying new products that fall under the IBC Code. We may need to make certain financial expenditures to comply with these amendments.

In 2013 the MEPC adopted by resolution amendments to the MARPOL Annex I Condition Assessment Scheme, CAS. These amendments pertain to revising references to the survey of bulk carriers and tankers after the 2011 ESP Code, which enhances the programs of inspections, becomes mandatory. We may need to make certain financial expenditures to comply with these amendments.

Air Emissions

In September of 1997, the IMO adopted Annex VI to MARPOL to address air pollution. Effective May 2005, Annex VI set limits on nitrogen oxide emissions from ships whose diesel engines were constructed (or underwent major conversions) on or after January 1, 2000. It also prohibits "deliberate emissions" of "ozone depleting substances," defined to include certain halons and chlorofluorocarbons. "Deliberate emissions" are not limited to times when the ship is at sea; they can for example include discharges occurring in the course of the ship's repair and maintenance. Emissions of "volatile organic compounds" from certain vessels, and the shipboard incineration (from incinerators installed after January 1, 2000) of certain substances (such as polychlorinated biphenyls, PCBs) are also prohibited.

Amended Annex VI seeks to further reduce air pollution by, among other things, implementing a progressive reduction of the amount of sulfur contained in any fuel oil used on board ships. On October 27, 2016, at its 70th session, MEPC 70, MEPC announced its decision concerning the implementation of regulations mandating a reduction in sulfur emissions from the current 3.5% to 0.5% as of the beginning of 2020. By 2020 ships will now have to either reduce sulfur from emissions through the installation and use of emission scrubbers or buy fuel with lower sulfur content. Consequently, complying with MEPC 70 could result in a significant capital expenditure or a significant increase in the cost of bunkers. The Company is currently reviewing alternatives to comply with MEPC 70 when it enters into force.

Sulfur content standards are even stricter within certain Emission Control Areas or ECAs. As of January 1, 2015, ships operating within an ECA may not use fuel with sulfur content in excess of 0.10%, which may cause additional costs to incur. Amended Annex VI established procedures for designating new ECAs. The Baltic and North Seas, certain coastal areas of North America and the United States Caribbean Sea are all within designated ECAs. If other ECAs are approved by the IMO or other new or more stringent requirements relating to emissions from marine diesel engines or port operations by vessels are adopted by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, or the EPA, or the states where we operate, compliance with these regulations could entail significant capital expenditures, operational changes, or otherwise increase the costs of our operations.

At MEPC 70 and MEPC 71, the MEPC approved the North Sea and Baltic Sea as ECAs for nitrogen oxides, effective January 1, 2021. It is expected that these areas will be formally designated after the draft amendments are presented at MEPC's next session. The EPA promulgated equivalent (and in some sense stricter) emissions standards in late 2009. At the MEPC meeting held from March to April 2014, amendments to Annex VI were adopted which address the date on which Tier III Nitrogen Oxide (NOx), standards in ECAs will go into effect. Under the amendments, Tier III NOx standards apply to ships that operate in North American and U.S. Caribbean Sea ECAs designed for the control of NOx with a marine diesel engine installed and constructed on or after January 1, 2016. Tier III requirements could apply to areas that will be designated for Tier III NOx in the future. We cannot assure you that the jurisdictions in which the vessels we may acquire may operate will not adopt more stringent emissions standards independent of the

IMO.

As of January 1, 2013, MARPOL made mandatory certain measures relating to energy efficiency for ships. Under these measures, by 2025, all new ships built will be 30% more energy efficient than those built in 2014. This included the requirement that all new ships utilize the Energy Efficiency Design Index, or EEDI, and all ships develop and implement Ship Energy Management Plans, or SEEMPs.

40

Table of Contents

We believe that all our vessels will be compliant in all material respects with these regulations. Additional or new conventions, laws and regulations may be adopted that could require the installation of expensive emission control systems and could adversely affect our business, results of operations, cash flows and financial condition.

Ballast Water Management

The IMO adopted the BWM Convention, in February 2004. 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. All ships will also have to carry a ballast water record book and an International Ballast Water Management Certificate. The BWM Convention entered into force on September 8, 2017. As of mid-December 2017, 67 countries, representing 74.9% of world tonnage, have ratified the BWM Convention.

Many of the implementation dates in the BWM Convention have already passed, so now that the BWM Convention has entered into force, the period of installation of mandatory ballast water exchange requirements would be extremely short, with several thousand ships a year needing to install ballast water management systems, or BWMS. For this reason, on December 4, 2013, the IMO Assembly passed a resolution revising the application dates of the BWM Convention so that they are triggered by the entry into force date and not the dates originally in the BWM Convention. This, in effect, makes all vessels constructed before the entry into force date "existing vessels" and allows for the installation of a BWMS on such vessels at the first International Oil Pollution Prevention renewal survey following entry into force of the convention. At MEPC 70, MEPC adopted updated "guidelines for approval of ballast water managements systems (G8)." AT MEPC 71, the schedule regarding the BWM Convention's implementation dates was also discussed and amendments were introduced to extend the date after which existing vessels are subject to certain ballast water standards.

Once mid-ocean ballast exchange and/or ballast water treatment system requirements become mandatory, the cost of compliance could increase for ocean carriers and the costs of ballast water treatment systems may be material.

However, many countries already regulate the discharge of ballast water carried by vessels from country to country to prevent the introduction of invasive and harmful species via such discharges. The United States for example, requires vessels entering its waters from another country to conduct mid-ocean ballast exchange, or undertake some alternate measure, and to comply with certain reporting requirements. Although the costs of such compliance could be material, it is difficult to predict the overall impact of such a requirement on our operations.

Safety Management System Requirements

The IMO has also adopted SOLAS and the LL Convention, which impose a variety of standards that regulate the design and operational features of ships. The IMO periodically revises the SOLAS and LL Convention standards. The Convention on Limitation of Liability for Maritime Claims, LLMC, was recently amended effective June 8, 2015. The amendments alter the limits of liability for loss of life or personal injury claims and property claims against ship owners. We believe that all our vessels will be in substantial compliance with SOLAS and LL Convention standards. Our operations are also subject to environmental standards and requirements under Chapter IX of SOLAS set forth in the ISM Code. The ISM Code requires the owner of a vessel, or any person who has taken responsibility for operation of a vessel, 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. We rely upon the safety management system that we and our technical manager have developed for compliance with the ISM Code. The failure of a ship owner or bareboat charterer to comply with the ISM Code 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.

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 the ISM Code requirements for a safety management system. No vessel can obtain a safety management certificate under the ISM Code unless its manager has been awarded a document of compliance, issued by classification societies under the authority of each flag state. SSM has or will obtain documents of compliance for their offices and will obtain safety management certificates for all of our vessels for which the certificates are required by the IMO. The document of compliance and safety management certificate are renewed every five years, but the document of compliance is subject to audit verification annually and the safety management certificate at least every 2.5 years.

The flag state, as defined by the United Nations Convention on Law of the Sea, has overall responsibility for implementing and enforcing a broad range of international maritime regulations with respect to all ships granted the right to fly its flag. The “Shipping Industry Flag State Performance Table” published annually by the International Chamber of Shipping evaluates and reports on flag states based on factors such as ratification, implementation, and enforcement of principal international maritime

Table of Contents

treaties and regulations, supervision of statutory ship surveys, and participation at IMO and ILO meetings. All of our vessels are or will be flagged in the Marshall Islands or Liberia. Marshall Islands and Liberian flagged vessels have historically received a good assessment in the shipping industry. We recognize the importance of a credible flag state and do not use flag states with poor performance indicators. Noncompliance with the ISM Code or other IMO regulations may subject the ship owner or bareboat charterer 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. The USCG and European Union authorities have indicated that vessels not in compliance with the ISM Code by the applicable deadlines will be prohibited from trading in U.S. and European Union ports, respectively. Each of our vessels will be ISM Code certified. However, there can be no assurance that such certificate will be maintained. Recent action by the IMO's Maritime Safety Committee and United States agencies indicate that cybersecurity regulations for the maritime industry are likely to be further developed in the near future in an attempt to combat cybersecurity threats. For example, cyber-risk management systems must be incorporated by ship-owners and managers by 2021. This might cause companies to cultivate additional procedures for monitoring cybersecurity, which could require additional expenses and/or capital expenditures. However, the impact of such regulations is hard to predict at this time.

Noncompliance with the ISM Code and other IMO regulations will subject the shipowner or bareboat charterer to increased liability, may lead to decreases in, or invalidation of, available insurance coverage for affected vessels and will result in the denial of access to, or detention in, some ports.

Pollution Control and Liability Requirements

The IMO has negotiated international conventions that impose liability for oil pollution in international waters and the territorial waters of the signatory to such conventions. Many countries have ratified and follow the liability plan adopted by the IMO and set out in the International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage of 1969, as amended by different Protocol in 1976, 1984, and 1992, and amended in 2000, or the CLC. Under this convention, and depending on whether the country in which the damage results is a party to the 1992 Protocol to the CLC, a vessel's registered owner is strictly liable for pollution damage caused in the territorial waters of a contracting state by discharge of persistent oil, subject to certain exceptions. The right to limit liability is forfeited under the CLC where the spill is caused by the ship owner's actual fault and under the 1992 Protocol where the spill is caused by the ship owner's intentional or reckless act or omission where the ship owner knew pollution damage would probably result. The CLC requires ships covered by it to maintain insurance covering the liability of the owner in a sum equivalent to an owner's liability for a single incident. We believe that our protection and indemnity insurance will cover the liability under the plan adopted by the IMO.

The IMO adopted the International Convention on Civil Liability for Bunker Oil Pollution Damage, or the Bunker Convention, to impose strict liability on ship owners for pollution damage in jurisdictional waters of ratifying states caused by discharges of bunker fuel. The Bunker Convention requires registered owners of ships over 1,000 gross tons 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). With respect to non-ratifying states, liability for spills or releases of oil carried as fuel in ship's bunkers typically is determined by the national or other domestic laws in the jurisdiction where the events or damages occur.

IMO regulations also require owners and operators of vessels to adopt shipboard oil pollution emergency plans and/or shipboard marine pollution emergency plans for noxious liquid substances in accordance with the guidelines developed by the IMO.

The IMO continues to review and introduce new regulations. It is impossible to predict what additional regulations, if any, may be passed by the IMO and what effect, if any, such regulations may have on our operations.

The U.S. Oil Pollution Act of 1990 and Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act The U.S. Oil Pollution Act of 1990, or OPA, established an extensive regulatory and liability regime for the protection and cleanup of the environment from oil spills. 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. The United States has also enacted the

Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, or CERCLA, which applies to the discharge of hazardous substances other than oil except in limited circumstances, whether on land or at sea. United States regulations require owners and operators of vessels to adopt and implement a United States specific Vessel Response Plan (VRP) to manage emergency situations, including oil spills, should they occur in United States ports. OPA and CERCLA both define “owner and operator” in the case of a vessel as any person owning,

Table of Contents

operating or chartering by demise, the vessel. OPA applies to oil tankers (which are not operated by us), as well as non-tanker ships that carry fuel oil, or bunkers, to power such ships. CERCLA also applies to our operations. Under OPA, vessel owners and operators 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 threatened discharges of oil from their vessels. OPA defines these other damages broadly to include:

- injury to, destruction or loss of, or loss of use of, natural resources and the costs of assessment thereof;
- injury to, or economic losses resulting from, the destruction of real and personal property;
- net loss of taxes, royalties, rents, fees or net profit revenues resulting from injury, destruction or loss of real or personal property, or natural resources;
- loss of subsistence use of natural resources that are injured, destroyed or lost;
- lost profits or impairment of earning capacity due to injury, destruction or loss of real or personal property or natural resources;
- net cost of increased or additional public services necessitated by removal activities following a discharge of oil, such as protection from fire, safety or health hazards.

OPA contains statutory caps on liability and damages; such caps do not apply to direct cleanup costs. Effective December 21, 2015, the USCG adjusted the limits of OPA liability for non-tank vessels, edible oil tank vessels, and any oil spill response vessels, to the greater of \$1,100 per gross ton or \$939,800 (subject to periodic adjustment for inflation). These limits of liability do not apply if an incident was proximately caused by the violation of an applicable U.S. federal safety, construction or operating regulation by a responsible party (or its agent, employee or a person acting pursuant to a contractual relationship), or a responsible party’s gross negligence or willful misconduct. The limitation on liability similarly does not apply if the responsible party fails or refuses to (i) report the incident where the responsible party knows or has reason to know of the incident; (ii) reasonably cooperate and assist as requested in connection with oil removal activities; or (iii) without sufficient cause, comply with an order issued under the Federal Water Pollution Act (Section 311 (c), (e)) or the Intervention on the High Seas Act.

CERCLA contains a similar liability regime whereby owners and operators of vessels are liable for cleanup, removal and remedial costs, as well as damage for injury to, or destruction or loss of, natural resources, including the reasonable costs associated with assessing same, and health assessments or health effects studies. There is no liability if the discharge of a hazardous substance results solely from the act or omission of a third party, an act of God or an act of war. Liability under CERCLA is limited to the greater of \$300 per gross ton or \$5 million for vessels carrying a hazardous substance as cargo and the greater of \$300 per gross ton or \$500,000 for any other vessel. These limits do not apply (rendering the responsible person liable for the total cost of response and damages) if the release or threat of release of a hazardous substance resulted from willful misconduct or negligence, or the primary cause of the release was a violation of applicable safety, construction or operating standards or regulations. The limitation on liability also does not apply if the responsible person fails or refused to provide all reasonable cooperation and assistance as requested in connection with response activities where the vessel is subject to OPA.

OPA and CERCLA both require owners and operators of vessels to establish and maintain with the USCG evidence of financial responsibility sufficient to meet the maximum amount of liability to which the particular responsible person may be subject. Vessel owners and operators may satisfy their financial responsibility obligations by providing a proof of insurance, a surety bond, qualification as a self-insurer or a guarantee. We plan to comply with the USCG’s financial responsibility regulations by providing a certificate of responsibility evidencing sufficient self-insurance. We currently maintain pollution liability coverage insurance in the amount of \$1.0 billion per incident for each of our vessels. If the damages from a catastrophic spill were to exceed our insurance coverage it could have an adverse effect on our business and results of operations.

The 2010 Deepwater Horizon oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico may also result in additional legislative or regulatory initiatives, including the raising of liability caps under OPA or more stringent operational requirements. For example, the U.S. Bureau of Safety and Economic Enforcement, or BSEE, issued final drilling safety rules for offshore oil and gas operations that strengthens the requirements for safety equipment, well control systems, and blowout prevention practices, and proposed rules to revise existing federal regulations regarding oil and gas production safety systems to

address technological advances. A new rule issued by the U.S. Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, or BOEM, that increased the limits of liability of damages for offshore facilities under OPA based on inflation took effect in January 2015. In December 2015, the BSEE announced a new pilot inspection

Table of Contents

program for offshore facilities. Compliance with any new requirements of OPA may substantially impact our cost of operations or require us to incur additional expenses to comply with any new regulatory initiatives or statutes. Additional legislation or regulations applicable to the operation of the vessels we may acquire that may be implemented in the future could adversely affect our business. If the damages from a catastrophic spill were to exceed our insurance coverage it could have an adverse effect on our business and results of operation.

OPA specifically permits individual states to impose their own liability regimes with regard to oil pollution incidents occurring within their boundaries, provided they accept, at a minimum, the levels of liability established under OPA, and some states have enacted legislation providing for unlimited liability for oil spills. Furthermore, many U.S. states that border a navigable waterway have enacted environmental pollution laws that impose strict liability on a person for removal costs and damages resulting from a discharge of oil or a release of a hazardous substance. These laws may be more stringent than U.S. federal law. Moreover, some states have enacted legislation providing for unlimited liability for discharge of pollutants within their waters. Yet, in some cases, states which have enacted this type of legislation have not yet issued implementing regulations defining vessel owners' responsibilities under these laws. We cannot predict what additional requirements, if any, may be enacted and what effect, if any, such requirements may have on our operations.

Other Environmental Initiatives

The CWA prohibits the discharge of oil or other substances in U.S. navigable waters unless authorized by a duly-issued permit or exemption, and imposes strict liability in the form of penalties for any unauthorized discharges. The CWA also imposes substantial liability for the costs of removal, remediation and damages and complements the remedies available under OPA and CERCLA. The EPA and USCG have enacted rules relating to ballast water discharge, compliance with which requires 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 costs, and/or otherwise restrict our vessels from entering U.S. waters. The EPA regulates the discharge of ballast water and other substances in U.S. waters under the CWA. EPA regulations require vessels 79 feet in length or longer (other than commercial fishing and recreational vessels) to comply with a Vessel General Permit, or VGP, that authorizes ballast water discharges and other discharges incidental to the operation of vessels. For a new vessel delivered to an owner or operator to be covered by the VGP, the owner must submit a Notice of Intent, or NOI, at least 30 days before the vessel operates in U.S. waters. The VGP imposes technology and water-quality based effluent limits for certain types of discharges and establishes specific inspection, monitoring, record keeping and reporting requirements to ensure the effluent limits are met. The VGP contains numeric ballast water discharge limits for most vessels to reduce the risk of invasive species in U.S. waters and stringent requirements for exhaust gas scrubbers and requires the use of environmentally acceptable lubricants. In October 2015, the Second Circuit Court of Appeals issued a ruling that directed the EPA to redraft the sections of the 2013 VGP that address ballast water. However, the Second Circuit stated that 2013 VGP will remain in effect until the EPA issues a new VGP.

The USCG, regulations adopted under the U.S. National Invasive Species Act, or NISA, also impose mandatory ballast water management practices for all vessels equipped with ballast water tanks entering or operating in U.S. waters. As of June 21, 2012, the USCG adopted revised ballast water management regulations that established standards for allowable concentrations of living organisms in ballast water discharged from ships in U.S. waters. The USCG must approve any technology before it is placed on a vessel.

As of January 1, 2014, vessels are technically subject to the phasing-in of these standards. As a result, the USCG has granted extensions to vessels which cannot install the as-yet unapproved technology. The EPA, on the other hand, has taken a different approach to enforcing ballast discharge standards under the VGP. On December 27, 2013, the EPA issued an enforcement response policy in connection with the new VGP in which the EPA indicated that it would take into account the reasons why vessels do not have the requisite technology installed, but will not grant any waivers. 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 these USCG and state regulations could have an adverse impact on the commercial operation of our vessels.

USCG has set up requirements for ships constructed before December 1, 2013 with ballast tanks trading with exclusive economic zones of the U.S. to install water ballast treatment systems as follows: (1) ballast capacity 1,500-5,000m³-first scheduled drydock after January 1, 2014; and (2) ballast capacity above 5,000m³-first scheduled drydock after January 1, 2016. All our vessels have ballast capacities over 5,000m³, and those of our vessels trading in the U.S. will have to install water ballast treatment plants at their first drydock after January 1, 2016.

Compliance with the EPA and the USCG regulations 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, or may otherwise restrict our vessels from entering U.S. waters. While we believe that our vessels have been fitted with systems that will comply with the standards, those systems may not be approved. If they are not approved it could

Table of Contents

have an adverse material impact on our business, financial condition, and results of operations depending on the available ballast water treatment systems and the extent to which existing vessels must be modified to accommodate such systems. In addition, certain states have enacted more stringent discharge standards as conditions to their required certification of the VGP. It presently remains unclear how the ballast water requirements set forth by the EPA, the USCG, and IMO BWM Convention, some of which are in effect and some which are pending, will co-exist. The U.S. Clean Air Act of 1970, as amended by the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1977 and 1990, or the CAA, requires the EPA to promulgate standards applicable to emissions of volatile organic compounds and other air contaminants. The CAA also requires states to adopt State Implementation Plans, or SIPs, designed to attain national health-based air quality standards in primarily major metropolitan and/or industrial areas. Several SIPs regulate emissions resulting from vessel loading and unloading operations which may affect our vessels.

The United States is currently experiencing changes in its environmental policy, the results of which have yet to be fully determined. For example, in April 2017, the President of the United States signed an executive order regarding the environment that targets the U.S. offshore energy strategy, which affects parts of the maritime industry.

European Union Regulations

In October 2009, the European Union amended a directive to impose criminal sanctions for illicit ship-source discharges of polluting substances, including minor discharges, if committed with intent, recklessly or with serious negligence and the discharges individually or in the aggregate result in deterioration of the quality of water. Aiding and abetting the discharge of a polluting substance may also lead to criminal penalties. The directive applies to all types of vessels, irrespective of their flag, but certain exceptions apply to warships or where human safety or that of the ship is in danger.

The European Union has implemented regulations requiring vessels to use reduced sulfur content fuel for their main and auxiliary engines. The European Union Directive 2005/EC/33 (amending Directive 1999/32/EC) introduced requirements parallel to those in Annex VI relating to the sulfur content of marine fuels. In addition, the European Union imposed a 0.1% maximum sulfur requirement for fuel used by ships at berth in European Union ports, lasting until 2020.

The European Union has adopted several regulations and directives requiring, among other things, more frequent inspections of high-risk ships, as determined by type, age, flag, and the number of times the ship has been detained. The European Union also adopted and then extended a ban on substandard ships and enacted a minimum ban period and a definitive ban for repeated offenses. The regulation also provided the European Union with greater authority and control over classification societies, by imposing more requirements on classification societies and providing for fines or penalty payments for organizations that failed to comply.

Greenhouse Gas Regulation

Currently, the emissions of greenhouse gases from international shipping are not subject to the Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which entered into force in 2005 and pursuant to which adopting countries have been required to implement national programs to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

International negotiations are continuing with respect to a successor to the Kyoto Protocol, which set emission reduction targets through 2012 and has been extended with new targets through 2020 pending negotiation of a new climate change treaty that would take effect in 2020. Restrictions on shipping emissions may be included in any new treaty. In December 2009, more than 27 nations, including the United States and China, signed the Copenhagen Accord, which includes a non-binding commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The 2015 United Nations Convention on Climate Change Conference in Paris resulted in the Paris Agreement, which entered into force on November 4, 2016. The Paris Agreement does not directly limit greenhouse gas emissions from ships. On June 1, 2017, the President of the United States announced that it is withdrawing from the Paris Agreement. The timing and effect of such action has yet to be determined.

The IMO may implement market-based mechanisms to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from ships at an upcoming MEPC session. As of January 1, 2013, ships were required to comply with new MEPC mandatory requirements to address greenhouse gas emissions from ships (as discussed above). For 2020, the European Union made a unilateral commitment to reduce overall greenhouse gas emissions from its member states from 20% of 1990 levels. The European Union also committed to reduce its emissions by 20% under the Kyoto Protocol's second period, from 2013

to 2020. In April 2015, a regulation was adopted requiring that large ships (over 5,000 gross tons) calling at European Union ports from January 2018 collect and publish data on carbon dioxide emissions and other information. In the United States, the EPA has issued a finding that greenhouse gases endanger the public health and safety, has adopted regulations to limit greenhouse gas emissions from certain mobile sources and has proposed regulations to limit greenhouse gas

45

Table of Contents

emissions from large stationary sources. Although the mobile source emissions regulations do not apply to greenhouse gas emissions from vessels, the EPA has received petitions from the California Attorney General and environmental groups to regulate greenhouse gas emissions from ocean-going vessels. Furthermore, in the United States individual states can also enact environmental regulations. For example, California has introduced caps for greenhouse gas emission and, in the end of 2016, signaled it might take additional actions regarding climate change.

Any passage of climate control legislation or other regulatory initiatives by the IMO, European Union, the United States or other countries where we operate, or any treaty adopted at the international level to succeed the Kyoto Protocol or Paris Agreement, that restrict emissions of greenhouse gases could require us to make significant financial expenditures which we cannot predict with certainty at this time. Even in the absence of climate control legislation, our business may be indirectly affected to the extent that climate change may result in sea level changes or more intense weather events.

International Labour Organization

The International Labour Organization (ILO) is a specialized agency of the UN with headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland. The ILO has adopted the Maritime Labor Convention 2006, or MLC 2006. A Maritime Labor Certificate and a Declaration of Maritime Labor Compliance will be required to ensure compliance with the MLC 2006 for all ships above 500 gross tons in international trade. The MLC 2006 came into force on August 20, 2013. Amendments to MLC were adopted in 2014 and 2016. We are in compliance with MLC 2006.

Vessel 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, the MTSA came into effect. To implement certain portions of the MTSA, in July 2003, the USCG issued regulations requiring the implementation of certain security requirements aboard vessels operating in waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and at certain ports.

Similarly, in December 2002, amendments to SOLAS created a new chapter of the convention dealing specifically with maritime security. The new Chapter XI-2 became effective in July 2004 and imposes various detailed security obligations on vessels and port authorities, and mandates compliance with the International Ship and Port Facility Security Code, or the ISPS Code. The ISPS Code is designed to enhance the security of ports and ships against terrorism. After July 1, 2004, to trade internationally, a vessel must attain an International Ship Security Certificate, or ISSC, from a recognized security organization approved by the vessel's flag state. The following are among the various requirements, some of which are found in SOLAS:

- on-board installation of automatic identification systems to provide a means for the automatic transmission of safety-related information from among similarly equipped ships and shore stations, including information on a ship's identity, position, course, speed and navigational status;

- on-board installation of ship security alert systems, which do not sound on the vessel but only alert the authorities on shore;

- the development of a ship security plan;

- ship identification number to be permanently marked on a vessel's hull;

- a continuous synopsis record kept onboard showing a vessel's history including the name of the ship, the state whose flag the ship is entitled to fly, the date on which the ship was registered with that state, the ship's identification number, the port at which the ship is registered and the name of the registered owner(s) and their registered address; and

- compliance with flag state security certification requirements.

Any vessel operating without a valid certificate may be detained at port until it obtains an ISSC, or it may be expelled from port, or refused entry at port. Amendments to SOLAS Chapter VII, made mandatory in 2004, apply to vessels transporting dangerous goods and require those vessels be in compliance with the International Maritime Dangerous Goods Code, or IMDG Code. Starting in January 1, 2016, the IMDG Code also includes updates to the provisions for radioactive material, reflecting the latest provisions from the IAEA, new marking requirements for "overpack" and "salvage" and updates to various individual packing requirements. The IMO has also adopted the International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers, or STCW. The STCW had a transitional period which ended on January 1, 2017 and which mandated certain requirements for security training,

and certifications. Flag states that have ratified SOLAS and STCW generally employ

46

Table of Contents

the classification societies, which have incorporated SOLAS and STCW requirements into their class rules, to undertake surveys to confirm compliance.

The USCG regulations, intended to align with international maritime security standards, exempt from MTSA vessel security measures non-U.S. vessels provided such vessels have on board a valid ISSC that attests to the vessel's compliance with SOLAS security requirements and the ISPS Code. Our managers intend to implement the various security measures addressed by MTSA, SOLAS and the ISPS Code, and we intend that our fleet will comply with applicable security requirements.

Surveys by Classification Societies

Every oceangoing 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 and/or to the regulations of the country concerned.

For maintenance of the class certification, 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 seagoing 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 one-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 the steel structures. 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 ship owner has the option of arranging with the classification society for the vessel's 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. Upon a ship owner's request, the surveys required for class renewal may be split according to an agreed schedule to extend over the entire period of class. This process is referred to as continuous class renewal.

All areas subject to survey as defined by the classification society are required to be surveyed at least once per class period, unless shorter intervals between surveys are prescribed elsewhere. The period between two subsequent surveys of each area must not exceed five years. Vessels under five years of age can waive drydocking in order to increase available days and decrease capital expenditures, provided the vessel is inspected underwater.

While most vessels are drydocked every 30 to 60 months depending on the age of the vessel, underwater surveys (UWILD) are also conducted approximately every 30 months for inspection of the underwater parts and for repairs related to inspections. If any defects are found, the classification surveyor will issue a "recommendation" which must be rectified by the ship owner within prescribed time limits.

Most insurance underwriters make it a condition for insurance coverage that a vessel be certified as "in class" by a classification society which is a member of the International Association of Classification Societies, or the IACS. In 2012, the IACS issued draft harmonized Common Structural Rules, that align with the IMO goals standards, and were adopted in winter 2013. All our vessels will be certified as being "in class" by the American Bureau of Shipping, or

ABS, and Det Norske Veritas, or DNV, major classification societies. All new and secondhand vessels that we acquire must be certified prior to their delivery

Table of Contents

under our standard purchase contracts and memorandum of agreement. If the vessel is not certified on the date of closing, we have no obligation to take delivery of the vessel.

Risk of Loss and Liability Insurance

The operation of any drybulk vessel includes risks such as mechanical and structural failure, hull damage, collision, property loss, cargo loss or damage due to political circumstances in foreign countries, piracy, hostilities, labor strikes and port or canal closures. In addition, there is always an inherent possibility of marine disaster, including oil spills and other environmental incidents, and the liabilities arising from owning and operating vessels in international trade. OPA, which imposes virtually unlimited liability upon owners, operators and demise charterers of vessels trading in the United States exclusive economic zone for certain oil pollution accidents in the United States plus excessive limits or exposures to third party claims including seeking United States jurisdiction, has made liability insurance more expensive for ship owners and operators trading in the United States market.

We maintain hull and machinery insurance, war risks insurance, protection and indemnity cover, and freight, demurrage and defense cover for our fleet in amounts that we believe to be prudent to cover normal risks in our operations. However, we may not be able to achieve or maintain this level of coverage throughout a vessel's useful life. In addition, while we believe that the insurance coverage that we have obtained 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 & Machinery and War Risks Insurance

We maintain marine hull and machinery and war risks insurance, which will include the risk of partial, actual or constructive total loss, for all of our vessels. Each of our vessels is covered up to at least fair market value with deductibles of \$100,000-\$150,000 per vessel per incident. We also maintain increased value coverage for most of our vessels. Under this increased value coverage, in the event of total loss of a 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 which are not recoverable under our hull and machinery policy by reason of under insurance. Under our war risks coverage a total loss would be paid in the event a vessel were confiscated or detained by unauthorized persons.

Protection and Indemnity Insurance

Protection and indemnity insurance is provided by mutual protection and indemnity associations, or P&I Associations, which insure liabilities to third parties in connection with our shipping activities. This includes third-party liability and other related expenses resulting from the injury or death of crew, passengers and other third parties, the 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. Our P&I coverage will be subject to and in accordance with the rules of the P&I Association in which the vessel is entered. Protection and indemnity insurance is a form of mutual indemnity insurance, extended by protection and indemnity mutual associations, or "clubs." Our coverage is limited to approximately \$8.0 billion, except for pollution which is limited to \$1.0 billion. If pollution liability costs are greater than \$1.0 billion, the International Oil Pollution Funds, would be expected to be utilized.

Our protection and indemnity insurance coverage for pollution will be \$1.0 billion per vessel per incident. The thirteen P&I Associations that comprise the International Group insure approximately 90% of the world's commercial tonnage and have entered into a pooling agreement to reinsure each association's liabilities. The International Group provides a unique and invaluable forum for sharing information on a number of issues such as oil pollution, environmental concerns, international legislation, sanctions, place of refuge for ships under distress, carriage of particular cargo, and loss prevention programs, amongst others. The International Group also represents all clubs' members at International conventions and in connection with legislations and regulations affecting shipowners' liability and related insurance matters. Each P&I Association has capped its exposure to this pooling agreement at \$8.0 billion. As a member of a P&I Association which is a member of the International Group, we are subject to calls payable to the associations based on the group's 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.

Permits and Authorizations

We are required by various governmental and quasi-governmental agencies to obtain certain permits, licenses and certificates with respect to our vessels. The kinds of permits, licenses and certificates required depend upon several factors, including the commodity transported, the waters in which the vessel operates, the nationality of the vessel's crew and the age of a vessel. We believe that we have obtained all permits, licenses and certificates currently required to permit our vessels to operate. Additional

48

Table of Contents

laws and regulations, environmental or otherwise, may be adopted which could limit our ability to do business or increase the cost of us doing business.

C. Organizational Structure

Scorpio Bulkiers Inc. is a company incorporated under the laws of the Marshall Islands. We own our vessels through separate wholly-owned subsidiaries that are incorporated in the Marshall Islands or Cayman Islands. Please see Exhibit 8.1 to this annual report for a list of our current subsidiaries.

D. Property, Plants and Equipment

Our only material assets consist of our vessels (including our contract for the construction of a new vessel) which are owned through our separate wholly owned subsidiaries.

For a description of our fleet, see “Item 4. Information on the Company—B. Business Overview—Our Fleet.”

ITEM 4A. UNRESOLVED STAFF COMMENTS

None.

ITEM 5. OPERATING AND FINANCIAL REVIEW AND PROSPECTS

A. Operating Results

The following presentation of management’s discussion and analysis of results of operations and financial condition should be read in conjunction with our consolidated financial statements, including the notes thereto.

Overview

We are an international shipping company that owns and operates the latest generation of newbuilding drybulk carriers with fuel-efficient specifications and carrying capacities of greater than 30,000 dwt. All of our owned vessels have carrying capacities of greater than 60,000 dwt. Our vessels transport a broad range of major and minor bulk commodities, including ores, coal, grains, and fertilizers, along worldwide shipping routes, and are employed primarily in the spot market or in spot market-oriented pools of similarly sized vessels.

As of January 1, 2016, we operated in the following two segments:

• **Ultramax Operations:** includes vessels ranging from approximately 60,200 dwt to 64,000 dwt.

• **Kamsarmax Operations:** includes vessels ranging from approximately 82,000 dwt to 84,000 dwt.

Prior to January 1, 2016, we operated in three segments: Ultramax Operations, Kamsarmax Operations, and Capesize Operations. The Capesize Operations segment included vessels of approximately 180,000 dwt. We sold all of our Capesize vessels and Capesize newbuilding vessels by the end of 2015.

Certain of the corporate general and administrative and financial expenses incurred by us are not attributable to any specific segment. Accordingly, these costs are not allocated to any of our segments and are included in the results below as “Corporate.”

We generate revenues by charging customers for the transportation of their drybulk cargoes using our vessels. Historically, these services generally have been provided under the following basic types of contractual relationships: Commercial Pools, whereby we participate with other shipowners to operate a large number of vessels as an integrated transportation system, which offers customers greater flexibility and a higher level of service while achieving scheduling efficiencies. Pools negotiate charters primarily in the spot market but may also arrange time charter agreements. The size and scope of these pools enable them to enhance utilization rates for pool vessels by securing backhaul voyages and COAs (described below), thus generating higher effective TCE revenues than otherwise might be obtainable in the spot market.

Table of Contents

• Voyage charters, which are charters for short intervals that are priced on current, or “spot,” market rates.

• Time charters, which are chartered to customers for a fixed period of time at rates that are generally fixed, but may contain a variable component based on inflation, interest rates, or current market rates.

• For all of our vessels in contractual relationships, we are responsible for crewing and other vessel operating costs for our owned vessels and the charterhire expense for vessels that we time charter-in.

The table below illustrates the primary distinctions among these different employment arrangements:

	Voyage Charter	Time Charter	Commercial Pool
Typical contract length	Single voyage	One year or more	Varies
Hire rate basis	Varies	Daily	Varies
Voyage expenses	We pay	Customer pays	Pool pays
Vessel operating costs for owned vessels	We pay	We pay	We pay
Charterhire expense for vessels chartered-in	We pay	We pay	We pay
Off-hire	Customer does not pay	Customer does not pay	Pool does not pay

As of the date of this annual report, all of our owned, finance leased and time chartered-in vessels are operating in the Scorpio Group Pools.

Important Financial and Operational Terms and Concepts

We use a variety of financial and operational terms and concepts. These include the following:

Hire rate. The basic payment from the charterer for the use of the vessel.

Vessel revenues. Vessel revenues primarily include revenues from time charters, pool revenues and voyage charters.

Vessel revenues are affected by hire rates and the number of days a vessel operates. Vessel revenues are also affected by the mix of business between vessels on time charter, vessels in pools and vessels operating on voyage charter.

Revenues from vessels in pools and on voyage charter are more volatile, as they are typically tied to prevailing market rates.

Voyage charters. Voyage charters or spot voyages are charters under which the customer pays a transportation charge for the movement of a specific cargo between two or more specified ports. We pay all of the voyage expenses.

Voyage expenses. Voyage expenses primarily include bunkers, port charges, canal tolls, cargo handling operations and brokerage commissions paid by us under voyage charters, as well as brokerage commissions and miscellaneous voyage expenses that we are unable to collect under time charter and pool arrangements. These expenses are subtracted from voyage charter revenues to calculate TCE revenues.

Vessel operating costs. For our owned vessels, we are responsible for vessel operating costs, which include crewing, repairs and maintenance, insurance, stores, lube oils, communication expenses, and technical management fees.

Technical management fees are paid to SSM, which is controlled by the Lolli-Ghetti family. Pursuant to our Revised Master Agreement, SSM provides us with technical services, and we provide them with the ability to subcontract technical management of our vessels with our approval.

Charterhire. Charterhire is the amount we pay the owner for time chartered-in vessels. The amount is usually for a fixed period of time at rates that are generally fixed, but may contain a variable component based on inflation, interest rates, or current market rates. The vessel’s owner is responsible for crewing and other vessel operating costs.

Drydocking. We periodically drydock each of our owned vessels for inspection, repairs and maintenance and any modifications to comply with industry certification or governmental requirements. Generally, each vessel is drydocked every 30 months to 60 months. We capitalize a substantial portion of the costs incurred during drydocking and amortize those costs on a straight-line basis from the completion of a drydocking to the estimated completion of the next drydocking. We immediately

Table of Contents

expense costs for routine repairs and maintenance performed during drydocking that do not improve or extend the useful lives of the assets. The number of drydockings undertaken in a given period and the nature of the work performed determine the level of drydocking expenditures.

Depreciation. Depreciation expense typically consists of:

- charges related to the depreciation of the historical cost of our owned vessels (less an estimated residual value) over the estimated useful lives of the vessels;
- charges related to the amortization of drydocking expenditures over the estimated number of years to the next scheduled drydocking; and
- amortization of assets under finance lease.

Time charter equivalent (TCE) revenue or rates. We report TCE revenues, a non-GAAP financial measure, because (i) we believe it provides additional meaningful information in conjunction with voyage revenues and voyage expenses, the most directly comparable U.S.-GAAP measure, (ii) it assists our management in making decisions regarding the deployment and use of our vessels and in evaluating their financial performance, (iii) it is a standard shipping industry performance measure used primarily to compare period-to-period changes in a shipping company's performance irrespective of changes in the mix of charter types (i.e., spot charters, time charters and bareboat charters) under which the vessels may be employed between the periods, and (iv) we believe that it presents useful information to investors. TCE revenue is vessel revenue less voyage expenses, including bunkers and port charges. The TCE rate achieved on a given voyage is expressed in U.S. dollars/day and is generally calculated by taking TCE revenue and dividing that figure by the number of revenue days in the period. For a reconciliation of TCE revenue, deduct voyage expenses from revenue on our Statement of Operations. Please also see "Non-GAAP Financial Measures."

Revenue days. Revenue days are the total number of calendar days our vessels were in our possession during a period, less the total number of off-hire days during the period associated with repairs or drydockings. Consequently, revenue days represent the total number of days available for the vessel to earn revenue. Idle days, which are days when a vessel is available to earn revenue, yet is not employed, are included in revenue days. We use revenue days to show changes in net vessel revenues between periods.

Contract of affreightment. A contract of affreightment, or COA, relates to the carriage of specific quantities of cargo with multiple voyages over the same route and over a specific period of time which usually spans a number of years. A COA does not designate the specific vessels or voyage schedules that will transport the cargo, thereby providing both the charterer and shipowner greater operating flexibility than with voyage charters alone. The charterer has the flexibility to determine the individual voyage scheduling at a future date while the shipowner may use different vessels to perform these individual voyages. As a result, COAs are mostly entered into by large fleet operators, such as pools or shipowners with large fleets of the same vessel type. We pay the voyage expenses while the freight rate normally is agreed on a per cargo ton basis.

Commercial pools. To increase vessel utilization and revenues, we participate in commercial pools with other shipowners and operators of similar modern, well-maintained vessels. By operating a large number of vessels as an integrated transportation system, commercial pools offer customers greater flexibility and a higher level of service while achieving scheduling efficiencies. Pools employ experienced commercial charterers and operators who have close working relationships with customers and brokers, while technical management is performed by each shipowner. Pools negotiate charters with customers primarily in the spot market. The size and scope of these pools enable them to enhance utilization rates for pool vessels by securing backhaul voyages and COAs, thus generating higher effective TCE revenues than otherwise might be obtainable in the spot market while providing a higher level of service offerings to customers.

Operating days. Operating days are the total number of available days in a period with respect to the owned vessels, before deducting available days due to off-hire days and days in drydock. Operating days is a measurement that is only applicable to our owned vessels, not our chartered-in vessels.

Off-hire. Time a vessel is not available for service due primarily to scheduled and unscheduled repairs or drydockings. For time chartered-in vessels, we do not pay the charterhire expense when the vessel is off-hire.

Non-GAAP Financial Measures

To supplement our financial information presented in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States, or GAAP, management uses certain “non-GAAP financial measures” as such term is defined in Regulation G promulgated by the SEC. Generally, a non-GAAP financial measure is a numerical measure of a company’s operating performance,

Table of Contents

financial position or cash flows that excludes or includes amounts that are included in, or excluded from, the most directly comparable measure calculated and presented in accordance with GAAP. Management believes the presentation of these measures provides investors with greater transparency and supplemental data relating to our financial condition and results of operations, and therefore a more complete understanding of factors affecting our business than GAAP measures alone. In addition, management believes the presentation of these matters is useful to investors for period-to-period comparison of results as the items may reflect certain unique and/or non-operating items such as asset sales, write-offs, contract termination costs or items outside of management's control.

Earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation and amortization, or EBITDA, adjusted net loss and related per share amounts, as well as adjusted EBITDA and TCE revenue are non-GAAP financial measures that we believe provide investors with a means of evaluating and understanding how our management evaluates our operating performance. These non-GAAP financial measures should not be considered in isolation from, as substitutes for, nor superior to financial measures prepared in accordance with GAAP.

Reconciliations of EBITDA, adjusted net loss, adjusted EBITDA and TCE revenue to the most directly comparable GAAP measures are provided below for the years ended December 31, 2017 and 2016.

EBITDA

In thousands	For the Year Ended December 31,	
	2017	2016
Net loss	\$(59,726)	\$(124,835)
Add Back:		
Net interest expense	27,307	16,326
Depreciation and amortization ⁽¹⁾	67,710	62,835
EBITDA	\$35,291	\$(45,674)

⁽¹⁾ Includes depreciation, amortization of deferred financing costs and restricted stock amortization.

Adjusted net loss

In thousands, except per share amounts	For the Year Ended December 31,					
	2017		2016		2015	
	Amount	Per share	Amount	Per share	Amount	Per share
Net loss	\$(59,726)	\$(0.83)	\$(124,835)	\$(2.22)	\$(510,789)	\$(23.86)
Adjustments:						
Loss / write down on assets held for sale	17,701	0.25	12,433	0.22	422,937	19.75
Write down of deferred financing cost	470	0.01	2,456	0.05	16,085	0.75
Charterhire contract termination	—	—	10,000	0.18	—	—
Total adjustments	18,171	0.26	24,889	0.45	439,022	20.50
Adjusted net loss	\$(41,555)	\$(0.57)	\$(99,946)	\$(1.77)	\$(71,767)	\$(3.36)

Table of Contents

Adjusted EBITDA

In thousands	For the Year Ended	
	December 31,	
	2017	2016
Net loss	\$(59,726)	\$(124,835)
Impact of Adjustments ⁽¹⁾	18,171	24,889
Adjusted net loss	(41,555)	(99,946)
Add Back:		
Net interest expense	27,307	16,326
Depreciation and amortization ⁽²⁾	67,710	62,835
Adjusted EBITDA	\$53,462	\$(20,785)

⁽¹⁾ Includes loss/write down on assets held for sale of \$17.7 million and a write down of deferred financing costs of \$0.5 million.

⁽²⁾ Includes depreciation, amortization of deferred financing costs and restricted stock amortization.

TCE Revenue

Time Charter Equivalent (TCE) revenue is defined as voyage revenues less voyage expenses. Such TCE revenue, divided by the number of our available days during the period, or revenue days, is TCE per revenue day, which we believe is consistent with industry standards. TCE per revenue day is a common shipping industry performance measure used primarily to compare daily earnings generated by vessels on time charters with daily earnings generated by vessels on voyage charters, because charter hire rates for vessels on voyage charters are generally not expressed in per-day amounts while charter hire rates for vessels on time charters generally are expressed in such amounts.

In thousands	For the Year Ended	
	December 31,	
	2017	2016
Vessel Revenues	\$162,205	\$78,402
Less:		
Voyage expenses (429)	45	
TCE revenue	\$161,776	\$78,447

Executive Summary for the Year Ended December 31, 2017

Our results for the year ended December 31, 2017 reflect the improving market and the growth of our fleet. Vessel revenues increased \$83.8 million to \$162.2 million as the combined rates of our Ultramax and Kamsarmax vessels significantly increased from \$5,789 per day to \$9,511 per day. Revenue days increased 26% to 17,009 representing the growth in our fleet. Despite these improvements we had a net loss of \$59.7 million or \$0.83 loss per diluted share, which included a loss on assets held for sale of \$17.7 million and a write off of deferred financing costs of \$0.5 million. Excluding these items, our adjusted net loss was \$41.6 million, or \$0.57 loss per diluted share (see Non-GAAP Financial Measures).

In the first half of 2017, we took delivery of the final six newbuilding vessels in our previously existing newbuilding program and were able to shift our focus from maintaining our balance sheet to operating our fleet in the improving spot market. As the market continued to improve and with our liquidity position solidified, we expanded our fleet through the purchase of nine secondhand vessels at the end of the year for total consideration of approximately \$207.0 million, bringing our operating fleet to a total of 56 vessels including 55 owned or finance leased vessels and one time-chartered in vessel. In addition, one vessel is currently under construction and expected to be delivered to us in mid-2018.

Our belief in the strength of our balance sheet and in the recovery of the spot market, has allowed us to institute a share repurchase program and declare quarterly cash dividends. During 2017, we repurchased 1.5 million shares under the Board of Directors authorized stock repurchase program at a cost of approximately \$11.0 million, or at an average cost of \$7.51 per share, and we declared our first quarterly cash dividend, paying out \$0.02 a share or approximately \$1.5 million.

Table of Contents

Results for the Year Ended December 31, 2017 Compared to the Year Ended December 31, 2016

For 2017, the Company's GAAP net loss was \$59.7 million, or \$0.83 loss per diluted share compared to a GAAP net loss of \$124.8 million, or \$2.22 loss per diluted share for the prior year. EBITDA for 2017 and 2016 were \$35.3 million and a loss of \$45.7 million, respectively (see Non-GAAP Financial Measures).

For 2017, the Company's adjusted net loss was \$41.6 million, or \$0.57 adjusted loss per diluted share, which excludes the impact of a write down of assets held for sale of \$17.7 million and a write off of deferred financing costs on the credit facility related to those specific vessels of \$0.5 million. For 2016, the Company's adjusted net loss was \$99.9 million, or \$1.78 adjusted loss per diluted share, which excludes a loss/write off of vessels and assets held for sale of \$12.4 million, the write off of deferred financing costs on credit facilities that will no longer be used of \$2.5 million and a charterhire contract termination fee of \$10.0 million (see Non-GAAP Financial Measures).

Total vessel revenues for 2017 were \$162.2 million, an increase of \$83.8 million from \$78.4 million in 2016. Our TCE revenue (see Non-GAAP Financial Measures) for 2017 was \$161.8 million, an increase of 106% from 2016. The increase in TCE revenue is attributable to rate increases throughout the year, a sustained increase in demand across all bulk sectors, regions and commodities, as well as a reduction in tonnage supply. We also experienced an increase in revenue days associated with the growth of our fleet.

Total operating expenses for 2017 were \$187.8 million compared to \$179.1 million in 2016, which included \$17.7 million and \$12.4 million, respectively, related to asset disposals (as described above). The year over year increase is primarily due to an \$17.8 million increase in vessel operating costs resulting from the increase in the size of our fleet.

Ultramax Operations

	For the Year Ended			
	December 31,		Change	% Change
	2017	2016		
TCE Revenue:				
Vessel revenue	\$94,380	\$46,718	\$47,662	102
Voyage expenses	129	36	93	258
TCE Revenue	\$94,251	\$46,682	\$47,569	102
Operating expenses:				
Vessel operating costs	51,445	41,749	9,696	23
Charterhire expense	975	5,033	(4,058)	(81)
Charterhire termination	—	7,500	(7,500)	(100)
Vessel depreciation	29,797	22,040	7,757	35
General and administrative expense	3,389	2,725	664	24
Loss / write down on assets held for sale	—	(130)	130	100
Total operating expenses	\$85,606	\$78,917	\$6,689	8
Operating loss	\$8,645	\$(32,235)	\$40,880	127

Vessel revenue for our Ultramax Operations increased to \$94.4 million in 2017 from \$46.7 million in 2016 due to significant increases in both rates and revenue days, the latter of which is associated with the growth of our fleet.

TCE revenue (see Non-GAAP Financial Measures) for our Ultramax Operations was \$94.3 million for 2017 and was associated with a day-weighted average of 28 vessels owned, compared to \$46.7 million for the prior year, which was associated with a day-weighted average of 22 vessels owned and one vessel time chartered-in. TCE revenue per day was \$9,159 and \$5,896 for 2017 and 2016, respectively. Increased worldwide demand across all bulk sectors, regions and commodities, as well as a reduction in supply drove the increase in rates for both of our vessel types.

Table of Contents

For the Year
Ended December
31,

Ultramax Operations:	2017	2016	Change	% Change
TCE Revenue	\$94,251	\$46,682	\$47,569	102
TCE Revenue / Day	\$9,159	\$5,896	\$3,263	55
Revenue Days	10,291	7,917	2,374	30

Our Ultramax Operations vessel operating costs were \$51.4 million in 2017, including approximately \$1.2 million of takeover costs associated with new deliveries and \$0.6 million of other non-operating expenses and related to 28 vessels owned, on average during the period. Vessel operating costs for the prior year were \$41.7 million and related to 22 vessels owned, on average during the period. Daily operating costs excluding takeover and other non-operating expenses for 2017 were \$4,842.

Charterhire expense for our Ultramax Operations decreased to \$1.0 million in 2017 from \$5.0 million in the prior year. We did not time charter-in any Ultramax vessels until the end of the third quarter of 2017, when we chartered-in one Ultramax vessel at \$10,125 per day. During 2016, we recorded a \$7.5 million charge to terminate three time charter-in contracts.

Ultramax Operations vessel depreciation increased to \$29.8 million in 2017 from \$22.0 million in the prior year, reflecting the increase in our weighted average vessels owned to 28 from 22.

General and administrative expense for our Ultramax Operations was \$3.4 million for 2017 and \$2.7 million for 2016. The increase was due to an increase in administrative services fees, reflecting the growth of our fleet.

During 2016, we recorded a reversal of loss/write off of vessels and assets held for sale related to Ultramax vessels held for sale at December 31, 2015, due to accrual adjustments and other cost true ups.

Kamsarmax Operations

	For the Year Ended December 31,			
	2017	2016	Change	% Change
TCE Revenue:				
Vessel revenue	\$67,825	\$31,684	\$36,141	114
Voyage expenses	300	(81)	381	470
TCE Revenue	\$67,525	\$31,765	\$35,760	113
Operating expenses:				
Vessel operating costs	35,336	27,083	8,253	30
Charterhire expense	4,417	12,323	(7,906)	(64)
Charterhire termination	—	2,500	(2,500)	(100)
Vessel depreciation	18,713	14,522	4,191	29
General and administrative expense	1,916	1,718	198	12
Loss / write down on assets held for sale	17,701	11,557	6,144	53
Total operating expenses	\$78,083	\$69,703	\$8,380	12
Operating loss	\$(10,558)	\$(37,938)	\$27,380	72

Vessel revenue for our Kamsarmax Operations increased to \$67.8 million in 2017 from \$31.7 million in 2016 due to significant increases in both rates and revenue days, the latter of which is associated with the growth of our fleet.

TCE revenue (see Non-GAAP Financial Measures) for our Kamsarmax Operations was \$67.5 million for 2017 and was associated with a day-weighted average of 18 vessels owned and one vessel time chartered-in, compared to \$31.8 million for the prior year, which was associated with a day-weighted average of 14 vessels owned and two vessels time chartered-in. TCE revenue per day was \$10,051 and \$5,639 for 2017 and 2016, respectively. Increased worldwide demand across all bulk sectors, regions and commodities, as well as a reduction in supply drove the increase in rates for both of our vessel types.

Table of Contents

For the Year
 Ended December
 31,

Kamsarmax Operations:	2017	2016	Change	% Change
TCE Revenue	\$67,525	\$31,765	\$35,760	113
TCE Revenue / Day	\$10,051	\$5,639	\$4,412	78
Revenue Days	6,718	5,633	1,085	19

Kamsarmax Operations vessel operating costs were \$35.3 million in 2017, including approximately \$1.4 million of takeover costs associated with new deliveries and \$1.0 million of other non-operating expenses and related to 18 vessels owned, on average during the period. Vessel operating costs for the prior year were \$27.1 million and related to 14 vessels owned, on average during the period. Daily operating costs excluding takeover and other non-operating expenses for 2017 were \$5,028.

Charterhire expense for our Kamsarmax Operations decreased to \$4.4 million in 2017 from \$12.3 million in the prior year reflecting the reduction in the number of vessels time chartered-in from four at the start of 2016 to none at the end of 2017. During 2016, we recorded a \$2.5 million charge to terminate one time charter-in contract.

Kamsarmax Operations vessel depreciation increased to \$18.7 million in 2017 from \$14.5 million in the prior year reflecting the increase in our weighted average vessels owned to 18 from 14.

General and administrative expense for our Kamsarmax Operations was \$1.9 million and \$1.7 million for 2017 and 2016, respectively. The increase was due to an increase in administrative services fees, reflecting the growth of our fleet.

During 2017, we recorded a write down on assets held for sale related to the sale of two Kamsarmax vessels to an unaffiliated third party and in 2016, we recorded a write down of vessels and assets held for sale related to the cancellation of a shipbuilding contract for a Kamsarmax bulk carrier.

Corporate

Corporate general and administrative and financial expenses increased from \$53.3 million in 2016 to \$57.9 million in 2017, as increases in financial expenses due to increasing LIBOR rates, higher levels of debt and reduced capitalization of interest outweighed decreases in restricted stock amortization as prior year grants, with higher fair values than current grants, vested and were fully expensed.

During 2017 and 2016, we wrote off \$0.5 million and \$2.5 million, respectively, of deferred financing costs accumulated on credit facilities for which the related vessels were sold or the commitments were otherwise reduced.

Table of Contents

Results for the Year Ended December 31, 2016 Compared to the Year Ended December 31, 2015

Ultramax Operations

	For the Year Ended December 31,		Change	% Change
	2016	2015		
TCE Revenue:				
Vessel revenue	\$46,718	\$26,771	19,947	75
Voyage expenses	36	176	(140)	(80)
TCE Revenue	\$46,682	\$26,595	\$20,087	76
Operating expenses:				
Vessel operating costs	41,749	14,297	27,452	192
Charterhire expense	5,033	21,880	(16,847)	(77)
Charterhire termination	7,500	—	7,500	NA
Vessel depreciation	22,040	6,104	15,936	261
General and administrative expense	2,725	713	2,012	282
Loss / write down on assets held for sale	(130)	5,622	(5,752)	(102)
Total operating expenses	\$78,917	\$48,616	\$30,301	62
Operating loss	\$(32,235)	\$(22,021)	\$(10,214)	(46)

Vessel revenue for our Ultramax Operations increased significantly to \$46.7 million in 2016 from \$26.8 million in 2015 due to the increase in revenue days associated with the growth of our fleet.

TCE revenue (see Non-GAAP Financial Measures) for our Ultramax Operations was \$46.7 million for 2016 and was associated with a day-weighted average of 22 vessels owned and one vessel time chartered-in, compared to \$26.6 million for the prior year, which was associated with a day-weighted average of seven vessels owned and five vessels time chartered-in. TCE revenue per day was \$5,896 and \$6,839 for 2016 and 2015, respectively. The decrease in TCE revenue per day was due to the depressed market in which we operated for most of the year. Overall TCE revenues increased versus the prior year despite the lower rates due to the increase in revenue days associated with the growth of our fleet

	For the Year Ended December 31,			
Ultramax Operations:	2016	2015	Change	% Change
TCE Revenue	\$46,682	\$26,595	\$20,087	76
TCE Revenue / Day	\$5,896	\$6,839	\$(943)	(14)
Revenue Days	7,917	3,889	4,028	104

Ultramax Operations vessel operating costs were \$41.7 million in 2016, including approximately \$2.0 million of takeover costs associated with new deliveries and \$1.2 million of other non-operating expenses and related to 22 vessels owned, on average during the period. Vessel operating costs for the prior year were \$14.3 million and related to seven vessels owned, on average during the period. Daily operating costs excluding takeover and other non-operating expenses for 2016 were \$5,063.

Charterhire expense for our Ultramax Operations decreased to \$5.0 million in 2016 from \$21.9 million in the prior year reflecting the reduction in the number of vessels time chartered-in. During 2016, we recorded a \$7.5 million charge to terminate three time charter-in contracts. Terminating these contracts reduced our cash outflow and had a positive impact on our future operating results as the contracts were at above current market rates.

Ultramax Operations vessel depreciation increased to \$22.0 million in 2016 from \$6.1 million in the prior year reflecting the increase in our weighted average vessels owned to 22 from seven.

General and administrative expense for our Ultramax Operations was \$2.7 million for 2016 and \$0.7 million for 2015. The increase was due to an increase in administrative services fees, reflecting the growth of our fleet.

Table of Contents

During 2016, we recorded a reversal of loss/write off of vessels and assets held for sale related to Ultramax vessels held for sale at December 31, 2015, including accrual adjustments and other cost true ups. The loss recorded in 2015 was associated with writing down vessels and construction contracts that were sold or classified as held for sale during 2015.

Kamsarmax Operations

	For the Year Ended December 31,			
	2016	2015	Change	% Change
TCE Revenue:				
Vessel revenue	\$31,685	\$26,712	\$4,973	19
Voyage expenses	(81)	331	(412)	(124)
TCE Revenue	\$31,766	\$26,381	\$5,385	20
Operating expenses:				
Vessel operating costs	27,083	9,986	17,097	171
Charterhire expense	12,323	29,509	(17,186)	(58)
Charterhire termination	2,500	—	2,500	NA
Vessel depreciation	14,522	4,536	9,986	220
General and administrative expense	1,718	498	1,220	245
Loss / write down on assets held for sale	11,557	8,997	2,560	28
Total operating expenses	\$69,703	\$53,526	\$16,177	30
Operating loss	\$(37,937)	\$(27,145)	\$(10,792)	(40)

Vessel revenue for our Kamsarmax Operations increased to \$31.7 million in 2016 from \$26.8 million in 2015 due to the increase in revenue days associated with the growth of our fleet.

TCE revenue (see Non-GAAP Financial Measures) for our Kamsarmax Operations was \$31.8 million for 2016 and was associated with a day-weighted average of 14 vessels owned and two vessels time chartered-in, compared to \$26.4 million for the prior year, which was associated with a day-weighted average of five vessels owned and seven vessels time chartered-in. TCE revenue per day was \$5,639 and \$6,660 for 2016 and 2015, respectively. The decrease in TCE revenue per day was due to the depressed market in which we operated for most of the year. Overall TCE revenues increased versus the prior year despite the lower rates due to the increase in revenue days associated with the growth of our fleet.

	For the Year Ended December 31,			
Kamsarmax Operations:	2016	2015	Change	% Change
TCE Revenue	\$31,766	\$26,381	\$5,385	20
TCE Revenue / Day	\$5,639	\$6,660	\$(1,021)	(15)
Revenue Days	5,633	3,961	1,672	42

Kamsarmax Operations vessel operating costs were \$27.1 million in 2016, including approximately \$0.8 million of takeover costs associated with new deliveries and \$1.0 million of other non-operating expenses and related to 14 vessels owned, on average during the period. Vessel operating costs for the prior year were \$10.0 million and related to five vessels owned, on average during the period. Daily operating costs excluding takeover and other non-operating expenses for 2016 were \$5,236.

Charterhire expense for our Kamsarmax Operations decreased to \$12.3 million in 2016 from \$29.5 million in the prior year reflecting the reduction in the number of vessels time chartered-in. During 2016, we recorded a \$2.5 million charge to terminate a time charter-in contract. Terminating this contract reduced our cash outflow and had a positive impact on our future operating results as the contract was at above current market rates. As of December 31, 2016, we had two remaining time chartered-in vessels. Of these two time chartered-in vessels, one was redelivered in the first

quarter of 2017, and the other was redelivered during the third quarter of 2017.

58

Table of Contents

Kamsarmax Operations depreciation increased to \$14.5 million in 2016 from \$4.5 million in the prior year reflecting the increase in our weighted average vessels owned to 14 from five.

General and administrative expense for our Kamsarmax Operations was \$1.7 million for 2016 and \$0.5 million for 2015. The increase was due to an increase in administrative services fees, reflecting the growth of our fleet.

During 2016, we recorded a loss/write off of vessels and assets held for sale of \$11.6 million, which primarily related to the cancellation of a shipbuilding contract for a Kamsarmax bulk carrier and additional expenses related to vessels held for sale at December 31, 2015, including accrual adjustments and other cost true ups. The loss recorded in the prior year was associated with writing down vessels and construction contracts that were sold or classified as held for sale during 2015, as well as incremental write-downs of certain construction contracts that were classified as held for sale at December 31, 2014.

Capesize Operations

	For the Year Ended			
	December 31,			
	2016	2015	Change	% Change
TCE Revenue:				
Vessel revenue	\$—	\$9,038	\$(9,038)	(100)
Voyage expenses	—	280	(280)	(100)
TCE Revenue	\$—	\$8,758	\$(8,758)	(100)
Operating expenses:				
Vessel operating costs	—	5,089	(5,089)	(100)
Vessel depreciation	—	3,623	(3,623)	(100)
General and administrative expense	380	275	105	38
Loss / write down on assets held for sale	1,006	408,318	(407,312)	(100)
Total operating expenses	\$1,386	\$417,305	\$(415,919)	(100)
Operating loss	\$(1,386)	\$(408,547)	\$407,161	(100)

Prior to 2016, the Company was organized into three operating segments: Ultramax, Kamsarmax and Capesize, the latter of which included vessels of approximately 180,000 DWT. However, we sold all of our Capesize vessels and Capesize newbuilding vessels by the end of 2015.

Corporate

Certain of the corporate general and administrative expenses we incurred and all of our financial expenses are not attributable to any specific segment. Accordingly, these costs are not allocated to any of our segments. General and administrative expenses decreased \$4.7 million from \$33.9 million in 2015 to \$29.2 million in 2016, primarily due to a decrease in restricted stock amortization as prior year grants, with higher fair values than current grants, vested and were fully expensed as well as the reversal of expense related to canceled awards. Financial expense, net increased from \$19.5 million in 2015 to \$24.9 million in 2016, due to higher levels of debt and lower levels of capitalized interest. During 2016 and 2015, we wrote off \$2.5 million and \$16.1 million, respectively, of deferred financing costs accumulated on credit facilities for which the related vessels were sold or the commitments were otherwise reduced.

Recent accounting pronouncements

In May 2017, the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) issued Accounting Standards Update (ASU) 2017-09, "Compensation - Stock Compensation (Topic 718): Scope of Modification Accounting", which clarifies when changes to the terms or conditions of a share-based payment must be accounted for as modifications. Under the new guidance, an entity will not apply modification accounting to a share-based payment award if all of the following are the same immediately before and after the change: (i) the award's fair value, (ii) the award's vesting conditions, and (iii) the award's classification as an equity or liability instrument. The new guidance does not change the accounting for modifications. The guidance is effective for annual periods, and interim periods within those annual periods, beginning after December 15, 2017 for all entities. Early adoption is permitted, including adoption in any interim period for which financial statements have not yet been issued or made available for issuance. We do not expect ASU 2017-09 to have a significant impact on our consolidated financial statements or financial disclosures.

Table of Contents

In November 2016, the FASB issued ASU 2016-18, “Restricted Cash”. When cash, cash equivalents, restricted cash and restricted cash equivalents are presented in more than one line item on the balance sheet, the new guidance requires a reconciliation of the totals in the statement of cash flows to the related captions in the balance sheet. This reconciliation can be presented either on the face of the statement of cash flows or in the notes to the financial statements. The guidance is effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2017, and interim periods within those years. Early adoption in an interim period is permitted, but any adjustments must be reflected as of the beginning of the fiscal year that includes that interim period. We do not expect ASU 2016-018 to have a significant impact on our Consolidated Statement of Cash Flows.

In August 2016, the FASB issued ASU 2016-15, “Classification of Certain Cash Receipts and Cash Payments”, which addresses classification issues related to the statement of cash flows. Classification issues relate to (i) debt repayment of debt extinguishment costs, (ii) settlement of zero-coupon bonds, (iii) contingent consideration payments made after a business combination, (iv) proceeds from the settlement of insurance claims, (v) proceeds from the settlement of corporate-owned life insurance policies, including bank-owned life insurance policies, (vi) distributions received from equity method investees, (vii) beneficial interests in securitization transactions, and (viii) separately identifiable cash flows and application of the predominance principle. The guidance is effective for annual and interim periods in fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2017. Early adoption is permitted, including adoption in an interim period. If an entity early adopts the ASU in an interim period, adjustments should be reflected as of the beginning of the fiscal year that includes that interim period. An entity that elects early adoption must adopt all of the amendments in the same period. Entities should apply this ASU using a retrospective transition method to each period presented. If it is impracticable for an entity to apply the ASU retrospectively for some of the issues, it may apply the amendments for those issues prospectively as of the earliest date practicable. We do not expect ASU 2016-15 to have a significant impact on our Consolidated Statement of Cash Flows.

In February 2016, the FASB issued ASU 2016-02, “Leases”, which is intended to improve financial reporting about leasing transactions. The ASU affects all companies that lease assets. The ASU will require organizations that lease assets, or lessees, to recognize on the balance sheet the assets and liabilities for the rights and obligations created by those leases with terms of more than twelve months. The accounting for lease arrangements by lessor will remain largely unchanged from current U.S. GAAP. The ASU will also require additional quantitative and qualitative disclosures to help financial statement users better understand the amount, timing, and uncertainty of cash flows arising from leases. The ASU is effective for fiscal years and interim periods beginning after December 15, 2018 although early adoption is permitted. The ASU requires reporting organizations to take a modified retrospective transition approach. While we are still reviewing our contracts to assess the overall impact of the guidance, we have determined that our existing pool arrangements meet the definition of leases under ASU 2016-02, with us as lessor, on the basis that the pool manages the vessels in order to enter into transportation contracts with their customers, and thereby enjoy the economic benefits derived from such arrangements. Furthermore, the pool can direct the use of a vessel (subject to certain limitations in the pool or charter agreement) throughout the period of use. On November 29, 2017 the FASB voted to propose amendments to the new leases guidance to add two practical expedients. The proposed changes would allow entities to elect a simplified transition approach, and provide lessors with an option related to how lease and other related revenues are presented and disclosed. We will adopt this new standard on January 1, 2019, applying the main transition option, with no restatement of comparative figures for prior periods.

ASU 2016-02 also amends the existing accounting standards to require lessees to recognize, on a discounted basis, the rights and obligations created by the commitment to lease assets on the balance sheet, unless the term of the lease is 12 months or less. Based on our operating fleet as of December 31, 2017, the standard will result in the recognition of right-of-use assets and corresponding liabilities, on the basis of the discounted remaining future minimum lease payments, relating to our existing bareboat chartered-in vessel commitments that are currently reported as operating leases. We do not expect this standard to impact the accounting for our existing time chartered-out vessels which are scheduled to expire in the first quarter of 2019. Furthermore, the eventual expected impact of this standard as it pertains to time or bareboat chartered-in vessels, cannot be estimated as we are unable to predict what our lease

commitments will be at December 31, 2018.

In May 2014, the Financial Accounting Standards Board (“FASB”) issued an accounting standards update in respect of revenue from contracts with customers (Topic 606). The effective date is for annual periods beginning after December 15, 2017. This standard will require to (1) identify the contract(s) with a customer; (2) identify the performance obligations in the contract; (3) determine the transaction price; (4) allocate the transaction price to the performance obligations in the contract; and (5) recognize revenue when (or as) the entity satisfies a performance obligation. We expect that our time charter arrangements may contain a service component, for example crew assistance, that will be in the scope of the new standard. Therefore the part of transaction price of charter arrangements should be allocated to service component and recognized in revenue in accordance with the requirements of the new standard. Revenue generated from pooling arrangements are within the scope of ASU 2016-02, which is discussed further above. Our time-chartered arrangements may contain both a lease and a service components. Prior to the expected adoption of ASC 842 practical expedients mentioned above, the non-lease component is supposed to be in the scope of the revenue standard. However, ASC 842 would allow lessor to not separate the lease components and the non-lease component. The lessor

Table of Contents

practical expedient would be limited to circumstances in which both (1) the timing and pattern of revenue recognition are the same for the nonlease component(s) and related lease component and (2) the combined single lease component would be classified as an operating lease. We also understand that lessors would not be required to account for the service component under ASC 606 in 2018, even if the future practical expedients will not be effective.

Critical Accounting Estimates

Our consolidated financial statements and accompanying notes are prepared in accordance with U.S. GAAP. In many instances, the application of such principles requires management to make estimates or to apply subjective principles to particular facts and circumstances. A change in the estimates or a variance in the application, or interpretation of U.S. GAAP could yield a materially different accounting result. A summary of our critical accounting estimates where we believe that the estimations, judgments or interpretations that we made, if different, would have yielded the most significant differences in our consolidated financial statements, can be found in the notes to the consolidated financial statements. In addition, for a summary of all of our significant accounting policies see Note 1, Organization and Basis of Presentation, in the notes to the consolidated financial statements.

Vessels and depreciation

We record the value of our vessels at their cost (which includes acquisition costs directly attributable to the vessel including capitalized interest and expenditures made to prepare the vessel for its initial voyage) less accumulated depreciation. We depreciate our vessels on a straight-line basis to their residual value over their estimated useful lives of 25 years from the date the vessel is ready for its first voyage. The estimated useful life of 25 years is management's best estimate and is also consistent with industry practice for similar vessels. The residual value is estimated as the lightweight tonnage of each vessel multiplied by an estimated scrap value per ton. The scrap value per ton is estimated taking into consideration the historical four years average scrap market rates at the balance sheet date.

An increase in the useful life of a vessel or in its residual value would have the effect of decreasing the annual depreciation charge and extending it into later periods. A decrease in the useful life of a vessel or in its residual value would have the effect of increasing the annual depreciation charge.

When regulations place limitations over the ability of a vessel to trade on a worldwide basis, or when the cost of complying with such regulations is not expected to be recovered, we will adjust the vessel's useful life to end at the date such regulations preclude such vessel's further commercial use.

The carrying value of our vessels does not represent the fair market value of such vessels or the amount we could obtain if we were to sell any of our vessels, which could be more or less. Under U.S. GAAP, we would not record a loss if the fair market value of a vessel (excluding its charter) is below its carrying value unless and until we determine to sell that vessel or the vessel is impaired as discussed below under "Impairment of long-lived assets held for use."

Pursuant to our bank credit facilities, prior to drawdown of loans under the credit facilities we submit to the lenders valuations of the vessels collateralizing the relevant facility. Thereafter, we will regularly submit to the lenders valuations of our vessels on an individual charter free basis in order to evidence our compliance with the collateral maintenance covenants under our bank credit facilities. Such a valuation is not necessarily the same as the amount any vessel may bring upon sale, which may be more or less, and should not be relied upon as such. We have received valuations on each vessel in our fleet as of December 31, 2017. If we were to apply those valuations to the carrying value of our vessels as of December 31, 2017, the aggregate carrying value would exceed the fair value of our vessels by an aggregate of \$156.3 million. The fair values of our vessels can fluctuate depending on the shipyards and the dates of delivery. These assumptions have not been taken into account in the amounts disclosed above.

Impairment of long-lived assets held for use

We follow Accounting Standards Codification or ASC Subtopic 360-10, Property, Plant and Equipment, or ASC 360-10, which requires impairment losses to be recorded on long-lived assets used in operations when indicators of

impairment are present and the undiscounted cash flows estimated to be generated by those assets are less than their carrying amounts. If indicators of impairment are present, we perform an analysis of the anticipated undiscounted future net cash flows of the related long-lived assets.

Table of Contents

When indicators of impairment are present and our estimate of undiscounted future cash flows for any vessel is lower than the vessel's carrying value, the carrying value is written down, by recording a charge to operations, to the vessel's fair market value if the fair market value is lower than the vessel's carrying value.

Our vessels are assessed for impairment whenever events or changes in circumstances indicate the carrying amount of our vessels and vessels under construction may not be recoverable. In developing our estimates of undiscounted cash flows, we make assumptions and estimates about vessels' future performance, with the most significant assumptions relating to (i) charter rates on expiry of existing charters, which are based on the current fixing applicable to five-year time charter rates and thereafter, a reversion to the ten-year historical average for each category of vessel, (ii) off-hire days, which are based on actual off-hire statistics for our fleet, (iii) operating costs, based on current levels escalated over time based on long term trends, (iv) drydocking frequency, duration and cost, (v) estimated useful life which is assessed as a total of 25 years and (vi) estimated scrap values. Specifically, we utilize the rates currently in effect for the duration of our vessel's current time charters, without assuming any profit sharing. For periods of time where our vessels are not fixed on time charters, we utilize an estimated daily TCE for our vessels' unfixed days using the five year time charter average in effect as of the date of the assessment for the next five years and the ten year historical average for the remainder of the vessels' useful lives, which is common practice for the industry. We further assume a utilization rate of 95% for our vessels and do not apply any inflation to the estimated rates used. We apply a 2% inflation rate to vessel operating costs.

During the year ended December 31, 2017, there were no changes in circumstances or events that indicated that the carrying amount of our vessels or vessel under construction may not be recoverable and therefore, an assessment of impairment was not performed.

During our fourth quarter 2016 assessment, we determined that the future income streams expected to be generated by our vessels, including vessels under construction which are carried at balances that approximate their fair values, over their remaining operating lives on an undiscounted basis would be sufficient to recover their carrying values and, accordingly, it confirmed that our vessels were not impaired under U.S. GAAP. Our estimated future undiscounted cash flows exceeded each of our vessels' carrying values, as well as the expected carrying values of vessels under construction upon their delivery to us by the shipyards, by a considerable margin (approximately 150% - 192% of carrying value). As of December 31, 2016 we owned 42 vessels with an average remaining useful life of 23.9 years.

During our fourth quarter 2015 assessment, we determined that the future income streams expected to be generated by our vessels, including vessels under construction and excluding assets held for sale which are carried at balances that approximate their fair values, over their remaining operating lives on an undiscounted basis would be sufficient to recover their carrying values and, accordingly, it confirmed that our vessels were not impaired under U.S. GAAP. Our estimated future undiscounted cash flows exceeded each of our vessels' carrying values, as well as the expected carrying values of vessels under construction upon their delivery to us by the shipyards, by a considerable margin (approximately 68% - 118% of carrying value). As of December 31, 2015, we owned 25 vessels, excluding those classified as held for sale, which had an average remaining useful life of 24.6 years.

In our impairment testing, we also examine the sensitivity of the future income streams expected to be earned by our vessels by reviewing other scenarios relative to the initial assumptions we used to see if the resulting impact would have resulted in a different conclusion. Accordingly, we perform sensitivity analyses based on more conservative charter rates and expected useful lives for our vessels, separately and in combination. We then evaluate the outcomes of the sensitivity analyses performed to assess their impact on our conclusions and determine whether there will be any impairment to our vessels.

Although we believe that the assumptions used to evaluate potential impairment are reasonable and appropriate, such assumptions are highly subjective. There can be no assurance as to how long charter rates and vessel values will

remain at their currently low levels or whether they will improve by any significant degree. Charter rates may remain at depressed levels for some time, which could adversely affect our revenue and profitability, and any future assessments of vessel impairment.

Management will continue to monitor developments in charter rates in the markets in which it participates with respect to the expectation of future rates over an extended period of time that are utilized in the analyses.

B. Liquidity and Capital Resources

Our primary source of funds for our short-term and long-term liquidity needs will be the cash flows generated from our vessels, which primarily operate in the Scorpio Group Pools, in the spot market or on time charter. We believe that the Scorpio Group Pools reduce volatility because (i) they aggregate the revenues and expenses of all pool participants and distribute net

Table of Contents

earnings to the participants based on an agreed upon formula and (ii) some of the vessels in the pool are on time charter. Furthermore, spot charters provide flexibility and allow us to fix vessels at prevailing rates.

At December 31, 2017, cash and cash equivalents totaled \$68.5 million. We believe that our current cash and cash equivalents balance as well as operating cash flows will be sufficient to meet our short-term and long-term liquidity needs for the next 12 months from the date of this annual report, which are primarily comprised of debt repayment obligations and a contract for the construction of a Kamsarmax vessel.

Equity Issuances

In November 2017, in connection with the purchase of three Ultramax vessels, we issued warrants to purchase approximately 1.6 million common shares at an exercise price of \$8.10 per share to an unaffiliated third party as part of the total consideration paid. The warrants were exercised and we issued the shares in January 2018.

In connection with the purchase of one Ultramax vessel, we issued approximately 0.9 million common shares to the parent of the seller of the vessel on December 29, 2017, upon delivery of such vessel.

During the years ended December 31, 2017 and 2016, we issued 12,946 common shares and 51,679 common shares, respectively, both with a fair value of \$0.1 million, to SSH pursuant to the Amended Administrative Services Agreement, relating to our Newbuilding Program.

On June 20, 2016, we issued 23.0 million common shares, par value \$0.01 per share, at \$3.05 per share in an underwritten public offering. SSH purchased an aggregate of approximately 5.3 million common shares at the public offering price. We received approximately \$67.5 million of net proceeds from the issuance.

On June 1, 2016, our shareholders approved an amendment to our Amended and Restated Articles of Incorporation to increase our total number of authorized common shares to 112.5 million shares at the annual general meeting of shareholders.

On March 22, 2016, we issued 21.0 million common shares, par value \$0.01 per share, at \$3.00 per share in an underwritten public offering. SSH and certain of our directors purchased an aggregate of 5,030,000 common shares at the public offering price. We received approximately \$60.6 million of net proceeds from the issuance.

On December 31, 2015, our board of directors effected a one-for-twelve reverse stock split of our common shares, par value \$0.01 per share, and a reduction in the total number of authorized common shares to approximately 56.3 million shares. Our shareholders approved the reverse stock split and change in authorized common shares at a special meeting of shareholders held on December 23, 2015. The reverse stock split reduced the number of outstanding common shares from approximately 344.2 million shares to approximately 28.7 million shares.

On June 16, 2015, we issued approximately 11.1 million common shares, par value \$0.01 per share at \$18.00 per share in an underwritten public offering. SSH and certain of our executive officers purchased an aggregate of 0.8 million common shares at the public offering price. We received \$190.2 million of proceeds from the issuance. On June 23, 2015, underwriters exercised their option to purchase approximately 1.7 million additional common shares in connection with the offering. The sale of these common shares resulted in net proceeds to us of approximately \$28.4 million, after deducting underwriters' discounts and commissions.

Table of Contents

Cash Flow

Operating Activities

The table below summarizes the effect of the major components of operating cash flow.

(in thousands)	For the Year Ended December 31,		
	2017	2016	2015
Net loss	\$(59,726)	\$(124,835)	\$(510,789)
Non-cash items included in net loss	84,181	73,644	479,872
Related party balances	(7,568)	5,656	(4,878)
Effect of changes in other working capital and operating assets and liabilities	2,695	(6,661)	653
Net cash used in operating activities	\$19,582	\$(52,196)	\$(35,142)

The cash flow provided by operating activities for the year ended December 31, 2017 was driven by a reduction in our net loss, resulting from an increase in the rates earned by our vessels and an increase in non-cash expense, primarily depreciation.

Investing Activities

Net cash used in investing activities of \$172.7 million reflects the investment we made in our fleet, which consisted of \$186.7 million related to the purchase of nine Ultramax vessels, a \$6.7 million deposit on one Kamsarmax vessel under construction and \$23.3 million related to the completion of our Newbuilding Program, partially offset by \$44.3 million from the sale of two Kamsarmax vessels.

Financing Activities

Net cash provided by financing activities of \$119.9 million reflects:

• Net issuance of long-term debt borrowings, offset by repayments of long-term debt, of \$134.6 million.

In October 2017, we entered into a financing transaction with respect to one of our Kamsarmax vessels with unaffiliated third parties involving the sale and leaseback of the SBI Rumba, a 2015 Japanese built Kamsarmax dry bulk vessel, for consideration of approximately \$19.6 million. After the repayment of approximately \$13.2 million of bank debt and the payment of fees, the transaction increased our liquidity by approximately \$6.0 million.

During 2017, we repurchased approximately 1.5 million shares of our common stock under our Board of Directors authorized stock repurchase program at a cost of approximately \$11.0 million, which was funded from our available cash resources. As of the date of this annual report, approximately \$39.0 million of the \$50.0 million authorized remains available for the repurchase of our common stock in open market or privately negotiated transactions. The specific timing and amounts of the repurchases will be in the sole discretion of management and may vary based on market conditions and other factors, but we are not obligated under the terms of the program to repurchase any of our common stock. The authorization has no expiration date.

• During 2017, our Board of Directors declared and we paid a quarterly cash dividend of \$0.02 per share totaling approximately \$1.5 million.

Credit Facilities, Finance Lease and Unsecured Notes

\$39.6 Million Credit Facility

On June 27, 2014, we entered into a \$39.6 million senior secured credit facility with NIBC Bank N.V. to finance a portion of two of the vessels then in our Newbuilding Program which secured this facility. This facility bore interest at LIBOR plus a margin of 2.925%. The term of this facility was originally five years, expiring in June 2019, and then subsequently extended to September 2020 should we have met certain conditions. This facility was secured by, among other things, a first priority mortgage on two Kamsarmax vessels and guaranteed by each of the vessel owning subsidiaries.

Table of Contents

During 2017, we sold the two Kamsarmax vessels collateralizing this facility, fully repaid this loan and terminated this credit facility.

\$330.0 Million Credit Facility

On July 29, 2014, we entered into a \$330.0 million senior secured credit facility with Credit Agricole Corporate and Investment Bank and Deutsche Bank AG London to finance a portion of the purchase price of 22 of the vessels then in our Newbuilding Program, which was subsequently reduced by \$15.0 million due to our sale of one of the vessels that was to collateralize this facility. This facility bears interest at LIBOR plus a margin of 2.925% and has a term of seven years. This facility is secured by, among other things, a first preferred cross-collateralized mortgage on each of 21 of our vessels (consisting of 15 Ultramax drybulk carriers and six Kamsarmax drybulk carriers) and guaranteed by each of the vessel owning subsidiaries.

As of December 31, 2017, we drew down \$294.2 million relating to 15 Ultramax vessels and six Kamsarmax vessels, of which approximately \$247.9 million was outstanding as of that date.

\$67.5 Million Credit Facility

On July 30, 2014, we entered into a \$67.5 million credit facility with a leading European financial institution. The proceeds of this facility were used to fund a portion of the purchase price of four of the vessels then in our Newbuilding Program that secure this facility. This facility has a seven year term from the date of delivery of each such vessel securing the loan, with customary financial and restrictive covenants. This facility bears interest at LIBOR plus a margin of 2.95%. The \$67.5 Million Credit Facility is secured by, among other things, a first priority mortgage on four of the vessels then in our Newbuilding Program (two Ultramax and two Kamsarmax vessels), and a parent company guarantee.

As of December 31, 2017, we borrowed \$53.8 million associated with drawdowns on two Kamsarmax vessels and two Ultramax vessels, of which approximately \$40.5 million was outstanding as of that date.

\$409.0 Million Credit Facility

On December 30, 2014, we entered into a \$409.0 million senior secured credit facility with Nordea Bank Finland PLC, New York Branch, and Skandinaviska Enskilda Banken AB (publ) to partially finance a portion of our acquisition of 20 of the vessels then in our Newbuilding Program (six Ultramax, nine Kamsarmax, and five Capesize vessels). This credit facility was subsequently (i) reduced by \$136.0 million due to the sale of five Capesize vessels and the addition of one Ultramax vessel to the security package under the facility, (ii) further reduced by \$14.6 million due to the cancellation of a shipbuilding contract for a Kamsarmax bulk carrier that would serve as partial security under the facility, and (iii) further reduced by approximately \$22.5 million due to the drop in vessel values. As amended, this credit facility was used to finance a portion of the purchase price of 15 vessels (seven Ultramax and eight Kamsarmax vessels). This facility bears interest at LIBOR plus a margin of 3.00% and has a term of six years. This facility is secured by, among other things, a first preferred mortgage on each of the 15 vessels.

As of December 31, 2017, we borrowed \$220.8 million on 15 vessels of which approximately \$174.4 million was outstanding as of that date.

\$42.0 Million Credit Facility

On January 30, 2015, we entered into a senior secured credit facility for up to \$42.0 million with a leading European financial institution to finance a portion of the purchase price of two Kamsarmax vessels which were delivered to us, and subsequently upsized by \$10.8 million to finance a portion of the purchase price of one Ultramax vessel. Each tranche for the Kamsarmax vessels has a final maturity of six years from the drawdown date of the respective vessel, and the tranche for the Ultramax vessel matures on September 21, 2021. This facility bears interest at LIBOR plus a margin of 2.97%. This facility is secured by, among other things, a first preferred mortgage on the three vessels and guaranteed by each of the vessel owning subsidiaries.

During 2017, we repaid approximately \$13.2 million of the \$42.0 Million Credit Facility upon the completion of the \$19.6 Million Lease Financing transaction.

As of December 31, 2017, the outstanding balance on this facility was approximately \$22.4 million.

Table of Contents

\$12.5 Million Credit Facility

On December 22, 2015, we entered into a senior secured credit facility for up to \$12.5 million, which was used to finance a portion of the purchase price of one Ultramax vessel which was delivered to us. The facility has a maturity date of December 22, 2020. This facility bears interest at LIBOR plus a margin of 3.00%. This facility is secured by, among other things, a first preferred mortgage on the Ultramax vessel and guaranteed by the vessel owning subsidiary. As of December 31, 2017, the outstanding balance on this facility was approximately \$10.2 million.

\$27.3 Million Credit Facility

On December 22, 2015, we entered into a senior secured credit facility for up to \$27.3 million, which was used to finance a portion of the purchase price of two Ultramax vessels then in our Newbuilding Program. Each tranche has a maturity of five years from the drawdown date. This facility bears interest at LIBOR plus a margin of 2.95%. This facility is secured by, among other things, a first preferred mortgage on the two Ultramax vessels and guaranteed by each of the vessel owning subsidiaries.

As of December 31, 2017, the outstanding balance on this facility was approximately \$18.2 million.

\$85.5 Million Credit Facility

On December 5, 2017, we entered into a senior secured credit facility for up to \$85.5 million which was used to finance a portion of the purchase price of six Ultramax vessels we acquired in the fourth quarter of 2017. The facility has a maturity date of February 15, 2023 and bears interest at LIBOR plus a margin of 2.85%. This facility is secured by, among other things, a first preferred mortgage on the six Ultramax vessels and guaranteed by each vessel owning subsidiary.

As of December 31, 2017, we drew down the entire amount available and the outstanding balance on this facility was approximately \$85.5 million.

\$38.7 Million Credit Facility

On December 13, 2017, we entered into a senior secured credit facility for up to \$38.7 million which was used to finance a portion of the purchase price of three Ultramax vessels we acquired in the fourth quarter of 2017. The facility has a maturity date of December 13, 2022 and bears interest at LIBOR plus a margin of 2.85%. This facility is secured by, among other things, a first preferred mortgage on the three Ultramax vessels and guaranteed by each vessel owning subsidiary.

As of December 31, 2017, we drew down the entire amount available and the outstanding balance on this facility was approximately \$38.7 million.

\$19.6 Million Lease Financing

In October 2017, we entered into a financing transaction regarding one of our Kamsarmax vessels with unaffiliated third parties involving the sale and leaseback of the SBI Rumba, a 2015 Japanese built Kamsarmax dry bulk vessel, for consideration of approximately \$19.6 million. As part of the transaction, we have agreed to make monthly payments of \$164,250 under a nine and a half year bareboat charter agreement with the buyers, which we have the option to extend for a further six months. The agreement also provides us with options to repurchase the vessel beginning on the fifth anniversary of the sale and until the end of the agreement.

The cost of the financing is equivalent to an implied fixed interest rate of 4.23% for 10 years. If converted to floating interest rates, based on the expected weighted average life of the transaction, the equivalent margin at the then prevailing swap rates would be LIBOR plus 2.07%.

Table of Contents

As of December 31, 2017, we had \$657.0 million of outstanding borrowings under the credit agreements and lease financing described above as shown in the following table (dollars in thousands):

	December 31, 2017 Amount outstanding	March 2, 2018 Amount outstanding
\$409 Million Credit Facility	174,443	173,123
\$330 Million Credit Facility	247,876	247,876
\$42 Million Credit Facility	22,354	22,354
\$67.5 Million Credit Facility	40,461	39,459
\$12.5 Million Credit Facility	10,183	10,183
\$27.3 Million Credit Facility	18,213	17,825
\$85.5 Million Credit Facility	85,500	85,500
\$38.7 Million Credit Facility	38,700	38,700
\$19.6 Million Lease Financing	19,268	19,073
Total	\$ 656,998	\$ 654,093

Our secured credit facilities are secured by, among other things: a first priority mortgage over the relevant collateralized vessels; a first priority assignment of earnings, and insurances from the mortgaged vessels for the specific facility; a pledge of the earnings account of the mortgaged vessels for the specific facility; and a pledge of the equity interests of each vessel owning subsidiary under the specific facility.

Loan Covenants

Certain of our credit facilities discussed above, have, among other things, the following financial covenants, as amended or waived, the most stringent of which require us to maintain:

• The ratio of net debt to total capitalization no greater than 0.60 to 1.00.

• Consolidated tangible net worth (adjusted for a minimum amount of \$100.0 million in historical non-operating costs and to exclude certain future non-operating items) including impairments, no less than \$500.0 million plus (i) 25% of cumulative positive net income (on a consolidated basis) for each fiscal quarter commencing on or after December 31, 2013 and (ii) 50% of the value of any new equity issues occurring on or after December 31, 2013.

• The ratio of EBITDA to net interest expense calculated on a year-to-date basis of greater than 1.00 to 1.00 for the quarters ending March 31, 2019 and June 30, 2019, 2.50 to 1.00 for the quarter ending September 30, 2019, calculated on a year-to-date basis and 2.50 to 1.00 for each quarter thereafter, calculated on a trailing four quarter basis.

• Minimum liquidity of not less than the greater of \$25.0 million or \$0.7 million per owned vessel.

• Maintain a minimum fair value of the collateral for each credit facility, such that the aggregate fair value of the vessels collateralizing the credit facility is 140%, except in the case of our \$67.5 Million Credit Facility, for which it is 115% of the aggregate principal amount outstanding under such credit facility, or, if we do not meet these thresholds to prepay a portion of the loan or provide additional security to eliminate the shortfall.

Our credit facilities discussed above have, among other things, the following restrictive covenants which would restrict our ability to:

- incur additional indebtedness;
- sell the collateral vessel, if applicable;
- make additional investments or acquisitions;
- pay dividends; and
- effect a change of control of us.

A violation of any of the financial covenants contained in our credit facilities described above may constitute an event of default under all of our credit facilities, which, unless cured within the grace period set forth under the credit facility, if applicable,

Table of Contents

or waived or modified by our lenders, provides our lenders with the right to, among other things, require us to post additional collateral, enhance our equity and liquidity, increase our interest payments, pay down our indebtedness to a level where we are in compliance with our loan covenants, sell vessels in our fleet, reclassify our indebtedness as current liabilities and accelerate our indebtedness and foreclose their liens on our vessels and the other assets securing the credit facilities, which would impair our ability to continue to conduct our business.

Furthermore, our credit facilities contain a cross-default provision that may be triggered by a default under one of our other credit facilities. A cross-default provision means that a default on one loan would result in a default on certain of our other loans. Because of the presence of cross-default provisions in certain of our credit facilities, the refusal of any one lender under our credit facilities to grant or extend a waiver could result in certain of our indebtedness being accelerated, even if our other lenders under our credit facilities have waived covenant defaults under the respective credit facilities. If our secured indebtedness is accelerated in full or in part, it would be very difficult in the current financing environment for us to refinance our debt or obtain additional financing and we could lose our vessels and other assets securing our credit facilities if our lenders foreclose their liens, which would adversely affect our ability to conduct our business.

Moreover, in connection with any waivers of or amendments to our credit facilities that we have obtained, or may obtain in the future, our lenders may impose additional operating and financial restrictions on us or modify the terms of our existing credit facilities. These restrictions may further restrict our ability to, among other things, pay dividends, make capital expenditures or incur additional indebtedness, including through the issuance of guarantees. In addition, our lenders may require the payment of additional fees, require prepayment of a portion of our indebtedness to them, accelerate the amortization schedule for our indebtedness and increase the interest rates they charge us on our outstanding indebtedness.

As of December 31, 2017, we were in compliance with all of the financial covenants contained in the credit facilities that we had entered into as of that date.

Please see Note 11, Debt, to our consolidated financial statements for additional information about our credit facilities. Senior Notes due 2019

On September 22, 2014, we issued \$65.0 million aggregate principal amount of our 7.50% senior unsecured notes due 2019, or our Senior Notes, in a registered public offering. The Senior Notes will mature on September 15, 2019, and may be redeemed in whole or in part at any time, or from time to time, after September 15, 2016. Interest on the Senior Notes is payable quarterly on each of March 15, June 15, September 15 and December 15, commencing on December 15, 2014. We used the net proceeds we received to fund installment payments due under our Newbuilding Program. On October 16, 2014, we issued an additional \$8.625 million aggregate principal amount of our Senior Notes, pursuant to the underwriters' option to purchase additional Senior Notes. Our Senior Notes due 2019 commenced trading on the NYSE on September 29, 2014 under the symbol "SLTB."

The indenture governing our Senior Notes contains certain restrictive covenants, including:

- (a) Limitation on Borrowings. We are prohibited from letting net borrowings equal or exceed 70% of our total assets, which are calculated as all of our assets of the types presented on our consolidated balance sheet.
- (b) Limitation on Minimum Tangible Net Worth. We shall ensure that our net worth always exceeds \$500 million.
- (c) Reports. Following any cross default, we shall promptly notify the holders of our Senior Notes of the occurrence of such cross default.
- (d) Limitation on Asset Sales. We shall not, and shall not permit any subsidiary to, in the ordinary course of business or otherwise, sell, lease, convey, transfer or otherwise dispose of any of our or any such subsidiary's assets (including capital stock and warrants, options or other rights to acquire capital stock) other than pursuant to a Permitted Asset Sale or a Limited Permitted Asset Sale (as such terms are defined in the indenture governing our Senior Notes and described below), unless (A) we receive, or the relevant subsidiary receives, consideration at the time of such asset sale at least equal to the fair market value (including as to the value of all non-cash consideration), as determined in good faith by our board of directors, of the assets subject to such asset sale, and (B) within 365 days after the receipt of any net proceeds from an asset sale, we or the relevant subsidiary, as the case may be, shall apply all such net proceeds to certain permitted purposes, including the repayment of secured indebtedness, capital expenditures, repayment of unsecured indebtedness, acquire all or substantially all of the

assets or, or the capital stock of, a person primarily engaged in a permitted business; provided, that in the case of the acquisition of capital stock of any person, such person is or becomes a subsidiary of the Company.

Table of Contents

For purposes of this covenant: a Permitted Asset Sale includes certain specified asset sales, certain vessel losses not to exceed 10% of the consolidated aggregate market value of our assets and any transaction or series of transactions involving assets disposed of for fair market value and having an aggregate market value in any one fiscal year of up to 25% of the consolidated aggregate market value of our assets; and a Limited Permitted Asset Sale includes any transaction or series of transactions during a single fiscal year, the net proceeds of which are not otherwise applied pursuant to the requirements set forth in this clause (d), that results in net proceeds in excess of 25% of the consolidated aggregate market value of our assets.

As of December 31, 2017, we were in compliance with the financial covenants of our Senior Notes.

If a Limited Permitted Asset Sale occurs, we must make an offer to purchase our Senior Notes having a principal amount equal to the excess proceeds of such Limited Permitted Asset Sale at a purchase price of 101% of the principal amount of our Senior Notes to be purchased, plus accrued and unpaid interest.

In addition, if a Change of Control (as defined in the indenture for the Senior Notes) occurs, holders of our Senior Notes have the right, at their option, to require us to purchase any or all of such holders' Senior Notes at a purchase price of 101% of the principal amount of our Senior Notes to be purchased, plus accrued and unpaid interest.

In addition, if an event of default or an event or circumstance which, with the giving of any notice or the lapse of time, would constitute an event of default under our Senior Notes has occurred and is continuing, or we are not in compliance with the covenant described under Limitation on Borrowings or Limitation on Minimum Tangible Net Worth described above, then none of the Company or any subsidiary will be permitted to declare or pay any dividends or return any capital to its equity holders (other than the Company or a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Company) or authorize or make any other distribution, payment or delivery of property or cash to its equity holders (other than the Company or a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Company), or redeem, retire, purchase or otherwise acquire, directly or indirectly, for value, any interest of any class or series of its equity interests (or acquire any rights, options or warrants relating thereto but not including convertible debt) now or hereafter outstanding and held by persons other than the Company or any wholly-owned subsidiary, or repay any subordinated loans to equity holders (other than the Company or a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Company) or set aside any funds for any of the foregoing purposes.

In December 2016, our Board of Directors authorized the repurchase of up to \$20.0 million of the outstanding Senior Notes in open market or privately negotiated transactions. The specific timing and amounts of the repurchases, which will be funded by available cash, will be in the sole discretion of management and vary based on market conditions and other factors. This authorization has no expiration date. As of December 31, 2017, the full \$20.0 million remains available for repurchases under this authorization.

C.Research and Development, Patents and Licenses, Etc.

Not applicable

D.Trend Information

See "Item 4. Information on the Company - B. Business Overview - Industry and Market Conditions."

E.Off-Balance Sheet Arrangements

As of December 31, 2017, we did not have any off-balance sheet arrangements. Currently, we are committed to make charter-hire payments to a third party for a chartered-in vessel. This arrangement is accounted for as an operating lease. Please see "Tabular Disclosure of Contractual Obligations" for our other contractual obligations and commitments.

Table of Contents

F. Tabular Disclosure of Contractual Obligations

The following table sets forth our total contractual obligations at December 31, 2017:

(in millions of U.S. dollars)	Less than 1 year	1 to 3 years	3 to 5 years	More than 5 years	Total
Vessels under construction ⁽¹⁾	\$ 18.8	\$—	\$—	\$—	\$ 18.8
Time charter-in commitments ⁽²⁾	3.7	2.8	—	—	6.5
Senior Notes ⁽³⁾	—	73.6	—	—	73.6
Bank loans ⁽⁴⁾	48.1	254.5	270.9	64.2	637.7
Interest payments ⁽⁵⁾	34.4	54.6	14.6	0.9	104.5
Financing obligation ⁽⁶⁾	2.0	3.9	3.9	9.5	19.3
Commercial management fee ⁽⁷⁾	3.1	—	—	—	3.1
Technical management fee ⁽⁸⁾	5.6	—	—	—	5.6
Total	\$ 105.0	\$ 385.5	\$ 285.5	\$ 65.1	\$ 841.1

(1) Represents the unpaid installments as of December 31, 2017 relating to a vessel under construction. Of the total \$25.5 million purchase price, \$18.8 million remains unpaid as of the date of this filing.

(2) Represents the amounts expected to be paid by us on the vessel that we have time chartered-in as of December 31, 2017, assuming we redeliver the vessel to its owner on the earliest redelivery date.

(3) Represents the repayment of our Senior Notes which mature in September 2019.

(4) Represents the repayment of installments under the bank loans outstanding as of December 31, 2017.

(5) Represents the interest payments on outstanding balances of our Senior Notes at 7.50% per annum and bank loans at the interest rates in effect at December 31, 2017.

(6) Represents the monthly payments of \$164,250 under a nine and a half year bareboat charter agreement entered into as part of the sale and leaseback of the SBI Rumba.

(7) Represents the fixed component of the termination fees we would have to pay our commercial manager, SCM, of \$300 per day for a notice period of three months' and a payment equal to three months of management fees for each vessel that we own and each vessel under construction as of December 31, 2017. Due to the variable nature of the commissions, they have been excluded from the above table.

(8) Represents the termination fees we would have to pay our technical manager, SSM, of \$0.2 million per vessel per year for a notice period of three months' and a payment equal to three months of management fees for each vessel that we own and each vessel under construction as of December 31, 2017.

ITEM 6. DIRECTORS, SENIOR MANAGEMENT AND EMPLOYEES

A. Directors and Senior Management

Set forth below are the names, ages and positions of our directors and executive officers. Our board of directors is elected annually on a staggered basis, and each director elected holds office for a three year term or until his successor shall have been duly elected and qualified, except in the event of his death, resignation, removal or the earlier termination of his term of office. Our Class B directors will serve for a term expiring at the 2018 annual meeting of shareholders, our Class C directors will serve for a term expiring at the 2019 annual meeting, and our Class A directors will serve for a term expiring at the 2020 annual meeting. Officers are elected from time to time by vote of our board of directors and hold office until a successor is elected. The business address of each of our directors and executive officers listed below is Scorpio Bulkiers Inc., 9, Boulevard Charles III, MC 98000 Monaco.

Table of Contents

Name	Age	Position
Emanuele A. Lauro	39	Chairman, Class A Director and Chief Executive Officer
Robert Bugbee	57	Class B Director and President
Cameron Mackey	49	Chief Operating Officer
Filippo Lauro	41	Vice President
Hugh Baker	50	Chief Financial Officer
Roberto Giorgi	67	Class A Director
Einar Michael Steimler	69	Class B Director
Christian M. Gut	38	Class C Director
Thomas Ostrander	67	Class A Director
James B. Nish	59	Class C Director
Anoushka Kachelo	37	Secretary

On September 25, 2017, Mr. Luca Forgione resigned as General Counsel of the Company, with an effective date of on or around November 10, 2017.

Biographical information concerning the directors and executive officers listed above is set forth below.

Emanuele A. Lauro, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer

Emanuele A. Lauro, the Company's co-founder, has served as our Chairman and Class A Director since April 9, 2013 and as our Chief Executive Officer since July 1, 2013. Mr. Lauro has also served as Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Scorpio Tankers (NYSE: STNG) since its initial public offering in April 2010, and as Director of the Standard Club since May 2013. He joined Scorpio Group in 2003 and has continued to serve there in a senior management position since 2004. Under Mr. Lauro's leadership, Scorpio Group has grown from an owner of three vessels in 2003 to become a leading operator and manager of approximately 230 vessels in 2017. Over the course of the last several years, Mr. Lauro has founded and developed all of the Scorpio Group Pools in addition to several other ventures such as Scorpio Logistics, which owns and operates specialized assets engaged in the transshipment of dry cargo commodities and invests in coastal transportation and port infrastructure developments in Asia and Africa since 2007. Mr. Lauro has a degree in international business from the European Business School, London. Mr. Lauro is the brother of our Vice President, Mr. Filippo Lauro.

Robert Bugbee, President and Director

Robert Bugbee, the Company's co-founder, has served as our Class B Director since April 9, 2013 and as our President since July 1, 2013. Mr. Bugbee has more than 30 years of experience in the shipping industry. Mr. Bugbee has also served as President and Director of Scorpio Tankers since its initial public offering in April 2010. He joined Scorpio Group in March 2009 and has continued to serve there in a senior management position. Prior to joining Scorpio Group, Mr. Bugbee was a partner at Ospraie Management LLP between 2007 and 2008, a company which advises and invests in commodities and basic industry. From 1995 to 2007, Mr. Bugbee was employed at OMI Corporation, or OMI, a NYSE-listed tanker company sold in 2007. While at OMI, Mr. Bugbee served as President from January 2002 until the sale of the company, and before that served as Executive Vice President since January 2001, Chief Operating Officer since March 2000 and Senior Vice President from August 1995 to June 1998. Mr. Bugbee joined OMI in February 1995. Prior to this, he was employed by Gotaas-Larsen Shipping Corporation since 1984. During this time he took a two year sabbatical from 1987 for the M.I.B. Program at the Norwegian School for Economics and Business administration in Bergen. He has a B.A. (Honors) from London University.

Cameron Mackey, Chief Operating Officer

Cameron Mackey has served as our Chief Operating Officer since July 1, 2013. Mr. Mackey has also served as Chief Operating Officer of Scorpio Tankers since its initial public offering in April 2010 and as a Director since May 2013. He joined Scorpio Group in March 2009, where he continues to serve in a senior management position. Prior to joining Scorpio Group, he was an equity and commodity analyst at Ospraie Management LLC from 2007 to 2008. Prior to that, he was Senior Vice President of OMI Marine Services LLC from 2004 to 2007, where he was also in Business Development from 2002 to 2004. He has been employed in the shipping industry since 1994 and, earlier in his career, was employed in unlicensed and licensed positions in the merchant navy, primarily on tankers in the international fleet of Mobil Oil Corporation, where he held the qualification of Master

Table of Contents

Mariner. He has an M.B.A. from the Sloan School of Management at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, a B.S. from the Massachusetts Maritime Academy and a B.A. from Princeton University.

Filippo Lauro, Vice President

Filippo Lauro has served as an executive officer of the Company with the title of Vice President since June 8, 2016. Mr. Filippo Lauro has also served as Vice President of Scorpio Tankers since May 2015. He joined Scorpio Group in 2010 and has continued to serve there in a senior management position. Prior to joining Scorpio Group, Mr. Filippo Lauro was the founder of and held senior executive roles in several private companies, primarily active in real estate, golf courses and resorts development. Mr. Filippo Lauro is the brother of our Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Mr. Emanuele Lauro.

Hugh Baker, Chief Financial Officer

Hugh Baker has served as our Chief Financial Officer since July 1, 2013. Since 2012, Mr. Baker has also been employed by Scorpio Tankers focusing on business development and finance. For three years before joining Scorpio, Mr. Baker was a Managing Director in the investment banking team at Evercore Partners in New York, concentrating on the shipping industry. Prior to Evercore, he was the Head of Shipping at HSH Nordbank in New York and was previously a Managing Director in the ship finance team at ING Bank in London. Prior to banking, Mr. Baker worked in commercial roles for Greek-owned shipping companies in London. Mr. Baker has a BA from the London School of Economics and a MSc in Shipping, Trade & Finance from Cass Business School. Mr. Baker is a Fellow of the Institute of Chartered Shipbrokers.

Roberto Giorgi, Director

Roberto Giorgi has served as our Class A Director since the closing of our initial public offering in December 2013. Mr. Giorgi has also served as Chairman of Fraser Yachts since September 2014 and as a committee member of Skuld P&I Club since June 2013. From 2014 to 2015, he served as Honorary President and member of the Group Executive of V.Ships, the world's largest ship management company. From 1988 to 2014, Mr. Giorgi has held various roles within V.Ships, including President of V.Ships Ship Management, Managing Director of V.Ships New York, head of V.Ships Leisure in the cruise sector, and head of V.Ship's ship management operation from its Monaco office. From 2008 to 2010, Mr. Giorgi also served as President of InterManager, the international trade association for third-party and in-house ship managers, whose members between them are responsible for approximately 3,700 ships and more than 200,000 crew members. Prior to joining the V.Ships Group, he attended the San Giorgio Nautical College in Genoa (1964 - 1969) and sailed from Deck Cadet to First Officer with Navigazione Alta Italia, Italian line and Sitmar Cruises. Before joining the merchant marine, he spent one year (1970/71) in the Naval Academy of Leghorn and sailed with the Italian Navy as Lieutenant.

Einar Michael Steimler, Director

Einar Michael Steimler has served as our Class B Director since the closing of our initial public offering in December 2013 and is our lead independent director. Mr. Steimler has also served as a director of DHT Holdings Inc. (NYSE:DHT), where he is also a member of the Nominating and Corporate Governance Committees, and the Chairman of the Compensation Committee. Mr. Steimler has over 45 years of experience in the shipping industry. In 2000, he was instrumental in the formation of Tanker (UK) Agencies, the commercial agent to Tankers International. He served as its Chief Executive Officer until the end of 2007, and subsequently as its Chairman until 2011. From 1998 to 2010, Mr. Steimler served as a Director of Euronav NV (EURN:EN Brussels). He has been involved in both sale and purchase and chartering brokerage in the tanker, gas and chemical sectors and was a founder of Stemoco, a Norwegian ship brokerage firm. He graduated from the Norwegian School of Business Management in 1973 with a degree in Economics.

Christian M. Gut, Director

Christian M. Gut has served as our Class C Director since the closing of our initial public offering in December 2013. Mr. Gut is the founder and manager of P2P Lending Fund, a Luxembourg based fund (SICAV-RAIF) launched in 2018 focused on marketplace consumer lending. He has over twelve years of experience in the consulting industry in the Asia Pacific region. Mr. Gut started his professional career at ThyssenKrupp Technologies AG (as it then was) in Essen, Germany in 2002. He later joined Singapore based EABC Pte Ltd., or EABC, in 2003 where he served as Director from 2006 to 2018. EABC's services comprise market intelligence and strategy, sales promotion and support

to project management in selected Asia Pacific countries, principally Australia. Furthermore, Mr. Gut co-founded and was a past manager of the Stellar Energy Fund, launched in Singapore in 2006, which invested in energy focused private companies to finance projects and expansion plans in Asia, Middle East and Europe in the following industries: oil trading and bunkering, gas E&P, solar, geothermal and power generating heat plants. Mr. Gut has a Bachelor's degree in international business from the European Business School in London.

Table of Contents

Thomas Ostrander, Director

Thomas Ostrander has served as our Class A director since January 2016. From 2013 to 2015, Mr. Ostrander served as Chief Financial Officer of U.S. Alliance Paper Inc., a privately held business involved in consumer tissue converting and marketing in the eastern half of the United States. From 2011 to 2013, he served as a Managing Director at GCA Savvian, a global investment bank. From 2006 to 2008, Mr. Ostrander served as a Managing Director and Sector Head in the Industrial Group at Banc of America Securities. From 1989 to 2006, he held various roles within Citigroup (legacy Salomon Brothers), where he was most recently Chairman of the Global Industrial Group for North America. Prior to that, he was Head of the Global Industrial Group for North America and Co-Head of the Global group. From 1976 to 1989, he served in various roles, including as a Managing Director, and he was a member of the Board of Directors of New York based Kidder Peabody & Co., where he also was Co-Founder and Co-Head of Equity Capital Markets. Furthermore, Mr. Ostrander was a Director of Westmoreland Coal Company for over 12 years, where he served as Chairman of the Corporate Governance Committee and was a member of the Audit, Compensation and Benefits, Finance and Nominating Committees. Mr. Ostrander has an MBA from Harvard Business School and an AB from the University of Michigan in Economics and Accounting.

James B. Nish, Director

James B. Nish has served as our Class C director since January 2016. Mr. Nish has 28 years of experience in investment banking, serving clients across a variety of international industrial markets. He also serves as a Board member and Chairman of the Audit Committee of Gibraltar Industries, Inc. (NASDAQ: ROCK), a manufacturer and distributor of products for building markets, a position he has held since 2015, and has served as a Board member of the CSG Group since 2014, a private company that provides security alarm monitoring and related home automation services to subscribers in the United States. From 2008 to 2012, Mr. Nish was Group Head of Middle Corporate Investment Banking at J.P. Morgan. From 1986 to 2008, he served as Co-Chairman of the Investment Banking Commitment Committee and Group Head of the General Industries Group of Bear Stearns & Co. Inc., where he organized and managed investment banking coverage of a diversified group of industrial companies. Mr. Nish is a Certified Public Accountant and Adjunct Professor in both the Undergraduate Business School and MBA Programs at Baruch College, Zicklin School of Business in New York and at Pace University, Lubin School of Business in New York, where he teaches a number of courses in both the Accounting and Finance departments. Mr. Nish has an MBA from the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania and a BS from the State University of New York at Buffalo in Accounting and Business.

Anoushka Kachelo, Secretary

Anoushka Kachelo has served as our Secretary since December 18, 2013. Mrs. Kachelo also serves as Secretary of Scorpio Tankers. She joined Scorpio Group in September 2010 as Senior Legal Counsel. Mrs. Kachelo is a Solicitor of the Supreme Court of England & Wales and has worked in the fields of commodity trading, energy and asset finance. Prior to joining the Scorpio Group, Mrs. Kachelo was Legal Counsel for the Commodities Team at JPMorgan (London) and prior to that in private practice for the London office of McDermott Will & Emery and Linklaters. She has a BA in Jurisprudence from the University of Oxford (U.K.).

B. Compensation

Each of our non-employee directors receive cash compensation in the aggregate amount of \$60,000 annually, plus either (i) an additional fee of \$10,000 per year for each committee on which a director serves or (ii) an additional fee of \$20,000 per year for each committee for which a director serves as Chairman. In addition, our lead independent director receives an additional fee of \$20,000 per year. All actual expenses incurred while acting in their capacity as a director are reimbursed. For each board or committee meeting the non-employee director attends, the director receives \$2,000. We do not have a retirement plan for our officers or directors. For the year ended December 31, 2017, we paid an aggregate compensation to our directors and senior management of approximately \$5.0 million.

Executive Officers

We have employment agreements with the majority of our executive officers. These employment agreements remain in effect until terminated in accordance with their terms upon no less than 24 months prior written notice. Pursuant to the terms of their respective employment agreements, our executive officers are prohibited from disclosing or unlawfully using any of our material confidential information.

Upon a change in control of us, the annual bonus provided under the employment agreement becomes a fixed bonus of between 150% and 250% of the executive's base salary, depending on the terms of the employment agreement applicable to each executive.

73

Table of Contents

Any such executive may be entitled to receive upon termination an assurance bonus equal to such fixed bonus and an immediate lump-sum payment in an amount equal to up to three times the sum of the executive's then current base salary and the assurance bonus. If an executive's employment is terminated for cause or voluntarily by the employee, he shall not be entitled to any salary, benefits or reimbursements beyond those accrued through the date of his termination, unless he voluntarily terminated his employment in connection with certain conditions. Those conditions include a change in control combined with a significant geographic relocation of his office, a material diminution of his duties and responsibilities, and other conditions identified in the employment agreement.

We believe that it is important to align the interests of our directors and management with that of our shareholders. In this regard, we have determined that it will generally be beneficial to us and to our shareholders for our directors and management to have a stake in our long-term performance. We expect to have a meaningful component of our compensation package for our directors and management consist of equity interests in us in order to provide them on an on-going basis with a meaningful percentage of ownership in us.

Equity Incentive Plan

Our board of directors has adopted an equity incentive plan, which we refer to as the Equity Incentive Plan, under which directors, officers and employees of us and our subsidiaries, as well as employees of affiliated companies are eligible to receive incentive stock options and non-qualified stock options, stock appreciation rights, restricted stock, restricted stock units and unrestricted common shares. As of December 31, 2017, we had reserved a total of 4,742,612 common shares, for issuance under the Equity Incentive Plan, subject to adjustment for changes in capitalization as provided in the Equity Incentive Plan. Our Equity Incentive Plan is administered by our Compensation Committee. Under the terms of the Equity Incentive Plan, stock options and stock appreciation rights granted under the Equity Incentive Plan will have an exercise price equal to the fair market value of a common share on the date of grant, unless otherwise determined by the plan administrator, but in no event will the exercise price be less than the fair market value of a common share on the date of grant. Options and stock appreciation rights will be exercisable at times and under conditions as determined by the plan administrator, but in no event will they be exercisable later than ten years from the date of grant.

The plan administrator may grant shares of restricted stock and awards of restricted stock units subject to vesting, forfeiture and other terms and conditions as determined by the plan administrator.

Adjustments may be made to outstanding awards in the event of a corporate transaction or change in capitalization or other extraordinary event. In the event of a "change in control" (as defined in the Equity Incentive Plan), unless otherwise provided by the plan administrator in an award agreement, awards then outstanding will become fully vested and exercisable in full.

Our board of directors may amend or terminate the Equity Incentive Plan and may amend outstanding awards, provided that no such amendment or termination may be made that would materially impair any rights, or materially increase any obligations, of a grantee under an outstanding award. Shareholder approval of Equity Incentive Plan amendments will be required under certain circumstances. Unless terminated earlier by our board of directors, the Equity Incentive Plan will expire ten years from the date the Equity Incentive Plan is adopted.

On February 2, 2018, we granted 646,182 restricted shares with an aggregate fair value of \$4.8 million to our officers, employees, members of our board of directors and SSH employees pursuant to the Equity Incentive Plan. These awards will vest in three equal annual installments beginning on December 9, 2019.

On June 1, 2017, we granted 150,000 restricted shares with an aggregate fair value of \$0.9 million to our independent directors pursuant to the Equity Incentive Plan. These awards will vest in three equal annual installments beginning on the first anniversary of the date of grant.

On July 28, 2016, we granted 2,265,000 restricted shares to our officers, employees, members of our board of directors and SSH employees pursuant to the Equity Incentive Plan. Of these restricted shares, 150,000 restricted shares vest in three equal annual installments beginning June 5, 2017 and 2,115,000 restricted shares vest in three equal annual installments beginning on June 5, 2018. The aggregate fair value of these awards is \$7.4 million.

Compensation cost is recognized on a straight-line basis over the requisite service period for each separately vesting portion of the award as if the award was, in-substance, multiple awards. Please see Note 10, Equity Incentive Plan, to our Consolidated Financial Statements included herein for additional information.

Table of Contents

C. Board Practices

Our board of directors currently consists of seven directors, five of whom have been determined by our board of directors to be independent under the rules of the NYSE and the rules and regulations of the SEC. Mr. Steimler is our lead independent director. Our board has an Audit Committee, a Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee and a Compensation Committee. During 2017 Messrs. Steimler and Gut stepped down from our Audit Committee and our Audit Committee is now comprised of Messrs. Ostrander, Giorgi and Nish. Our Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee and our Compensation Committee are comprised of Messrs. Steimler, Giorgi and Gut. The Audit Committee, which operates under a charter, among other things, reviews our external financial reporting, engages our external auditors and oversees our internal audit activities, procedures and the adequacy of our internal controls. In addition, provided that no member of the Audit Committee has a material interest in such transaction, the Audit Committee is responsible for reviewing transactions that we may enter into in the future with other members of the Scorpio Group that our board believes may present potential conflicts of interests between us and the Scorpio Group. The Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee is responsible for recommending to the board of directors nominees for director and directors for appointment to board committees and advising the board with regard to corporate governance practices. The Compensation Committee oversees our equity incentive plan and recommends director and senior employee compensation. Our shareholders may also nominate directors in accordance with procedures set forth in our bylaws.

D. Employees

For the years ended December 31, 2017, 2016, and 2015 we had six, three and four full time equivalents (excluding our executive officers), respectively.

Our executive officers are employed by us and our support staff is provided by SSH pursuant to the Amended Administrative Services Agreement. Our technical manager, SSM, is responsible for identifying, screening and recruiting, directly or through a crewing agent, the officers and all other crew members for our vessels that are employed by our vessel-owning subsidiaries.

E. Share ownership

The common shares beneficially owned by our directors and our executive officers are disclosed in “Item 7. Major Shareholders and Related Party Transactions—A. Major Shareholders.”

ITEM 7. MAJOR SHAREHOLDERS AND RELATED PARTY
TRANSACTIONS.

A. Major shareholders.

The following table sets forth information regarding beneficial ownership of our common shares for (i) owners of more than five percent of our common shares and (ii) our directors and executive officers, of which we are aware as of February 15, 2018. All of our shareholders, including the shareholders listed in the table below, are entitled to one vote for each share of our common stock held.

Name	No. of Shares	% Owned (1)
Scorpio Services Holding Limited	13,977,513(2)	18.1 %
GRM Investments Ltd.	12,839,328(3)	16.6 %
Evermore Global Advisors, LLC *	6,324,477 (4)	8.2 %
Directors and executive officers as a group	3,547,840	4.6 %

(1) Calculated based on 77,141,140 common shares outstanding as of February 15, 2018.

(2) This information is derived from a Schedule 13D/A filed with the SEC on June 23, 2017 adjusted for additional common shares issued to SSH as payment for fees pursuant to the Amended Administrative Services Agreement and shares subsequently purchased by SSH in the open market. Ms. Annalisa Lolli-Ghetti may be deemed to be the beneficial owner of these shares by virtue of being the majority shareholder of SSH. Emanuele Lauro, our Director and Chief Executive Officer, Robert Bugbee, our Director and President, and Cameron Mackey, our Chief Operating Officer, own 10%, 10% and 7% of

SSH, respectively.

(3) This information is derived from Schedule 13G/A filed with the SEC on July 25, 2017.

(4) This information is derived from Schedule 13G/A filed with the SEC on January 23, 2018.

Table of Contents

* Includes common shares held by funds managed thereby.

As of February 15, 2018, we had 71 shareholders of record, 12 of which were located in the United States and held an aggregate of 72,705,769 shares of our common stock, representing 94.3% of our outstanding common shares.

However, one of the U.S. shareholders of record is Cede & Co., a nominee of The Depository Trust Company, which held 70,667,878 shares of our common stock, as of that date. Accordingly, we believe that the shares held by Cede & Co. include common shares beneficially owned by both holders in the United States and non-U.S. beneficial owners. We are not aware of any arrangements the operation of which may at a subsequent date result in our change of control.

B. Related Party Transactions

Management of Our Fleet

Commercial and Technical Management Agreements - Revised Master Agreement

Our vessels are commercially managed by SCM and technically managed by SSM pursuant to the Revised Master Agreement, which may be terminated by either party upon 24 months' notice, unless terminated earlier in accordance with the provisions of the Revised Master Agreement. In the event of the sale of one or more vessels, a notice period of three months' and a payment equal to three months of management fees will apply, provided that the termination does not amount to a change of control, including a sale of substantially all vessels, in which case a payment equal to 24 months of management fees will apply. SCM and SSM are companies affiliated with us. The vessel we charter-in is also commercially managed by SCM. We expect that additional vessels that we may charter-in or acquire in the future, including the newbuilding vessel to be delivered to us during the middle of 2018, will also be managed under the Revised Master Agreement or on substantially similar terms.

SCM's services include securing employment for our vessels in the spot market and on time charters. SCM also manages the Scorpio Group Pools in which our vessels are employed. For commercial management of any of our vessels that does not operate in one of these pools, we pay SCM a daily fee of \$300 per vessel, plus a 1.75% commission on the gross revenues per charter fixture. The Scorpio Group Pool participants, including us and third-party owners of similar vessels, are each expected to pay SCM a pool management fee of \$300 per vessel per day, plus a 1.75% commission on the gross revenues per charter fixture.

SSM's services include providing technical support, such as arranging the hiring of qualified officers and crew, supervising the maintenance and performance of vessels, purchasing supplies, spare parts and new equipment, arranging and supervising drydocking and repairs, and monitoring regulatory and classification society compliance and customer standards. We pay SSM an annual fee of \$160,000 plus charges for certain itemized services per vessel to provide technical management services for each of our owned vessels. In addition, representatives of SSM, including certain subcontractors, provide us with construction supervisory services while our vessels are being constructed in shipyards. For these services, we compensate SSM for its direct expenses, which can vary between \$200,000 and \$500,000 per vessel.

Amended Administrative Services Agreement

In 2016, we entered into the Amended Administrative Services Agreement with SSH for the provision of administrative staff, office space and accounting, legal compliance, financial and information technology services. SSH is a company affiliated with us. The services provided to us by SSH may be sub-contracted to other entities within the Scorpio Group. Pursuant to the Amended Administrative Services Agreement, we reimburse SSH for the reasonable direct or indirect expenses it incurs in providing us with the administrative services described above. SSH also arranges vessel sales and purchases for us. We previously paid SSH a fee, payable in our common shares, for arranging vessel acquisitions, including newbuildings. The amount of common shares payable was determined by dividing \$250,000 by the market value of our common shares based on the volume weighted average price of our common shares over the 30 trading day period immediately preceding the contract date of a definitive agreement to acquire any vessel. As of the date of this annual report, we issued an aggregate of 180,716 common shares to SSH in connection with the deliveries of newbuilding vessels. In November 2014, SSH agreed to waive its fee on vessel acquisitions contracted after November 20, 2014, for so long as the closing price of our common shares remained below a specified threshold. Effective September 29, 2016, pursuant to the terms of the Amended Administrative Services Agreement, we agreed with SSH to eliminate this fee on all future acquisitions.

SSH has agreed with us not to own any drybulk carriers greater than 30,000 dwt for so long as the Amended Administrative Services Agreement is in full force and effect. This agreement may be terminated by SSH upon 12 months' prior written notice or by us with 24 months' notice.

Table of Contents

For the years ended December 31, 2017, 2016 and 2015, we had the following balances with entities controlled by the Lolli-Ghetti family and with Scorpio Tankers (herein referred to as “related parties”), which have been included in the consolidated statement of operations (amounts in thousands):

	For the year ended December 31,		
	2017	2016	2015
Vessel revenue			
Scorpio Kamsarmax Pool	\$67,825	\$31,319	\$25,151
Scorpio Ultramax Pool	94,380	46,227	26,338
Scorpio Capesize Pool	—	—	4,857
SCM	—	856	718
Total vessel revenue	\$162,205	\$78,402	\$57,064
Voyage expense			
SCM	\$172	\$319	\$664
Vessel operating cost:			
SSM	\$9,379	\$7,191	\$2,765
General and administrative expense:			
SCM	\$108	\$43	\$258
SSH	5,643	3,949	1,265
Scorpio UK Limited	971	862	486
Total general and administrative expense	\$6,722	\$4,854	\$2,009
Write down on assets held for sale			
SCM	\$147	\$500	\$12,465
SSM	200	500	13,000
Total write down on assets held for sale	\$347	\$1,000	\$25,465

At December 31, 2017 and 2016, we had the following balances with related parties, which have been included in the consolidated balance sheets (amounts in thousands):

	As of December 31,	
	2017	2016
Assets		
Due from related parties-current:		
Scorpio Kamsarmax Pool	\$3,977	\$2,579
Scorpio Ultramax Pool	2,578	1,661
Total due from related parties-current	\$6,555	\$4,240
Due from related parties non-current:		
Scorpio Kamsarmax Pool	\$5,080	\$4,606
Scorpio Ultramax Pool	10,741	6,633
Total due from related parties non-current	\$15,821	\$11,239
Liabilities		
Due to related parties-current:		
SCM	\$—	\$507
SSM	69	209
SSH	297	321
Total due from related parties-current	\$366	\$1,037

Please see “Item 3. Key Information - D. Risk Factors - Risks Related to our Relationship with Scorpio Group and its Affiliates”.

Table of Contents

Related Party Share Issuances

On June 20, 2016, we issued 23.0 million common shares, par value \$0.01 per share, at \$3.05 per share in an underwritten public offering. SSH purchased an aggregate of approximately 5.3 million common shares at the public offering price.

On March 22, 2016, we issued 21.0 million common shares, par value \$0.01 per share, at \$3.00 per share in an underwritten public offering. SSH and certain of our directors purchased an aggregate of approximately 5.0 million common shares at the public offering price.

On June 16, 2015, we issued approximately 11.1 million common shares, par value of \$0.01 per share at \$18.00 per share in an underwritten public offering. SSH and certain of our executive officers purchased an aggregate of approximately 0.8 million common shares at the public offering price. On June 23, 2015, underwriters exercised their option to purchase approximately 1.7 million additional common shares in connection with the public offering.

For information on additional share issuances under the Equity Incentive Plan see “Item 6. Directors, Senior Management and Employees - B. Equity Incentive Plan.”

C. INTERESTS OF EXPERTS AND COUNSEL

Not applicable.

ITEM 8. FINANCIAL INFORMATION

A. Consolidated Statements and Other Financial Information

See “Item 18. Financial Statements.”

Legal Proceedings

To our knowledge, we are not currently a party to any lawsuit that, if adversely determined, would have a material adverse effect on our financial position, results of operations or liquidity. As such, we do not believe that pending legal proceedings, taken as a whole, should have any significant impact on our financial statements. From time to time in the future we may be subject to legal proceedings and claims in the ordinary course of business, principally personal injury and property casualty claims. While we expect that these claims would be covered by our existing insurance policies, those claims, even if lacking merit, could result in the expenditure of significant financial and managerial resources. We have not been involved in any legal proceedings which may have, or have had, a significant effect on our financial position, results of operations or liquidity, nor are we aware of any proceedings that are pending or threatened which may have a significant effect on our financial position, results of operations or liquidity.

Dividend Policy

The declaration and payment of dividends is subject at all times to the discretion of our board of directors. The timing and amount of dividends, if any, depends on, among other things, our earnings, financial condition, cash requirements and availability, fleet renewal and expansion, restrictions in our loan agreements, the provisions of Marshall Islands law affecting the payment of dividends and other factors.

We are a holding company with no material assets other than the equity interests in our wholly-owned subsidiaries. As a result, our ability to pay dividends, if any, depends on our subsidiaries and their ability to distribute funds to us. Our credit facilities have restrictions on our ability, and the ability of certain of our subsidiaries, to pay dividends in the event of a default or breach of covenants under the credit facility agreement. Under such circumstances, we or our subsidiaries may not be able to pay dividends so long as we are in default or have breached certain covenants of the credit facility without our lender’s consent or waiver of the default or breach. In addition, Marshall Islands law generally prohibits the payment of dividends (i) other than from surplus (retained earnings and the excess of consideration received for the sale of shares above the par value of the shares) or (ii) when a company is insolvent or (iii) if the payment of the dividend would render the company insolvent.

In addition, we may incur expenses or liabilities, including extraordinary expenses, decreases in revenues, including as a result of unanticipated off-hire days or loss of a vessel, or increased cash needs that could reduce or eliminate the amount of cash that we have available for distribution as dividends.

Table of Contents

During the fourth quarter of 2017, our Board of Directors declared and we paid a quarterly cash dividend of \$0.02 per share totaling approximately \$1.5 million in the aggregate. In February 2018, our Board of Directors declared a quarterly cash dividend of \$0.02 per share, payable on or about March 15, 2018, to all shareholders of record as of February 15, 2018. Please see “Item 10. Additional Information - E. Taxation” for additional information relating to the U.S. federal income tax treatment of our dividend payments, if any are declared in the future.

B. Significant Changes.

There have been no significant changes since the date of the consolidated financial statements included in this annual report.

Table of Contents

ITEM 9. OFFER AND THE LISTING

A. Offer and Listing Details.

Our common shares have traded on the NYSE since December 12, 2013 under the symbol "SALT." In addition, during the period from July 3, 2013 through July 31, 2014, our common shares minimally traded on the Norwegian OTC under the symbol "SALT." The following table sets forth the high and low closing prices for our common shares for the periods indicated, as reported by the NYSE.

All share prices have been adjusted to account for the one-for-twelve reverse stock split effected on December 31, 2015.

For the Fiscal Year Ended	NYSE	
	High	Low
	(U.S.\$)	(U.S.\$)
December 31, 2017	\$9.8	\$ 5.65
December 31, 2016	8.34	1.84
December 31, 2015	33.12	7.20
December 31, 2014	126.9	2.92
December 31, 2013 (beginning December 12, 2013)	120.6	12.56

For the Quarter Ended	NYSE	
	High	Low
	(U.S.\$)	(U.S.\$)

December 31, 2017	\$8.70	\$ 6.75
September 30, 2017	8.40	6.55
June 30, 2017	9.80	5.80
March 31, 2017	9.70	5.65
December 31, 2016	5.80	3.39
September 30, 2016	3.99	2.91
June 30, 2016	4.20	2.65
March 31, 2016	8.34	1.84

For the Month	NYSE	
	High	Low
	(U.S.\$)	(U.S.\$)

February 2018	\$8.25	\$ 7.08
January 2018	8.45	7.40
December 2017	7.70	7.20
November 2017	8.20	7.10
October 2017	8.70	6.75
September 2017	7.95	6.85
August 2017	8.40	7.20

B. Plan of Distribution

Not applicable

Table of Contents

C. Markets

Our common shares have traded on the NYSE, since December 12, 2013, under the symbol “SALT,” and our Senior Notes have traded on the NYSE since September 29, 2014 under the symbol “SLTB.” During the period from July 3, 2013 through July 31, 2014, our common shares minimally traded on the Norwegian OTC under the symbol “SALT.”

D. Selling Shareholders

Not applicable.

E. Dilution

Not applicable.

F. Expenses of the Issue

Not applicable.

ITEM 10. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

A. Share capital.

Not applicable.

B. Memorandum and Articles of Association.

Our Amended and Restated Articles of Incorporation and bylaws have been filed as Exhibit 3.1 and Exhibit 3.2, respectively, to our Registration Statement on Form F-1 (Registration No. 333-192246), declared effective by the SEC on December 11, 2013, and are hereby incorporated by reference into this annual report. In December 2015, upon receiving shareholder approval, we amended our Amended and Restated Articles of Incorporation to effect a one-for-twelve reverse stock split of our common shares, par value \$0.01 per share, and to reduce the total number of authorized common shares to 56,250,000 shares. In June 2016, upon receiving shareholder approval, we amended our Amended and Restated Articles of Incorporation to increase the aggregate number of shares of capital stock that we are authorized to issue to One Hundred and Sixty-Two Million Five Hundred Thousand (162,500,000), consisting of One Hundred and Twelve Million Five Hundred Thousand (112,500,000) common shares, par value \$0.01 per share, and Fifty Million (50,000,000) preferred shares, par value \$0.01 per share. These amendments to our Amended and Restated Articles of Incorporation are filed as exhibits to this annual report.

Information regarding the rights, preferences and restrictions attaching to each class of our shares is described in the section entitled “Description of Capital Stock” in the accompanying prospectus to our Registration Statement on Form F-3 (File No. 333-222013) declared effective by the SEC on December 27, 2017, provided that since the date of such Registration Statement, our total issued and outstanding common shares has increased to 77,141,140 as of February 15, 2018.

C. Material contracts.

Attached as exhibits to this annual report are the contracts we consider to be both material and outside the ordinary course of business during the two-year period immediately preceding the date of this annual report. We refer you to “Item 4. Information on the Company”, “Item 5. Operating and Financial Review and Prospects - B. Liquidity and Capital Resources”, “Item 6. Directors, Senior Management and Employees—B. Compensation” and “Item 7. Major Shareholders and Related Party Transactions—B. Related Party Transactions” for a discussion of these agreements. Other than as set forth above, there were no material contracts, other than contracts entered into in the ordinary course of business, to which we were a party during the two year period immediately preceding the date of this annual report.

D. 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 our common shares.

E. Taxation

Table of Contents

The following is a discussion of the material Marshall Islands and U.S. federal income tax considerations of the ownership and disposition by a U.S. Holder and a Non-U.S. Holder, each as defined below, with respect to our common shares. This discussion does not purport to deal with the tax consequences of owning common shares to all categories of investors, some of which, such as dealers in securities or commodities, financial institutions, insurance companies, tax-exempt organizations, U.S. expatriates, persons liable for the alternative minimum tax, persons who hold common shares as part of a straddle, hedge, conversion transaction or integrated investment, U.S. Holders whose functional currency is not the United States dollar and investors that own, actually or under applicable constructive ownership rules, 10% or more of our common shares, may be subject to special rules. This discussion deals only with holders who hold our common shares as a capital asset. You are encouraged to consult your own tax advisors concerning the overall tax consequences arising in your own particular situation under U.S. federal, state, local or foreign law of the ownership of our common shares.

Marshall Islands Tax Considerations

In the opinion of Seward & Kissel LLP, the following are the material Marshall Islands tax consequences of our activities to us and of our common shares to our shareholders. We are incorporated in the Marshall Islands. Under current Marshall Islands law, we are not subject to tax on income or capital gains, and no Marshall Islands withholding tax will be imposed upon payments of dividends by us to our shareholders.

U.S. Federal Income Tax Considerations

In the opinion of Seward & Kissel LLP, our U.S. counsel, the following are the material U.S. federal income tax consequences of our activities to us, and of the ownership of our common shares to U.S. Holders and Non-U.S. Holders, each as defined below. The following discussion of U.S. federal income tax matters is based on the Code, judicial decisions, administrative pronouncements, and existing and proposed regulations issued by the U.S. Department of the Treasury, or the Treasury Regulations, all of which are subject to change, possibly with retroactive effect.

U.S. Federal Income Taxation of Operating Income: In General

We anticipate that we will earn substantially all our income from the hiring or leasing of vessels for use on a spot or time charter basis, from participation in a pool or from the performance of services directly related to those uses, all of which we refer to as “shipping income.”

Unless we qualify from an exemption from U.S. federal income taxation under Section 883 of the Code, or Section 883, as discussed below, a foreign corporation will be subject to U.S. federal income taxation on its “shipping income” that is treated as derived from sources within the United States, to which we refer as “U.S. source shipping income.” For U.S. federal income tax purposes, “U.S. source shipping income” includes 50% of shipping income that is attributable to transportation that begins or ends, but that does not both begin and end, in the United States.

Shipping income attributable to transportation exclusively between non-U.S. ports will be considered to be 100% derived from sources entirely outside the United States. Shipping income derived from sources outside the United States will not be subject to any U.S. federal income tax.

Shipping income attributable to transportation exclusively between U.S. ports is considered to be 100% derived from U.S. sources. However, we are not permitted by U.S. law to engage in the transportation that produces 100% U.S. source shipping income.

In the absence of exemption from tax under Section 883, we anticipate that our gross U.S. source shipping income would be subject to a 4% U.S. federal income tax imposed without allowance for deductions, as described below.

Exemption of Operating Income from U.S. Federal Income Taxation

Under Section 883 and the Treasury Regulations thereunder, a foreign corporation will be exempt from U.S. federal income taxation of its U.S. source shipping income if:

- (1) it is organized in a “qualified foreign country,” which is one that grants an “equivalent exemption” from tax to corporations organized in the U.S. in respect of each category of shipping income for which exemption is being claimed under Section 883; and
- (2) one of the following tests is met: (A) more than 50% of the value of its shares is beneficially owned, directly or indirectly, by “qualified shareholders,” which as defined includes individuals who are “residents” of a qualified foreign country,

Table of Contents

to which we refer as the “50% Ownership Test”; or (B) its shares are “primarily and regularly traded on an established securities market” in a qualified foreign country or in the United States, to which we refer as the “Publicly-Traded Test.” The Republic of the Marshall Islands, the jurisdiction where we are incorporated, has been officially recognized by the IRS as a qualified foreign country that grants the requisite “equivalent exemption” from tax in respect of each category of shipping income we earn and currently expect to earn in the future. Therefore, we will be exempt from U.S. federal income taxation with respect to our U.S. source shipping income if we satisfy either the 50% Ownership Test or the Publicly-Traded Test.

Given the widely held nature of our common shares, we do not currently anticipate circumstances under which we would be able to satisfy the 50% Ownership Test.

Publicly-Traded Test

The Treasury Regulations promulgated under Section 883 provide, in pertinent part, that shares of a foreign corporation will be considered to be “primarily traded” on an established securities market in a country if the number of shares of each class of stock that are traded during any taxable year on all established securities markets in that country exceeds the number of shares in each such class that are traded during that year on established securities markets in any other single country. Our common shares, which constitute our sole class of issued and outstanding stock, are “primarily traded” on the NYSE, which is an established market for these purposes.

Under the Treasury Regulations, our common shares will be considered to be “regularly traded” on an established securities market if one or more classes of our shares representing more than 50% of our outstanding stock, by both total combined voting power of all classes of stock entitled to vote and total value, are listed on such market, to which we refer as the “listing threshold.” Our common shares, which constitutes our sole class of issued and outstanding stock, is listed on the NYSE. Accordingly, we will satisfy the listing threshold.

The Treasury Regulations also require that with respect to each class of stock relied upon to meet the listing threshold, (1) such class of stock is traded on the market, other than in minimal quantities, on at least 60 days during the taxable year or one-sixth of the days in a short taxable year, which we refer to as the “trading frequency test”; and (2) the aggregate number of shares of such class of stock traded on such market during the taxable year must be at least 10% of the average number of shares of such class of stock outstanding during such year or as appropriately adjusted in the case of a short taxable year, which we refer to as the “trading volume” test. Even if this were not the case, the Treasury Regulations provide that the trading frequency and trading volume tests will be deemed satisfied if, as is expected to be the case with our common shares, such class of stock is traded on an established securities market in the United States and such shares are regularly quoted by dealers making a market in such shares.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Treasury Regulations provide, in pertinent part, that a class of shares will not be considered to be “regularly traded” on an established securities market for any taxable year in which 50% or more of the vote and value of the outstanding shares of such class are owned, actually or constructively under specified share attribution rules, on more than half the days during the taxable year by persons who each own 5% or more of the vote and value of such class of outstanding stock, to which we refer as the “5% Override Rule.”

For purposes of being able to determine the persons who actually or constructively own 5% or more of the vote and value of our common shares, or “5% Shareholders,” the Treasury Regulations permit us to rely on those persons that are identified on Schedule 13G and Schedule 13D filings with the SEC, as owning 5% or more of our common shares.

The Treasury Regulations further provide that an investment company that is registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, will not be treated as a 5% Shareholder for such purposes.

In the event the 5% Override Rule is triggered, the Treasury Regulations provide that the 5% Override Rule will nevertheless not apply if we can establish that within the group of 5% Shareholders, qualified shareholders (as defined for purposes of Section 883) own sufficient number of shares to preclude non-qualified shareholders in such group from owning 50% or more of our common shares for more than half the number of days during the taxable year.

We believe that we satisfied the Publicly-Traded Test for the 2017 taxable year and were not subject to the 5% Override Rule, and we intend to take that position on our 2017 U.S. federal income tax returns.

Taxation in Absence of Section 883 Exemption

If the benefits of Section 883 are unavailable, our U.S. source shipping income would be subject to a 4% tax imposed by Section 887 of the Code on a gross basis, without the benefit of deductions, or the “4% gross basis tax regime,” to the

extent that such income is not considered to be “effectively connected” with the conduct of a U.S. trade or business, as described below. Since under the sourcing rules described above, no more than 50% of our shipping income would be treated as being U.S. source

Table of Contents

shipping income, the maximum effective rate of U.S. federal income tax on our shipping income would never exceed 2% (i.e., 50% of 4% gross basis tax regime).

To the extent our U.S. source shipping income is considered to be “effectively connected” with the conduct of a U.S. trade or business, as described below, any such “effectively connected” U.S. source shipping income, net of applicable deductions, would be subject to U.S. federal income tax, currently imposed at rates of up to 35%. In addition, we would generally be subject to the 30% “branch profits” tax on earnings effectively connected with the conduct of such trade or business, as determined after allowance for certain adjustments, and on certain interest paid or deemed paid attributable to the conduct of our U.S. trade or business.

Our U.S. source shipping income would be considered “effectively connected” with the conduct of a U.S. trade or business only if:

- (1) we have, or are considered to have, a fixed place of business in the United States involved in the earning of U.S. source shipping income; and
- (2) substantially all of our U.S. source shipping income is attributable to regularly scheduled transportation, such as the operation of a vessel that follows a published schedule with repeated sailings at regular intervals between the same points for voyages that begin or end in the United States.

We do not intend to have, or permit circumstances that would result in having, any vessel sailing to or from the United States on a regularly scheduled basis. Based on the foregoing and on the expected mode of our shipping operations and other activities, it is anticipated that none of our U.S. source shipping income will be treated as “effectively connected” with the conduct of a U.S. trade or business, which we refer to as ECI.

U.S. Taxation of Gain on Sale of Vessels

Regardless of whether we qualify for exemption under Section 883, we will not be subject to U.S. federal income tax with respect to gain realized on a sale of a vessel, provided the sale is considered to occur outside of the United States under U.S. federal income tax principles. In general, a sale of a vessel will be considered to occur outside of the United States for this purpose if title to the vessel, and risk of loss with respect to the vessel, pass to the buyer outside of the United States. It is expected that any sale of a vessel by us will be considered to occur outside of the United States.

U.S. Federal Income Taxation of U.S. Holders

As used herein, the term “U.S. Holder” means a holder that for U.S. federal income tax purposes is a beneficial owner of common shares and is an individual U.S. citizen or resident, a U.S. corporation or other U.S. entity taxable as a corporation, an estate the income of which is subject to U.S. federal income taxation regardless of its source, or a trust if a court within the United States is able to exercise primary jurisdiction over the administration of the trust and one or more U.S. persons have the authority to control all substantial decisions of the trust.

If a partnership holds the common shares, the tax treatment of a partner will generally depend upon the status of the partner and upon the activities of the partnership. If you are a partner in a partnership holding the common shares, you are encouraged to consult your tax advisor.

Distributions

Subject to the discussion of passive foreign investment companies below, any distributions made by us with respect to our common shares to a U.S. Holder will generally constitute dividends to the extent of our current or accumulated earnings and profits, as determined under U.S. federal income tax principles. Distributions in excess of such earnings and profits will be treated first as a nontaxable return of capital to the extent of the U.S. Holder’s tax basis in our common shares and thereafter as capital gain. Because we are not a U.S. corporation, U.S. Holders that are corporations will not be entitled to claim a dividends received deduction with respect to any distributions they receive from us. Dividends paid with respect to our common shares will generally be treated as foreign source dividend income and will generally constitute “passive category income” for purposes of computing allowable foreign tax credits for U.S. foreign tax credit purposes.

Dividends paid on our common shares to certain non-corporate U.S. Holders will generally be treated as “qualified dividend income” that is taxable to such U.S. Holders at preferential tax rates provided that (1) the common shares are readily tradable on an established securities market in the United States (such as the NYSE); (2) we are not a passive foreign investment company for the taxable year during which the dividend is paid or the immediately preceding

taxable year (as discussed in detail

84

Table of Contents

below); (3) the non-corporate U.S. Holder has owned the common shares for more than 60 days in the 121-day period beginning 60 days before the date on which the common shares become ex-dividend; and (4) certain other conditions are met.

There is no assurance that any dividends paid on our common shares will be eligible for these preferential rates in the hands of such non-corporate U.S. Holders. Any dividends paid by us which are not eligible for these preferential rates will be taxed as ordinary income to a non-corporate U.S. Holder.

Special rules may apply to any “extraordinary dividend” generally, a dividend in an amount which is equal to or in excess of 10% of a shareholder’s adjusted tax basis in a common share-paid by us. If we pay an “extraordinary dividend” on our common shares that is treated as “qualified dividend income,” then any loss derived by certain non-corporate U.S. Holders from the sale or exchange of such common shares will be treated as long term capital loss to the extent of such dividend.

Sale, Exchange or Other Disposition of Common Shares

Assuming we do not constitute a passive foreign investment company for any taxable year, a U.S. Holder generally will recognize taxable gain or loss upon a sale, exchange or other disposition of our common shares in an amount equal to the difference between the amount realized by the U.S. Holder from such sale, exchange or other disposition and the U.S. Holder’s tax basis in such shares. Such gain or loss will be treated as long-term capital gain or loss if the U.S. Holder’s holding period is greater than one year at the time of the sale, exchange or other disposition. Such capital gain or loss will generally be treated as U.S. source income or loss, as applicable, for U.S. foreign tax credit purposes. Long-term capital gains of certain non-corporate U.S. Holders are currently eligible for reduced rates of taxation. A U.S. Holder’s ability to deduct capital losses is subject to certain limitations.

Passive Foreign Investment Company Status and Significant Tax Consequences

Special U.S. federal income tax rules apply to a U.S. Holder that holds shares in a foreign corporation classified as a “passive foreign investment company,” or a PFIC, for U.S. federal income tax purposes. In general, we will be treated as a PFIC with respect to a U.S. Holder if, for any taxable year in which such holder holds our common shares, either

at least 75% of our gross income for such taxable year consists of passive income (e.g., dividends, interest, capital (1) gains and rents derived other than in the active conduct of a rental business), which we refer to as the income test;

or

(2) at least 50% of the average value of our assets during such taxable year produce, or are held for the production of, passive income, which we refer to as the asset test.

For purposes of determining whether we are a PFIC, cash will be treated as an asset which is held for the production of passive income. In addition, we will be treated as earning and owning our proportionate share of the income and assets, respectively, of any of our subsidiary corporations in which we own at least 25% of the value of the subsidiary’s stock. Income earned, or deemed earned, by us in connection with the performance of services would not constitute passive income. By contrast, rental income would generally constitute “passive income” unless we were treated under specific rules as deriving our rental income in the active conduct of a trade or business.

For our 2017 taxable year and subsequent taxable years, whether we will be treated as a PFIC will depend upon the nature and extent of our operations. In making the determination as to whether we are a PFIC, we intend to treat the gross income that we derive or that we are deemed to derive from the spot chartering and time chartering activities of us or any of our subsidiaries as services income, rather than rental income. Correspondingly, such income should not constitute passive income, and the assets that we or our wholly owned subsidiaries own and operate in connection with the production of such income should not constitute passive assets for purposes of determining whether we are a PFIC. We believe that there is substantial legal authority supporting our position consisting of case law and IRS pronouncements concerning the characterization of income derived from time charters and voyage charters as services income for other tax purposes. However, there is also authority which characterizes time charter income as rental income rather than services income for other tax purposes. In the absence of any legal authority specifically relating to the statutory provisions governing PFICs, the IRS or a court could disagree with our position. In addition, although we intend to conduct our affairs in a manner to avoid being classified as a PFIC with respect to any taxable year, we cannot assure you that the nature of our operations will not change in the future.

As discussed more fully below, if we were to be treated as a PFIC for any taxable year, a U.S. Holder would be subject to different taxation rules depending on whether the U.S. Holder makes an election to treat us as a “Qualified Electing Fund,” which election we refer to as a “QEF election.” As an alternative to making a QEF election, a U.S. Holder should be able to make a “mark-to-market” election with respect to our common shares, as discussed below. If we were treated as a PFIC, a U.S. Holder will generally be required to file IRS Form 8621 with respect to its ownership of our common shares, and may be subject to

Table of Contents

additional U.S. tax or information reporting obligations in connection with the acquisition, holding or disposition of our common shares.

Taxation of U.S. Holders Making a Timely QEF Election

If a U.S. Holder makes a timely QEF election, which U.S. Holder we refer to as an “Electing Holder,” the Electing Holder must report for U.S. federal income tax purposes its pro rata share of our ordinary earnings and net capital gain, if any, for each of our taxable years during which we are a PFIC that ends with or within the taxable year of the Electing Holder, regardless of whether distributions were received from us by the Electing Holder. No portion of any such inclusions of ordinary earnings will be treated as “qualified dividend income.” Net capital gain inclusions of certain non-corporate U.S. Holders may be eligible for preferential capital gains tax rates. The Electing Holder’s adjusted tax basis in the common shares will be increased to reflect any income included under the QEF election. Distributions of previously taxed income will not be subject to tax upon distribution but will decrease the Electing Holder’s tax basis in the common shares. An Electing Holder would not, however, be entitled to a deduction for its pro rata share of any losses that we incur with respect to any taxable year. An Electing Holder would generally recognize capital gain or loss on the sale, exchange or other disposition of our common shares. A U.S. Holder would make a timely QEF election for our common shares by filing IRS Form 8621 with his U.S. federal income tax return for the first year in which he held such shares when we were a PFIC. If we determine that we are a PFIC for any taxable year, we intend to provide each U.S. Holder with information necessary for the U.S. Holder to make the QEF election described above. If we were treated as a PFIC for our 2017 taxable year, we anticipate that, based on our current projections, we would not have a significant amount of taxable income or gain that would be required to be taken into account by U.S. Holders making a QEF election effective for such taxable year.

Taxation of U.S. Holders Making a “Mark-to-Market” Election

If we were to be treated as a PFIC for any taxable year and, as we anticipate will be the case, our shares are treated as “marketable stock,” a U.S. Holder would be allowed to make a “mark-to-market” election with respect to our common shares, provided the U.S. Holder completes and files IRS Form 8621 in accordance with the relevant instructions and related Treasury Regulations. If that election is made, the U.S. Holder generally would include as ordinary income in each taxable year the excess, if any, of the fair market value of the common shares at the end of the taxable year over such Holder’s adjusted tax basis in the common shares. The U.S. Holder would also be permitted an ordinary loss in respect of the excess, if any, of the U.S. Holder’s adjusted tax basis in the common shares over its fair market value at the end of the taxable year, but only to the extent of the net amount previously included in income as a result of the mark-to-market election. A U.S. Holder’s tax basis in our common shares would be adjusted to reflect any such income or loss amount recognized. Any gain realized on the sale, exchange or other disposition of our common shares would be treated as ordinary income, and any loss realized on the sale, exchange or other disposition of the common shares would be treated as ordinary loss to the extent that such loss does not exceed the net mark-to-market gains previously included by the U.S. Holder.

Taxation of U.S. Holders Not Making a Timely QEF or Mark-to-Market Election

If we were to be treated as a PFIC for any taxable year, a U.S. Holder who does not make either a QEF election or a “mark-to-market” election for that year, which we refer to as a “Non-Electing Holder,” would be subject to special rules with respect to (1) any excess distribution (i.e., the portion of any distributions received by the Non-Electing Holder on the common shares in a taxable year in excess of 125% of the average annual distributions received by the Non-Electing Holder in the three preceding taxable years, or, if shorter, the Non-Electing Holder’s holding period for the common shares), and (2) any gain realized on the sale, exchange or other disposition of our common shares. Under these special rules:

- (1) the excess distribution or gain would be allocated ratably over the Non-Electing Holder’s aggregate holding period for the common shares;
- (2) the amount allocated to the current taxable year, and any taxable year prior to the first taxable year in which we were a PFIC, would be taxed as ordinary income and would not be “qualified dividend income”; and the amount allocated to each of the other taxable years would be subject to tax at the highest rate of tax in effect for
- (3) the applicable class of taxpayer for that year, and an interest charge for the deemed tax deferral benefit would be imposed with respect to the resulting tax attributable to each such other taxable year.

U.S. Federal Income Taxation of “Non-U.S. Holders”

As used herein, the term “Non-U.S. Holder” means a holder that, for U.S. federal income tax purposes, is a beneficial owner of common shares (other than a partnership) and who is not a U.S. Holder.

Table of Contents

If a partnership holds our common shares, the tax treatment of a partner will generally depend upon the status of the partner and upon the activities of the partnership. If you are a partner in a partnership holding our common shares, you are encouraged to consult your tax adviser.

Dividends on Common Shares

A Non-U.S. Holder generally will not be subject to U.S. federal income or withholding tax on dividends received from us with respect to our common shares, unless that income is effectively connected with the Non-U.S. Holder's conduct of a trade or business in the United States. In general, if the Non-U.S. Holder is entitled to the benefits of an applicable U.S. income tax treaty with respect to those dividends, that income is taxable only if it is attributable to a permanent establishment maintained by the Non-U.S. Holder in the United States.

Sale, Exchange or Other Disposition of Common Shares

A Non-U.S. Holder generally will not be subject to U.S. federal income or withholding tax on any gain realized upon the sale, exchange or other disposition of our common shares, unless:

- (1) the gain is effectively connected with the Non-U.S. Holder's conduct of a trade or business in the United States; in general, in the case of a Non-U.S. Holder entitled to the benefits of an applicable U.S. income tax treaty with respect to that gain, that gain is taxable only if it is attributable to a permanent establishment maintained by the Non-U.S. Holder in the United States; or
- (2) the Non-U.S. Holder is an individual who is present in the United States for 183 days or more during the taxable year of disposition and who also meets other conditions.

Income or Gains Effectively Connected with a U.S. Trade or Business

If the Non-U.S. Holder is engaged in a U.S. trade or business for U.S. federal income tax purposes, dividends on the common shares and gains from the sale, exchange or other disposition of the shares, that are effectively connected with the conduct of that trade or business (and, if required by an applicable U.S. income tax treaty, is attributable to a U.S. permanent establishment), will generally be subject to regular U.S. federal income tax in the same manner as discussed in the previous section relating to the taxation of U.S. Holders. In addition, in the case of a corporate Non-U.S. Holder, its earnings and profits that are attributable to the effectively connected income, which are subject to certain adjustments, may be subject to an additional U.S. federal branch profits tax at a rate of 30%, or at a lower rate as may be specified by an applicable U.S. income tax treaty.

Backup Withholding and Information Reporting

In general, dividend payments, or other taxable distributions, and the payment of gross proceeds on a sale or other disposition of our common shares, made within the United States to a non-corporate U.S. Holder will be subject to information reporting. Such payments or distributions may also be subject to backup withholding if the non-corporate U.S. Holder:

- (1) fails to provide an accurate taxpayer identification number;
- (2) is notified by the IRS that it has failed to report all interest or dividends required to be shown on its U.S. federal income tax returns; or
- (3) in certain circumstances, fails to comply with applicable certification requirements.

Non-U.S. Holders may be required to establish their exemption from information reporting and backup withholding with respect to dividend payments or other taxable distributions on our common shares by certifying their status on an applicable IRS Form W-8. If a Non-U.S. Holder sells our common shares to or through a U.S. office of a broker, the payment of the proceeds is subject to both U.S. backup withholding and information reporting unless the Non-U.S. Holder certifies that it is a non-U.S. person, under penalties of perjury, or it otherwise establishes an exemption. If a Non-U.S. Holder sells our common shares through a non-U.S. office of a non-U.S. broker and the sales proceeds are paid outside the United States, then information reporting and backup withholding generally will not apply to that payment. However, U.S. information reporting requirements, but not backup withholding, will apply to a payment of sales proceeds, even if that payment is made outside the United States, if a Non-U.S. Holder sells our common shares through a non-U.S. office of a broker that is a U.S. person or has some other contacts with the United States. Such information reporting requirements will not apply, however, if the broker has documentary evidence in its records that the Non-U.S. Holder is not a U.S. person and certain other conditions are met, or the Non-U.S. Holder otherwise establishes an exemption.

Table of Contents

Backup withholding is not an additional tax. Rather, a refund may generally be obtained of any amounts withheld under backup withholding rules that exceed the taxpayer's U.S. federal income tax liability by filing a timely refund claim with the IRS.

Individuals who are U.S. Holders (and to the extent specified in applicable Treasury Regulations, Non-U.S. Holders and certain U.S. entities) who hold "specified foreign financial assets" (as defined in Section 6038D of the Code) are required to file IRS Form 8938 with information relating to the asset for each taxable year in which the aggregate value of all such assets exceeds \$75,000 at any time during the taxable year or \$50,000 on the last day of the taxable year (or such higher dollar amount as prescribed by applicable Treasury Regulations). Specified foreign financial assets would include, among other assets, our common shares, unless the common shares are held in an account maintained with a U.S. financial institution. Substantial penalties apply to any failure to timely file IRS Form 8938, unless the failure is shown to be due to reasonable cause and not due to willful neglect. Additionally, in the event an individual U.S. Holder (and to the extent specified in applicable Treasury Regulations, a Non-U.S. Holder or a U.S. entity) that is required to file IRS Form 8938 does not file such form, the statute of limitations on the assessment and collection of U.S. federal income taxes of such holder for the related tax year may not close until three years after the date that the required information is filed. U.S. Holders (including U.S. entities) and Non-U.S. Holders are encouraged to consult their own tax advisors regarding their reporting obligations in respect of our common shares.

F. Dividends and paying agents.

Not applicable.

G. Statement by experts.

Not applicable.

H. Documents on display.

We file reports and other information with the SEC. These materials, including this annual report and the accompanying exhibits, may be inspected and copied at the public reference facilities maintained by the SEC at 100 F Street, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20549, or from its website <http://www.sec.gov>. You may obtain information on the operation of the public reference room by calling 1 (800) SEC-0330, and you may obtain copies at prescribed rates. Shareholders may also request a copy of our filings at no cost, by writing to us at the following address: 9, Boulevard Charles III, Monaco, 98000 or telephoning us at + 377 9798 5715.

I. Subsidiary Information

Not applicable.

ITEM 11. QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE DISCLOSURES ABOUT MARKET RISK

Interest Rate Risk

We are exposed to the impact of interest rate changes primarily through our unhedged variable-rate borrowings. Significant increases in interest rates could adversely affect our operating margins, results of operations and our ability to service our debt. As of December 31, 2017, we have variable-rate borrowings totaling \$730.6 million. A one percent increase in LIBOR rates would increase our interest payments by approximately \$7.3 million per year from January 1, 2018. We entered into interest rate cap agreements, in which we receive payments if floating rates rise above a specified cap rate, to help mitigate the interest rate volatility associated with the variable rate interest on the amounts outstanding. Please see Note 12, Derivatives, to our Consolidated Financial Statements included herein for additional information.

Spot Market Rate Risk

The cyclical nature of the tanker industry causes significant increases or decreases in the revenue that we earn from our vessels, particularly those vessels that operate in the spot market or participate in pools that are concentrated in the spot market such as the Scorpio Group Pools. Our owned and chartered-in vessels operated for 17,010 days in the spot market or in the Scorpio Group Pools during 2017. Additionally, we have the ability to remove our vessels from the pools on relatively short notice if attractive time charter opportunities arise. A \$1,000 per day increase or decrease in spot rates for our operating fleet of 55 vessels would increase or decrease our operating income loss by \$17.1 million on an annual basis.

Table of Contents

Foreign Exchange Rate Risk

Our primary economic environment is the international shipping market. This market utilizes the U.S. dollar as its functional currency. Consequently, virtually all of our revenues and the majority of our operating expenses will be in U.S. dollars. However, we will incur some of our combined expenses in other currencies, particularly the Euro. The amount and frequency of some of these expenses (such as vessel repairs, supplies and stores) may fluctuate from period to period. Depreciation in the value of the U.S. dollar relative to other currencies will increase the U.S. dollar cost of us paying such expenses. The portion of our business conducted in other currencies could increase in the future, which could expand our exposure to losses arising from currency fluctuations.

There is a risk that currency fluctuations will have a negative effect on our cash flows. We have not entered into any hedging contracts to protect against currency fluctuations. However, we have some ability to shift the purchase of goods and services from one country to another and, thus, from one currency to another, on relatively short notice. We may seek to hedge this currency fluctuation risk in the future.

ITEM 12. DESCRIPTION OF SECURITIES OTHER THAN EQUITY SECURITIES

Not applicable.

PART II

ITEM 13. DEFAULTS, DIVIDEND ARREARAGES AND DELINQUENCIES

None.

ITEM 14. MATERIAL MODIFICATIONS TO THE RIGHTS OF SECURITY HOLDERS AND USE OF PROCEEDS

None.

ITEM 15. CONTROLS AND PROCEDURES

A. Disclosure Controls and Procedures

We maintain disclosure controls and procedures that are designed to ensure that information required to be disclosed in our reports under the Exchange Act is recorded, processed, summarized and reported within time periods specified in the SEC's rules and forms, and that such information is accumulated and communicated to management, including the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, as appropriate, to allow timely decisions regarding required disclosures. Our controls and procedures are designed to provide reasonable assurance of achieving their objectives. We carried out an evaluation under the supervision, and with the participation of our management, including our Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer, of the effectiveness of the design and operation of our disclosure controls and procedures (as defined in Rules 13a-15(e) and 15d-15e under the Securities Act) as of December 31, 2017. Based upon that evaluation, our Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer concluded that our disclosure controls and procedures were effective as of December 31, 2017 to provide reasonable assurance that (1) information required to be disclosed by us in the reports that we file under the Exchange Act is recorded, processed, summarized and reported within the time periods specified in the SEC's rules and forms, and (2) such information is accumulated and communicated to our management, including our Chief Executive Officer and our Chief Financial Officer, as appropriate, to allow timely decisions regarding required disclosures.

Table of Contents

There are inherent limitations to the effectiveness of any system of disclosure controls and procedures, including the possibility of human error and the circumvention or overriding of the controls and procedures. Accordingly, even effective disclosure controls and procedures can only provide reasonable assurance of achieving their control objectives.

B. Management's Annual Report on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting.

In accordance with Rule 13a-15(f) of the Exchange Act, the management of the Company is responsible for the establishment and maintenance of adequate internal controls over financial reporting for the Company. Internal control over financial reporting is a process designed to provide reasonable assurance regarding the reliability of financial reporting and the preparation of financial statements for external purposes in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. The Company's system of internal control over financial reporting includes those policies and procedures that (i) pertain to the maintenance of records that, in reasonable detail, accurately and fairly reflect the transactions and dispositions of the assets of the Company; (ii) provide reasonable assurance that transactions are recorded as necessary to permit preparation of financial statements in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, and that receipts and expenditures of the Company are being made only in accordance with authorizations of management and directors of the Company; and (iii) provide reasonable assurance regarding prevention or timely detection of unauthorized acquisition, use, or disposition of the Company's assets that could have a material effect on the financial statements. Management has performed an assessment of the effectiveness of the Company's internal controls over financial reporting as of December 31, 2017 based on the provisions of Internal Control—Integrated Framework issued by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission or COSO in 2013. Based on our assessment, management determined that the Company's internal controls over financial reporting were effective as of December 31, 2017 based on the criteria in Internal Control—Integrated Framework issued by COSO (2013).

The Company's internal control over financial reporting, at December 31, 2017, has been audited by PricewaterhouseCoopers Audit, an independent registered public accounting firm, who also audited the Company's consolidated financial statements for that year, which are filed as a part of this annual report. PricewaterhouseCoopers Audit has issued an attestation report on management's assessment of the Company's internal control over financial reporting.

C. Attestation Report of the Registered Public Accounting Firm.

The attestation report of PricewaterhouseCoopers Audit is presented on page F-2 of the Financial Statements filed as part of this annual report.

D. Changes in Internal Control Over Financial Reporting.

None

ITEM 16A. AUDIT COMMITTEE FINANCIAL EXPERT

Our Board of Directors has determined that Mr. James B. Nish, who serves on the Audit Committee, qualifies as an "audit committee financial expert" and that he is "independent" according to SEC rules.

ITEM 16B. CODE OF ETHICS

We have adopted a Code of Conduct and Ethics that applies to all of the Company's employees, directors, officers and agents. A copy of our Code of Conduct and Ethics, as in effect on the date hereof, has been filed as an exhibit to this annual report.

Shareholders may also request a copy of our Code of Conduct and Ethics at no cost, by writing to us at 9, Boulevard Charles III, Monaco, 98000 or telephoning us at + 377 9798 5715.

Table of Contents

ITEM 16C. PRINCIPAL ACCOUNTING FEES AND SERVICES

A. Audit Fees

Our principal accountant for the years ended December 31, 2017 and December 31, 2016 was PricewaterhouseCoopers Audit, and the audit fees for those periods were \$417,000 and \$283,500 respectively.

B. Audit-Related Fees

During 2016, our principal accountant, PricewaterhouseCoopers Audit, provided services related to our public offerings, the fee for which was \$120,100. No such services were provided during 2017.

C. Tax Fees

None.

D. All Other Fees

None.

E. Audit Committee's Pre-Approval Policies and Procedures

Our Audit Committee pre-approves all audit, audit-related and non-audit services not prohibited by law to be performed by our independent auditors and associated fees prior to the engagement of the independent auditor with respect to such services.

F. Audit Work Performed by Other Than Principal Accountant if Greater Than 50%

Not applicable.

ITEM 16D. EXEMPTIONS FROM LISTING STANDARDS FOR AUDIT COMMITTEES

Not applicable.

ITEM 16E. PURCHASES OF EQUITY SECURITIES BY THE ISSUER AND AFFILIATED PURCHASERS

The following table sets forth our stock repurchase activity during 2017, including the number of shares purchased, the average price paid per share, the number of shares repurchased as part of a publicly announced plan or program and the amount yet to be used on share repurchases under the plan or program.

Period	Total Number of Common Shares Purchased	Average Price Paid per Common Share	Total Maximum Number of Shares Purchased as Part of Publicly Announced Plan or Program (a)	Maximum Amount that May Yet Be Expected on Share Repurchases Under the Plan or Program (a)
November 2017	1,265,448	\$ 7.54	1,265,448	\$ 40.5
December 2017	200,000	\$ 7.33	200,000	\$ 39.0
	1,465,448	\$ 7.51	1,465,448	

^(a) In September 2017, our Board of Directors authorized the repurchase of up to \$50.0 million of our common stock in open market or privately negotiated transactions. The specific timing and amounts of the repurchases are in the sole discretion of management and may vary based on market conditions and other factors, but we are not obligated under the terms of the program to repurchase any of our common stock. The authorization has no expiration date.

Table of Contents

The following table sets forth the stock purchase activity of affiliated purchasers during 2017, including the number of shares purchased, the average price paid per share, the number of shares repurchased as part of a publicly announced plan or program and the amount yet to be used on share repurchases under the plan or program.

Name	Period	Total Number of Common Shares Purchased (a)	Average Price Paid per Common Share	Total Number of Shares Purchased as Part of Publicly Announced Plans or Programs	Maximum Amount that May Yet Be Purchased Under the Plans or Programs
Scorpio Services Holding Ltd.	May 2017	315,000	\$ 6.27	N/A	N/A
Robert Bugbee	May 2017	32,000	\$ 6.37	N/A	N/A
Einar Michael Steimler	May 2017	10,000	\$ 6.50	N/A	N/A
Scorpio Services Holding Ltd.	October 2017	150,000	\$ 7.06	N/A	N/A
Scorpio Services Holding Ltd.	November 2017	350,000	\$ 7.19	N/A	N/A

(a) Purchased in the open market.

In 2016, our Board of Directors authorized the repurchase of up to \$20.0 million of our outstanding Senior Notes in open market or privately negotiated transactions. As of December 31, 2017, the entire \$20.0 million was available.

ITEM 16F. CHANGE IN REGISTRANT'S CERTIFYING ACCOUNTANT

None.

ITEM 16G. CORPORATE GOVERNANCE

Pursuant to an exception for foreign private issuers, we, as a Marshall Islands company, are not required to comply with the corporate governance practices followed by U.S. companies under the NYSE listing standards. We believe that our established practices in the area of corporate governance are in line with the spirit of the NYSE standards and provide adequate protection to our shareholders. In this respect, we have voluntarily adopted NYSE required practices, such as (i) having a majority of independent directors, (ii) establishing audit, compensation and nominating committees and (iii) adopting a Code of Ethics.

There are two significant differences between our corporate governance practices and the practices required by the NYSE. The NYSE requires that non-management directors meet regularly in executive sessions without management. The NYSE also requires that all independent directors meet in an executive session at least once a year. Marshall Islands law and our bylaws do not require our non-management directors to regularly hold executive sessions without management. During 2017 and through the date of this annual report, our non-management directors met in executive session five times. The NYSE requires companies to adopt and disclose corporate governance guidelines. The guidelines must address, among other things: director qualification standards, director responsibilities, director access to management and independent advisers, director compensation, director orientation and continuing education, management succession and an annual performance evaluation. We are not required to adopt such guidelines under Marshall Islands law and we have not adopted such guidelines.

ITEM 16H. MINE SAFETY DISCLOSURE

Not applicable.

PART III**ITEM 17. FINANCIAL STATEMENTS**

See “Item 18. Financial Statements.”

92

Table of Contents

ITEM 18. FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

The financial statements, together with the report of PricewaterhouseCoopers Audit thereon, beginning on page F-1, are filed as a part of this annual report.

93

Table of Contents

ITEM
19. EXHIBITS

Number Description

- 1.1 Amended and Restated Articles of Incorporation of the Company (1)
- 1.2 Amendment to the Amended and Restated Articles of Incorporation of the Company, effective December 30, 2015 (5)
- 1.3 Certificate of Correction to the Amended and Restated Articles of Incorporation of the Company (6)
- 1.4 Amendment to the Amended and Restated Articles of Incorporation of the Company, effective June 1, 2016 (7)
- 1.5 Amended and Restated Bylaws of the Company (1)
- 2.1 Form of Common Share Certificate (6)
- 2.2 Base Indenture, dated September 22, 2014, by and between the Company and Deutsche Bank Trust Company Americas, relating to the 7.50% Senior Notes due 2019 (3)
- 2.3 First Supplemental Indenture, dated September 22, 2014, by and between the Company and Deutsche Bank Trust Company Americas (3)
- 4.1 Master Agreement (1)
- 4.2 Administrative Services Agreement (1)
- 4.3 Equity Incentive Plan (1)
- 4.4 \$67.5 Million Credit Facility (2)
- 4.5 \$330.0 Million Credit Facility (2)
- 4.6 \$39.6 Million Credit Facility (2)
- 4.7 \$409.0 Million Credit Facility (4)
- 4.8 \$42.0 Million Credit Facility (4)
- 4.9 \$12.5 Million Credit Facility (6)
- 4.10 \$27.3 Million Credit Facility (6)
- 4.11 Deed of Amendment to the Master Agreement, Dated September 29, 2016 (7)
- 4.12 Deed of Amendment to the Master Agreement, Dated November 25, 2016 (7)
- 4.13 First Supplemental Agreement to the \$67.5 Million Senior Secured Credit Facility, dated September 14, 2015 (7)
- 4.14 Second Supplemental Agreement to the \$67.5 Million Senior Secured Credit Facility, dated October 23, 2015 (7)
- 4.15 Third Supplemental Agreement to the \$67.5 Million Senior Secured Credit Facility, dated April 5, 2016 (7)
- 4.16 Fourth Supplemental Agreement to the \$67.5 Million Senior Secured Credit Facility, dated June 15, 2016 (7)
- 4.17 Fifth Supplemental Agreement to the \$67.5 Million Senior Secured Credit Facility, dated December 27, 2016 (7)
- 4.18 Letter Agreement, dated September 30, 2015, relating to the \$67.5 Million Senior Secured Credit Facility (7)
- 4.19 Letter Agreement, dated July 10, 2015, relating to the \$330.0 Million Senior Secured Credit Facility (7)
- 4.20 Letter Agreement, dated October 27, 2015, relating to the \$330.0 Million Senior Secured Credit Facility (7)
- 4.21 Letter Agreement, dated April 26, 2016, relating to the \$330.0 Million Senior Secured Credit Facility (7)
- 4.22 Letter Agreement, dated June 15, 2016, relating to the \$330.0 Million Senior Secured Credit Facility (7)
- 4.23 Letter Agreement, dated December 15, 2016, relating to the \$330.0 Million Senior Secured Credit Facility (7)
- 4.24 Supplemental Agreement to the \$39.6 Million Senior Secured Credit Facility, dated January 14, 2016 (7)
- 4.25 Fourth Supplemental Agreement to the \$39.6 Million Senior Secured Credit Facility, dated March 29, 2016 (7)
- 4.26 Fifth Supplemental Agreement to the \$39.6 Million Senior Secured Credit Facility, dated June 15, 2016 (7)
- 4.27 Sixth Supplemental Agreement to the \$39.6 Million Senior Secured Credit Facility, dated December 22, 2016 (7)
- 4.28 First Amendment to the \$409.0 Million Senior Secured Credit Facility, dated March 6, 2015 (7)
- 4.29 Second Amendment to the \$409.0 Million Senior Secured Credit Facility, dated October 21, 2015 (7)
- 4.30 Third Amendment to the \$409.0 Million Senior Secured Credit Facility, dated December 14, 2015 (7)
- 4.31 Fourth Amendment to the \$409.0 Million Senior Secured Credit Facility, dated April 7, 2016 (7)
- 4.32 Fifth Amendment to the \$409.0 Million Senior Secured Credit Facility, dated June 1, 2016 (7)

4.33 Sixth Amendment to the \$409.0 Million Senior Secured Credit Facility, dated August 9, 2016 (7)

94

Table of Contents

Number	Description
<u>4.34</u>	<u>Seventh Amendment to the \$409.0 Million Senior Secured Credit Facility, dated December 14, 2016 (7)</u>
<u>4.35</u>	<u>Letter Agreement, dated May 8, 2015, relating to the \$409.0 Million Senior Secured Credit Facility (7)</u>
<u>4.36</u>	<u>Letter Agreement, dated January 8, 2016, relating to the \$409.0 Million Senior Secured Credit Facility (7)</u>
<u>4.37</u>	<u>Letter Agreement, dated May 04, 2016, relating to the \$42.0 Million Senior Secured Credit Facility (7)</u>
<u>4.38</u>	<u>Letter Agreement, dated June 28, 2016, relating to the \$42.0 Million Senior Secured Credit Facility (7)</u>
<u>4.39</u>	<u>Letter Agreement, dated January 4, 2017, relating to the \$42.0 Million Senior Secured Credit Facility (7)</u>
<u>4.40</u>	<u>Letter Agreement, dated February 25, 2016 relating to the \$12.5 Million Senior Secured Credit Facility (7)</u>
<u>4.41</u>	<u>Letter Agreement, dated June 14, 2016, relating to the \$12.5 Million Senior Secured Credit Facility (7)</u>
<u>4.42</u>	<u>Letter Agreement, dated December 16, 2016, relating to the \$12.5 Million Senior Secured Credit Facility (7)</u>
<u>4.43</u>	<u>First Supplemental Agreement to the \$27.3 Million Senior Secured Credit Facility, dated April 6, 2016 (7)</u>
<u>4.44</u>	<u>Second Supplemental Agreement to the \$27.3 Million Senior Secured Credit Facility, dated June 2, 2016 (7)</u>
<u>4.45</u>	<u>Third Supplemental Agreement to the \$27.3 Million Senior Secured Credit Facility, dated December 30, 2016 (7)</u>
<u>4.46</u>	<u>\$85.5 Million Senior Secured Credit Facility</u>
<u>4.47</u>	<u>\$38.7 Million Senior Secured Credit Facility</u>
<u>4.48</u>	<u>\$19.6 Million Lease Financing</u>
<u>4.49</u>	<u>Deed of Amendment to the Master Agreement, dated February 22, 2018</u>
<u>8.1</u>	<u>List of Subsidiaries</u>
<u>11.1</u>	<u>Code of Conduct and Ethics</u>
<u>12.1</u>	<u>Rule 13a-14(a)/15d-14(a) Certification of Principal Executive Officer</u>
<u>12.2</u>	<u>Rule 13a-14(a)/15d-14(a) Certification of Principal Financial Officer</u>
<u>13.1</u>	<u>Certification of Principal Executive Officer pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 1350, as adopted pursuant to Section 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002</u>
<u>13.2</u>	<u>Certification of Principal Financial Officer pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 1350, as adopted pursuant to Section 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002</u>
<u>15.1</u>	<u>Consent of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm</u>
<u>15.2</u>	<u>Consent of SSY Consultancy & Research Ltd</u>
101.	XBRL Instance Document
INS	
101.	XBRL Taxonomy Extension Schema
SCH	
101.	XBRL Taxonomy Extension Schema Calculation Linkbase
CAL	
101.	XBRL Taxonomy Extension Schema Definition Linkbase
DEF	
101.	XBRL Taxonomy Extension Schema Label Linkbase
LAB	
101.	XBRL Taxonomy Extension Schema Presentation Linkbase
PRE	

(1) Incorporated by reference to the Company's Registration Statement on Form F-1, which was declared effective by the SEC on December 11, 2013 (File No. 333-192246).

(2) Incorporated by reference to the Company's Registration Statement on Form F-1, which was declared effective by the SEC on September 15, 2014 (File No. 333-197949).

(3) Incorporated by reference to the Company's Report on Form 6-K, filed with the SEC on September 25, 2014.

(4) Incorporated by reference to the Company's Annual Report on Form 20-F, filed with the SEC on April 2, 2015.

(5) Incorporated by reference to the Company's Report on Form 6-K, filed with the SEC on January 4, 2016.

(6) Incorporated by reference to the Company's Annual Report on Form 20-F, filed with the SEC on March 1, 2016.

(7) Incorporated by reference to the Company's Annual Report on Form 20-F, filed with the SEC on February 28, 2017.

Table of Contents

SIGNATURES

The registrant hereby certifies that it meets all of the requirements for filing on Form 20-F and has duly caused and authorized the undersigned to sign this annual report on its behalf.

Dated March 2, 2018

Scorpio Bulkera Inc.
(Registrant)

/s/ Emanuele Lauro

Emanuele Lauro
Chief Executive Officer

Table of Contents

INDEX TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

	Page
<u>Report of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm</u>	<u>F-2</u>
<u>Consolidated Balance Sheets as of the years ended December 31, 2017 and 2016</u>	<u>F-3</u>
<u>Consolidated Statement of Operations for the years ended December 31, 2017, 2016 and 2015</u>	<u>F-4</u>
<u>Consolidated Statement of Changes in Shareholders' Equity for the years ended December 31, 2017, 2016 and 2015</u>	<u>F-5</u>
<u>Consolidated Statements of Cash Flows for the years ended December 31, 2017, 2016 and 2015</u>	<u>F-6</u>
<u>Notes to the Consolidated Financial Statements</u>	<u>F-7</u>

F- 1

To the Board of Directors and Shareholders of Scorpio Bulkers Inc.

Opinions on the Financial Statements and Internal Control over Financial Reporting

We have audited the accompanying consolidated balance sheets of Scorpio Bulkers Inc. and its subsidiaries as of December 31, 2017 and 2016, and the related consolidated statements of income, of changes in shareholders' equity and of cash flows for each of the three years in the period ended December 31, 2017, including the related notes (collectively referred to as the "consolidated financial statements"). We also have audited the Company's internal control over financial reporting as of December 31, 2017, based on criteria established in Internal Control - Integrated Framework (2013) issued by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (COSO).

In our opinion, the consolidated financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the Company as of December 31, 2017 and 2016, and the results of their operations and their cash flows for each of the three years in the period ended December 31, 2017 in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. Also in our opinion, the Company maintained, in all material respects, effective internal control over financial reporting as of December 31, 2017, based on criteria established in Internal Control - Integrated Framework (2013) issued by the COSO.

Basis for Opinions

The Company's management is responsible for these consolidated financial statements, for maintaining effective internal control over financial reporting, and for its assessment of the effectiveness of internal control over financial reporting, included in Management's Annual Report on Internal Control over Financial Reporting appearing under item 15. Our responsibility is to express opinions on the Company's consolidated financial statements and on the Company's internal control over financial reporting based on our audits. We are a public accounting firm registered with the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (United States) ("PCAOB") and are required to be independent with respect to the Company in accordance with the U.S. federal securities laws and the applicable rules and regulations of the Securities and Exchange Commission and the PCAOB.

We conducted our audits in accordance with the standards of the PCAOB. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audits to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the consolidated financial statements are free of material misstatement, whether due to error or fraud, and whether effective internal control over financial reporting was maintained in all material respects.

Our audits of the consolidated financial statements included performing procedures to assess the risks of material misstatement of the consolidated financial statements, whether due to error or fraud, and performing procedures that respond to those risks. Such procedures included examining, on a test basis, evidence regarding the amounts and disclosures in the consolidated financial statements. Our audits also included evaluating the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall presentation of the consolidated financial statements. Our audit of internal control over financial reporting included obtaining an understanding of internal control over financial reporting, assessing the risk that a material weakness exists, and testing and evaluating the design and operating effectiveness of internal control based on the assessed risk. Our audits also included performing such other procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances. We believe that our audits provide a reasonable basis for our opinions.

Definition and Limitations of Internal Control over Financial Reporting

A company's internal control over financial reporting is a process designed to provide reasonable assurance regarding the reliability of financial reporting and the preparation of financial statements for external purposes in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. A company's internal control over financial reporting includes those policies and procedures that (i) pertain to the maintenance of records that, in reasonable detail, accurately and fairly reflect the transactions and dispositions of the assets of the company; (ii) provide reasonable assurance that transactions are recorded as necessary to permit preparation of financial statements in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, and that receipts and expenditures of the company are being made only in accordance with authorizations of management and directors of the company; and (iii) provide reasonable assurance regarding prevention or timely detection of unauthorized acquisition, use, or disposition of the company's assets that could have a material effect on the financial statements.

Because of its inherent limitations, internal control over financial reporting may not prevent or detect misstatements. Also, projections of any evaluation of effectiveness to future periods are subject to the risk that controls may become inadequate because of changes in conditions, or that the degree of compliance with the policies or procedures may deteriorate.

PricewaterhouseCoopers Audit

PricewaterhouseCoopers is represented by PricewaterhouseCoopers Audit, 63 rue de Villiers - 92200 Neuilly-sur-Seine, France.

Marseille, France

March 2, 2018

We have served as the Company's auditor since 2013.

F- 2

Scorpio Bulkers Inc. and Subsidiaries
Consolidated Balance Sheets
(Dollars in thousands, except per share data)

	As of December 31,	
	2017	2016
Assets		
Current assets		
Cash and cash equivalents	\$68,535	\$101,734
Due from related parties	6,555	4,240
Inventories	3,674	2,950
Prepaid expenses and other current assets	3,791	6,556
Total current assets	82,555	115,480
Non-current assets		
Vessels, net	1,534,782	1,234,081
Vessels under construction	6,710	180,000
Deferred financing cost, net	3,068	3,307
Other assets	474	3,050
Due from related parties	15,821	11,239
Total non-current assets	1,560,855	1,431,677
Total assets	\$1,643,410	\$1,547,157
Liabilities and shareholders' equity		
Current liabilities		
Bank loans, net	\$46,993	\$13,480
Financing obligation	1,144	—
Accounts payable and accrued expenses	10,087	10,033
Due to related parties	366	1,037
Total current liabilities	58,590	24,550
Non-current liabilities		
Bank loans, net	576,967	493,793
Financing obligation	17,747	—
Senior Notes, net	72,726	72,199
Total non-current liabilities	667,440	565,992
Total liabilities	726,030	590,542
Commitment and contingencies (Note 7)		
Shareholders' equity		
Preferred stock, \$0.01 par value; 50,000,000 shares authorized; no shares issued or outstanding	—	—
Common stock, \$0.01 par value per share; authorized 112,500,000 shares; issued and outstanding 74,902,364 and 75,298,676 shares as of December 31, 2017 and December 31, 2016, respectively	762	753
Paid-in capital	1,745,844	1,714,358
Common stock held in treasury, at cost; 1,465,448 shares at December 31, 2017	(11,004)	—
Accumulated deficit	(818,222)	(758,496)
Total shareholders' equity	917,380	956,615
Total liabilities and shareholders' equity	\$1,643,410	\$1,547,157

See notes to the consolidated financial statements.

Edgar Filing: SCORPIO BULKERS INC. - Form 20-F

Scorpio Bulkiers Inc. and Subsidiaries
 Consolidated Statement of Operations
 (Amounts in thousands, except per share data)

	For the Year Ended December 31,		
	2017	2016	2015
Revenue:			
Vessel revenue	\$—	\$—	\$5,457
Vessel revenue-related party pools	162,205	78,402	57,064
Total vessel revenue	162,205	78,402	62,521
Operating expenses:			
Voyage expenses	257	(364) 123
Voyage expenses-related party	172	319	664
Vessel operating costs	77,285	61,641	26,607
Vessel operating costs-related party	9,379	7,191	2,765
Charterhire expense	5,392	17,356	51,389
Charterhire termination	—	10,000	—
Vessel depreciation	48,510	36,562	14,263
General and administrative expenses	22,359	29,141	33,373
General and administrative expenses-related party	6,722	4,854	2,009
Loss / write down on assets held for sale	17,354	11,433	397,472
Loss / write down on assets held for sale-related party	347	1,000	25,465
Total operating expenses	187,777	179,133	554,130
Operating loss	(25,572) (100,731) (491,609
Other income (expense):			
Interest income	1,100	933	356
Foreign exchange gain (loss)	(292) (116) (12
Financial expense, net	(34,962) (24,921) (19,524
Total other (loss) income	(34,154) (24,104) (19,180
Net loss	\$(59,726)	\$(124,835)	\$(510,789)
Weighted-average shares outstanding:			
Basic	71,794	56,174	21,410
Diluted	71,794	56,174	21,410
Loss per common share:			
Basic	\$(0.83) \$(2.22) \$(23.86
Diluted	\$(0.83) \$(2.22) \$(23.86

See notes to the consolidated financial statements.

Edgar Filing: SCORPIO BULKERS INC. - Form 20-F

Scorpio Bulkiers Inc. and Subsidiaries

Consolidated Statement of Changes in Shareholders' Equity

(Dollars in thousands)

	Number of shares outstanding	Common stock	Paid-in capital	Treasury stock	Accumulated deficit	Total
Balance as of December 31, 2014	15,024,974	\$ 1,803	\$ 1,321,057	\$	—\$(122,872)	\$ 1,199,988
Net loss					(510,789)	\$(510,789)
Net proceeds from common stock offering:						
Private placement	—	—	250	—	—	250
Public offering	11,083,333	1,330	188,343	—	—	189,673
Overallotment of public offering	1,662,500	200	28,230	—	—	28,430
Reverse stock split	(29)	(3,155)	3,155	—	—	—
Common Stock issued to SSH	111,725	13	2,367	—	—	2,380
Issuance of shares of restricted stock	804,058	96	(96)	—	—	—
Restricted stock amortization	—	—	24,599	—	—	24,599
Balance as of December 31, 2015	28,686,561	\$ 287	\$ 1,567,905	\$	—\$(633,661)	\$ 934,531
Net loss					(124,835)	(124,835)
Net proceeds from common stock offering:						
Public offering	44,000,000	440	127,672	—	—	128,112
Common stock issued to SSH	51,679	—	198	—	—	198
Issuance of shares of restricted stock, net of forfeitures	2,560,436	26	(26)	—	—	—
Restricted stock amortization	—	—	18,609	—	—	18,609
Balance as of December 31, 2016	75,298,676	\$ 753	\$ 1,714,358	\$	—\$(758,496)	\$ 956,615
Net loss						