


Incidents involving
the IOPC Funds

• **2013**



**International Oil Pollution
Compensation Funds**





Incidents (in chronological order)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1 <i>Vistabella</i> , 07.03.1991 | 10 <i>Hebei Spirit</i> , 07.12.2007 |
| 2 <i>Aegean Sea</i> , 03.12.1992 | 11 Incident in Argentina, 26.12.2007 |
| 3 <i>Iliad</i> , 09.10.1993 | 12 <i>King Darwin</i> , 27.09.2008 |
| 4 <i>Nissos Amorgos</i> , 28.02.1997 | 13 <i>Redffern</i> , 30.03.2009 |
| 5 <i>Plate Princess</i> , 27.05.1997 | 14 <i>JS Amazing</i> , 06.06.2009 |
| 6 <i>Erika</i> , 12.12.1999 | 15 <i>Haekup Pacific</i> , 20.04.2010 |
| 7 <i>Prestige</i> , 13.11.2002 | 16 <i>Alfa I</i> , 05.03.2012 |
| 8 <i>Solar I</i> , 11.08.2006 | 17 <i>Nesa R3</i> , 19.06.2013 |
| 9 <i>Volgoneft 139</i> , 11.11.2007 | |

- States Parties to the 1992 Fund Convention
- States Parties to the Supplementary Fund Protocol
- States Parties to the 1992 Civil Liability Convention
- States Parties to the 1969 Civil Liability Convention

Incidents involving the IOPC Funds – 2013

Contents

Page

Foreword 02

Introduction 03

1992 FUND

Erika 06

Prestige 12

Solar 1 20

Volgoneft 139 24

Hebei Spirit 30

Incident in Argentina 40

King Darwin 44

Redferrm 46

JS Amazing 51

Haekup Pacific 56

Alfa I 59

Nesa R3 63

Summary of Incidents 66

1971 FUND

Vistabella 70

Aegean Sea 73

Iliad 75

Nissos Amorgos 78

Plate Princess 87

Summary of Incidents 98

List of Currencies 110

Acknowledgements 111

International Oil Pollution Compensation Funds

Portland House

Bressenden Place

London SW1E 5PN

United Kingdom

Telephone: +44 (0)20 7592 7100

Fax: +44 (0)20 7592 7111

E-mail (for all enquiries): info@iopcfunds.org

Website: www.iopcfunds.org

Opposite: Map of incidents involving the IOPC Funds as at October 2013.

Cover: Oiled shoreline following the *Nesa R3* incident.

Foreword

This Report provides information on incidents in which the Secretariat of the International Oil Pollution Compensation Funds (IOPC Funds) was involved in 2013. It sets out the developments in the various cases during the course of the year and the position taken by the governing bodies in respect of claims. The Report is not intended to reflect in full the discussions of the governing bodies. These discussions are reflected in the Records of Decisions of the meetings of these bodies, which are available on the document services section of the IOPC Funds' website (www.iopcfunds.org).

Disclaimer

While the Secretariat of the IOPC Funds has made every reasonable effort in compiling the information and figures in the Report relating to claims, settlements and payments, it may not be held liable for the accuracy of the figures. The reader should note that the figures in the Report are given for the purpose of providing an overview of the situation for various incidents and may therefore not correspond exactly to the figures given in the IOPC Funds' Financial Statements. The CLC limits are reported as established by the Limitation Court; or as estimated, based on the vessel's tonnage in accordance with the CLC applicable to the incident where no limitation fund is established; or based on the currency conversion figure calculated at the date of adoption of the Record of Decisions of the session of the governing body at which payment is authorised to be made. For consistency, conversion into Pounds sterling has been made on the basis of the exchange rate as at 31 December 2013. Figures relating to paid amounts are provided in the currency in which they were paid. In summary tables these figures are also provided in Pounds sterling for comparison purposes only. Due to fluctuations in currencies over time, the figures in Pounds sterling may vary significantly in some instances to the amounts actually paid on the date of payment.

Published by the
INTERNATIONAL OIL POLLUTION COMPENSATION FUNDS
Portland House
Bressenden Place
London SW1E 5PN
United Kingdom

Copyright ©IOPC FUNDS 2014

Permission is granted to reproduce for personal and educational use only but acknowledgement is requested. Commercial copying, hiring or lending is prohibited.

All other rights are reserved.

Introduction

The International Regime

The IOPC Funds are three intergovernmental organisations (the 1992 Fund, the Supplementary Fund and the 1971 Fund) established by States for the purpose of providing compensation for victims of oil pollution damage resulting from spills of persistent oil from tankers.

The legal framework

The compensation regime was originally established in 1978 and is now based on two Conventions: the 1992 International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage (1992 Civil Liability Convention) and the 1992 International Convention on the Establishment of an International Fund for Compensation for Oil Pollution Damage (1992 Fund Convention). These Conventions were adopted under the auspices of the International Maritime Organization (IMO), a specialised agency of the United Nations.

The 1992 Civil Liability Convention (1992 CLC) provides a first tier of compensation which is paid by the owner of a ship which causes pollution damage.

Under the 1992 CLC, the shipowner has strict liability for any pollution damage caused by the oil, ie the owner is liable even if there was no fault on the part of the ship or its crew. However, the shipowner can normally limit his financial liability to an amount that is determined by the tonnage of the ship. This amount is guaranteed by the shipowner's liability insurer.

Normally, the Conventions only apply to tankers carrying persistent oil as cargo. However, under certain circumstances, the Conventions also apply to spills from unladen tankers.

The 1992 Fund Convention provides a second tier of compensation which is financed by receivers of oil in States Parties to the Convention after sea transport. The 1992 Fund was set up in 1996 when the 1992 Fund Convention entered into force.

A Protocol to the 1992 Fund Convention adopted in 2003, the Supplementary Fund Protocol, provides an extra layer of compensation via the Supplementary Fund, which was set up in March 2005. Membership of this Fund is open to any State that is a Member of the 1992 Fund.

States which ratify these legal instruments must implement them into their national law.

The role of the IOPC Funds

The 1992 Fund and, if applicable, the Supplementary Fund provide additional compensation when the amount payable by the shipowner and his insurer is insufficient to cover all the damage.

Amount of compensation available

The maximum amounts of compensation payable by the shipowner's insurer and the IOPC Funds were fixed by Governments at the Diplomatic Conferences that adopted the relevant international treaties. As at 31 December 2013, the maximum amount payable for each incident was 203 million Special Drawing Rights (SDR) of the International Monetary Fund, equal to about £190 million for incidents covered by the 1992 Fund. For incidents which are covered by the Supplementary Fund the maximum amount payable was 750 million SDR (about £701 million). An earlier Fund, the 1971 Fund, still exists but is in the process of being wound up and does not cover incidents occurring after 24 May 2002.

Since their establishment, the 1992 Fund and the preceding 1971 Fund have been involved in some 147 incidents of varying sizes all over the world. In the great majority of cases, all claims have been settled out of court. No incidents have occurred so far which have involved or are likely to involve the Supplementary Fund.

The great majority of maritime States are Members of the IOPC Funds

As at 31 December 2013, the 1992 Fund had 111 Member States, and two further States will become Members by July 2014. In addition, 29 of these States were Members of the Supplementary Fund, and one further State will become a Member by July 2014. All Member States are shown in the table on page 5.

Damage covered by the Conventions

Anyone in a Member State of the 1992 Fund who has suffered pollution damage caused by oil transported by a tanker can claim compensation from the shipowner/insurer, the 1992 Fund and, if applicable, the Supplementary Fund. This applies to individuals, businesses, local authorities and States.

To be entitled to compensation, the pollution damage must result in an actual and quantifiable economic loss. The claimant must be able to demonstrate the amount of his loss or damage by producing accounts, tax records or other appropriate evidence.

An oil pollution incident can generally give rise to claims for five types of pollution damage:

- Property damage
- Costs of clean-up operations at sea and on shore
- Economic losses by fishermen or those engaged in mariculture
- Economic losses in the tourism sector
- Costs for reinstatement of the environment

Claims are assessed according to criteria established by the Governments of Member States. These criteria, which also apply to claims against the Supplementary Fund, are set out in the 1992 Fund's Claims Manual, which is a practical guide on how to present claims for compensation. The Claims Manual is available on the Publications page of the Funds' website: www.iopcfunds.org.

Depending on the nature of the claims, the IOPC Funds use experts in different fields to assist in their assessment.

Structure of the IOPC Funds

The 1992 Fund is governed by an Assembly composed of representatives of the Governments of all its Member States. The Assembly holds a regular session once a year. It elects an Executive Committee made up of 15 Member States. The main function of the Executive Committee is to approve the settlement of claims for compensation.

The Supplementary Fund has its own Assembly which is composed of all States that are Members of that Fund whereas the 1971 Fund has an Administrative Council which is composed of all former Member States.

Organisations connected with the maritime transport of oil, such as those representing shipowners, marine insurers and the oil industry, as well as environmental organisations, are represented as observers at the IOPC Funds' meetings. Decisions by the IOPC Funds' governing bodies are, however, taken solely by the Governments of the Member States.


The 1992 Fund Assembly appoints the Director of the IOPC Funds, who is responsible for the operation of the three Funds and has extensive authority to take decisions regarding the settlement of claims. The 1992 Fund, Supplementary Fund and 1971 Fund have their headquarters in London and are administered by a joint Secretariat.

Financing of the IOPC Funds

The IOPC Funds are financed by contributions levied on any entity that has received in the relevant calendar year more than 150 000 tonnes of contributing oil (ie crude and/or heavy fuel oil) in ports or terminal installations in a Member State, after carriage by sea.

The levy of contributions depends on reports of the amounts of oil received by individual contributors, which the Governments of Member States are obliged to submit annually to the Secretariat. These amounts are used as the basis of the levy, calculated to provide sufficient monies to administer the Funds and to pay claims approved by the governing bodies.

Contributions to the 1992 Fund by Member State



Figures shown are General Fund contributions for 2013 (based on 2012 oil receipts), the most recent year for which contributions were levied.

External Relations

In addition to cooperating closely with other intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations, the Director and staff of the IOPC Funds regularly participate in seminars, conferences and workshops around the world in order to disseminate information on the Funds' activities and to promote awareness of the international compensation regime.

Member States of the 1992 Fund

111 States for which the 1992 Fund Convention is in force (as at 31 December 2013) (29 States which are also Members of the Supplementary Fund are marked in **bold**):

Albania	Ghana	Oman
Algeria	Greece	Palau
Angola	Grenada	Panama
Antigua and Barbuda	Guinea	Papua New Guinea
Argentina	Hungary	Philippines
Australia	Iceland	Poland
Bahamas	India	Portugal
Bahrain	Ireland	Qatar
Barbados	Islamic Republic of Iran	Republic of Korea
Belgium	Israel	Russian Federation
Belize	Italy	Saint Kitts and Nevis
Benin	Jamaica	Saint Lucia
Brunei Darussalam	Japan	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
Bulgaria	Kenya	Samoa
Cambodia	Kiribati	Senegal
Cameroon	Latvia	Serbia
Canada	Liberia	Seychelles
Cape Verde	Lithuania	Sierra Leone
China ^{<1>}	Luxembourg	Singapore
Colombia	Madagascar	Slovenia
Comoros	Malaysia	South Africa
Congo	Maldives	Spain
Cook Islands	Malta	Sri Lanka
Croatia	Marshall Islands	Sweden
Cyprus	Mauritania	Switzerland
Denmark	Mauritius	Syrian Arab Republic
Djibouti	Mexico	Tonga
Dominica	Monaco	Trinidad and Tobago
Dominican Republic	Montenegro	Tunisia
Ecuador	Morocco	Turkey
Estonia	Mozambique	Tuvalu
Fiji	Namibia	United Arab Emirates
Finland	Netherlands	United Kingdom
France	New Zealand	United Republic of Tanzania
Gabon	Nigeria	Uruguay
Georgia	Niue	Vanuatu
Germany	Norway	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

In addition, an instrument of accession to the 1992 Fund Convention was deposited during 2013 by Côte d'Ivoire, a former 1971 Fund Member State. Instruments of accession to the 1992 Fund Convention and the Supplementary Fund Protocol were also deposited by Slovakia. On 8 July 2014, the 1992 Fund Convention will enter into force for Côte d'Ivoire and the 1992 Fund Convention and Supplementary Fund Protocol will enter into force for Slovakia.

^{<1>} The 1992 Fund Convention applies to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region only.

Erika

Date of incident	12 December 1999
Place of incident	Brittany, France
Cause of incident	Breakage, sinking
Quantity of oil spilled (approximate)	19 800 tonnes of heavy fuel oil
Area affected	West coast of France
Flag State of ship	Malta
Gross tonnage	19 666 GT
P&I insurer	Steamship Mutual Underwriting Association (Bermuda) Ltd (Steamship Mutual)
CLC limit	9 159 720 SDR or €12 843 484 (£10 685 095)
STOPIA/TOPIA applicable	No
CLC + Fund limit	135 million SDR or €184 763 149 (£153 713 102)
Total compensation paid	€129.7million SDR (£108 million)

Conversion into Pounds sterling has been made on the basis of the exchange rate as at 31 December 2013.



Map data ©2011 Europa Technologies, Google, Tele Atlas, GeoBasis-DE/BKG (©2009)

Incident

On 12 December 1999, the Maltese-registered tanker *Erika* (19 666 GT) broke in two in the Bay of Biscay, some 60 nautical miles off the coast of Brittany, France. All members of the crew were rescued by the French maritime rescue services.

The tanker was carrying a cargo of 31 000 tonnes of heavy fuel oil of which some 19 800 tonnes were spilled at the time of the incident. The bow section sank in about 100 metres of water. The stern section sank to a depth of 130 metres about ten nautical miles from the bow section. Some 6 400 tonnes of cargo remained in the bow section and a further 4 800 tonnes in the stern section.

Impact

Some 400 kilometres of shoreline were affected by oil.

Response operations

Although the removal of the bulk of the oil from shorelines was completed quite rapidly, considerable secondary cleaning was still required in many areas in 2000. Operations to remove residual contamination began in spring 2001. By the summer tourist season of 2001, almost all of the secondary cleaning had been completed, apart from a small number of difficult sites in Loire Atlantique and the islands of Morbihan. Clean-up efforts continued at these sites in the autumn and most were completed by November 2001.

More than 250 000 tonnes of oily waste were collected from shorelines and temporarily stockpiled. Total SA, the French oil company, engaged a contractor to deal with the disposal of the recovered waste and the operation was completed in December 2003. The cost of the waste disposal is believed to have been some €46 million.

The French Government decided that the oil should be removed from the two sections of the wreck. The oil removal operations, which were funded by Total SA, were carried out by an international consortium during the period June to September 2000. No significant quantities of oil escaped during the operations.

Applicability of the Conventions

At the time of the incident France was Party to the 1992 Civil Liability Convention (1992 CLC) and 1992 Fund Convention. In accordance with the 1992 CLC, the *Erika* was insured for oil pollution liability with the Steamship Mutual Underwriting Association (Bermuda) Ltd (Steamship Mutual). At the request of the shipowner, the Commercial Court in Nantes issued an order on 14 March 2000 opening limitation proceedings. The Court determined the limitation amount applicable to the *Erika* at FF84 247 733 corresponding to €12 843 484 and declared that the shipowner had constituted the limitation fund by means of a letter of guarantee issued by the shipowner's liability insurer, Steamship Mutual.

In 2002, the limitation fund was transferred from the Commercial Court in Nantes to the Commercial Court in Rennes. In 2006, the limitation fund was again transferred, this time to the Commercial Court in Saint-Brieuc.

The maximum amount available for compensation under the 1992 CLC and the 1992 Fund Convention for the *Erika* incident is 135 million SDR, equal to FF1 211 966 811 or €184 763 149.

The level of payments by the 1992 Fund was initially limited to 50% of the amount of the loss or damage actually suffered by the respective claimants. The 1992 Fund Executive Committee decided in January 2001 to increase the level of payments from 50% to 60%, and in June 2001, to 80%. In April 2003, the level of payments was increased to 100%.

Claims for compensation Undertakings by Total SA and the French Government

Total SA undertook not to pursue claims against the 1992 Fund or against the limitation fund constituted by the shipowner or his insurer relating to its costs arising from operations in respect of the wreck, the clean up of shorelines, the disposal of oily waste and from a publicity campaign to restore the image of the Atlantic coast, if and to the extent that the presentation of such claims would result in the total amount of all claims arising out of this incident exceeding the maximum amount of compensation available for this incident under the 1992 Conventions, ie 135 million SDR.

The French Government also undertook not to pursue claims for compensation against the 1992 Fund or the limitation fund established by the shipowner or his insurer, if and to the extent that the presentation of such claims would result in the maximum amount available under the 1992 Conventions being exceeded. However, the French Government's claims would rank before any claims by Total SA if funds were available after all other claims had been paid in full.

General claims

As at October 2013, 7 131 claims for compensation had been submitted for a total of €388.9 million. Payments of compensation had been made for a total of €129.7 million, out of which Steamship Mutual, the shipowner's insurer, had paid €12.8 million and the 1992 Fund €116.9 million²⁹.

Criminal proceedings

On the basis of a report by an expert appointed by a magistrate in the Criminal Court of First Instance in Paris, criminal charges were brought in that Court against the master of the *Erika*, the representative of the registered owner (Tevere Shipping), the president of the management company (Panship Management and Services Srl), the deputy manager of Centre Régional Opérationnel de Surveillance et de Sauvetage (CROSS), three officers of the French Navy who were responsible for controlling the traffic off the coast of Brittany, the classification society Registro Italiano Navale (RINA), one of RINA's managers, three companies of the Total Group (Total SA, and two subsidiaries, Total Transport Corporation (TTC), voyage charterer of the *Erika*, and Total Petroleum Services Ltd, the agent of TTC) and some of its senior staff. A number of claimants, including the French Government and several local authorities, joined the criminal proceedings as civil parties, claiming compensation totalling €400 million.

Judgement by the Criminal Court of First Instance in Paris

The Criminal Court of First Instance delivered its judgement in January 2008.

In its judgement, the Criminal Court of First Instance held the following four parties criminally liable for the offense of causing pollution: the representative of the shipowner (Tevere Shipping), the president of the management company (Panship Management and Services Srl), the classification society (RINA) and Total SA.

The representative of the shipowner and the president of the management company were found guilty of lack of proper maintenance, leading to general corrosion of the ship; RINA was

²⁹ For details of the assessment and payment of the claim by the French State in respect of costs incurred in the clean-up response, reference is made to the Annual Report 2008 (pages 79 and 80).

found guilty of imprudence in renewing the *Erika*'s classification certificate on the basis of an inspection that fell below the standards of the profession; and Total SA was found guilty of imprudence when carrying out its vetting operations prior to the chartering of the *Erika*.

The representative of the shipowner and the president of the management company were sentenced to pay a fine of €75 000 each. RINA and Total SA were sentenced to pay a fine of €375 000 each.

Regarding civil liabilities, the judgement held the four condemned parties jointly and severally liable for the damage caused by the incident.

The judgement considered that Total SA could not avail itself of the benefit of the channelling provisions of Article III.4(c) of the 1992 CLC since it was not the charterer of the *Erika*. The judgement considered that the charterer was one of Total SA's subsidiaries.

The judgement considered that the other three parties, RINA in particular, were not protected by the channelling provisions of the 1992 CLC either, since they did not fall into the category of persons performing services for the ship. The judgement concluded that French internal law should be applied to the four parties and that therefore the four parties had civil liability for the consequences of the incident.

The compensation awarded to the civil parties by the Criminal Court of First Instance was based on national law. The Court held that the 1992 Conventions regime did not deprive the civil parties of their right to obtain compensation for their damage in the Criminal Courts and, in the proceedings, awarded claimants compensation for economic losses, damage to the image of several regions and municipalities, moral damages and damages to the environment. The Court assessed the total damages at the amount of €192.8 million.

The Criminal Court of First Instance recognised the right to compensation for damage to the environment for a local authority with special powers for the protection, management and conservation of a territory. The judgement also recognised the right of an environmental protection association to claim compensation, not only for the moral damage caused to the collective interests which was its purpose to defend, but also for the damage to the environment which affected the collective interests which it had a statutory mission to safeguard.

The four parties held criminally liable and some 70 civil parties appealed against the judgement.

Following the judgement, Total made voluntary payments to the majority of the civil parties, including the French Government, for a total of €171.3 million.

Judgement by the Court of Appeal in Paris

The Court of Appeal in Paris rendered its judgement in March 2010.

In its decision, the Court of Appeal confirmed the judgement of the Criminal Court of First Instance who had held criminally liable for the offense of causing pollution: the representative of the shipowner (Tevere Shipping), the president of the management company (Panship Management and Services Srl), the classification society (RINA) and Total SA. The Court of Appeal also confirmed the fines imposed.

Regarding civil liabilities, in its judgement, the Court of Appeal ruled that:

- The representative of the registered owner of the *Erika* was an 'agent of the owner', as defined by Article III.4(a) and that, although, as such, he was theoretically entitled to benefit from the channelling provisions of the 1992 CLC, he had acted recklessly and with knowledge that damage would probably result, which deprived him of protection in the circumstances. Thus, the Court of Appeal confirmed the judgement on his civil liability;
- The president of the management company (Panship) was the agent of a company who performs services for the ship (Article III.4(b)) and as such was not protected by the channelling provisions of the 1992 CLC;
- The classification society RINA, cannot be considered as a 'person who performs services for the ship', as per the definition of Article III.4(b) of the 1992 CLC. Indeed the Court ruled that, in issuing statutory and safety certificates, the classification society had acted as an agent of the Maltese State (the Flag State). The Court also held that the classification society would have been entitled to take advantage of the immunity of jurisdiction, as would the Maltese State, but that in the circumstances it was deemed to have renounced such immunity by not having invoked it at an earlier stage in the proceedings; and
- Total SA was '*de facto*' the charterer of the *Erika* and could therefore benefit from the channelling provision of Article III.4(c) of the 1992 CLC since the imprudence committed in its vetting of the *Erika* could not be considered as having been committed with the intent to cause such damage, or recklessly and with knowledge that such damage would probably result. The Court of Appeal thus held that Total SA could benefit from the channelling provisions in the 1992 CLC and therefore did not have civil liability. The Court of Appeal also decided that the voluntary payments made by Total SA to the civil parties, including to the French Government following the judgement of the Criminal Court of First Instance were final payments which could not be recovered from the civil parties.

Regarding reputation, image, moral and environmental damage, in its judgement the Court of Appeal accepted not only material damages (clean up, restoration measures and property damage) and economic losses but also moral damage resulting from the pollution, including loss of enjoyment, damage to reputation and brand image and moral damage arising from damage to the natural heritage. The Court of Appeal's judgement confirmed the compensation rights for moral damage awarded by the Criminal Court of First Instance to a number of local authorities and has in addition accepted claims for moral damage from other civil parties.

The Court of Appeal accepted the right to compensation for pure environmental damage, ie damage to non-marketable environmental resources that constitute a legitimate collective interest. The Court of Appeal considered that it was sufficient that the pollution touched the territory of a local authority for these authorities to be able to claim for the direct or indirect damage caused to them by the pollution. The Court of Appeal awarded compensation for pure environmental damage to local authorities and environmental associations.

The amounts awarded by the Court of Appeal are summarised in the table below.

Taking into account the amounts paid in compensation by Total SA following the judgement of the Criminal Court of First Instance, the balance to be compensated by the representative of the shipowner (Tevere Shipping), the president of the management company (Panship Management and Services Srl) and the classification society (RINA) was €32.5 million.

Some 50 parties, including the representative of Tevere Shipping, Panship Management and Services, RINA and Total SA, appealed to the French Supreme Court (Court of Cassation).

Judgement by the Court of Cassation

On 25 September 2012 the Criminal Section of the Court of Cassation rendered its judgement. In a 320-page judgement the Court decided as set out below. The judgement is available in its original French language version via the Incidents section of the IOPC Funds' website: www.iopecfunds.org.

Jurisdiction

The Court of Cassation decided that French courts had jurisdiction to determine both criminal and civil liabilities arising from the *Erika* incident even though the sinking of the vessel had taken place in the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) of France and not within its territory and/or territorial waters. In its judgement, the Court, based on a number of dispositions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (10 December 1982, Montego Bay), justified France exercising its jurisdiction to impose sanctions on those responsible for an oil spill from a foreign-flagged vessel in the EEZ of France causing serious damage in its territorial sea and to its coastline.

With respect to the classification society RINA, the Court of Cassation did not address the question of whether the classification society would have been entitled to take advantage of the immunity of jurisdiction, as would the Maltese State (the Flag State of the *Erika*), since RINA was deemed to have renounced such immunity by having taken part in the criminal proceedings.

The Court stated that, since the 1992 Fund had not taken part in the criminal proceedings, it would not be bound by any judgement or decision in the proceedings.

Criminal liabilities

The Court of Cassation confirmed the decision by the Criminal Court of First Instance and by the Court of Appeal which had held the following four parties criminally liable for the offense of causing pollution: the representative of the shipowner (Tevere Shipping), the president of the management company (Panship Management and Services Srl), the classification society (RINA) and Total SA.

Civil liabilities

Regarding civil liabilities, the Court of Cassation decided that under Article IX.2 of the 1992 CLC, it was entitled to exercise jurisdiction in respect of actions for compensation. In its judgement the Court held that RINA and Total SA were covered by the channelling provisions of the 1992 CLC. They could not, however, rely on this protection since the damage resulted from ➤

Damage awarded	Criminal Court of First Instance (million €)	Criminal Court of Appeal (million €)
Material damage	163.91	165.4
Moral damage (loss of enjoyment, damage to reputation and brand image, moral damage arising from damage to the natural heritage)	26.92	34.1
Pure environmental damage	1.32	4.3
Total	192.15	203.8

their personal acts or omissions, committed with the intent to cause such damage, or recklessly and with knowledge that such damage would probably result.

In relation to RINA, the Court of Cassation decided that the Court of Appeal had been wrong in deciding that a classification society could not benefit from the channelling provisions contained in Article III.4 of the 1992 CLC. The Court decided, however, that the damage had resulted from RINA's recklessness and that therefore RINA could not rely on the protection awarded by the 1992 CLC.

In relation to Total SA, the Court of Cassation quashed the decision by the Court of Appeal and decided that, since the damage had resulted from Total SA's recklessness, it could not rely on the protection awarded by the 1992 CLC.

Material, moral and pure environmental damages

The Court of Cassation confirmed the decision by the Court of Appeal which had awarded the amounts set out in the table on page 9.

Consideration by the 1992 Fund Executive Committee of the judgement by the Court of Cassation

At the April 2013 session of the 1992 Fund Executive Committee, the Director presented an analysis of the judgement by the Criminal Section of the Court of Cassation rendered in September 2012. Discussions focussed on three key issues: the jurisdiction of the criminal courts in France for a spill which had occurred in the EEZ, ie outside of French territorial waters; the Court of Cassation's decision that although all liable parties, including the classification society (RINA), could benefit from the channelling provisions contained in Article III.4 of the 1992 CLC, the four parties had acted recklessly and were therefore held liable under French law of tort for the damage caused; and the decision that compensation should be paid for pure environmental damage under French law. The 1992 Fund Executive Committee noted that this judgement was not binding on the 1992 Fund, which was not a party to the criminal proceedings.

Civil proceedings

Legal actions against the shipowner, Steamship Mutual and the 1992 Fund were taken by 796 claimants. As at October 2013, out-of-court settlements had been reached with a great number of these claimants and the courts had rendered judgements in respect of most of the other claims. One action remained pending against the 1992 Fund with a total amount claimed of €87 467.

Global settlement

At its July 2011 session the 1992 Fund Executive Committee authorised the Director to reach a global settlement between the

1992 Fund, Steamship Mutual (acting on its own behalf and also on behalf of the shipowner's interests), RINA and Total in respect of the *Erika* incident.

The main objective of the global settlement was to ensure that civil parties who had been awarded compensation by the judgement of the Criminal Court of Appeal in Paris received compensation as soon as possible.

In October 2011, the Secretariat was informed that 47 out of 58 civil parties (81%) who had been awarded compensation had either signed a protocol with RINA or agreed to be paid by RINA the amounts awarded by the Criminal Court of Appeal in Paris. These civil parties represent 99% of the total amounts awarded by the Court of Appeal.

Since the vast majority of civil parties who had been awarded compensation by the Criminal Court of Appeal in Paris had agreed to receive compensation, on 14 October 2011 the Director signed on behalf of the 1992 Fund a global settlement with Steamship Mutual, RINA and Total.

The global settlement was formalised in four agreements as detailed below.

General four party agreement

Under the general four party agreement, the 1992 Fund, Steamship Mutual, RINA and Total undertook to withdraw all proceedings against the other parties to the agreement and, in addition, waived any rights to bring any claim or action which they might have in relation to the *Erika* incident against any of the other parties to the agreement.

In accordance with the general agreement the parties withdrew their actions.

Settlement agreement between Steamship Mutual and the 1992 Fund

A bilateral agreement was signed between Steamship Mutual and the 1992 Fund whereby:

- Steamship Mutual undertook to pay to the 1992 Fund a lump sum of €2.5 million as a contribution to the agreement;
- the 1992 Fund undertook to waive and renounce all claims against Steamship Mutual and discontinue all pending actions against Steamship Mutual;
- Steamship Mutual undertook to waive and renounce all claims against the 1992 Fund; and
- the 1992 Fund undertook to meet any judgements against Steamship Mutual and/or the 1992 Fund and agreed to indemnify Steamship Mutual if the judgements were enforced against Steamship Mutual.

In accordance with that agreement, Steamship Mutual paid the 1992 Fund a lump sum of €2.5 million.

Settlement agreement between RINA and the 1992 Fund

A bilateral agreement was signed between RINA and the 1992 Fund whereby:

- RINA undertook to pay to those civil parties who agree to settlement, the amounts awarded by the decision of the Criminal Court of Appeal in Paris;
- the 1992 Fund undertook to waive and renounce all claims against RINA. The 1992 Fund also undertook to discontinue all pending actions against RINA; and
- RINA also undertook to waive and renounce all claims against the 1992 Fund.

In accordance with that agreement, RINA paid the amounts awarded by the decision of the Criminal Court of Appeal in Paris to all civil parties who agreed to settlement.

Settlement agreement between Total and the 1992 Fund

A bilateral agreement was signed between Total and the 1992 Fund whereby:

- Total undertook to waive and renounce all claims against the 1992 Fund and discontinue all pending actions against the Fund; and
- the 1992 Fund undertook to waive and renounce all claims against Total and discontinue all pending actions against Total.

The global settlement has been fully executed. Under the global settlement the 1992 Fund will continue to handle the pending legal actions brought against it and will pay in accordance with judgements. As stated in the civil proceedings section above, as at October 2013 only one action remained pending against the 1992 Fund with a total amount claimed of €87 467.

Refund to contributors

As a result of the global settlement and after providing for claims in court, there remained a significant surplus on the *Erika* Major Claims Fund. On 1 March 2012 the 1992 Fund reimbursed £25 million of that surplus to the contributors of the Major Claims Fund and in October 2013 the 1992 Fund Administrative Council, acting on behalf of the 1992 Fund Assembly, decided to close the *Erika* Major Claims Fund and instructed the 1992 Fund to reimburse the remaining £26.2 million to contributors on 1 March 2014.

Shoreline clean-up operations following the Erika incident.



Prestige

Date of incident	13 November 2002
Place of incident	Spain
Cause of incident	Breaking and sinking
Quantity of oil spilled (approximate)	63 300 tonnes of heavy fuel oil
Area affected	Spain, France and Portugal
Flag State of ship	Bahamas
Gross tonnage	42 820 GT
P&I insurer	London Steamship Owners' Mutual Insurance Association Ltd (London Club)
CLC limit	18.9 million SDR or €22 777 986 (£19 million)
STOPIA/TOPIA applicable	No
CLC + Fund limit	135 million SDR or €171 520 703 (£142.7 million)
Total compensation paid	€121 028 500 (£100.7 million)

Conversion into Pounds sterling has been made on the basis of the exchange rate as at 31 December 2013.



Map data ©2011 Europa Technologies, GIS Innovatsia, GGeoBasis-DE/BKG
(©2009), Google, Tele Atlas, Transnavicom

Incident

On 13 November 2002, the Bahamas-registered tanker *Prestige* (42 820 GT), carrying 76 972 tonnes of heavy fuel oil, began listing and leaking oil some 30 kilometres off Cabo Finisterre (Galicia, Spain). On 19 November, whilst under tow away from the coast, the vessel broke in two and sank some 260 kilometres west of Vigo (Spain), the bow section to a depth of 3 500 metres and the stern section to a depth of 3 830 metres. The break-up and sinking released an estimated 63 272 tonnes of cargo. Over the following weeks oil continued to leak from the wreck at a declining rate. It was subsequently estimated that approximately 13 700 tonnes of cargo remained in the wreck.

Impact

Due to the highly persistent nature of the *Prestige*'s cargo, released oil drifted for extended periods with winds and currents, travelling great distances. The west coast of Galicia was heavily contaminated and oil eventually moved into the Bay of Biscay, affecting the north coast of Spain and France. Traces of oil were detected in the United Kingdom (the Channel Islands, the Isle of Wight and Kent).

Response operations

Major clean-up operations were carried out at sea and on shore in Spain. Significant clean-up operations were also undertaken in France. Clean-up operations at sea were undertaken off Portugal.

Between May and September 2004 some 13 000 tonnes of cargo were removed from the fore part of the wreck. Approximately 700 tonnes were left in the aft section.

In anticipation of a large number of claims, and after consultation with the Spanish and French authorities, the London Club (the shipowner's

insurer) and the 1992 Fund established claims-handling offices in La Coruña (Spain) and Bordeaux (France). In September 2006 the 1992 Fund decided to close the claims-handling office in Bordeaux. As at October 2013, the claims-handling office in La Coruña remained open.

Applicability of the Conventions

At the time of the incident France, Portugal and Spain were Parties to the 1992 Civil Liability and Fund Conventions. The *Prestige* was insured for oil pollution liability with the London Steamship Owners' Mutual Insurance Association Ltd (London Club).

The limitation amount applicable to the *Prestige* under the 1992 CLC is approximately 18.9 million SDR or €22 777 986. In May 2003, the shipowner deposited this amount with the Criminal Court in Corcubión (Spain) for the purpose of constituting the limitation fund required under the 1992 CLC.

The maximum amount of compensation under the 1992 CLC and the 1992 Fund Convention is 135 million SDR which corresponds to €171 520 703.

Level of payments

Unlike the policy adopted by the insurers in previous IOPC Funds' cases, the London Club decided not to make individual compensation payments up to the shipowner's limitation amount. This position was taken following legal advice that if the Club were to make payments to claimants in line with past practice, it was likely that these payments would not be taken into account by the Spanish courts when the shipowner set up the limitation fund, with the result that the Club could end up paying twice the limitation amount.

In May 2003, the Executive Committee decided that the 1992 Fund's payments should for the time being be limited to 15% of the loss or damage actually suffered by the respective claimants as assessed by the experts engaged by the Fund and the London Club. The decision was taken in light of the figures provided by the delegations of the three affected States and an assessment by the 1992 Fund's experts, which indicated that the total amount of the damage could be as high as €1 000 million. The Executive Committee further decided that the 1992 Fund should, in view of the particular circumstances of the *Prestige* case, make payments to claimants, although the London Club would not pay compensation directly to them.

In October 2005, the Executive Committee considered a proposal by the Director for an increase in the level of payments. This proposal was based on a provisional apportionment between the three States concerned of the maximum amount payable by the 1992 Fund on the basis of the total amount of the admissible

claims as established by the assessment which had been carried out at that time. The proposed increase was also subject to the provision of certain undertakings and guarantees by the States of France, Portugal and Spain.

On the basis of the figures presented by the Governments of the three States affected by the incident, which indicated that the total amount of the claims could be as high as €1 050 million, it was considered likely that the level of payments would have to be maintained at 15% for several years unless a new approach could be taken. The Director therefore proposed that, instead of the usual practice of determining the level of payments on the basis of the total amount of claims already presented and possible future claims, it should be determined on an estimate of the final amount of admissible claims against the 1992 Fund, established either as a result of agreements with claimants or by final judgements of competent courts.

On the basis of an analysis of the opinions of the joint experts engaged by the London Club and the 1992 Fund, the Director considered that it was unlikely that the final admissible claims would exceed the following amounts:

State	Estimated final admissible claims (€) (rounded figures)
Spain	500 million
France	70 million
Portugal	3 million
Total	573 million

The Director therefore considered that the level of payments could be increased to 30%^{<3>} if the 1992 Fund was provided with appropriate undertakings and guarantees from the three States concerned to ensure that it was protected against an overpayment situation and that the principle of equal treatment of victims was respected. The Executive Committee agreed with the Director's proposal.

In December 2005, the Portuguese Government informed the 1992 Fund that it would not provide a bank guarantee and as a consequence would only request payment of 15% of the assessed amount of its claim.

In January 2006 the French Government gave the required undertaking to 'stand last in the queue' in respect of its own claim, until all other claimants in France had been compensated.

^{<3>} €171.5 million/€573 million = 29.9%.

In March 2006 the Spanish Government gave the required bank guarantee and undertaking to compensate all claimants in Spain and, as a consequence, a payment of €56 365 000 was made in March 2006. As requested by the Spanish Government the 1992 Fund retained €1 million in order to make payments at the level of 30% of the assessed amounts in respect of the individual claims that had been submitted to the claims-handling office in Spain. These payments would be made on behalf of the Spanish Government in compliance with its undertaking, and any amount left after paying all the claimants in the claims-handling office would be returned to the Spanish Government. If the amount of €1 million were to be insufficient to pay all the claimants who submitted claims to the claims-handling office, the Spanish Government undertook to make payments to these claimants up to 30% of the amount assessed by the London Club and the 1992 Fund.

Since the conditions set by the Executive Committee had been met, the Director increased the level of payments to 30% of the established claims for damage in Spain and in France with effect from 5 April 2006.

Investigations into the cause of the incident^{<4>}

An investigation into the cause of the incident was carried out by the Bahamas Maritime Authority (the authority of the Flag State). The report of the investigation was published in November 2004. The Spanish Ministry of Public Works (Ministerio de Fomento) also carried out an investigation into the cause of the incident through the Permanent Commission on the Investigation of Maritime Casualties, which is tasked with determining the technical causes of maritime accidents.

The French Ministry of Transport and the Sea (Secrétariat d'État aux Transports et à La Mer) carried out a preliminary investigation into the cause of the incident through the General Inspectorate of Maritime Affairs, Investigations Bureau, accidents/sea (Inspection générale des services des affaires maritimes, Bureau enquêtes, accidents/mer (BEAmer)).

A criminal investigation into the cause of the incident had been commenced by an examining magistrate in Brest. Subsequently the magistrate reached an agreement with the Criminal Court in Corcubión by which the criminal file was transferred from Brest to Corcubión.

Claims for compensation Spain

General overview

The claims-handling office in La Coruña received 845 claims totalling €1 037 million. These included 15 claims from the Spanish

Government totalling €984.8 million. The claims, excluding those of the Spanish Government, have been assessed for €3.9 million. Interim payments totalling €564 976 have been made in respect of 175 of the assessed claims, mainly at 30% of the assessed amount. Compensation payments made by the Spanish Government to claimants have been deducted when calculating the interim payments. Some claims were either rejected or could not be assessed due to lack of documentation and no response to the repeated requests by the 1992 Fund.

The experts engaged by the 1992 Fund have also assessed the court claims (see section on criminal proceedings below) submitted by individual claimants in Spain. Interim payments totalling €94 751 have been made at 30% of the assessed amount, taking into account the aid received, in respect of those court claims that had not been submitted to the claims-handling office.

Claims submitted by the Spanish Government

The Spanish Government submitted a total of 15 claims for an amount of €984.8 million. The claims by the Spanish Government relate to costs incurred in respect of at sea and on shore clean-up operations, removal of the oil from the wreck, compensation payments made in relation to the spill on the basis of national legislation (Royal Decrees)^{<5>}, tax relief for businesses affected by the spill, administration costs, costs relating to publicity campaigns, costs incurred by local authorities and paid by the State, costs incurred by 67 towns that had been paid by the State, costs incurred by the regions of Galicia, Asturias, Cantabria and Basque Country and costs incurred in respect of the treatment of the oily residues.

Removal of oil from the wreck

The claim for the removal of the oil from the wreck, initially for €109.2 million, was reduced to €24.2 million to take account of funding obtained from another source.

At its February 2006 session, the Executive Committee decided that some of the costs incurred in 2003 prior to the removal of the oil from the wreck, including sealing the oil leaking from the wreck and various surveys and studies that had a bearing on the assessment of the pollution risk posed, were admissible in principle, but that the claim for costs incurred in 2004 relating to the removal of oil from the wreck was inadmissible. Following the Executive Committee's decision, the claim was assessed at €9.5 million^{<6>}.

^{<4>} A summary of the findings of the investigations into the cause of the incident carried out by the Bahamas Maritime Authority, the Spanish Ministry of Works and the French Ministry of Transport and the Sea can be found in the Annual Report 2005 pages 116-119.

^{<5>} For details regarding the scheme of compensation set up by the Spanish Government reference is made to the Annual Report 2006, pages 109 to 111.

Payments to the Spanish Government

The first claim received from the Spanish Government in October 2003 for €383.7 million was assessed on an interim basis in December 2003 at €107 million. The 1992 Fund made a payment of €16 050 000, corresponding to 15% of the interim assessment. The 1992 Fund also made a general assessment of the total admissible damage in Spain and concluded that the admissible damage would be at least €303 million. On that basis, and as authorised by the 1992 Fund Assembly, the Director made an additional payment of €41 505 000, corresponding to the difference between 15% of €383.7 million (ie €57 555 000) and 15% of the preliminarily assessed amount of the State's claim (ie €16 050 000). That payment was made against the provision by the Spanish Government of a bank guarantee covering the above-mentioned difference (ie €41 505 000) from the Instituto de Crédito Oficial, a Spanish bank with high standing in the financial market, and an undertaking by the Spanish Government to repay any amount of the payment decided by the Executive Committee or the Assembly. In March 2006 the 1992 Fund made an additional payment of €56 365 000 to the Spanish Government.

Assessment of the claims by the Spanish Government

The claims by the Spanish Government, totalling €984.8 million, were assessed at €300.2 million.

The reasons for the difference between the claimed and assessed amounts in respect of the claims by the Spanish Government are principally as follows:

- Costs incurred in clean-up operations: applying the Fund's criteria of technical reasonableness, there was found to be a disproportion between the response carried out by the Spanish Government and the pollution and threat thereof, both with regard to the human and material resources employed and to the length of the operations;

- Subrogated claim for the compensation payments made in the fisheries sector in relation to the spill on the basis of national legislation, including tax relief for businesses affected by the spill: some of these payments and tax relief had the character of aid and were paid to the population in the affected areas without consideration of the damage or losses suffered by the recipients of the payments. The Fund's assessment of these claims was based on an estimation of the losses actually suffered by the fisheries sector;
- Value added tax (VAT): the amount claimed by the Spanish Government included VAT. Since the Government recovers the VAT, the corresponding amounts have been deducted; and
- Removal of oil from the wreck: as noted above, the assessed amount was limited to some of the costs incurred in 2003, prior to the removal of the oil from the wreck, in respect of sealing the oil leaking from the wreck and various surveys and studies that had a bearing on the assessment of the pollution risk posed.

France

General overview

The claims-handling office in Lorient received 482 claims totalling €109.7 million. This includes the claims by the French Government totalling €67.5 million. The claims submitted to the claims-handling office were assessed at €57.5 million and interim payments totalling €5.6 million had been made at 30% of the assessed amounts in respect of 361 claims. Some claims were either rejected or could not be assessed due to lack of documentation and no response to the repeated requests by the 1992 Fund.

Claim submitted by the French Government

The French Government submitted claims for €67.5 million in relation to the costs incurred for clean up and preventive measures. The 1992 Fund and the London Club assessed the claims at €38.5 million and a letter explaining the assessment was sent to the Government.

^{<6>} For details regarding the assessment of the claim in respect of the cost incurred in the removal of oil from the wreck see Annual Report 2006, pages 111 to 114.

The Prestige leaking oil before breaking and sinking.



Meetings have taken place, between the Secretariat, its experts, and the French Government to discuss the assessment of the Government's claims. As at October 2013, no payment had been made as the Government is standing last in the queue.

A letter was received from the French Government setting out the reasons for disagreement with the Fund's assessment of their claim. One of the reasons was that VAT had been deducted when calculating the assessment. At the October 2013 sessions of the governing bodies, the Director submitted a document on the inclusion of VAT in claims for compensation and the French Government submitted a document containing a legal opinion on the issue. Details of the discussions which took place at the October sessions can be found in the Record of Decisions to that meeting via the IOPC Funds' document services website (document IOPC/OCT13/11/1).

Portugal

The Portuguese Government submitted a claim totalling €4.3 million in respect of the costs incurred in clean up and preventive measures. The claim was finally assessed at €2.2 million and the 1992 Fund made a payment of €328 488, corresponding to 15% of the final assessment.

Criminal proceedings

Shortly after the incident, the Criminal Court in Corcubión (Spain) started an investigation into the cause of the incident to determine whether any criminal liability could arise from the events. In July 2010 the Criminal Court in Corcubión decided that four persons should stand trial for criminal and civil liability as a result of the *Prestige* oil spill, namely, the master, the Chief Officer and the Chief Engineer of the *Prestige* and the civil servant who had been involved in the decision not to allow the ship into a place of refuge in Spain. In the decision, the Court stated that the London Club and the 1992 Fund were directly liable for the damages arising from the incident and that their liability was joint and several. The Court also decided that the shipowner, the ship's management company and the Spanish Government were vicariously liable.

The proceedings were transferred to another court, the Audiencia Provincial in La Coruña, to conduct the criminal trial. The hearing started on 16 October 2012 and continued until July 2013. Since the Chief Officer of the *Prestige* could not be located the proceedings continued only against the master, the Chief Engineer of the *Prestige* and the civil servant who had been involved in the decision not to allow the ship into a place of refuge in Spain.

Civil claims in the criminal proceedings

Under Spanish law, civil claims may be submitted in the criminal proceedings as the criminal court will decide not only on criminal

liability but also on civil liability derived from the criminal action. The criminal court is acting as a limitation court awarding compensation for losses suffered as a result of the spill.

In May 2003, the shipowner deposited with the Criminal Court in Corcubión the estimated limitation amount applicable to the *Prestige* under the 1992 CLC of approximately 18.9 million SDR or €22 777 986, for the purpose of constituting the limitation fund required under the 1992 CLC. The 1992 Fund has been a party to the proceedings from the beginning, as a party with strict civil liability under the 1992 Fund Convention. As at October 2013, some 2 531 claims were lodged in the legal proceedings before the Criminal Court in Corcubión.

The Criminal Court in Corcubión appointed court experts to examine the civil claims lodged in the criminal proceedings. In January 2010, the experts appointed by the Court submitted their assessment report. The experts engaged by the 1992 Fund examined the report and concluded that, in general, the court experts had noticed the lack of supporting documentation submitted in most claims. In their assessments the court experts had not, in most cases, examined the link of causation between the damage and the pollution. In some cases, the amount assessed by the 1992 Fund was higher than the court experts' assessment due to the fact that the 1992 Fund's experts had more information available to them, allowing a more detailed assessment of the claims.

The total amount claimed in the criminal proceedings in Spain is €2 317 million including some €1 214 million claimed for pure environmental damage, mainly by the Spanish Government, and some €2.37 million claimed for moral damage by a number of individuals. In their interventions, some claimants have argued that, since their claims were not against the 1992 Fund but against whoever resulted in being criminally liable, the admissibility criteria applied under the Civil Liability and Fund Conventions should not be applied in these proceedings. It has further been argued that the shipowner should not be entitled to limit his liability.

The 1992 Fund has, in its interventions, defended the application of the Conventions in the proceedings.

Judgement of the Audiencia Provincial (Criminal Court)

The Audiencia Provincial (Criminal Court) in La Coruña issued its judgement on 13 November 2013. In its judgement, the Court found the master, the Chief Engineer of the *Prestige* and the civil servant who had been involved in the decision not to allow the ship into a place of refuge in Spain, not criminally liable for damages to the environment. The master was convicted of disobeying the Spanish authorities during the crisis and was sentenced to nine months in prison. He will however not need to

serve any additional time in prison since he had already served a period under detention.

As regards the damages arising out of the incident, the Criminal Court can only declare civil liability when there has been a criminal offence. The judgement found that the only criminal offence was the disobedience of the master. However, since this was not the cause of the damage, the Court could not judge on any civil liability arising from the damage.

On the subject of the limitation fund established by the London Club, totalling some €22 million, the Court decided that the fund was at the Club's disposal for the Club to decide on its distribution, subject to any appeal by the affected parties.

A number of parties have announced their intention to appeal against the judgement before the Supreme Court.

Civil proceedings France

Two hundred and thirty-two claimants, including the French Government, brought legal actions against the shipowner, the London Club and the 1992 Fund in 16 courts in France, requesting compensation totalling some €111 million, including €67.7 million claimed by the Government.

One hundred and eleven of these claimants have withdrawn their actions. Therefore, actions by 121 claimants remain pending in court amounting to a total of €79.1 million.

The courts have granted a stay of proceedings in 17 legal actions, either in order to give the parties time to discuss their claims out of court, or until the outcome of the criminal proceedings in Corcubión is known.

Some 174 French claimants, including the French Government and various communes, have joined the legal proceedings in Corcubión, Spain.

United States

Spain took legal action against the classification society of the *Prestige*, namely the American Bureau of Shipping (ABS), before the Federal Court of First Instance in New York requesting compensation for all damage caused by the incident, estimated initially to exceed US\$700 million and estimated later to exceed US\$1 000 million. Spain has maintained that ABS had been negligent in the inspection of the *Prestige* and had failed to detect corrosion, permanent deformation, defective materials and fatigue in the vessel and had been negligent in granting classification.

ABS denied the allegation made by Spain and in its turn took action against Spain, arguing that if Spain had suffered damage this was caused in whole or in part by its own negligence. ABS made a counterclaim and requested that Spain should be ordered to indemnify ABS for any amount that ABS may be obliged to pay pursuant to any judgement against it in relation to the *Prestige* incident.

ABS's counterclaim was dismissed based on the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act (FSIA). The District Court held that ABS's counterclaim did not arise from the same transaction as Spain's claim and, therefore, did not fall under the FSIA exception permitting counterclaims against a foreign sovereign entity if they arose out of the same transaction as the sovereign entity's original claim.

First judgement by the District Court in New York

In January 2008 the District Court accepted ABS's argument that ABS fell into the category of 'any other person who performs services for the ship' under Article III.4 (b) of the 1992 CLC. The Court further ruled that, under Article IX.1 of the 1992 CLC, Spain could only make claims against ABS in its own courts and it therefore granted ABS's motion for summary judgement, dismissing Spain's claim.

Spain appealed. ABS also filed an appeal against the Court's decision to dismiss its counterclaims for lack of jurisdiction.

Decision by the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

The Court of Appeals rendered its decision in June 2009, reversing both the dismissal of Spain's case and the dismissal of ABS's counterclaims, which the District Court had held did not fall under an exception to the FSIA.

With respect to Spain's claim, the Court of Appeals held that the 1992 CLC could not divest a US federal court of subject matter jurisdiction. However, in sending the case to the District Court, the Court of Appeals stated that the District Court might still exercise its discretion to decline jurisdiction based on *forum non conveniens* or principles of international comity.

The case was sent to the District Court for further consideration.

Second judgement by the District Court in New York

The District Court issued its second judgement in August 2010, granting ABS's motion for summary judgement and again dismissing Spain's claims against ABS.

The Court stated that it was unwilling to accept Spain's proposed rule 'that a classification society owes a duty to refrain from reckless behaviour to all coastal States that could foreseeably be harmed by failures of classified ships', finding that that would amount to an 'unwarranted expansion of the existing scope of tort liability'. The Court also held that such an expansion would be inconsistent with a shipowner's non-delegable duty to provide a seaworthy vessel.

Spain appealed against the judgement of the District Court.

Judgement by the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

The Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit delivered its judgement in August 2012, dismissing the claim by Spain. In its judgement the Court held that Spain had not produced sufficient evidence to establish that ABS had acted in a reckless manner. In the absence of such evidence of reckless behaviour, the Court avoided ruling on whether ABS owed a duty to coastal states to avoid reckless behaviour.

In reaching its decision, the Court of Appeals took note of the following facts:

- In addition to its functions as a not-for-profit classification society, ABS had a for-profit subsidiary that conducted computer analysis of vessels (the SafeHull program) to assess and predict possible areas of future structural failure. The owners of two sister ships[↗] of the *Prestige* had SafeHull analyses done on those vessels, but the owners of the *Prestige* did not. The results of the computer analyses of the sister ships were not shared with the *Prestige*'s owners nor with the ABS surveyors inspecting the *Prestige*;
- Following the *Erika* incident, ABS proposed that it and other classification societies enact classification rules changes, which would have included the use of the SafeHull computer analysis. The proposals were never implemented. ABS also stated at the time that it was engaged in a review of all vessels it classed which were over 20 years old. However, the evidence

showed that no meaningful review was ever conducted;

- In December 2000 the *Castor*, a small tanker classed by ABS, suffered serious structural damage. As a result, in October 2001 ABS stated that certain changes in the classification rules were required, particularly with respect to ballast tanks on older tankers. However, no rule changes had been implemented by the time of the *Prestige*'s final annual survey in May 2002; and
- The *Prestige*'s final Special Survey took place in China in April/May 2001 and its final annual survey was conducted in the United Arab Emirates in May 2002. In both cases the vessel remained in class. Spain contended, and ABS disputed, that in August 2002 the master of the *Prestige* had sent a fax to ABS giving notice of serious structural and mechanical problems. However, Spain was never able to prove that ABS received that fax.

On the issue of applicable law, the Court examined the traditional choice of law factors applied in maritime law and concluded that the place of the alleged negligence/recklessness by ABS (the US headquarters of ABS) was the most significant factor and that this justified the District Court's application of US maritime law.

The Court of Appeals did not address the legal issue of whether ABS owed a duty to coastal states to avoid reckless behaviour. Instead, the Court held that Spain had not proved that ABS had acted in a reckless manner. This approach by the Court of Appeals has left the possibility for that legal issue to be decided in another case.

Had the Court of Appeals affirmed the District Court's ruling that there was no duty, not even for reckless behaviour, that might have barred the possibility of a future recovery by a third party in a case with strong evidence of reckless behaviour by a classification society. The policy adopted by the District Court that ABS did not owe a duty to Spain to avoid recklessness, is a ruling for this case only and is only persuasive, but not binding, as a precedent.

Spain has not appealed against the judgement and therefore the judgement is final.

[↗] Sister ships are those built to the same design, although there may be small differences.

Heavily oiled beach at Finisterre, Galicia, Spain, following the Prestige incident.



Legal action by France against ABS in France

In April 2010, France brought a legal action in the Court of First Instance in Bordeaux against three companies in the group of ABS. The defendants opposed this action relying on the defence of sovereign immunity. The Judge has referred the case for a preliminary ruling by the Court on the question of whether ABS was entitled to sovereign immunity from legal proceedings.

Recourse actions

United States

In October 2004 the Executive Committee decided that the 1992 Fund should not take recourse action against ABS in the United States. The Director was instructed to follow the ongoing litigation in the United States, monitor the ongoing investigations into the cause of the incident and take any steps necessary to protect the 1992 Fund's interests in any relevant jurisdiction. The Executive Committee stated that this decision was without prejudice to the Fund's position in respect of legal actions against other parties.

Spain

As regards a possible recourse action in Spain, the Director was advised by the 1992 Fund's Spanish lawyer that an action against ABS in Spain would face procedural difficulties. Criminal proceedings have been brought in Spain against four parties, namely the master, the Chief Officer and the Chief Engineer of the *Prestige* and the civil servant who had been involved in the decision not to allow the ship into a place of refuge in Spain. ABS was not a defendant in the proceedings. Under Spanish law, when a criminal action has been brought, any action for compensation based on the same or substantially the same facts as those forming the basis of the criminal action, whether against the defendants in the criminal proceedings or against other parties, cannot be pursued until the final judgement has been rendered in the criminal case. On the basis of the Fund's Spanish lawyer's advice, the Director did not recommend bringing an action against ABS in Spain.

France

At its October 2012 session the Executive Committee took note of the judgement rendered by the Court of Cassation in France in the context of the *Erika* incident. It was noted that in its judgement the Court of Cassation had stated that, in relation to the classification society, Registro Italiano Navale (RINA), the Court of Appeal had been wrong in deciding that a classification society could not benefit from the channelling provisions contained in Article III.4 of the 1992 CLC. It was noted, however, that the Court of Cassation had decided that the damage had resulted from RINA's recklessness and that therefore RINA could not rely on the protection awarded by the 1992 CLC.

It was also noted that the Court of Cassation had not addressed the question of whether the classification society would have been entitled to invoke sovereign immunity since RINA was deemed to have renounced such immunity by having taken part in the preliminary criminal proceedings.

The Director noted that he had previously been advised by the Fund's French lawyer that in a possible action against ABS in France in the context of the *Prestige* incident, the Court would most likely apply French law. It was noted that the Court of Cassation judgement in the *Erika* incident, which held RINA liable for the pollution arising from the *Erika* incident, could constitute a precedent that would be followed by a French court in an action against ABS in the *Prestige* incident.

Following the decision of the 1992 Fund Executive Committee at their October 2012 session, the 1992 Fund brought a recourse action against ABS in the Court of First Instance in Bordeaux as an interim measure to avoid the action becoming time-barred under French law.

ABS submitted points of defence alleging that it was entitled to sovereign immunity as the Bahamas (the flag State of the *Prestige*) would be.

As at October 2013, the proceedings in the Bordeaux Court had been stayed pending the decision in the criminal proceedings in Spain.

Solar I

Date of incident	11 August 2006
Place of incident	Guimaras Strait, the Philippines
Cause of incident	Sinking
Quantity of oil spilled (approximate)	2 100 tonnes of industrial fuel oil
Area affected	Guimaras Island and Iloilo Province, the Philippines
Flag State of ship	Republic of the Philippines
Gross tonnage	998 GT
P&I insurer	Shipowners' Mutual Protection and Indemnity Association (Luxembourg) (Shipowners' Club)
CLC limit	4.51 million SDR (£4.2 million)
STOPIA/TOPIA applicable	Yes – STOPIA 2006 limit of 20 million SDR (£18.7 million)
CLC + Fund limit	203 million SDR (£190 million)
Total compensation paid	PHP 986 646 031 (£13.4 million)

Conversion into Pounds sterling has been made on the basis of the exchange rate as at 31 December 2013.



Incident

On 11 August 2006, the Philippines registered tanker *Solar I* (998 GT), laden with a cargo of 2 081 tonnes of industrial fuel oil, sank in heavy weather in the Guimaras Strait, some ten nautical miles south of Guimaras Island, Republic of the Philippines.

Impact

After the vessel sank, an unknown but substantial quantity of oil was released from the vessel. The sunken wreck then continued to release oil, albeit in ever decreasing quantities. During an operation to remove the remaining oil from the wreck it was found that virtually the entire cargo had been spilled at the time of the incident.

Response operations

The Shipowners' Club and the 1992 Fund established a claims office in Iloilo to assist with the handling of claims. The office was closed in 2010 after the majority of claims had been dealt with.

Applicability of the Conventions

The Republic of the Philippines is Party to the 1992 Civil Liability Convention (1992 CLC) and the 1992 Fund Convention.

The *Solar I* was entered with the Shipowners' Mutual Protection and Indemnity Association (Luxembourg) (Shipowners' Club).

The limitation amount applicable to the *Solar I* in accordance with the 1992 CLC is 4.51 million SDR, but the owner of the *Solar I* is a party to the Small Tanker Oil Pollution Indemnification Agreement 2006 (STOPIA 2006) whereby the limitation amount applicable to the tanker is increased, on a voluntary basis, to 20 million SDR. However, the 1992 Fund continues to be liable to compensate claimants if, and to the extent

Map data ©2011 Google

that, the total amount of admissible claims exceeds the limitation amount applicable to the *Solar 1* under the 1992 CLC. Under STOPIA 2006, the 1992 Fund has legally enforceable rights of indemnification from the shipowner of the difference between the limitation amount applicable to the tanker under the 1992 CLC and the total amount of admissible claims up to 20 million SDR.

The Fund and the Shipowners' Club agreed that the 1992 Fund would make compensation payments once the limitation amount under the 1992 CLC had been reached and that the Club would reimburse the Fund any payments made within two weeks of being invoiced by the Fund, an arrangement that has worked very well throughout the handling of the incident.

Claims for compensation

As at October 2013, some 32 466 claims had been received and payments totalling PHP 987 million had been made in respect of 26 870 claims, mainly in the fisheries sector. All claims had been assessed and the local claims office had closed.

The claims situation as at October 2013 is summarised in the table below.

It should be noted that many claimants did not indicate a claimed amount on their claim form. Therefore the total claimed amount cannot be established.

The Shipowners' Club and the 1992 Fund received a further 132 642 claims, not included in the table, mainly from fisherfolk and seaweed producers in Guimaras Island and in the Province of Iloilo. The majority of the associated claim forms were incomplete and a significant number were from people under the age of 18 years, which is the minimum age at which people are allowed to engage in fishing in the Philippines. After a detailed screening process which included comparison of the details on the claims forms with the electoral register, the Club and Fund decided not to process further those forms that did not relate to valid claims.

Clean up and preventive measures

Twenty-eight claims were submitted in relation to clean up and preventive measures by individuals, clean-up contractors, Petron Corporation and government agencies. Claims from contractors and Petron Corporation for clean up at sea and on shore, as well as underwater surveys and oil recovery operations, have been settled for a total of PHP 775.22 million. Seven individual claims for small-scale additional clean-up measures have also been assessed as reasonable and six of those claims have now been settled for PHP 373 918. The other claimant received an offer of settlement but did not accept it. The claim is now considered time-barred.

Two claims submitted by the Philippine Coastguard (PCG) in respect of the preventive measures carried out in response to the incident have been received and assessed. A settlement offer for both claims for PHP 104.8 million was made and has been accepted by the PCG.

Property damage

A total of 3 260 claims have been received for damage to fishing gear, fishing boats and beach front properties, of which 631 have been paid for a total of PHP 5.12 million. As at October 2013, some 122 approved claims for property damage could not be paid to claimants, since cheques for compensation had not been collected. A consolidation of accounts has been undertaken with the bank in the Philippines and remaining compensation will be available directly from the 1992 Fund upon request. Some 2 507 claims have been rejected since claimants were unable to provide any evidence of having been affected.

Economic losses in the capture fisheries sector

Of the 27 812 claims received from fisherfolk, some 25 940 have been settled and paid for PHP 190.4 million and 598 have been rejected. As at October 2013, over 250 claimants have failed to collect their compensation. Since cheques have a limited period of validity, the 1992 Fund has had to re-issue cheques >

Category of claim	Claims submitted and assessed	Assessed amount (PHP)	Claims paid	Paid amount (PHP)	Claims rejected
Capture fishery	27 812	207 678 149	25 940	190 392 018	598
Mariculture	771	3 704 266	198	3 308 273	465
Miscellaneous	170	6 934 644	11	6 852 074	157
Property damage	3 260	5 341 587	631	5 117 154	2 507
Tourism	425	5 489 437	75	5 381 627	346
Clean up	28	885 668 092	15	775 594 885	13
Total	32 466	1 114 816 175	26 870	986 646 031	4 086

which had expired. This created some discrepancies when payments made were reported, since figures related to cheques issued but not necessarily collected. Since some payments had been re-issued several times without being collected, a consolidation of accounts has now been undertaken as far as possible. Remaining claimants will be able to collect their compensation at any time by making contact with the 1992 Fund directly.

Economic losses in the mariculture sector

The Shipowners' Club and the 1992 Fund have received 771 claims from seaweed farmers and fishpond operators for damage to their crops as a result of the contamination. Some 198 of these claims have been paid for a total of PHP 3.3 million with another ten additional payments not collected. A further 465 claims have been rejected on the grounds that the claimants could not credibly show that they had been involved in the claimed activities at the time of the incident or that their crops were actually affected by the contamination.

Some 98 seaweed farmers and one fishpond operator received offers of payment but chose not to accept the compensation, considering it inappropriately low. In the absence of additional corroborating evidence, the Shipowners' Club and 1992 Fund have been unable to resolve this issue and these claims are now considered time-barred.

Tourism and other economic losses

The Shipowners' Club and the 1992 Fund have received some 425 claims in the tourism sector from owners of small resorts, tour boat operators and various service providers. Overall, some 75 claims have been settled and paid for a total of PHP 5.38 million while 346 have been rejected because of insufficient proof that the claimants had suffered losses as a result of the pollution.

Several claimants submitted follow-up claims pertaining to additional losses throughout 2008 and 2009. These were assessed in the light of corroborating evidence, such as visitor numbers to the Island and ferry receipts, and were settled and paid where appropriate.

Miscellaneous

Some 170 claims have been received for economic losses, incurred mainly by convenience stores and livestock farmers. The majority of these claims have been rejected as there was an insufficiently close link of causation between the contamination and the alleged damages.

Eleven claims for a total of PHP 6.85 million have been paid in respect of costs incurred by a number of government units, mainly to compensate for part of the fixed costs of salaries and overtime for staff involved in the response to the incident. Compensation for a further claim, also from a government unit, was declined by the claimant after changes in the local administration.

Civil proceedings

Legal proceedings by 967 fisherfolk

A civil action was filed in August 2009 by a law firm in Manila that had previously represented a group of fisherfolk from Guimaras Island. The action pertains to claims from 967 of these fisherfolk totalling PHP 286.4 million for property damage as well as economic losses. The claimants rejected the 1992 Fund's assessment of a 12-week business interruption period as applied to all similar claims in this area, arguing that fisheries were disrupted for over 22 months, without however providing any evidence or support. The 1992 Fund filed defence pleadings in response to the civil action.

A pre-trial hearing took place in July 2012 in order to explore the possibility of an amicable settlement. The Court ordered that mediation hearings should take place in August and September 2012 before a court-accredited mediator. The 1992 Fund's lawyer met with the claimants' lawyers before the first mediation hearing in August in an attempt to settle the matter and to minimise the costs that would otherwise be incurred by attending the mediation hearings. During that meeting, the claimants' lawyers had not prepared any formal documentation furthering their case and no progress was made in settling the matter at the first mediation meeting in August 2012. A proposal for an amicable settlement was expected to be put forward by the claimants' lawyers but, in the absence of such submissions, the matter proceeded to an initial pre-trial hearing in October 2012.

One of the sensitive areas affected by the Solar 1 oil spill.



Directions were given for the future conduct of the case, including discovery procedures for the presentation of documents to the opposing party and the Court. In June 2013, the claimants failed to submit Judicial Affidavits as required under Philippine law; the 1992 Fund's lawyer therefore applied that the Court declare the claimants as having waived the right to adduce evidence, in effect, requesting a plea for the outright dismissal of the claim. The request was deemed submitted for resolution, however, in July 2013 the Court also set the cases for conclusion of the preliminary stages (further discovery procedures) and ordered that the final conclusion of pre-trial proceedings take place in September 2013. In October 2013, the 1992 Fund's application to dismiss the claim was denied and the matter was set for trial in December 2013.

Legal proceedings by the PCG

The PCG brought legal proceedings to ensure its rights were safeguarded in relation to two claims for costs incurred during clean-up and pumping operations. Defence pleadings were filed by the 1992 Fund. An offer of settlement for PHP 104.8 million was made for both claims and was accepted by the PCG. In April 2012, the Secretariat provided the PCG with a draft compromise agreement, the terms of which were quickly agreed with the PCG. However, since then due to a number of changes in personnel at the PCG, and the necessity to gain approval of the terms of the compromise agreement from the Office of the Solicitor General of the Philippines, matters were delayed. Despite numerous requests made thereafter, the Office of the Solicitor General did not sign the compromise agreement.

In an attempt to progress matters, in May 2013 the Director wrote to the Ambassador of the Philippines in London with a request for any assistance that he could provide to enable the 1992 Fund to make payment. In addition, in October 2013, the Solicitor General declined to sign the settlement documents pending the provision of further information explaining how the submitted claim had been calculated and why the assessment by the 1992 Fund was reasonable. Although as of October 2013, no progress had been made in resolving the outstanding payment, the Secretariat remains optimistic that the settlement monies will be paid in the near future.

Legal proceedings by a group of municipal employees

Ninety-seven individuals employed by a municipality on Guimaras during the response to the incident have taken action in court against the mayor, the ship's captain, various agents, ship and cargo owners and the 1992 Fund on the grounds of not having been paid for their services. After a thorough review of the legal documents received, the 1992 Fund filed pleadings of defence in court, noting in particular that the majority of claimants were not engaged in activities admissible in principle. Furthermore, a number of the claimants had already been included in a claim submitted and settled by the Municipality of Guimaras.

A pre-trial hearing took place in July 2012 in order to explore the possibility of an amicable settlement but it was not successful. The Court ordered that the parties enter into a series of pre-hearings and mediation meetings. The 1992 Fund instructed its lawyers to meet with the claimants' lawyers before the first mediation hearing in August 2012 in an attempt to settle the matter and to minimise the costs that would otherwise be incurred by attending the mediation hearings.

However, as at October 2013, the claimants' lawyers had made no further proposals nor had they produced any further evidence to support their case, so no progress has been made in resolving the proceedings. The Court set a similar timetable as for the claim involving the 967 fisherfolk and therefore the matter had been set for trial in December 2013.

Legal proceedings by the 1992 Fund against the shipowner

In September 2010, in order to protect its claims against the shipowner under STOPIA 2006, the 1992 Fund brought legal proceedings against the shipowner before the English courts. Following an agreement reached with the shipowner's insurer not to invoke the time bar provisions of STOPIA 2006, the 1992 Fund agreed not to serve the legal proceedings and to let the time expire. No further developments had taken place in this regard in 2013.

Considerations

This is the first incident where STOPIA 2006 has applied and the 1992 Fund is receiving regular reimbursements from the Shipowners' Club. It is very unlikely that the amount of compensation payable in respect of this incident will exceed the STOPIA 2006 limit of 20 million SDR, and therefore very unlikely that the 1992 Fund will be called upon to pay compensation.

Volgoneft 139

Date of incident	11 November 2007
Place of incident	Kerch Strait, between the Sea of Azov and the Black Sea, Russian Federation and Ukraine
Cause of incident	The vessel broke into two sections
Quantity of oil spilled (approximate)	Up to 2 000 tonnes of fuel oil
Area affected	Taman Peninsula, Tuzla Spit and Chushka Spit, Russian Federation and Ukraine
Flag State of ship	Russian Federation
Gross tonnage	3 463 GT
P&I insurer	Ingosstrakh
CLC limit	4.51 million SDR or RUB 174.8 million (£3.2 million)
STOPIA/TOPIA applicable	No
CLC + Fund limit	203 million SDR or RUB 7 868.3 million (£144.5 million)
Total compensation paid	RUB 76 247 635 (£1 400 982)

Conversion into Pounds sterling has been made on the basis of the exchange rate as at 31 December 2013.



Map data ©2011 Basarsoft, GIS Innovatsia, Google, Tele Atlas, Transnavicom

Incident

On 11 November 2007, the Russian-registered tanker *Volgoneft 139* (3 463 GT, built in 1978) broke in two in the Strait of Kerch linking the Sea of Azov and the Black Sea between the Russian Federation and Ukraine. The tanker was at anchor when it was caught in a severe storm and heavy seas. After the vessel had broken in two, the stern section remained afloat and using the casualty's own engines, the Captain managed to beach it on a nearby sand bank. The crew were then rescued and taken to the Port of Kavkaz (Russian Federation). The fore section remained afloat at anchor for a while and then sank.

The tanker was loaded with 4 077 tonnes of heavy fuel oil. It is understood that between 1 200 and 2 000 tonnes of fuel oil were spilt. Following removal of 913 tonnes of heavy fuel oil, the aft section was towed to Kavkaz, where it was eventually sold. A month after the incident, the fore section was temporarily raised and 1 200 tonnes of a mixture of fuel oil and water were recovered from tanks one and two. In August 2008 the fore section of the wreck was raised again and towed to the Port of Kavkaz where it was dismantled for scrap.

It was reported that three other cargo vessels loaded with sulphur (*Volnogorsk*, *Nakhichevan* and *Kovel*) also sank in the same area within two hours of the incident.

Impact

Some 250 kilometres of shoreline, both in the Russian Federation and in Ukraine, are understood to have been affected by the oil. Heavy bird casualties, numbering in excess of 30 000, were reported.

Response operations

A joint crisis centre was set up to coordinate the response between the Russian Federation and Ukraine. Operations at sea were reported to have recovered some 200 tonnes of heavy fuel oil.

In the Russian Federation significant parts of the shorelines of the Taman peninsula and the Tuzla and Chushka Spits were affected by the oil. Shoreline clean up was undertaken by the Russian military and civil emergency forces and some 70 000 tonnes of oily debris, sand and sea grass were taken away for disposal.

In Ukraine some 6 500 tonnes of oily waste were collected, mainly from Tuzla Island, and were transferred to the Port of Kerch prior to disposal.

In November and December 2007, the Secretariat contacted the Russian Embassy in London and the Ministry of Transport in Moscow, offering the help of the 1992 Fund to the Russian authorities in dealing with the incident. A number of meetings took place at the 1992 Fund Secretariat's offices at which the compensation regime was explained in detail. The 1992 Fund offered to send experts to the Russian Federation to monitor the situation and provide advice to the Russian authorities. However, no official reply was received from the Russian authorities and, without the required letters of invitation and visas, neither the representatives of the 1992 Fund nor its experts could visit the affected area to monitor the clean-up operations.

Applicability of the Conventions

The Russian Federation is a Party to the 1992 Civil Liability Convention (1992 CLC) and 1992 Fund Convention. Ukraine was not, at the time of the incident, Party to the 1992 Civil Liability or Fund Conventions. Although it had deposited an instrument of ratification of the 1992 CLC with the Secretary-General of the International Maritime Organization (IMO) on 28 November 2007, this did not enter into force in Ukraine until 28 November 2008.

The *Volgoneft 139* was owned by JSC Volgotanker. In March 2008, JSC Volgotanker was declared bankrupt by the Commercial Court in Moscow.

The *Volgoneft 139* was insured by Ingosstrakh (Russian Federation) for 3 million SDR, ie the minimum limit of liability under the 1992 CLC prior to November 2003. The minimum limit under the 1992 CLC after November 2003, however, is 4.51 million SDR. There is therefore an 'insurance gap' of some 1.51 million SDR.

The *Volgoneft 139* was not insured by a P&I Club belonging to the International Group of P&I Associations and was therefore not covered by the Small Tanker Oil Pollution Indemnification Agreement (STOPIA) 2006.

Claims for compensation

During 2009, a number of meetings were held in London and Moscow between the Russian authorities, the Secretariat and the 1992 Fund's experts to facilitate the exchange of information and to monitor the progress of claims. The Secretariat and the Fund's experts visited Moscow, Krasnodar and the Vessel Traffic System (VTS) in Kavkaz in February 2010, where they held meetings with the Ministry of Transport, a representative of the owner and the charterer of the *Volgoneft 139*, several local authorities in the Krasnodar area, the Harbour Masters of Kavkaz and Temryuk and a claimant in the tourism sector.

The Secretariat and the 1992 Fund's experts visited Krasnodar in February 2011 to meet with claimants to try to solve the issues pending with the claims. Meetings were held with the regional and municipal authorities whose claims, relating to clean up and preventive measures, constitute the majority of the claimed amount. The main point of disagreement with these claimants was the amount of waste collected which, in the Fund's view, was not technically reasonable. A meeting was also held with a representative of the Port of Kerch to discuss the claim submitted by the Port for clean up and preventive measures. During that visit, meetings also took place with representatives of some individual claimants in the fisheries and tourism sectors.

A meeting took place in London in late February 2011 between the 1992 Fund, its lawyer and experts and representatives of the Russian Ministry of Transport. The Fund and its experts made a further visit to Moscow in March 2011, to meet with representatives of the Russian Government and the insurer.

At its April 2013 session, the 1992 Fund Executive Committee decided to authorise the Director to pay private claimants in full according to the ruling of the Arbitration Court of Saint Petersburg and Leningrad Region and make interim payments to the three government claimants with pro-rated deductions to cover the 'insurance gap'. In accordance with that decision the 1992 Fund paid all private claimants in full and there remain only the three government agencies to be paid. As at October 2013, the 1992 Fund is awaiting a reply from the three government agencies to be able to pay the amounts owed to them after having discounted the 'insurance gap'.

The table on page 26 summarises the claims situation as at October 2013.

Civil proceedings 'Metodika' claim

At a meeting in May 2008 the Russian authorities informed the 1992 Fund that Rosprirodnadzor had submitted a claim for environmental damage for some RUB 6 048.6 million. This claim ➤

Claimant	Awarded by Court or settled (including costs) (RUB)	To be paid by Ingosstrakh (RUB)	To be paid by 1992 Fund (RUB)	Paid by 1992 Fund (RUB)	To be paid by 1992 Fund (RUB)	'Insurance gap' (RUB)
Federal agency	781 461	186 048	595 413	0	484 211	111 202
Regional government	379 216 773	89 721 648	289 495 125	0	236 451 561	53 043 564
Local government	38 474 867	9 054 181	29 420 686	0	24 047 852	5 372 834
Contractor	68 280 170	13 543 513	54 736 656	54 736 656	0	0
Charterer	3 258 211	652 582	2 605 629	2 605 629	0	0
Shipowner (out of court settlement)	8 755 555	0	8 755 555	8 755 555	0	0
Tourist operator (private)	8 524 153	2 267 460	6 256 693	6 256 693	0	0
Port of Kerch (Ukraine)	4 959 886	1 066 685	3 893 101	3 893 101	0	0
Total	512 251 076	116 492 117	395 758 858	76 247 634	260 983 624	58 527 600

was based on the quantity of oil spilled, multiplied by an amount of Roubles per ton ('Metodika'). The Secretariat informed the Russian authorities that a claim based on an abstract quantification of damages calculated in accordance with a theoretical model was in contravention of Article I.6 of the 1992 CLC and therefore not admissible for compensation, but that the 1992 Fund was prepared to examine the activities undertaken by Rosprirodnadzor to combat oil pollution and to restore the environment to determine if and to what extent they qualified for compensation under the Conventions. The 1992 Fund has assessed the costs incurred by Rosprirodnadzor at RUB 688 487.

In September 2010, the Arbitration Court of Saint Petersburg and Leningrad Region rendered a judgement rejecting the 'Metodika' claim. In its judgement the Court noted that, under Article I.6 of the 1992 CLC, compensation for damage to the environment, other than loss of benefit caused by such damage, should be limited to the expenses for the reasonable reinstatement measures, as well as the expenses for the preventive measures and subsequent damage caused by such measures. The Court also noted that the expenses included in the other claims arising from the incident covered any preventive and reinstatement measures actually taken as a result of the incident.

Rosprirodnadzor has not appealed and the judgement is therefore final.

Force majeure

Ingosstrakh, the shipowner's insurer, submitted a defence in Court arguing that the incident was wholly caused by a natural

phenomenon of an exceptional, inevitable and irresistible character (*force majeure*) and that therefore no liability should be attached to the owner of the *Volgoneft 139* (Article III.2(a) of the 1992 CLC). If this argument were to be accepted by the Court, the shipowner and its insurer would be exonerated from liability and the 1992 Fund would have to pay compensation to the victims of the spill from the outset (Article 4.1(a) of the 1992 Fund Convention).

The 1992 Fund appointed a team of experts to examine the weather conditions in the area and the circumstances at the time of the incident to determine the validity of the shipowner's defence. In June 2008 the experts visited the area where the incident occurred and inspected the aft section of the wreck in the Port of Kavkaz.

In summary, the conclusions of the experts were as follows:

- the storm of 11 November 2007 was not exceptional since there are records of similar and comparable storms being experienced in the region four times in the past 20 years;
- it was not inevitable that the *Volgoneft 139* would be caught in the storm. There were timely forecasts of the storm and conditions were accurately predicted so there had been sufficient opportunities to avoid the vessel being exposed to the storm in the way it had been; and
- the storm of 11 November 2007 was irresistible in so far as the *Volgoneft 139* was concerned, as the conditions associated with the storm were in excess of the vessel's design criteria.

To fully understand the circumstances of the incident, the Secretariat and the 1992 Fund's experts visited the Kerch VTS

in Ukraine in November 2009 and the VTS in Kavkaz, Russian Federation, in February 2010.

On the basis of the additional information made available during the visits, the 1992 Fund's experts broadly confirmed their preliminary conclusions that the storm of 11 November 2007 was not exceptional. They concluded that it was not inevitable that the *Volgoneft 139* would be caught in the storm, since there had been sufficient opportunities to avoid the vessel being exposed to the storm in the way it had been. The experts also confirmed their initial view that the *Volgoneft 139* should not have been in the area at the time of the incident since the conditions associated with the storm were in excess of the vessel's design criteria.

Whereas the 1992 Fund's experts' initial view had been that the Kerch Strait anchorage was considered as a commercial port, the experts understood from their visits in November 2009 and February 2010 that the Strait was not operated as a port. During the visits to the VTS in Kerch and in Kavkaz, the experts learned that none of the port authorities had powers to close the anchorage in case of a storm warning or to direct vessels to vacate the anchorage. It was therefore the conclusion of the experts that it was the responsibility of the master and the shipowner to take action to avoid the casualty.

In September 2010 the Arbitration Court of Saint Petersburg and Leningrad Region decided that the shipowner and its insurer had not provided evidence that the oil spill resulted from an act of God, which was exceptional and unavoidable. The Court concluded that the master, having had all the necessary storm warnings, had not taken all necessary measures to avoid the incident and that therefore the incident was not unavoidable for the vessel. The Court also concluded that the storm was not exceptional since there was data of comparable storms in the area. In its judgement the Court decided that the spill did not result from a natural phenomenon of an exceptional nor inevitable character, and that the shipowner and his insurer were therefore liable for the pollution damage caused by the spill.

Ingosstrakh has not appealed and the judgement is therefore final.

Quantum and merits of claims for compensation

At a hearing in January 2011, the Arbitration Court of Saint Petersburg and Leningrad Region requested that the 1992 Fund present a justification for its position on the relationship between the amount of oil spilled and the amount of waste collected, which was the main contentious issue in the assessment of some clean-up claims.

The 1992 Fund submitted its report to the Court at a hearing in March 2011. The report compared the amount of oily waste collected during the response to the incident and the oily waste collected in a number of other incidents. The report concluded that in the *Volgoneft 139* incident, the amount of oily waste collected was some 40 times the amount of oil spilled whereas in other spills this proportion was between 2.5 times and 15 times. The cost of this additional clean up and disposal of oily waste would therefore not be considered reasonable and therefore would not be admissible for compensation.

Hearings took place in May, July, October, November and December 2011, and in February, April and June 2012 at the Arbitration Court of Saint Petersburg and Leningrad Region.

At the February 2012 hearing the Court decided that all claimants had the right to legal interest according to Russian law and ordered the claimants to submit their interest calculations.

In June 2012 the Court delivered its judgement on quantum, awarding amounts totalling RUB 503.2 million, including legal interest. In addition, the Court awarded some claimants court fees totalling RUB 164 445 to be paid by Ingosstrakh, the shipowner and the 1992 Fund in equal parts.

Clean-up operations on the shore of the Kerch Strait following the Volgoneft 139 incident.



The table below summarises the amounts awarded by the judgement of the Arbitration Court of Saint Petersburg and Leningrad Region, against the 1992 Fund's assessment of the claims.

The Court decided that the shipowner/Ingosstrakh should pay the awarded amounts up to 3 million SDR and that the 1992 Fund should pay all amounts above 3 million SDR. Since the 1992 CLC limit applicable at the time of the incident was 4.51 million SDR, there remains an 'insurance gap' of some 1.51 million SDR. In the judgement, the Court decided that the shipowner's limit should be 3 million SDR since that was the limit of liability under the 1992 CLC at the time of the incident as published by the Russian Official Gazette.

In August 2012, the 1992 Fund appealed against the judgement on the grounds that:

- i. the limit of the shipowner's liability under the 1992 CLC at the time of the incident was 4.51 million SDR and therefore the Court's ruling establishing the shipowner's limitation fund at only 3 million SDR should be amended; and
- ii. the judgement does not explain the assessment of the amounts of compensation adjudicated in favour of the various claimants. Therefore, it remains unclear how the Court calculated the awarded amounts and on what evidence the judgement was reached.

A local authority claiming for the costs incurred in clean up and preventive measures also appealed against the judgement since the amount awarded was lower than the claimed amount. The judgement was confirmed by the Court of Appeal and the Court of Cassation. The 1992 Fund requested leave to appeal to the Supreme Court.

The 'insurance gap'

In February 2008 the Arbitration Court of Saint Petersburg and Leningrad Region issued a ruling declaring that the limitation fund had been constituted by means of a letter of guarantee for 3 million SDR (RUB 116.3 million). In April 2008 the 1992 Fund appealed against the Court's ruling, arguing that at the time of the incident the limit of the shipowner's liability under the 1992 CLC was 4.51 million SDR (RUB 174.8 million) and that therefore the Court's ruling which had established the shipowner's limitation fund at only 3 million SDR should be amended. The Court of Appeal, the Court of Cassation and the Supreme Court confirmed the decision of the Arbitration Court of Saint Petersburg and Leningrad Region, maintaining that Russian Courts should apply the limits as published in the Russian Official Gazette at the time when the incident occurred.

In June 2012 the Arbitration Court of Saint Petersburg and Leningrad Region delivered its judgement on quantum, awarding amounts totalling RUB 503.2 million including legal interest. In addition, the Court awarded some claimants' court fees and expenses totalling RUB 318 969 to be paid by Ingosstrakh, the shipowner and the 1992 Fund in equal parts.

The Court decided that the shipowner/Ingosstrakh should pay the awarded amounts up to 3 million SDR and that the 1992 Fund should pay all amounts above 3 million SDR. In the judgement, the Court decided that the shipowner's limit should be 3 million SDR since that was the limit of liability under the 1992 CLC at the time of the incident as published by the Russian Official Gazette.

The 1992 Fund appealed against the judgement by the Arbitration Court, but the judgement was confirmed by the Court of Appeal in

	Claimed amount (RUB)	1992 Fund assessment (RUB)	Court judgement (RUB)	
			Principal	Legal interest
Clean up contractor	63 926 933	50 766 549	50 766 549	17 413 621
Regional government	434 687 072	241 045 047	337 866 060	41 350 713
Local government	42 960 768	24 949 162	33 954 965	4 456 180
Port of Kerch (Ukraine)	9 170 697	1 739 454	3 770 772	1 089 164
Charterer	9 499 078	2 312 714	2 312 714	891 050
Tourist operator (private)	8 524 153	8 524 153	8 524 153	0
Shipowner	27 706 290	8 755 555	0	0
Federal agency (Rosprirodnadzor)	753 332	688 487	688 487	92 974
Total	597 228 323	338 781 121	437 883 700	65 293 702
			503 177 402	

September 2012 and the Court of Cassation in January 2013. The 1992 Fund has requested leave to appeal to the Supreme Court.

In a ruling delivered in July 2013, the Supreme Court decided that the Presidium of the Supreme Court should consider the 1992 Fund's appeal on the 'insurance gap'. The Supreme Court stated that:

- When rendering their judgements the lower courts had not taken into account the amendments to the liability limits under the 1992 Civil Liability and Fund Conventions that had been introduced through a resolution adopted by the Legal Committee of the IMO in October 2000, which had entered into force in November 2003.
- The lower courts had not taken into account that in accordance with the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties 1969, a treaty enters into force in the order and on the date provided in the treaty itself. This Convention also provides that a treaty shall be amended by agreement among the participants. In the course of consideration of the present case, a question arose as to whether the amendments to the liability limits had been published in the Russian Federation when the limitation fund was established in 2007. International practice in similar cases established that a company (unlike a physical person) cannot justify performance of actions in violation of any rules of law by referring to the fact that these rules had not been officially published in the State.
- The lower courts had not investigated the question of whether the shipowner knew or should have known about the increase of the liability limits. In addition, the lower courts should have questioned whether the insurance company, as a professional participant of the market of international insurance of liability in connection with the transportation of oil, should have been aware of the resolutions of the IMO, increasing the limits of liability of the shipowners.
- The approach by the lower courts, according to which the 1992 Fund should pay the amount of underinsurance because the amendments of the liability limits had not been published prior to the date of the incident in the Russian Federation nor brought to the knowledge of professional participants of the market, incorrectly took into account the circumstance that the 1992 CLC and the 1992 Fund Convention contained a rule that amendments thereto were introduced on the basis of decisions of the IMO.
- The approach taken by the lower courts violated the rights and lawful interests not only of the 1992 Fund but also of its contributors in Member States.

- A lower liability limit imposed an unjustifiable additional financial burden on the 1992 Fund and its contributors by way of the difference between 4.51 million SDR and 3 million SDR.

In a judgement rendered in October 2013 the Presidium of the Supreme Court ordered that the judgements of the Arbitration Court of Saint Petersburg and Leningrad Region, the Court of Appeal and the Court of Cassation be set aside in respect of the part that had ordered the Fund to cover the 'insurance gap' of 1.51 million SDR and ordered that the case be sent to the Arbitration Court of Saint Petersburg and Leningrad Region for reconsideration on that point. As at October 2013, the text of the judgement by the Presidium of the Supreme Court had not been published.

Hebei Spirit

Date of incident	7 December 2007
Place of incident	Taeon, Republic of Korea
Cause of incident	Collision
Quantity of oil spilled (approximate)	10 900 tonnes of crude oil
Area affected	The three southerly provinces on the west coast of the Republic of Korea
Flag State of ship	Hong Kong, China
Gross tonnage	146 848 GT
P&I insurer	China Shipowners Mutual Insurance Association (China P&I)/Assuranceföreningen Skuld (Gjensidig) (Skuld Club)
CLC limit	89.8 million SDR or approximately KRW 186.8 billion (£106.7 million)
STOPIA/TOPIA applicable	No
CLC + Fund limit	203 million SDR or KRW 321.6 billion (£184 million)
Total compensation paid	KRW 171.9 billion (£98.3 million)

Conversion into Pounds sterling has been made on the basis of the exchange rate as at 31 December 2013.



Map data ©2011 SK M&C

Incident

On 7 December 2007 the Hong Kong-registered tanker *Hebei Spirit* (146 848 GT) was struck by the crane barge *Samsung N°1* while at anchor about five nautical miles off Taeon on the west coast of the Republic of Korea. The crane barge was being towed by two tugs (*Samsung N°5* and *Samho T3*) when the tow line broke. Weather conditions were poor and it was reported that the crane barge had drifted into the tanker, puncturing three of its port cargo tanks.

The *Hebei Spirit* was laden with about 209 000 tonnes of four different crude oils. Due to inclement weather conditions, repairs of the punctured tanks took four days to complete. In the meantime, the crew of the *Hebei Spirit* tried to limit the quantity of cargo spilled through holes in the damaged tanks by making it list and transferring cargo between tanks. However, as the tanker was almost fully laden, the possibilities for such actions were limited. As a result of the collision a total of 10 900 tonnes of oil (a mix of Iranian Heavy, Upper Zakum and Kuwait Export) escaped into the sea.

The *Hebei Spirit* is owned by *Hebei Spirit Shipping Company Limited*. It is insured by China Shipowners Mutual Insurance Association (China P&I) and Assuranceföreningen Skuld (Gjensidig) (Skuld Club) and managed by V-Ships Limited. The crane barge and the two tugs are owned and/or operated by Samsung Corporation and its subsidiary Samsung Heavy Industries (SHI) which belong to the Samsung Group, the Republic of Korea's largest industrial conglomerate.

Impact

Large parts of the Republic of Korea's western coast were affected to varying degrees. The shoreline, composed of rocks, boulders and pebbles as well as long sand amenity beaches and port installations in the Taean peninsula and in the nearby islands, was polluted. Over a period of several weeks, mainland shorelines and islands further south also became contaminated by emulsified oil and tar balls. A total of some 375 kilometres of shoreline was affected along the west coast of the Republic of Korea. A considerable number of commercial vessels were also contaminated.

The west coast of the Republic of Korea hosts a large number of mariculture facilities, including several thousand hectares of seaweed cultivation. It is also an important area for shellfish cultivation and for large-scale hatchery production facilities. The area is also exploited by small and large-scale fisheries. The oil affected a large number of these mariculture facilities as it passed through the supporting structures, contaminating buoys, ropes, nets and produce. The Korean Government financed the removal operations of the most affected oyster farms in two bays in the Taean peninsula. The removal operations were completed in early August 2008.

The oil also impacted amenity beaches and other areas of the Taean National Park.

Response operations

The Korea National Coast Guard Agency, a department of the Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries (MOMAF), has overall responsibility for marine pollution response in the waters under the jurisdiction of the Republic of Korea. By the first quarter of 2008, responsibility for overseeing onshore clean up had been passed on to the affected local governments.

The government-led response at sea was completed within two weeks although a large number of fishing vessels were still deployed in the following weeks to tow sorbent booms and collect tar balls. Some were used to transport manpower and materials to offshore islands in support of clean-up operations until later in the year.

The Korean Coast Guard tasked a total of 21 licensed clean-up contractors, supported by local authorities and fisheries cooperatives, to undertake shoreline clean-up operations. Onshore clean-up operations were carried out at numerous locations along the western coast of the Republic of Korea. Local villagers, army and navy cadets and volunteers from all over the Republic of Korea also participated in the clean-up operations.

The removal of the bulk oil was completed by the end of March 2008. The major part of secondary clean-up operations, involving, among other techniques, surf washing, flushing and hot water high-pressure treatment, were completed by the end of

June 2008. Some clean-up operations in remote areas continued until October 2008.

The 1992 Fund and the Skuld Club opened a Claims Handling Office (*Hebei Spirit* Centre) in Seoul to assist claimants in the presentation of their claims for compensation and appointed a team of Korean and international surveyors to monitor the clean-up operations and investigate the potential impact of the pollution on fisheries, mariculture and tourism activities.

Applicability of the Conventions

The Republic of Korea is a Party to the 1992 Civil Liability Convention (1992 CLC) and the 1992 Fund Convention but, at the time of the spill, had not ratified the Supplementary Fund Protocol.

The tonnage of the *Hebei Spirit* (146 848 GT) is in excess of 140 000 GT. The limitation amount applicable is therefore the maximum under the 1992 CLC, namely 89.77 million SDR. The total amount available for compensation under the 1992 CLC and the 1992 Fund Convention is 203 million SDR.

Level of payments

At its March 2008 session, the 1992 Fund Executive Committee authorised the Director to settle and pay claims arising from this incident to the extent that they did not give rise to questions of principle not previously decided by the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee also decided that the conversion of 203 million SDR into Korean Won would be made on the basis of the value of that currency against the SDR on the date of the adoption of the Executive Committee's Record of Decisions of its 40th session, ie 13 March 2008, at the rate of 1 SDR = KRW 1 584.330, giving a total amount available for compensation of KRW 321 618 990 000.

At the same session, the 1992 Fund Executive Committee noted that, based on a preliminary estimation by the Fund's experts, the total amount of the losses arising as a result of the *Hebei Spirit* incident was likely to exceed the amount available under the 1992 Civil Liability and Fund Conventions. In view of the uncertainty as to the total amount of the losses, the 1992 Fund Executive Committee decided that payments should for the time being be limited to 60% of the established damages.

In June 2008, the Executive Committee took note of new information which indicated that the extent of the damage was likely to be greater than initially estimated in March 2008. At that session, the 1992 Fund Executive Committee decided that, in view of the increased uncertainty as to the total amount of the potential claims and the need to ensure equal treatment of all claimants, payments made by the 1992 Fund should, for the time being, be limited to 35% of the established damages.

The 1992 Fund Executive Committee decided to maintain the level of payments at 35% of the established damages at its subsequent sessions in October 2008, March, June and October 2009 and June and October 2010.

In March 2011, the 1992 Fund Executive Committee authorised the Director to increase the level of payments to 100% of the established claims, subject to a number of safeguards being in place before the 1992 Fund commenced making payments. It was decided that if these safeguards were not provided, the level of payments should be maintained at 35% of the established losses and that this should be reviewed at the next session of the Executive Committee.

In August 2011, the Korean Government informed the Acting Director that, in view of the significant administrative burden that the safeguards determined by the Executive Committee at its March 2011 session would place on the Korean Government, it did not intend to set up the guarantee as determined by the Executive Committee, with the understanding that this would likely result in the 1992 Fund not increasing the level of payments to 100% of the established claims.

At each of its sessions from October 2011 to October 2013 the 1992 Fund Executive Committee decided to maintain the level of payments at 35% and to review the level of payments at its next session.

Actions by the Korean Government **Special Law for the support of the victims of the Hebei Spirit incident**

At the June 2008 session of the 1992 Fund Executive Committee, the Korean Government informed the 1992 Fund that a special law for the 'Support of affected inhabitants and the restoration of the marine environment in respect of the *Hebei Spirit* oil pollution incident' was approved by the National Assembly in March 2008. Under the provisions of the Special Law, the Korean Government was authorised to make payments in full to claimants based on the assessments made by the Skuld Club and the 1992 Fund within 14 days of the date they submitted proof of assessment to the Government.

The Korean Government also informed the 1992 Fund that under the Special Law, if the Fund and the Skuld Club paid claimants compensation on a pro-rata basis, the Korean Government would pay the claimants the remaining percentage so that all claimants would receive 100% of the assessment. The Special Law entered into force on 15 June 2008.

As at October 2013, the Korean Government had made payments totalling KRW 37 674 million in respect of 697 claims in the clean-up, tourism and fisheries and aquaculture sectors based on assessments provided by the Skuld Club and the 1992 Fund, and submitted subrogated claims against the Skuld Club and the Fund. The Skuld Club had paid the Government KRW 32 992 million in respect of 662 of these claims.

Under the Special Law the Korean Government has set up a scheme to provide loans to victims of pollution damage for an amount fixed in advance if they have submitted a claim to the Skuld Club and the 1992 Fund but have not received an offer of compensation within six months. As at 31 October 2013, the Korean Government had granted 21 286 loans totalling KRW 50 673 million.

Decision of the Korean Government to 'stand last in the queue'

At the June 2008 session of the 1992 Fund Executive Committee, the Korean Government informed the Executive Committee of its decision to 'stand last in the queue' in respect of compensation for clean-up costs and other expenses incurred by the central and local governments.

In August 2011, the Secretariat carried out an investigation into the claims submitted by the Korean authorities and identified 71 such claims submitted by 34 separate government agencies and local authorities, totalling some KRW 444 800 million. The claims corresponded to selected costs incurred by the Government and local authorities in respect of clean up and preventive measures, environmental studies, restoration, marketing campaigns, tax relief and other expenses incurred in dealing with the pollution.

The 1992 Fund and the Skuld Club are in frequent contact with the Korean Government to maintain a coordinated system for the exchange of information regarding compensation in order to avoid duplication of payments.

First Cooperation Agreement between the Korean Government, the shipowner and the Skuld Club

In January 2008, discussions took place on compensation issues which resulted in the First Cooperation Agreement concluded between the shipowner, Skuld Club, the Korean Government and Korea Marine Pollution Response Corporation (KMPRC). The 1992 Fund was consulted during the negotiations but was not a party to the Agreement. In accordance with the Agreement, in exchange for the Club's expedited payment to large numbers of individuals engaged by clean-up contractors as labour in shoreline response operations, the Korean Government undertook to facilitate cooperation with the experts appointed by the Club and the 1992 Fund, and KMPRC undertook to request the release of the *Hebei Spirit* from arrest.

Second Cooperation Agreement between the Korean Government, the shipowner and the Skuld Club

The Skuld Club also entered into discussions with the Korean Government in order to resolve its concern that Korean courts dealing with the limitation proceedings might not fully take into account payments made by the Skuld Club and that the Club would therefore run the risk of paying compensation in excess of the limitation amount.

In July 2008, a Second Cooperation Agreement was concluded between the shipowner, Skuld Club and the Korean Government (Ministry of Land, Transport and Maritime Affairs, which had incorporated part of the functions of MOMAF). Under this Agreement, the Skuld Club undertook to pay claimants 100% of the assessed amounts up to the shipowner's limit of liability under the 1992 CLC, namely 89.77 million SDR. In return, to ensure that all claimants would receive compensation in full, the Korean Government undertook to pay in full all claims as assessed by the Club and Fund once the 1992 CLC and 1992 Fund Convention limits were reached as well as all amounts awarded by judgements under the 1992 CLC and 1992 Fund Convention in excess of the limit. The Korean Government further undertook to deposit the amount already paid out by the Skuld Club to claimants in court should the Limitation Court order a deposit of the limitation fund.

Investigation into the cause of the incident

Investigation in the Republic of Korea

An investigation into the cause of the incident was initiated soon after the incident by the Incheon District Maritime Safety Tribunal in the Republic of Korea.

In September 2008, in a decision rendered by the Incheon Tribunal, both the two tugs and the *Hebei Spirit* were considered at fault for causing the collision. The Tribunal found that the master and the duty officer of the *Hebei Spirit* were also partly liable for the collision between the crane barge and the *Hebei Spirit*. A number of defendants, including SHI, the masters of the tugboats and the master and duty officer of the *Hebei Spirit* appealed against the decision to the Central Maritime Safety Tribunal.

In December 2008 the Central Maritime Safety Tribunal delivered its decision. The decision of the Central Tribunal was similar to that of the Incheon Tribunal in that the two tugs were found mainly responsible and the master and the duty officer of the *Hebei Spirit* were also found partly liable for the collision between the crane barge and the *Hebei Spirit*.

Investigation in China

An investigation into the cause of the incident was also carried out by the ship's Flag State administration in China. The investigation found that the decision by the operator of the tugboats and of the crane barge (the Marine Spread), to undertake the towing voyage when adverse weather had been forecast was the main contributory factor to this accident. Moreover, the delay by the Marine Spread in notifying the Vessel Traffic Information Station and other ships in the vicinity resulted in insufficient time being given to the *Hebei Spirit* to take all necessary actions to avoid the collision. The investigation further indicated that the actions taken by the master and the crew of the *Hebei Spirit* after the collision had fully complied with the provisions as set out in the ship's Shipboard Oil Pollution Emergency Plan.

A dried fish seller at a market in Boryeong, Republic of Korea.



Claims for compensation

As at October 2013, 127 483 claims totalling KRW 4 023 billion had been submitted to the limitation proceedings and the Limitation Court had appointed a court administrator to deal with them. As a matter of Korean law and practice, no further claims would be registered nor would changes be made to the amounts claimed. A total of 9 937 claimants had received offers for compensation by the Club and the 1992 Fund but they had not responded. The table below provides the status of the claims submitted as at October 2013 by category of claims.

Criminal proceedings

In January 2008, the Public Prosecutor of the Seosan Branch of the Daejeon District Court (Seosan Court) brought criminal charges against the masters of the crane barge and the two tugs. The masters of the two tugs were arrested. Criminal proceedings were also brought against the master and chief officer of the *Hebei Spirit* who were not arrested, but were not permitted to leave the Republic of Korea.

In June 2008, the Seosan Court delivered its judgement to the effect that:

- i. the master of one of the tugboats was sentenced to three years imprisonment and a fine of KRW 2 million;
- ii. the master of the other tugboat was sentenced to one year imprisonment;
- iii. the owners of the two tugboats (SHI) were sentenced to a fine of KRW 30 million;
- iv. the master of the crane barge was found not guilty; and
- v. the master and chief officer of the *Hebei Spirit* were also found not guilty.

The Public Prosecutor and the owners of the tugboats appealed against the judgement.

In December 2008, the Criminal Court of Appeal (Daejeon Court) rendered its judgement. In its judgement, the Court reduced the sentence against the masters of the two tugboats. The judgement overturned the not guilty judgements for the master of the crane barge and the master and chief officer of the *Hebei Spirit*. The owner of the *Hebei Spirit* was also given a fine of KRW 30 million and the master and chief officer of the *Hebei Spirit* were arrested. The *Hebei Spirit*'s interests appealed to the Supreme Court.

In April 2009, the Korean Supreme Court annulled the Court of Appeal's decision to arrest the crew members of the *Hebei Spirit* and they were allowed to leave the Republic of Korea. The Supreme Court, however, upheld the decision to arrest the masters of one of the towing tugs and of the crane barge and confirmed the fines imposed by the Court of Appeal.

In June 2009, the master and chief officer of the *Hebei Spirit* were released from arrest and left the Republic of Korea.

Limitation proceedings The owner of the *Hebei Spirit*

In February 2008, the owner of the *Hebei Spirit* made an application to commence limitation proceedings before the Seosan Branch of the Daejeon District Court (Limitation Court).

In February 2009, the Limitation Court rendered an order for the commencement of the limitation proceedings. According to the Limitation Order, the persons who had claims against the owner of the *Hebei Spirit* had to register their claims by 8 May 2009,

Category of claim	Number of claims	Claimed amount (KRW million)	Number of claims assessed		Assessed amount (KRW million)	Number of claims paid	Paid amount (KRW million)
			More than 0	Rejected			
Clean up and preventive measures	252	148 834	218	23	98 907	184	93 070
Property damage	20	2 344	16	4	854	12	824
Fisheries and mariculture	110 332	1 605 338	38 010	72 322	47 962	29 456	44 967
Tourism and other economic damage	17 737	406 953	2 946	14 789	34 028	2 768	32 997
SLQ claims	62	611 817	23	38	16 989	0	0
Total	128 403	2 775 286	41 213	87 176	198 740	32 420	171 858
			128 389				

failing which the claimants would lose their rights against the limitation fund.

Also in February 2009 a number of claimants appealed to the Daejeon Court of Appeal against the decision of the Limitation Court to commence limitation proceedings. In July 2009 the appeal was dismissed. A number of claimants appealed to the Supreme Court.

In November 2009 the Supreme Court dismissed an appeal made by a number of claimants against the decision of the Limitation Court. Consequently, the Limitation Court's decision for the commencement of the limitation proceedings for the owner of the *Hebei Spirit* became final.

One hundred and twenty-seven thousand four hundred and fifty-nine claims totalling KRW 4 091 billion were submitted to the Limitation Court. In 2009, the Limitation Court indicated that it would not accept further claims. The claimants would, however, still have time to modify the amount of their claim until such time as the Limitation Court would complete the assessment of the claims.

In February 2011, the Court appointed a court expert to review the evidence filed by both sides with the intention of issuing a decision by the end of 2011.

On 27 August 2012 the Limitation Court held a hearing. At the hearing, the Court listed the claims which had been submitted. A total of 127 483 claims totalling KRW 4 023 billion had been submitted. As a matter of Korean Law and practice, no further claims would be registered nor would changes to the amount claimed be accepted.

In January 2013 a judgement was rendered by the Seosan District Court (Limitation Court) granting KRW 738 billion in compensation to victims of the *Hebei Spirit* incident. The amount decided by the Court is significantly less than the amount claimed in court (some KRW 4 227 billion) but nevertheless is significantly larger than the 1992 Fund's assessment of admissible claims of KRW 181 billion.

In accordance with Korean law, once proceedings started, claimants had two weeks to submit objections to the Limitation Court's decision. Some 149 714 objections to the Limitation Court's decision were filed in the Seosan Court within that deadline (86 578 by the claimants and 63 163 by the Club/1992 Fund). A number of objections were subsequently withdrawn.

The objections filed by the claimants were allocated to 126 cases and the objections filed by the Club/1992 Fund were allocated to 54 cases. By July 2013, the Seosan Court had consolidated them into some 90 cases. In the same month, the Seosan Court commenced preliminary hearings for three of these cases.

In May 2013 the National Assembly of the Republic of Korea passed a number of amendments to the Special Law which required the Seosan Court to take a decision on the Limitation Court decision within ten months of the date of entry into force of the amendments, and that a second or third appeal should be issued within five months of the previous decision. The amendments entered into force in July 2013. As at October 2013, a decision by the Seosan Court was expected by the end of May 2014. The Court was still considering the appeals.

The bareboat charterer of the Marine Spread

In December 2008, the bareboat charterer of the *Marine Spread* (the crane barge, the two tugs and the anchor boat), SHI, filed a petition requesting the Seoul Central District Court to issue an order granting the right to limit its liability in the amount of 2.2 million SDR.

In March 2009, the Limitation Court rendered the order for the commencement of the limitation proceedings. The Court decided to grant SHI the right to limit its liability and set the limitation fund at KRW 5 600 million including legal interest. SHI deposited this amount in court. The Limitation Court also decided that claims against the limitation fund should be registered with the Court by 19 June 2009.

In June 2009 a number of claimants appealed to the Seoul Court of Appeal against the decision of the Limitation Court to grant to the bareboat charterer the right to limit its liability. On 20 January 2010, the Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal and confirmed the Limitation Court's decision. The claimants appealed to the Supreme Court. In April 2012 the Supreme Court dismissed the appeal.

Civil proceedings Claim by a clean-up company against the Republic of Korea

In July 2008, following the *Hebei Spirit* incident, a clean-up company which had been involved in clean-up operations at the instruction of the Incheon Coast Guard took action in the Incheon District Court (Court of First Instance) against the Republic of Korea, claiming costs for KRW 727 578 150. The clean-up company argued that it had entered into a service contract with the Republic of Korea. It argued that even if the Court held that no such service contract existed, the clean-up company should nevertheless be compensated by the State, who should have borne the clean-up costs in any event, and who would otherwise gain unjust enrichment were it not to pay the company's costs.

In early 2010, the Court of First Instance decided that there was no service contract between the company and the Republic of Korea but accepted that the latter was still liable to compensate the company for the clean-up costs. The Court ordered the

Republic of Korea to pay a sum of KRW 674 683 401 as reasonable compensation. Both parties appealed against the decision of the Court.

In July 2010, after two preliminary hearings, the Court of Appeal ordered a mediation session to explore a possibility of settlement between the parties. The 1992 Fund intervened in the proceedings as an interested party and participated in the mediation. At the mediation hearing, the Appeal Court Mediator requested the plaintiff to submit the claim for clean-up costs to the Club and the 1992 Fund for an assessment. The plaintiff submitted a claim to the Club and 1992 Fund in September 2010. The Club and 1992 Fund assessed the claim at KRW 304 177 512 and offered settlement to the claimant in April 2011.

The Court held a number of hearings in summer 2011 where an amicable settlement was discussed between the Government and the plaintiff without success.

In September 2011, the Court suggested that the plaintiff should receive the amount assessed by the Club and 1992 Fund and decided that once the assessed amount had been paid, it would consider whether to continue the mediation for the remainder of their claim for clean-up costs.

In January 2012, the Court of Appeal issued a judgement to the effect that, whilst the assessment made by the Club and the 1992 Fund was considered reasonable, the amount recognised by the Court was KRW 318 450 947. The amount assessed by the Club and the 1992 Fund totalled KRW 304 177 512, which was paid to the plaintiff in September 2011. The Court ordered the Korean Government to pay the clean-up company the difference plus interest, equivalent to KRW 24 429 768. Both parties appealed to the Supreme Court. As at October 2013, the case was pending at the Supreme Court.

Claim by a clean-up company against the Club and the 1992 Fund

In November 2010, a contractor who was engaged in clean-up operations after the *Hebei Spirit* incident filed a claim against the owners and insurers of the *Hebei Spirit* and the 1992 Fund in the Seoul Central District Court.

The contractor had submitted a claim totalling KRW 889 427 355 for costs incurred in clean-up operations from January to June 2008. The Club and the 1992 Fund assessed the claim for the period January to March 2008 at KRW 233 158 549. The Club and the 1992 Fund rejected the claim for costs for part of March 2008 and the remaining period, since the area in which the claimant operated was cleaned by mid-March 2008 and therefore further clean-up operations were considered not technically reasonable.

The contractor claimed in Court for the balance between the amount claimed and the amount assessed, ie KRW 656 268 806. In January 2011, the 1992 Fund's lawyers filed an answer in court on behalf of the 1992 Fund stating the 1992 Fund's position that it would not be liable unless, and until, it was proved that the amount of the shipowner's liability was insufficient to fully cover the loss arising from the *Hebei Spirit* incident.

Court hearings were held in summer 2011 where the Court considered primarily whether to proceed with or stay the current proceedings until the limitation proceedings at Seosan Court were finalised.

The contractor argued that the work carried out after March 2008 was technically reasonable. The 1992 Fund filed a submission to rebut the contractor's attempt to challenge the Club and the 1992 Fund's assessment. In its submission, the Fund stressed that its experts had visited the affected area several times from early February to late March 2008 and found that further clean-up work was technically not required. The contractor was at the time recommended not to continue further work and also reminded that no compensation would be available from the international compensation regime for technically unreasonable work.

In November 2011, the Court dismissed the company's lawsuit against the 1992 Fund. The Court ruled that the claim against the 1992 Fund was groundless since:

- a. unless and until the total amount of oil pollution claims was confirmed, the claim against the 1992 Fund could not be specified and the 1992 Fund's liability could therefore not be determined; and
- b. in any event, the company's reasonable costs were KRW 233 158 549 and this amount had already been paid by the Club.

The clean-up company appealed against the judgement to the Court of Appeal. Further hearings took place in October 2012, at which further information was requested.

In a hearing in January 2013, the Court of Appeal noted that the Limitation Court had considered the 1992 Fund's assessment of the claim as reasonable. However, the claimant argued that since the local authority that paid for villagers' costs in the same area where the company was employed, was awarded 25% of the villagers' costs for the period of operations beyond what was considered reasonable by the 1992 Fund, the claimant should also be awarded the same percentage of the claimed amount.

The 1992 Fund expressed the view that, since it was not clear whether the increased assessment of the costs of the local authority referred specifically to the villagers' costs incurred for work in the exact location of the clean-up company and since the Limitation Court had confirmed the reasonableness of the 1992 Fund's assessment, the assessment of the local authority's costs by the Limitation Court should not be considered in determining the reasonableness of the claimant's operation.

In its judgement in March 2013, the Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal. The Court also made it clear that all the legal costs incurred after the appeal was filed should be borne by the claimant. The claimant appealed the judgement to the Supreme Court. A judgement by the Supreme Court is expected in 2014.

Claim by a group of fishermen and sellers of marine products

In December 2010, a group of some 50 residents in two villages in the area affected by the *Hebei Spirit* incident filed a lawsuit against the 1992 Fund and the Republic of Korea. The 50 claimants, all engaged in fishery activities or selling marine products, requested compensation totalling KRW 150 million. It is unclear on what basis this claim has been presented.

At its first hearing in March 2011, the Court decided to adjourn the proceedings until the limitation proceedings by the owners of the *Hebei Spirit* had been finalised.

Claim by the owner of a vessel

In February 2011, a vessel owner filed a lawsuit against the owners of the *Hebei Spirit* and the 1992 Fund. At the time the vessel owner had not submitted a claim to the Fund although a claim was presented in the *Hebei Spirit* limitation proceedings. The vessel owner argued that their vessel was polluted by the oil leaked by the *Hebei Spirit* and that they had incurred cleaning costs. The vessel owner claimed KRW 99 878 861 and interest of 5% per annum from 11 December 2007, reserving their right to increase the claim amount to cover the loss of income during the

period of cleaning work. The 1992 Fund argued that it would not be liable unless, and until, it was proved that the amount of the owner's liability was insufficient to fully cover the loss arising from the *Hebei Spirit* incident.

The vessel owner then submitted the claim to the Club and the 1992 Fund for assessment. The Court decided to stay the proceedings until the Club and the Fund had assessed the claim.

Claim by the owner of an abalone farm

In March 2011, the former owner of an abalone farm filed a lawsuit against the 1992 Fund in court. He alleged in his claim that he had sold his farm in August 2007 and that the buyer had agreed to pay the purchase price with the proceeds from the sale of the first crop of abalone, which he failed to do due to the *Hebei Spirit* incident. The new owner had claimed compensation for the lost crop from the Club and the 1992 Fund, and to secure his claim for the outstanding price of the farm, the former owner obtained a Court Order in 2010 to transfer the compensation obtained by the new owner to him. The former owner requested the Court to order the 1992 Fund to pay KRW 121 million, together with interest.

In May 2011, the 1992 Fund's position in Court was that it would not be liable unless, and until, it was proved that the amount of the owner's liability was insufficient to fully cover the loss arising from the *Hebei Spirit* incident.

In September 2011, the former farm owner discontinued his lawsuit against the 1992 Fund, reserving his right to file a lawsuit again against the Fund once the current limitation proceedings had been finalised.

An excavator shifting sand to accelerate natural cleaning of oiled pebbles following the Hebei Spirit incident.



Recourse action by the 1992 Fund against Samsung C&T Corporation (Samsung C&T) and SHI

The owner and insurer of the *Hebei Spirit* commenced a recourse action in January 2009 against Samsung C&T and SHI, the owner and operator/bareboat charterer of the *Marine Spread*, in the Court of Ningbo in the People's Republic of China, combined with an attachment of SHI's shares in shipyards in the People's Republic of China as security.

In January 2009, the Director decided that in order to protect the interests of the 1992 Fund, the Fund should also commence its own recourse action against Samsung C&T and SHI in the Court of Ningbo in the People's Republic of China, combined with an attachment of SHI's shares in the shipyards in the People's Republic of China as security.

In January 2009, the Ningbo Maritime Court accepted the two recourse actions filed by the owner/Skuld Club and the 1992 Fund. The total amount claimed in each action was RMB 1 367 million or US\$ 200 million. The Court also accepted the two applications for attachment of SHI's shares in the shipyards and issued orders accordingly.

In relation to the attachment of SHI's shares, the 1992 Fund arranged for the deposit of the required countersecurity, corresponding to 10% of the amount claimed by a letter of undertaking issued by the Skuld Club.

At its session in March 2009, the 1992 Fund Executive Committee endorsed the decision taken by the Director in January 2009 to commence recourse action against Samsung C&T and SHI in the Ningbo Maritime Court in China at the same time as the owner and the insurer of the *Hebei Spirit*. The Executive Committee also decided that the 1992 Fund should continue the recourse action.

The 1992 Fund then signed an agreement with the ship's interests in connection with the recourse action under which the 1992 Fund and the ship's interests would continue their actions separately, sharing the costs of the recourse actions and the proceeds of any recovery by court judgement or settlement on a 50/50 basis.

Service of proceedings on both Samsung C&T and SHI was effected in September 2009 but both filed applications objecting to the jurisdiction of the Court of Ningbo and, in the case of SHI, objecting to the attachment. Submissions in response to the applications were lodged on behalf of the 1992 Fund.

In September 2010, the Ningbo Maritime Court dismissed the applications. In October 2010, Samsung C&T and SHI lodged an appeal against the decision of the Ningbo Maritime Court.

In February 2011, the Court of Appeal issued its decision. In the decision the Court of Appeal accepted the appeal by Samsung C&T and SHI that the Court of Ningbo was a '*forum non-conveniens*' and that a recourse action should be pursued in a Korean Court.

In March 2011, both the 1992 Fund and the owner and insurers of the *Hebei Spirit* lodged separate applications for retrial with the Supreme Court in Beijing. The Supreme Court agreed to hear the applications and the Court documents were served on Samsung C&T and SHI. The Court ordered an adjournment of any application to set aside the attachment order pending the hearing of the application for a retrial.

In July 2011, the Supreme Court held a reconciliation hearing with the parties, with the aim of exploring a possible settlement of their dispute. The 1992 Fund took part in the hearing. In December 2011 the Supreme Court dismissed the 1992 Fund's application for retrial on the grounds of *forum non-conveniens*.

In December 2011 the owner and the insurer of the *Hebei Spirit* concluded a settlement agreement under which Samsung C&T and SHI would pay the amount of US\$10 million to the shipowner and its insurer.

As the 1992 Fund had concluded an agreement with the owner and the insurer of the *Hebei Spirit* under which the 1992 Fund and the ship's interests would share the legal costs of the recourse actions and the proceeds of any recovery under a court judgement or settlement on a 50/50 basis, the 1992 Fund recovered US\$5 million from the Skuld Club in accordance with this agreement. In accordance with the agreement, the 1992 Fund will reimburse the Skuld Club and the China P&I Club for each share of the legal costs incurred in bringing the recourse action.

Other issues

Time bar

The six-year anniversary of the date of the incident fell on 7 December 2013. In accordance with Articles 6 and 7.6 of the 1992 Fund Convention and its application under Korean law, in order for the victims to preserve their right to claim compensation from the 1992 Fund, they must bring a legal action against the 1992 Fund within three years from the date of the damage or six years from the date of the incident.

As at October 2013 four legal actions against the 1992 Fund had been commenced by 53 claimants, one of which had recently been discontinued. More than 70 000 claimants had filed objections against the Limitation Court judgement. Under Korean law, any decision of the limitation proceedings would only be directly enforceable upon the shipowner and, whilst the 1992 Fund would be bound by the facts and findings established in those proceedings, the decision would not be enforceable against the 1992 Fund.

The Director held consultations with the Korean Government in order to explore practical ways, compatible with Korean law, to ensure that the claimants did not lose their right to receive compensation from the 1992 Fund due to their claims becoming time-barred. In order to clarify the interpretation of Articles 6 and 7.6 of the 1992 Fund Convention and its application under Korean law, the Director and the Korean Government agreed to jointly appoint a former Supreme Court Judge to issue an opinion on the matter and to abide by his opinion.

The former Supreme Court Judge supported the Director's view that in order for the victims to preserve their right to claim compensation from the 1992 Fund, they should bring a legal action against the 1992 Fund within three years from the date of the damage or six years from the date of the incident.

The Korean Government held consultations with the representatives of private claimants and the local authorities in order to inform them that, if no settlement was reached before December 2013, they needed to file an action in court against the 1992 Fund. As at October 2013 it is expected that all claimants who had not yet settled their claims would commence an action against the 1992 Fund by December 2013. The Korean Government has already started actions against the 1992 Fund and is expected to file all actions in court for all its claims by the end of November 2013.

Decision of Samsung

It is understood that in October 2013 Samsung, the owner of the Marine Spread, decided to provide additional compensation of some KRW 360 billion (\$340 million) to the victims of the spill.

Incident in Argentina (Presidente Illia)

Date of incident	25/26 December 2007
Place of incident	Argentina
Cause of incident	Unknown
Quantity of oil spilled (approximate)	Between 50 to 200 tonnes of crude oil
Area affected	Caleta Córdova, Chubut Province (Argentina)
Flag State of ship	Argentina
Gross tonnage	35 995 GT
P&I insurer	West of England Ship Owners Mutual Insurance Association (Luxembourg) (West of England Club)
CLC limit	24 067 845 SDR (AR\$242 million or £22.5 million)
STOPIA/TOPIA applicable	No
CLC + Fund limit	203 million SDR (AR\$2 040 million or £190 million)
Total compensation paid	AR\$3.6 million (£333 472) and US\$115 949 (£70 000)

Conversion into Pounds sterling has been made on the basis of the exchange rate as at 31 December 2013.



Map data ©2012 Europa Technologies, Google, Inav/Geosistemas SRL, Mapcity, MapLink

Incident

Following reports of oil at sea on 26 December 2007, the Argentine authorities undertook over-flights of the coastal area off Caleta Córdova, Chubut Province, Argentina, and reported a slick covering about 14 km² and estimated to contain about 50-200 tonnes of crude oil. Later the same day, a significant quantity of oil impacted the shoreline in Caleta Córdova. A total of 5.7 kilometres of coast was reported to have been affected.

Several vessels were investigated as the possible source of the pollution, one of which was the *Presidente Umberto Arturo Illia* (*Presidente Illia*), which was engaged in cabotage trade around the Argentinean coast. It was suggested that the *Presidente Illia* could have caused a spill of oil whilst loading Escalante crude oil on 25 and 26 December 2007 at a loading buoy off Caleta Córdova. The owner of the *Presidente Illia* and its insurer contest liability and argue that the oil which impacted the coast must have come from another source.

Impact

Some 400 birds were reported to have died as a result of the spill. Animal welfare and environmental associations, together with some 250 volunteers, undertook bird rescue and rehabilitation. A bird recovery centre was set up in an abandoned poultry farm.

Local fishing activities were disrupted, although the operator of the loading buoy arranged for transport of the subsistence fishermen to alternative sites further along the coastline to enable them to continue their fishing operations. Nevertheless, the fisheries sector suffered economic losses.

The area affected by the spill was also used for recreational purposes which led to claims for losses in the tourism sector.

Response operations

Clean-up operations on the shoreline were undertaken from 27 December 2007 to 22 February 2008 by local contractors under the supervision of the local government.

Clean up was concentrated on the 1.5 kilometres of coastline most heavily oiled and involved the removal of some oiled beach substrate. Local environmental scientists advised against this measure and less intrusive methods of clean up were used thereafter.

Approximately 160 m³ of oily water and 900 m³ of oily debris were collected during the clean-up operations.

Applicability of the Conventions

At the time of the incident Argentina was a Party to the 1992 Civil Liability Convention (1992 CLC) and 1992 Fund Convention.

The *Presidente Illia* was insured for pollution liabilities with the West of England Ship Owners Mutual Insurance Association (Luxembourg) (West of England Club).

The limit of liability of the owner of the *Presidente Illia* under the 1992 CLC is estimated to be 24 million SDR. It is however unlikely that the total amount of the damage will exceed the shipowner's limit of liability, in which case the 1992 Fund would not be called upon to pay compensation.

The shipowner and his insurer maintain that the *Presidente Illia* did not cause the spill that impacted the coast. However, following discussions between the 1992 Fund and the West of England Club, it was agreed that the shipowner and his insurer would pay claims for compensation assessed and approved

in accordance with the principles laid down in the 1992 Civil Liability and Fund Conventions. It was agreed that if it is finally established that the oil which impacted the coast did not come from the *Presidente Illia* but from another source, the shipowner and the West of England Club would attempt to recover the amounts of compensation paid from the party responsible for the oil spill. It was also agreed that if it is proved that the oil spill must have come from a tanker other than the *Presidente Illia* but it remains unknown which one, a so-called 'mystery spill', the shipowner and the West of England Club would recover the amounts of compensation paid from the 1992 Fund.

Investigations into the cause of the incident

Soon after the spill the Argentine Coast Guard (Prefectura Naval) started an investigation into the incident. The Coast Guard inspected the *Presidente Illia* both in Caleta Córdova and in the port of discharge, Campana. These inspections revealed a fault in the ballast system and the presence of residues of crude oil in three ballast tanks.

A number of other vessels in the area were inspected by the Argentine Coast Guard but all were allowed to continue on their passage.

Claims for compensation

As at October 2013, 331 claims for compensation for a total of AR\$53.3 million and US\$391 294 had been submitted^{<8>}. One hundred and forty-three claims have been assessed at a total of AR\$4.6 million and US\$115 949. Payments totalling AR\$3.6 million and US\$115 949 have been made by the West of England Club. Among the 143 assessed claims, 33 have been rejected. Two claims are being assessed and the remaining claims are time-barred. The table below summarises the claims situation by claim category.

Claim Category	Claims			Assessed			Paid by Club		
	No.	Amount (AR\$)	Amount (US\$)	No.	Amount (AR\$)	Amount (US\$)	No.	Amount (AR\$)	Amount (US\$)
Tourism	11	1 644 366	0	4	5 247	0	2	12 000	0
Clean up and preventive measures	10	2 642 061	132 467	7	1 094 618	115 949	4	665 988	115 949
Fisheries	310	48 969 282	258 827	132	3 513 510	0	75	2 934 746	0
Total	331	53 255 709	391 294	143	4 613 375	115 949	81	3 612 734	115 949

^{<8>} The majority of claims were originally submitted by individuals. Investigations revealed that many of these individuals work in groups and their claims have therefore been consolidated, as appropriate, into group claims.

Criminal proceedings

The 1992 Fund appointed an Argentine lawyer to follow the legal proceedings initiated as a result of this incident.

An investigation into the cause of the incident was commenced by the Federal Court of Comodoro Rivadavia (Criminal Section). Following a court order, the *Presidente Illia* was detained in Campana in January 2008. An inspection of the ship revealed a leak in the ballast line passing through N°1 centre cargo tank. In a second inspection residues of crude oil were found in three ballast tanks. The Court investigated in particular the role of the shipowner's representative (Superintendente), the master and several other officers of the *Presidente Illia*, the operator of the loading buoy and the cargo inspector.

In March 2008 the Federal Court (Criminal Section) rendered a preliminary decision where five persons including the master, officers and crew were charged with a water pollution offence under Argentine environment law, whilst the shipowner's representative (Superintendente) was charged under Argentine criminal law with having hidden information and evidence.

The Court considered that whilst the *Presidente Illia* was loading Escalante crude oil on 25 and 26 December 2007 at a loading buoy off Caleta Córdova, an unknown quantity of the oil that was being loaded had entered the ballast system due to a fault in the ballast line and had subsequently been spilled during the deballasting process.

The Court stated that its conclusions were supported by chemical analyses which show that remains of hydrocarbons were found in the ballast pipes, as well as in the pump of segregated ballast from the *Presidente Illia*, and that these remains matched the type of

oil loaded at the loading buoy, and were also substantially similar to the samples taken on the shore in Caleta Córdova. When the authorities carried out their inspection and took samples upon the vessel's arrival at the port of discharge, they observed the dripping of hydrocarbon coming from the ballast-discharging pipe. Moreover, information contained in the relevant reports by the cargo inspector allegedly indicated that the quantity received ashore at the discharge port was notably less than the quantity transferred to the ship at the loading port.

The accused parties appealed, having pleaded not guilty, thus leading to the opening of the trial phase. The accused parties applied to be put on probation⁹⁹. The request was denied but the accused parties appealed against this decision. The file has been under the consideration of the Criminal Court of Appeals since February 2012.

The shipowner and the insurer maintained that the *Presidente Illia* was unlikely to have caused the damage. They argued that any spill caused by the *Presidente Illia* was very minor and highly unlikely to have reached the coast and that the oil that had reached the coast must therefore have come from another source. The shipowner and the insurer also argued that anonymous oil spills are frequent in Caleta Córdova and questioned the validity of the analysis carried out by the laboratory appointed by the Court.

Taking into consideration that criminal court decisions are not binding on civil judges, the owner of the *Presidente Illia* will be entitled to try and prove, in any of the civil court proceedings, that the spill did not come from the *Presidente Illia*. However, the findings in the criminal proceedings will have a weight when the civil judge delivers a decision.

⁹⁹ The effect of being placed on probation can be to temporarily suspend the execution of a sentence for the period of probation. The Court may impose conditions on the offender which, if complied with, may result in the revocation of the original sentence.

Oiled shoreline in Caleta Córdova



Civil proceedings

A legal action was brought in the Federal Court in Comodoro Rivadavia (Civil Section) by the Chubut Province against the master and the owner of the *Presidente Illia* claiming compensation for the damage caused by the incident, including damage to the environment. The shipowner submitted points of defence denying his liability for the spill and requesting the Court to bring the 1992 Fund into the proceedings. The Court agreed to this request and the 1992 Fund was formally notified. The 1992 Fund, based on the investigations of its experts, submitted pleadings arguing that the most likely source of the spill was the *Presidente Illia*. However, in its pleadings the 1992 Fund also considered the possibility that the source of the spill could have been another ship, the *San Julian*, which was close to the area at the time of the incident.

Twenty-one other actions, representing 82 claimants, remain pending against the owner of the *Presidente Illia* and the West of England Club in the Federal Court of Comodoro Rivadavia (Civil Section). These actions also include the 1992 Fund either as a defendant or as an interested third party.

In December 2010 the 1992 Fund brought an action in a Civil Court of Buenos Aires against the owner of the *San Julian* and its insurer in order to protect its compensation rights in case the Argentine courts were to find that the spilling vessel was not the *Presidente Illia* but the *San Julian*. The parties have agreed to stay the proceedings pending the resolution of the civil actions brought by claimants against the owner of the *Presidente Illia* and its insurer.

An action was also brought by the owner of the *Presidente Illia* and the West of England Club against the 1992 Fund in Buenos Aires, in order to protect their compensation rights against the 1992 Fund in case it was finally established that the spill originated from a tanker other than the *Presidente Illia*. The parties agreed to stay the proceedings pending the resolution of the civil actions brought by claimants against the owner of the *Presidente Illia* and its insurer.

King Darwin

Date of incident	27 September 2008
Place of incident	Canada, New Brunswick
Cause of incident	Oil spilled during discharge into port facility
Quantity of oil spilled (approximate)	64 tonnes of bunker C fuel oil
Area affected	Port of Dalhousie, New Brunswick, Canada
Flag State of ship	Marshall Islands
Gross tonnage	42 010 GT
P&I insurer	Steamship Mutual Underwriting Association (Bermuda) Limited (Steamship Mutual)
CLC limit	27 863 310 SDR (£26 million)
STOPIA/TOPIA applicable	No
CLC + Fund limit	203 million SDR (£190 million)
Total compensation paid	US\$ 1 332 488 (£804 497) Can\$ 5 000 (£2 841)

Conversion into Pounds sterling has been made on the basis of the exchange rate as at 31 December 2013.



Map data ©2011 Europa Technologies, GIS Innovatsia, GeoBasis-DE/BKG (©2009), Google, Tele Atlas, Transnavicom

Incident

On 27 September 2008, the Marshall Islands-registered oil tanker *King Darwin* (42 010 GT) released approximately 64 tonnes of bunker C fuel oil into the waters of the Restigouche River during discharge operations in the Port of Dalhousie, New Brunswick, Canada.

Response operations

Initial oil spill response operations were carried out by the terminal. Operations included containment of the oil within the port area through the use of booms and adding straw to absorb the oil. The owner of the *King Darwin* engaged a private contractor to conduct clean-up operations on the shoreline, the ice defences, the exterior cladding and the port structures. The majority of the clean-up operations were completed by 5 October 2008.

The final area to be cleaned related to the section of the wharf closest to where the *King Darwin* was berthed, which was also contaminated following the spill. The Canadian authorities considered that the only acceptable level of cleaning of the area was to return it to a state where no sheen was observed emanating from the wharf in order to protect migratory birds which came to the area in springtime. The private contractor engaged by the owner of the *King Darwin* carried out the necessary cleaning of the jetty to the standard ordered by the authorities before the winter season. Monitoring of the area for release of oil after the winter season continued in the following months. The local authorities declared the clean-up operations completed by September 2009.

Applicability of the Conventions

At the time of the incident, Canada was a Party to the 1992 Civil Liability Convention (1992 CLC) and 1992 Fund Convention. The limit of liability of the owner of the *King Darwin* under the 1992 CLC is estimated to be 27 863 310 SDR.

The *King Darwin* was insured for pollution liabilities with Steamship Mutual Underwriting Association (Bermuda) Limited (Steamship Mutual).

Claims for compensation

Two claims were submitted for the costs of the clean-up operations carried out. The total amount paid by Steamship Mutual for these two claims was US\$1 332 488, well within the ship's limitation amount.

One claim was submitted by the port authorities for additional expenses. From the analysis of the supporting documents provided, it appeared, however, that the expenses were either a duplication of costs already submitted or paid for clean up or for expenses not related to the incident. The claim was therefore queried by Steamship Mutual.

A dredging company operating in the Port of Dalhousie at the time of the incident submitted a claim for losses, alleging that the company had had to interrupt its work whilst clean up of the dock was undertaken. However, on the basis of the supporting documentation provided, it appeared that the contracted work was finalised within the scheduled timeframe, that the company had incurred no penalty under the contract terms and that no other loss was established. Steamship Mutual requested further information which was not provided.

Civil proceedings

The *King Darwin* was arrested in September 2009 in connection with the claim by the dredging company. The vessel was released upon submission of a bank guarantee by the shipowner.

In September 2009, the dredging company also filed an action in the Federal Court in Halifax, Nova Scotia, against the owner of the *King Darwin*, Steamship Mutual, the Canadian Ship Source Oil Pollution Fund (SOPF) and the 1992 Fund, claiming property damage due to the fouling of equipment caused by the spilled oil and consequential losses totalling Can\$143 417. The plaintiff later discontinued its action against SOPF.

In June 2013, the claimant accepted a full and final offer of settlement from Steamship Mutual totalling Can\$5 000. As a consequence, in July 2013 all legal actions related to this incident against the shipowner, Steamship Mutual and the 1992 Fund were withdrawn.

In October 2013, the Secretariat informed the 1992 Fund Executive Committee that the incident was closed.

The Port of Dalhousie



Redfferm

Date of incident	30 March 2009
Place of incident	Tin Can Island, Lagos, Nigeria
Cause of incident	Barge sinking following transhipment operation
Quantity of oil spilled (approximate)	Unknown. Reports range from the residues of oil on board to between 100-650 tonnes.
Area affected	Tin Can Island, Lagos, Nigeria
Flag State of ship	Nigeria
Gross tonnage	430 GT
P&I insurer	Not insured or unknown
CLC limit	Estimated to be 4.51 million SDR (£4.2 million)
STOPIA/TOPIA applicable	No
CLC + Fund limit	203 million SDR (£190 million)
Total compensation paid	None

Conversion into Pounds sterling has been made on the basis of the exchange rate as at 31 December 2013.



Map data ©2013 Google

Incident

On 30 March 2009, the barge *Redfferm* (430 GT) sank at Tin Can Island, Lagos, Nigeria. The circumstances surrounding the incident are not clear and it is not known what caused the *Redfferm* to sink. However, it is believed that, following a transhipment operation from the tanker *MT Concep* using a number of vessels, including the barges *Abiding Grace* and *Redfferm*, the barge *Redfferm* sank in the turning circle basin off the finger jetty of Tin Can Island port spilling its cargo of low pour fuel oil (LPFO), causing contamination to the surrounding shoreline. It has not been possible to verify the quantity of oil on board or the quantity actually spilled. The Secretariat was not informed of the incident until late January 2012.

Impact

Nine months after the spill from the *Redfferm*, the National Oil Spill Detection and Response Agency (NOSDRA) commissioned a firm of estate valuers and surveyors to provide an estimation of the loss of income suffered by five communities with fish ponds allegedly affected by the *Redfferm* spill on Snake Island. The valuation concluded that over a five month period, the aggregate compensatory value of the properties, interests and rights of 316 individual fishermen in the five communities amounted to NGN 18.96 million.

However, a valuation obtained by the same five communities but listing 847 claimants, each with several fish nets, and also including claims for damaged boat engines, respraying boats, damage to economic crops and 'injurious affection' amounted to NGN 150.9 million.

Subsequently, the 1992 Fund received a valuation in respect of 63 communities amounting to NGN 1.89 billion, later amended to NGN 2.8 billion; a claim in respect of 102 communities amounting to US\$16.25 million, later amended to US\$26.25 million when filed at court; and a position statement from the Nigerian Government at the April 2013 session of the 1992 Fund Executive Committee amounting to US\$92.62 million.

Response operations

The Nigerian Maritime Administration and Safety Agency (NIMASA) and NOSDRA were notified a few hours after the spill but due to a lack of resources and the impending nightfall, no action was taken to contain the spill until the following day, 31 March 2009.

A Nigerian Ports Authority (NPA) report indicates that at approximately 07:50 on 31 March 2009 (the day after the *Redferrm* sank) it was observed that the tanker *MT Concep* was moored midstream and discharging LPFO into a second barge, around which oil could be seen. On 31 March 2009, the authorities commenced clean-up operations with the use of skimmers for recovery of stranded oil at the finger jetty.

Further surveys the next day indicated stranded oil to the north and on the southern shore of Tin Can Island. It also appears that oil stranded on the northern shores of Snake Island and Sagbokeji Island where many communities are located, but due to a lack of resources and concerns for the safety of the clean-up crews, little or no clean-up operations were conducted at these locations.

Clean-up operations continued over the following days with the assistance of local young people collecting oil into canoes and by the professional services of African Circle. The clean-up operations concentrated on the areas of the Apapa Boat Yard, Folawiyo, Nedo Gas Dock, Lister Jetty, Liverpool Bridge and the Federal Palace Hotel.

While clean-up operations continued, the operation to salvage the *Redferrm* using a crane barge began on 6 April 2009.

The *Redferrm* was finally refloated on 9 April 2009 when Concel Engineering Nigeria Ltd (the owners of the *MT Concep*/charterers of the *Redferrm*) paid NGN 5 750 000 to lift the barge. Shoreline clean-up operations were completed by 22 April 2009. The NPA subsequently rendered an invoice for the cost of the clean-up operation. An NPA memorandum lists the materials and the costs of the personnel deployed from the Tin Can and Apapa Port complexes which together amount to some NGN 101 400.

Following the conclusion of the clean-up operations NPA fined Concel Engineering Nigeria Ltd, the owners of the tanker *MT Concep*, the sum of US\$52 000. Concel Engineering Nigeria

Ltd denied responsibility for the pollution incident, claiming that it was the owners of the barge *Redferrm* who should pay.

Applicability of the Conventions

Nigeria is a Party to the 1992 Civil Liability Convention (1992 CLC) and the 1992 Fund Convention.

At the time of the incident, the *Redferrm* was owned by Captain Orizu, but his current whereabouts are not known.

The tanker *MT Concep* was owned by Concel Engineering Nigeria Ltd, which had also chartered the barge *Redferrm*. A company, Thame Shipping Agency Ltd, acted as agents for the owners of both the *MT Concep* and the *Redferrm*.

Article VII.1 of the 1992 CLC states:

The owner of a ship registered in a Contracting State and carrying more than 2 000 tons of oil in bulk as cargo shall be required to maintain insurance or other financial security, such as the guarantee of a bank or a certificate delivered by an international compensation fund, in the sums fixed by applying the limits of liability prescribed in Article V, paragraph 1 to cover his liability for pollution damage under this Convention.

The *Redferrm* was reported as carrying less than 2 000 tonnes of oil at the time of the incident and there was therefore no requirement for the shipowner to have compulsory insurance for his liability for pollution damage, as required for vessels carrying over 2 000 tonnes. It appears unlikely that the shipowner will have sufficient assets to pay any claims for compensation. It is therefore possible that the 1992 Fund will have to pay the claims for compensation from the outset, and then decide whether to attempt to recover the sums from the shipowner by way of a recourse action in the future.

Investigation into the cause of the incident

After being informed in early 2012 of the spill, the Secretariat conducted initial investigations, including requesting the International Group of P&I Associations (International Group) and the International Tanker Owners Pollution Federation (ITOPF) for details of any information they held regarding the incident, the vessels concerned and the barge owner's identity. The Secretariat found no records of either vessel being covered by a P&I Club of the International Group and the vessels' owners were not ITOPF members.

In June 2012, the Director and members of the Secretariat visited Nigeria to meet with the lawyer representing the 102 communities which had submitted a claim in court as well as representatives from NIMASA, NOSDRA and the NPA, in order to investigate ➤

the circumstances of the incident, gather facts and to visit the spill location.

The Secretariat instructed its Nigerian lawyers to conduct a preliminary fact-finding investigation. The Secretariat also made contact with NIMASA and requested their assistance in providing further details of the incident.

Marine Board of Inquiry

In February 2013 the Federal Ministry of Transport established a Marine Board of Inquiry for the Redfferm incident, which commenced sitting in March 2013 when it heard testimony from 24 witnesses and examined a large number of exhibits.

Events surrounding the sinking of the barge Redfferm

No definitive answer has been provided as to what caused the sinking of the barge. During the Marine Board of Inquiry, several possibilities were raised by the witnesses called by the Board including a collision between the tanker and barge, overloading, lack of structural integrity or poor construction. According to letters of protest prepared by marine cargo surveyors believed to have been appointed by oil receivers at the power plant receiving the discharged oil from the Redfferm, there was a shortage of delivery between the amount discharged from the MT Concep tanker and the amount discharged from the barge Redfferm to the power plant due to cargo having leaked from the barge's cargo tanks into its flotation compartments. Additionally, the letters of protest noted that some of the barge hatches did not have provisions for sealing them.

The amount of oil on board at the time of the incident

During the Marine Board of Inquiry, conflicting evidence of the amount of oil on board at the time of the incident was provided. A NIMASA report dated 1 April 2009 stated that the barge was empty alongside the MT Concep when she began to sink and that the spill consisted of the remaining on board residual cargo of black oil which had been previously carried by the barge during the earlier voyage to the power plant.

Other evidence indicated that at a meeting held on 28 May 2009 between representatives of the NPA and Thame Shipping (the charterers of the MT Concep), one of the representatives of Thame Shipping confirmed that the barge had undertaken two voyages from the tanker MT Concep and was about to load for the last voyage when the incident occurred. That representative indicated that the oil remaining on board amounted to approximately 100 tonnes of LPFO and it was this residue that had been spilled. The representative explained that the oil receivers had informed him of this remaining quantity on board the Redfferm, insisting that he should confirm that the barge operators did not tamper with it before loading for the next voyage, which was expected to be the last.

The seaworthiness of the barge Redfferm

According to documents tendered to the Marine Board of Inquiry, the barge Abiding Grace was found to have carried a boat licence and loadline certificates, but that these were found to have expired in December 2006. The Abiding Grace was therefore trading without valid licences at the time of the incident.

Additionally, the Marine Board of Inquiry ascertained that the barge Redfferm was not registered on the Nigerian Ship Registry. She was also only certified by NIMASA with a loadline certificate valid for 'inland waters of Nigeria only'. Both the Abiding Grace and the Redfferm were not therefore certified for sea-going voyages.

Claims for compensation

Following the incident, in 2009 and 2010, the NPA, NOSDRA and NIMASA were involved in a series of meetings with representatives of five communities allegedly affected by the spill.

The valuations and claims submitted to the 1992 Fund as at October 2013 are as shown below and on page 49.

Date	Type of claim	Claim amount	Comment	Status
July 2009	Valuation	NGN 150.94 million (US\$945 150)	Valuation of five communities commissioned by the five communities on Snake Island	Not filed at court. Time-barred
February 2010	Valuation	NGN 18.96 million (US\$118 700)	Valuation of five communities on Snake Island by NOSDRA	Not filed at court. Time-barred
January 2013	Valuation	NGN 1.89 billion (US\$11.86 million)	Fund receives valuation on behalf of 63 communities. Survey partly conducted in 2012.	Not filed at court. Time-barred
February 2013	Valuation	NGN 2.8 billion (US\$17.6 million)	Above-mentioned valuation amended to include fees.	Not filed at court. Time-barred

Date	Type of claim	Claim amount	Comment	Status
March 2012	Claim on behalf of 102 communities	US\$26.25 million	Before claim was filed at court, the claimants' lawyer stated that the claims amounted to US\$16.25 million, but when the claim was filed at court, this had increased to US\$26.25 million.	Filed at court. Not time-barred
April 2013	Clean up, remediation, health issues, and other items	US\$92.62 million	Presented by the Nigerian delegation at April 2013 meeting of the 1992 Fund Executive Committee.	Not filed at court. Time-barred

The position statement submitted by the Nigerian Government at the April 2013 session of the 1992 Fund Executive Committee is set out above.

Of these claims and valuations, only the claim filed at court in March 2012 is not time-barred pursuant to Article VIII of the 1992 CLC.

Civil proceedings

The claim for US\$26.25 million was filed by a lawyer representing 102 communities allegedly affected by the spill against the owners of the *MT Concep*, the owners of the *Redferrm*, Thame Shipping Agency Ltd (agent of both the *MT Concep* and the *Redferrm*) and the 1992 Fund. It comprises claims for clean-up and pollution prevention measures (US\$1.5 million); claims for property damage (US\$2.5 million); claims for economic loss in the fisheries, mariculture and fish processing sectors (US\$10 million); claims for economic loss in the tourism sector (US\$1.5 million); claims for environmental damages and economic losses (US\$750 000); and general damages (US\$10 million).

The 1992 Fund's experts have undertaken an analysis of the claims submitted which reveals that the claimed number of boats per claimant, at an average of over three damaged boats per claimant, appears untenable, as do the number of damaged engines, with over 6 000 engines alleged to have been replaced, and the number of damaged engines per claimant. Notably, no documentary evidence at all has been submitted in support of the claims presented. It also appears that the average replacement value per net (alleged at £125 per net) is excessive compared to other contemporary sources of gear prices. Furthermore, the costs claimed for cleaning fishing boats alleged to have been oiled by the incident appear excessive as do the total number of claimants alleged to have been affected by this incident. A total of 21 344 nets were claimed to have been damaged by oil, which at an average length of 66 metres gives a total of 1 408 km of gill nets purportedly damaged. The 1992 Fund's experts have stated that given the total area of the Lagos Lagoon area, compared to the small allegedly affected areas, this density of nets appears untenable. Overall, the 1992 Fund's experts

have concluded that the claims are excessive and inconsistent with other published data relating to the area alleged to have been impacted by the spill.

The 1992 Fund applied to be removed from the proceedings as a defendant and replaced as an intervenor on the basis that primary liability for the spill rests with the owner of the *Redferrm*. The claimants' lawyer also agreed to stay the proceedings against the 1992 Fund, in order that the claims assessment process could commence without the need for the 1992 Fund to simultaneously defend a legal action. Later however, the claimants' lawyer opposed the 1992 Fund's application to be removed as a defendant and replaced as an intervenor. The Judge denied the Fund's application, so the 1992 Fund appealed the decision. As at October 2013, no further steps had been taken in this regard.

Other issues

The shipowner and insurance of the barge *Redferrm*

There appears to be no information available on the Nigerian Ship Registry regarding the ownership of the barge, with whom primary liability for the spill rests. However, the Secretariat was informed verbally that at the time of the incident, the barge was owned by Captain Orizu. This was subsequently confirmed at the Marine Board of Inquiry. The Secretariat was also informed that following the refloating of the *Redferrm*, the barge was adapted into a floating dock. However, the current location of the barge/ floating dock and its owner are not known.

NIMASA has no records or details of the registration or any information relating to *Redferrm*. Additionally, NPA has no written records regarding the movements of the barge prior to the spill or of its conversion into a floating dock.

Redfferm as a sea-going ship

Article I.1 of the 1992 CLC states:

“Ship” means any sea-going vessel and seaborne craft of any type whatsoever constructed or adapted for the carriage of oil in bulk as cargo, provided that a ship capable of carrying oil and other cargoes shall be regarded as a ship only when it is actually carrying oil in bulk as cargo and during any voyage following such carriage unless it is proved that it has no residues of such carriage of oil in bulk aboard.

The Secretariat is investigating if the *Redfferm* is a sea-going vessel within the meaning of Article I.1 of the 1992 CLC. As at October 2013, it appears that there is no documentary evidence showing earlier trans-shipment operations involving the barge *Redfferm* at sea. Furthermore, no evidence was presented at the Marine Board of Inquiry of the barge *Redfferm* having been constructed as a sea-going vessel in accordance with relevant classification regulations as the barge was built without plan approval in contravention of the Nigerian Merchant Shipping Act 2007.

Finally, no evidence was presented to show that the barge *Redfferm* was in fact ever used or certified to carry persistent oil at sea.

Shortly before the October 2013 session of the 1992 Fund Executive Committee, the Nigerian delegation submitted additional documentation relating to the incident. As at October 2013 the 1992 Fund was examining the submitted documents with the intention of reporting upon this at the next session of the 1992 Fund Executive Committee.

Considerations

At the October 2013 session of the 1992 Fund Executive Committee, the Director commented upon the many difficulties which needed to be overcome with this incident, including the fact that the 1992 Fund was informed of the incident several years after the event and that it was difficult to ascertain who truly was affected by the spill. The Director also noted the 1992 Fund expert’s analysis of the claims submitted, which revealed

excessive and untenable numbers in respect of the boats, engines and nets claimed to have been affected by the incident. The Director noted that the difficulties in ascertaining who was truly affected by the spill, combined with the difficulty in ascertaining the quantum of losses for the claimants and the lack of evidence presented to show that the barge *Redfferm* was in fact ever used or certified to carry persistent oil at sea, made it impossible for him to recommend that he be instructed by the 1992 Fund Executive Committee to make payment of compensation to the claimants in respect of this incident.



The barge Redfferm sinking in Tin Can Island port.

JS Amazing

Date of incident	6 June 2009
Place of incident	Ijala, Warri River, Delta State, Nigeria
Cause of incident	Hull of vessel punctured during cargo loading due to underwater obstruction at berth
Quantity of oil spilled (approximate)	1 000 tonnes of low pour fuel oil
Area affected	Warri River, Delta State, Nigeria
Flag State of ship	Nigeria
Gross tonnage	3 384 GT
P&I insurer	Said to be uninsured at the time of incident, although pre- and post-incident was insured by the South of England P&I Club (in liquidation)
CLC limit	4.51 million SDR (£4.2 million)
STOPIA/TOPIA applicable	No
CLC + Fund limit	203 million SDR (£190 million)
Total compensation paid	None

Conversion into Pounds sterling has been made on the basis of the exchange rate as at 31 December 2013.



Map data ©2011 Europa Technologies, Google

Incident

On 6 June 2009, the Nigerian-registered tanker *JS Amazing* spilled approximately 1 000 tonnes of low pour fuel oil (LPFO) into the Warri River, Delta State, Nigeria.

On 5 June 2009, the *JS Amazing* had received orders to proceed to the refinery loading berth II, owned by the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (NNPC), to load 5 000 tonnes of LPFO. Loading of the cargo commenced on 5 June 2009, but shortly after midnight an oil leak was noted from the vessel's hull. In the early hours of 6 June, shortly after loading was suspended, the vessel listed approximately 45° to port. Oil continued to spill from the casualty.

The next day, a diver's inspection revealed that the port side of the vessel's hull had been punctured by two iron pipes from the wreck of a submerged mooring dolphin under the hull of the vessel.

It is understood that the tanker stopped leaking oil on 11 June 2009 when the two iron pipes were cut from the mooring dolphin wreck and the casualty was stabilised.

The 1992 Fund was not informed of the incident until May 2011. The incident was not widely reported outside of Nigeria and preliminary investigations by the 1992 Fund failed to reveal a great deal of information regarding the spill from the *JS Amazing*, or the identity of the shipowner.

Impact

According to a Pipelines and Product Marketing Company (PPMC) internal memorandum, the quantity of oil on board the *JS Amazing* ➤

before the incident totalled 3 338.6 tonnes. After the incident 2 303.8 tonnes were pumped from the vessel. Accordingly, it is believed that some 1 000 tonnes of oil leaked into the Warri River on the days following the incident.

Joint visit by NOSDRA and PPMC to the affected area

Within days of the spill, the National Oil Spill Detection and Response Agency (NOSDRA) was notified that some 12 communities had been impacted by the spill. Shortly thereafter, NOSDRA conducted a joint visit with PPMC to assess the impact of the spill upon the environment and upon the communities affected. NOSDRA and PPMC visited 232 communities between July and September 2009 and listed the inventory of each community.

As a result of the visit, NOSDRA requested PPMC to take immediate steps to clean up and remediate the impacted areas. By December 2009, PPMC had not complied with NOSDRA's request to clean up the impacted areas, as a result of which NOSDRA fined PPMC the sum of NGN 1 million.

In September 2010, NOSDRA commenced legal proceedings against PPMC for failing to clean up and remediate the impacted areas and failing to pay the fine. The proceedings concluded in May 2012 when the judge decided that:

- PPMC was in breach of legislation when it failed to clean up the area impacted by the *JS Amazing* spill;
- PPMC should pay the fine of NGN 1 million to NOSDRA; and
- PPMC should immediately clean up and remediate the impacted sites as directed.

It is not known whether PPMC carried out any clean-up and remediation work or whether it has paid the fine.

Damage assessment and valuations

In July 2009 NOSDRA commissioned a firm of estate surveyors and valuers to conduct a damage assessment report on behalf of 245 communities allegedly affected by the incident. The damage assessment report concluded that the losses and injuries suffered and the damage to the property, interests and rights of the communities as a result of the spill from the *JS Amazing*, amounted to NGN 2 241 million.

In 2010, as a result of pressure from a number of committee groups established following the incident, PPMC paid to a number of communities the total sum of NGN 30 million.

In July 2011 PPMC appointed a valuer to conduct an assessment of damages in conjunction with an NNPC committee established to handle the assessment and payment of compensation.

The results of the assessment and details of any additional compensation paid by PPMC are not known.

Post spill socio-economic impact assessment study

In accordance with Nigerian legislation, NOSDRA commissioned a post-spill socio-economic impact assessment study of the incident. The study was conducted by a firm of environmental consultants. The fieldwork was carried out between 15 July and 15 August 2009 (approximately 6-10 weeks after the incident) and consisted of samples taken from soil, surface water and sediment. In addition, top and bottom soil samples, surface water and sediments were taken from fishponds at various locations.

The study lists 100 communities affected by the LPFO spill from the *JS Amazing*. The study states that all water samples contained heavy metals in traces, but that these were far below the Department of Petroleum Resources (DPR) intervention levels and notes that many of the heavily impacted sites were within 7.5 km of the site of the spill.

The study concludes that the soil samples collected showed no significant increase in heavy metal concentrations, as they were all below established DPR intervention levels, but that there were 'heavily impacted' bottom sediments found around the PPMC loading jetty where the spill occurred and at three other areas/fishponds where the petroleum hydrocarbon concentrations exceeded the DPR intervention levels. The study also lists two other categories, namely 'moderately impacted' and 'low impacted' areas, which appear to have been categorised on the basis of the sedimentation readings obtained by the field study.

The report also states that there was a presence of petroleum hydrocarbons at all the sites within the study area. It is suggested that this could indicate a pre-existing presence of hydrocarbons, prior to the spill from the *JS Amazing*.

Response operations

The Warri Port Manager initially notified the Nigerian Ports Authority of the incident in the early hours of 6 June 2009. At approximately the same time NOSDRA was notified of the spill by a member of one of the communities affected. Later that morning, several NOSDRA officials, community members and NNPC representatives went to the jetty area.

Response operations commenced on 6 June 2009 with the mobilisation of an oil spill response team and equipment. In addition, Clean Nigeria Associates were retained to assist with the clean-up operation using oil skimmer equipment. The amount of oil recovered in the days following the incident appears to have been minimal. It appears that only on 10 June 2009 were booms placed around the tanker to limit the pollution to the tidal

Warri River and that clean-up operations were restricted to the immediate area surrounding the tanker.

The tanker was restored to her initial stability on 11 June 2009. In 2011 the submerged remains of the mooring dolphin were finally removed from the NNPC jetty site.

Applicability of the Conventions

Nigeria is a Party to the 1992 Civil Liability Convention (1992 CLC) and 1992 Fund Convention. The limit of liability of the owner of the *JS Amazing* under the 1992 CLC is estimated to be 4.51 million SDR.

Investigation into the cause of the incident

In March 2012, the Nigerian Federal Ministry of Transport established a Marine Board of Inquiry to carry out an investigation into the cause of the spill.

Poor ship handling

The Marine Board of Inquiry noted that the vessel was improperly moored with insufficient mooring lines and that as the tide flowed, it pushed the stern of the vessel approximately ten metres away from the jetty. As a consequence, the bow was pushed into the jetty where the vessel struck the underwater wreck of the mooring dolphin. It also appears that as tidal conditions changed, no crew members tended the mooring lines.

No safe minimum manning documentation

The Marine Board of Inquiry report highlighted that the vessel was undermanned because:

- i. there was no officer of the watch;
- ii. the chief engineer was not certified competent to be the chief engineer; and
- iii. there was no second engineer, which was unusual for a vessel of that size.

Unqualified master and crew

The Marine Board of Inquiry report also highlighted that:

- i. the master of the *JS Amazing* was not certified to take command of a vessel of such gross tonnage and did not possess an advanced tanker certificate/endorsement which was necessary for a vessel such as the *JS Amazing*;
- ii. the master had no knowledge of the certificates the vessel was required to carry, the requirement to comply with the provisions of the International Safety Management Code, the relevant nautical publications the vessel was required to carry and the emergency procedures to follow after an incident; and
- iii. the master had no knowledge of the provisions of the 1992 CLC or the need to forward the certificate of insurance (blue card)

from the insurer to the Nigerian Maritime Administration and Safety Agency (NIMASA) for issuance of the CLC certificate.

In addition, the master testified at the Inquiry that he could not locate the majority of the relevant certificates which are required under Nigerian and international law.

Insurance cover of the *JS Amazing*

The 1992 Fund's Nigerian lawyers contacted the shipowner, Equitorial Energy Ltd, who accepted that an oil spill took place in Ijala in June 2009. The shipowner stated, however, that they had resolved the problem but they refused to divulge any information regarding either the actual steps they had taken or the identity of their insurers. Subsequently, the Secretariat was informed that the *JS Amazing* was insured with the South of England P&I Club.

Amongst the exhibits tendered to the Marine Board of Inquiry were copies of:

- a. a Certificate of Entry from the South of England P&I Club for the 2008 policy year; and
- b. a Certificate (blue card) furnished as evidence of insurance pursuant to Article VII of the 1969 CLC and Article VII of the 1992 CLC for the period from July 2010 to January 2011, issued by the South of England P&I Club to NIMASA.

Evidence of insurance with the South of England P&I Club has been provided for the 2008 and 2010 policy years, however, no evidence of insurance has been provided for the 2009 policy year when the incident occurred. Under cross-examination at the Marine Board of Inquiry, the representative of the shipowner stated that the shipowners had paid the insurance cover annually to a broker since 2005 and that the vessel was insured at the time of the incident.

Claims for compensation

Following the incident in June 2009, NOSDRA conducted a joint investigation visit (JIV) with the PPMC to assess the impact of the spill on the environment and upon the communities affected.

In July 2009, NOSDRA commissioned a firm of estate surveyors and valuers to conduct a damage assessment report on behalf of 245 communities allegedly affected by the incident. The report concluded that the losses suffered and the damage to the property, interests and rights of the communities as a result of the spill amounted to NGN 2 241 million.

In May 2012 a claim for NGN 30.5 billion was filed against, *inter alia*, the 1992 Fund by fourteen representatives on behalf of 248 unnamed communities allegedly affected by the spill.

Subsequently, some of the representatives submitted information on behalf of 189 communities to the Secretariat for consideration. The information submitted was not complete and, in some instances, consisted only of individual photographs of claimants or copies of voter's cards, very few of which provided details of the claimants' occupations. In many other cases, the information comprising the claim simply consisted of a spreadsheet detailing each claim, but without any supporting evidence. Furthermore, no official government data had been provided to support the numbers of claimants alleged to be within the communities, or generally within the Warri River area.

Analysis of the claims submitted

The information submitted on behalf of the 189 communities was passed to the 1992 Fund's experts for consideration. Their analysis revealed that the 189 communities represented some 21 000 individual claimants and totalled NGN 18 015 million. The losses claimed were mainly for damage to fishing gear, loss of earnings from fishing, damage to economic trees and crops, general damage to communities, displacement and ecological damage, and damage to ancestral shrines. In some claims, damages were only estimated for losses to fishing interests (gear damage, loss of earnings or, in some cases, both); in other claims, general losses to the whole community had been claimed.

The claimed losses of NGN 850 000 per claimant represented on average a loss of 14 years' earnings on an average wage of NGN 60 000 per year, as quoted in the post-spill impact assessment (PSIA) report conducted by NOSDRA following the incident.

The number of claimants (more than 21 000) was far in excess of the data from the PSIA report, which suggested a total of approximately 3 200 fishermen across the whole of the 245 communities purportedly affected by the spill from the *JS Amazing*.

The overall average difference between the numbers of items in the claim and those reported in the NOSDRA JIV reports was at a ratio of 65:1. The 1992 Fund's experts considered this to be implausible and suggested that this showed a high degree of overestimation in a number of claims.

The 1992 Fund's experts had also stated that the numbers of fishing gear items were not feasible for the area of river under consideration. For example, with reference to gill nets at an assumed length of 65 metres, the total length of nets would be in the region of 3 200 km. Furthermore, as the river level was higher than normal at the time of the incident due to flood waters, it was unlikely that many gill nets would have been in use at the time of the incident due to high current speeds.

Civil proceedings

Five sets of legal proceedings have been commenced:

- i. Legal proceedings by NOSDRA against PPMC;
- ii. Legal proceedings commenced by some communities against the shipowner;
- iii. Legal proceedings commenced by the shipowner for recovery of damage to the ship;
- iv. Legal proceedings commenced by 248 communities for compensation; and
- v. Legal proceedings commenced by claimants to arrest the *JS Amazing*.

However of these, only one set of legal proceedings involves the 1992 Fund as detailed below.

Legal proceedings commenced by 248 communities for compensation

In May 2012 a claim for NGN 30.5 billion was filed against the shipowner, the joint liquidators of the South of England P&I Club and the 1992 Fund by representatives of 248 communities allegedly affected by the spill.

In July 2012 the 1992 Fund applied to strike itself out as a defendant but had sought leave to be an intervenor on the basis that primary liability for the first tier of compensation rested with the shipowner, but recognising that the 1992 Fund might be called upon to pay compensation in excess of the shipowner's limit of liability.

In February 2013 the 1992 Fund's Nigerian lawyer advised that the case had been transferred from the Federal High Court in Asaba to a new Federal High Court established in Warri, Delta State, and as a consequence, the 1992 Fund's motion to strike itself out as a defendant and to be replaced as an intervenor had been adjourned.

In June 2013, the shipowner applied to have the proceedings by the claimants dismissed, arguing the lack of jurisdiction of the court and an improper service of legal proceedings upon the defendants.

Legal proceedings commenced by 248 communities to arrest the *JS Amazing*

In March 2013, upon the claimants' application, the Court ordered the arrest and detention of the *JS Amazing*, pending the provision of a bank guarantee to cover the claim, or the deposit of the sum of NGN 30.5 billion into court. As at October 2013, no further information had been provided on the status of those legal proceedings.

Other issues

Certificate of Entry with the South of England P&I Club (2008 policy year)

Notwithstanding that no policy documents have been provided for the 2009 policy year, the Certificate of Entry for the 2008 policy year states:

‘This Certificate of Entry is only to provide cover for liability in respect of Cargo on board the Entered Ship in accordance with Rule 29A of the South of England Rules of the Association, when such cargo is homogenous liquids in bulk of a non-persistent nature.’

Accordingly, the tanker was not insured in the 2008 policy year to carry persistent mineral oils as defined in Article I of the 1992 CLC.

Certificate of Class for Hull and Machinery Equipment (2010 policy year)

Amongst the documents tendered to the Marine Board of Inquiry was a Certificate of Class for Hull and Machinery Equipment issued by the International Naval Surveys Bureau in 2010, which stated that the vessel was not classed to carry heavy grade oil.

Accordingly, in 2010, the vessel was not designed to carry heavy grade oils of the type covered by Article I of the 1992 CLC.

The liquidation of the South of England P&I Club

In 2011, the Supreme Court of Bermuda handed down a winding up order in relation to the South of England P&I Club. The Court also ordered that joint provisional liquidators be appointed to oversee the winding up of the Club.

The Secretariat contacted the joint liquidators to alert them as to the existence of the incident and to enquire whether they had documentation which might assist in identifying the insurer at the time of the incident. The joint liquidators stated that they had not been provided with much information regarding the incident but that they had had several conversations with the placing broker who had stated that the vessel was not insured with the South of England P&I Club at the time of the incident.

As at October 2013 the Secretariat had not seen any documentation that indicated that the vessel was insured for the 2009 policy year. It also appeared that she was not classed to carry heavy grade oil in 2008 or 2010.

Considerations

There are many difficulties inherent in investigating an incident which occurred over three years ago despite the cooperation and assistance provided by the Nigerian authorities since 2012.

A number of issues remain outstanding, including:

- a. the fact that no steps had been taken by the shipowner to fully pay the first tier of compensation in accordance with the provisions of Article III (1) of the 1992 CLC;
- b. the fact that the Secretariat had not seen any evidence that the *JS Amazing* was insured in accordance with the provisions of Article VII of the 1992 CLC at the time of the incident;
- c. the fact that there was a large amount of unregulated oil refining occurring in the Niger Delta area and there was a high likelihood that there was a degree of contamination from these operations as well as previous oil spills in the area. This raised additional difficulties for the Fund's experts when attempting to differentiate between the contamination that resulted from the *JS Amazing* incident and earlier contamination from previous spills;
- d. the fact that the incident was caused by the hull of the tanker hitting the wreck of a submerged mooring dolphin, the existence and location of which was known to the authorities;
- e. an analysis of the evidence submitted in support of the claims revealed a high degree of overestimation. For instance, the overall average difference between the numbers of items in the claim and those reported in the NOSDRA JIV reports was at a ratio of 65:1; and
- f. the 1992 Fund experts stated that the number of fishing gear items claimed was not feasible for the area of river under consideration. For example, with reference to gill nets at an assumed length of 65 metres, the total length of allegedly damaged nets would cover some 3 200 km.

Taking into account the background levels of pre-existing contamination in the area, there are great difficulties in ascertaining the level of damages suffered as a result of the *JS Amazing* incident.

The Director regrets that due to the delay between the incident occurring and the 1992 Fund receiving notification of the incident, the claimants will struggle to prove their losses or to establish a link of causation between the damage and the contamination.

In October 2013 the Nigerian delegation submitted additional documentation relating to the incident which the 1992 Fund was examining.

Haekup Pacific

Date of incident	20 April 2010
Place of incident	Yeosu, Republic of Korea
Cause of incident	Collision and subsequent sinking
Quantity of oil spilled (approximate)	0.02 tonnes
Area affected	No immediate impact on coastline
Flag State of ship	Republic of Korea
Gross tonnage	1 087 GT
P&I insurer	UK P&I Club
CLC limit	4.51 million SDR (£4.2 million)
STOPIA/TOPIA applicable	Yes – STOPIA 2006 limit of 20 million SDR (£18.7 million)
CLC + Fund limit	203 million SDR (£190 million)
Total compensation paid	US\$136 000 (£82 000)

Conversion into Pounds sterling has been made on the basis of the exchange rate as at 31 December 2013.



Incident

On 20 April 2010, the asphalt carrier *Haekup Pacific* collided with the *Zheng Hang*, a 1983-built bulk carrier of 35 838 GT, south of Yeosu, Republic of Korea. At the time of the collision the *Haekup Pacific* was laden with 1 135 tonnes of asphalt cargo loaded at Ulsan for Jeju Island, with 23.37 tonnes of intermediate fuel oil (IFO) and 13 tonnes of medium diesel oil (MDO) as bunkers.

As a result of the collision with the *Zheng Hang*, the *Haekup Pacific* was heavily damaged on her aft port quarter and sank in waters approximately 90 metres deep on 21 April 2010, approximately ten nautical miles off the coast of Baekdo Island, Republic of Korea, before towage arrangements could be made to bring the casualty to Yeosu.

Impact

Other than the initial minor spill of approximately 200 litres (approximately one barrel) of oil, as at October 2013 there had been no further impact as a result of the incident. However, oil and wreck removal orders were issued by the Korean authorities in May 2010, and as at October 2013 these remained in force.

Response operations

Before leaving the vessel the crew undertook a series of anti-pollution measures, including closing lines and air vents to the fuel tanks, in order to minimise the risk of spillage of the estimated 23.37 tonnes of IFO and 13 tonnes of MDO carried as bunkers.

Map data ©2014 AutoNavi, Google, Kingway, SK planet, ZENRIN

There was, however, a minor spill of approximately 200 litres (approximately one barrel) of oil. The local coastguard commenced a clean-up operation and ordered the shipowner to monitor any further oil spill at the site for a period of one month. No oil was reportedly found during that period.

The Korean authorities nevertheless issued an oil removal order on 6 May 2010 and a wreck removal order (with the asphalt cargo on board) on 7 May 2010. The shipowner obtained the advice of the International Tanker Owners Pollution Federation Ltd (ITOPF) on the likely environmental impact arising from the incident. ITOPF were of the view that the asphalt cargo would become solidified in the cold, 90 metre deep sea and would not pose a threat to the environment. Additionally, they suggested that the MDO would evaporate quickly if it leaked out and any IFO spilled would reasonably be expected to drift away from the Korean coast in a north-easterly direction under the influence of winds and a strong current.

The shipowner's insurer, the UK P&I Club, subsequently engaged surveyors to arrange a sonar scan of the vessel, undertake a survey of the prevailing currents and a survey of the wreck using a remotely-operated vehicle. The surveyors also advised on the feasibility of complying with the wreck and cargo removal orders issued by the Korean authorities.

The survey reports indicated that the vessel sank at a depth of 90 metres and was resting on a muddy and sandy seabed, lying on her port side having sunk into the seabed by approximately 1.6 metres. The air vents were seen to be intact without any trace of oil leakage and solidified asphalt was found to be present on a broken handrail close to the damaged area of the hull. It was also found to be difficult to perform the surveys due to the strong and turbulent currents, which halted the survey operation several times. The surveyors concluded that it was technically difficult and too dangerous to perform the removal operations and that accordingly it would be prudent leave the wreck in place.

Thereafter, in August 2010, the shipowner submitted both ITOPF's and the surveyor's reports to the Korean authorities, stating that:

- a. no further oil leakage had been observed;
- b. there had been no adverse effect on the marine environment; and
- c. the wreck (with cargo on board) and oil removal operations were not justified.

Since 2010, no further response has been received from the Korean authorities and no steps have been taken to enforce the removal orders issued in 2010. However, the removal orders remain in force as they have not yet been officially revoked. Theoretically therefore, at some stage in the future the shipowner/UK P&I Club might be required to undertake, or bear the costs of, the removal operations.

Applicability of the Conventions

At the time of the incident, the Republic of Korea was a Party to the 1992 Civil Liability Convention (1992 CLC) and the 1992 Fund Convention. The limit of liability of the owner of the tanker is estimated to be 4.51 million SDR. The *Haekup Pacific* was also entered as a 'relevant ship' within the definition of STOPIA 2006, whereby the limitation amount applicable to the vessel under that Convention is increased, on a voluntary basis, to 20 million SDR.

Under the terms of STOPIA 2006, the 1992 Fund has legally enforceable rights of indemnification from the shipowner of the difference between the limitation amount applicable to the tanker under the 1992 CLC (4.51 million SDR) and the total amount of admissible claims, or 20 million SDR, whichever is the less.

The time-bar provisions of the 1992 Fund Convention has been highlighted in this case. Article 6 of the 1992 Fund Convention states:

Rights to compensation under Article 4 shall be extinguished unless an action is brought thereunder or a notification has been made pursuant to Article 7, paragraph 6, within three years from the date when the damage occurred. However, in no case shall an action be brought after six years from the date of the incident which caused the damage.

The provisions relating to preventive measures under Article I of the 1992 CLC have also been highlighted. Article I.6 (b) of the 1992 CLC states:

'Pollution damage' means:

- (b) the costs of preventive measures and further loss or damage caused by preventive measures.

Article I.7 of the 1992 CLC states:

'Preventive measures' means any reasonable measures taken by any person after an incident has occurred to prevent or minimize pollution damage.

Accordingly, elements of the proposed cargo removal operations could fall within the definition of 'preventive measures', pursuant to Article I.7 of the 1992 CLC.

Claims for compensation

The UK P&I Club reportedly paid some US\$136 000 in respect of clean-up and preventive measures following the incident. The surveyors retained by the Club estimated that the oil removal operation would cost approximately US\$5 million, but for the

wreck removal operations (with the asphalt cargo on board) these costs could escalate to in excess of US\$25 million, should these operations ever proceed in compliance with the removal orders originally issued in May 2010.

As at October 2013 no claims against the 1992 Fund had been presented for assessment.

Civil proceedings

In April 2013, the shipowner/UK P&I Club commenced legal proceedings against the 1992 Fund in the Seoul Central District Court.

At the time of filing the proceedings against the 1992 Fund, the UK P&I Club indicated to the Secretariat that they had no wish to further pursue the matter through the courts but only wished to protect their rights in respect of the costs already incurred and their potential claim for the costs of the removal operations before the expiry of the three-year anniversary of the date of the damage. The UK P&I Club indicated that because the Korean authorities had not yet officially withdrawn the removal orders originally issued in 2010, the shipowner/UK P&I Club might yet be required to undertake or bear the costs of the removal operations at some stage in the future.

In this regard, the UK P&I Club indicated that if the shipowner/UK P&I Club and the 1992 Fund could agree that the pollution damage which would trigger the three-year time bar under Article 7, paragraph 6 of the 1992 Fund Convention had not yet occurred (as no costs had yet been paid in respect of the potential claim for removal operations), then only the six-year time limit under Article 6 of the 1992 Fund Convention would be applicable. Assuming such agreement could be reached, the shipowner/UK P&I Club would withdraw the lawsuit they had filed and would await developments regarding the potential claim for the removal operations until the six-year time period expired. Such a contractual agreement would be in the interests of the shipowner/UK P&I Club and the 1992 Fund as neither party wished to continue with potentially costly legal proceedings.


Therefore, in conjunction with the 1992 Fund's Korean lawyers and noting that the ultimate decision regarding the time-bar issue would be a matter for the national courts to decide, the 1992 Fund agreed the terms of an agreement on the basis of the fact that since the removal operations had not yet taken place and the estimated costs had not been incurred by the shipowner/UK P&I Club, the damage in respect of the removal operation claim had not yet occurred for the purposes of Article 6 of the 1992 Fund Convention.

As a consequence of signing the agreement, the legal proceedings commenced by the shipowner/UK P&I Club were withdrawn in June 2013. As at October 2013 the parties were awaiting developments regarding the removal orders and the removal operations.

Alfa I

Date of incident	5 March 2012
Place of incident	Elefsis Bay, Piraeus, Greece
Cause of incident	Collision with submerged wreck of vessel
Quantity of oil spilled (approximate)	330 tonnes
Area affected	Contamination along some 13 km of shoreline of Elefsis Bay near Piraeus, Greece
Flag State of ship	Greece
Gross tonnage	1 648 GT
P&I insurer	Aigaion Marine Insurance, Greece – insurance cover limited to €2 million (£1.7 million) and to non-persistent oil
CLC limit	4.51 million SDR (£4.2 million)
STOPIA/TOPIA applicable	No
CLC + Fund limit	203 million SDR (£190 million)
Total compensation paid	None

Conversion into Pounds sterling has been made on the basis of the exchange rate as at 31 December 2013.



Map data ©2013 Basarsoft, Google

Incident

On 5 March 2012, the tanker *Alfa I* (1 648GT) hit a submerged object, the marked wreck of the vessel *City of Mykonos*, while crossing Elefsis Bay near Piraeus, Greece. The impact punctured the bottom hull plating of *Alfa I* over a length of some 30 metres. Shortly thereafter, the *Alfa I* listed over onto her starboard side and sank. The *Alfa I* came to rest in 18-20 metres of water with her stern in contact with the seabed but the bow still visible above water. The incident also resulted in the tragic loss of the master's life.

The *Alfa I* was built in 1972 as a single hull tanker with 12 cargo tanks and later converted to a double-hulled tanker. At the time of the incident, the *Alfa I* was said to be loaded with some 2 070 tonnes of cargo comprising 1 500 tonnes of fuel oil N°2, 300 tonnes of fuel oil N°1 and 270 tonnes of gas oil. The exact amount and specifications of the cargo and bunkers on board at the time of the incident are not known. After sinking, an unknown quantity of oil was released from the tanker through the manholes, vent pipes and sounding pipes on her deck.

Impact

Oil impacted along some 13 kilometres of the shoreline of Elefsis Bay, contaminating a number of local beaches in Loutropyrgos, Neraki and Nea Peramos, and also the Salamina Island (Faneromenis and Batsi). In addition it is reported that some oil impacted less accessible areas of rocky shore and a naval base.

Response operations

At-sea operations

A salvage company was engaged by the shipowner under a salvage contract and divers employed by this company stopped >

the release of oil into the water by closing and tightening the manholes, vent pipes and sounding pipes. No further loss of oil was reported.

A perimeter consisting of two sets of booms was placed around the wreck of the tanker and anchored at regular intervals to maintain it in the prevailing weather conditions.

Subsequent salvage activity focussed on the removal of the cargo from *Alfa I* by 'hot tapping' which involved drilling into each cargo tank and pumping out the contents. The salvors recovered some 1 579 m³ of heavy fuel oil (fuel oil N°2), some 158 m³ of marine grade oil (fuel oil N°1) and some 94 m³ of slops from the wreck of the tanker between 13 March and 28 April 2012.

The viscous nature of the cargo and the equipment employed during the oil removal delayed the operations, but reports provided by surveyors appointed by the shipowner's insurer indicate that the oil removal operations from the wreck of the tanker were completed by 25 April 2012 and tank flushing and sealing operations continued until 28 April 2012. Following the oil removal operation, the surveyors appointed by the shipowner's insurer requested that the clean-up contractors provide documentation and an estimate of the costs incurred during the operation, but this was not provided until late August 2012.

Another company was contracted to undertake the response operations at sea using oil recovery vessels, booms and skimmers. An unknown quantity of oil was recovered at sea by vessels normally used for oil and debris removal in the port. The clean-up contractors reported that some 1 200 metres of booms were deployed around the casualty and skimmers were used to collect the oil. It is understood that the contractors were instructed to surround the area where the tanker sank with two booms (one within the other). In addition, allegedly some 200 to 300 metres of booms were deployed to protect a marina and an oyster farm nearby.

In February 2013, the 1992 Fund received notification that the clean-up contractors would remove the booms on 21 February 2013.

Shoreline clean up

The amount of oil which impacted the shoreline and the quantity of waste material removed during the clean-up operations is not known.

The company contracted to undertake response operations at sea was also contracted to carry out the manual cleaning of the shoreline affected. Some 30 to 50 people were employed to manually remove the oil along with beach sediment (mainly gravel and pebbles) and to put the waste in bags for disposal.

One clean-up team consisting of nine people remained operating at Faneromeni and Salamis on 5 May 2012. According to reports provided by the clean-up contractors, cleaning of the equipment used during the response operations (with the exception of the booms surrounding the sunken tanker) was completed on or around 5 June 2012. It is understood that clean-up operations were completed by 30 June 2012.

Site visit by the 1992 Fund Secretariat

In May 2012, the Head of the Claims Department and the Claims Manager handling the incident visited the location of the sunken tanker and the areas affected by the spill.

The Secretariat was informed that only a small area contaminated by the spill remained to be cleaned and that the majority of the clean-up operations had been concluded. It was noted that the site of the sunken tanker was only marked by the presence of floating oil booms with a salvage tug in attendance and that no marker buoys had been placed to warn other ships of the location of the sunken tanker, or of its proximity to the surface of the sea. Both the experts retained by the Fund and the Fund's Head of Claims/Technical Adviser at the time noted that the presence of two booms as a perimeter was unnecessary if just one boom was deployed correctly. No visible oil was seen to be leaking from the wreck.

Applicability of the Conventions

Greece is a Party to the 1992 Civil Liability and Fund Conventions.

Since the *Alfa I* (1 648 GT) is below 5 000 units of tonnage, the limitation amount applicable under the 1992 CLC is 4.51 million SDR. The total amount available for compensation under the 1992 CLC and 1992 Fund Convention is 203 million SDR.

Consequently, if the total amount of damages caused by the spill were to exceed the limitation amount applicable under the 1992 CLC, the 1992 Fund would be liable to pay compensation to the victims of the spill.

Alternatively, the 1992 Fund would be liable to pay compensation if the shipowner was financially incapable of meeting his obligations in full and any insurance provided did not cover or was insufficient to satisfy the claims for compensation, after the claimants had taken all reasonable steps to pursue the legal remedies available to them (Article 4(1)(b) of the 1992 Fund Convention).

Greece is also a Party to the Supplementary Fund Protocol. The *Alfa I* is therefore the first incident taking place in a Member State of the Supplementary Fund. It is however very unlikely that the incident will exceed the limit under the 1992 Fund Convention.

Investigation into the cause of the incident

The Secretariat was informed that the Greek authorities were conducting an investigation into the incident, but that this would initially be confidential and would only be made available to the general public when the files were forwarded to the District Attorney of Athens for publication.

Early in 2013, the 1992 Fund received a copy of the report of the Council of Investigation of Marine Incidents regarding the *Alfa I* incident.

The Council of Investigation of Marine Incidents on behalf of the Greek Government found that the tanker was seaworthy in all respects and had undergone partial reconstruction as a double-hulled tanker. The Council considered that the liability for the incident was attributable to the master, but that it was unclear what had led the master to take the actions he had taken and thus there were a number of questions that remained unanswered and which required further investigation.

The Council found that the master of the *Alfa I* had made efforts to lessen the consequences of the collision with the wreck of the *City of Mykonos* and to avoid the sinking of his ship. This was evidenced by the position of the engine controls, attempts to manoeuvre by turning the rudder, warning of the crew and nearby vessels by sound signals and his attempts to confirm that all members of his crew had obeyed his order to abandon ship, which may have deprived him of the possibility of saving himself.

For the reasons detailed above, the Council concluded that the sinking of the *Alfa I*, the abandonment of the vessel by her crew, the total loss of the cargo and the death of her master constituted a maritime accident and was due to the fault of the master of the tanker.

The Secretariat requested the 1992 Fund's Greek lawyer to ascertain what further investigations, if any, were taken in light of the points raised in the Council's report. As at October 2013, the Secretariat is awaiting further details.

Claims for compensation

The clean-up contractors have filed a claim against the shipowner and the shipowner's insurer before the Court of First Instance in Piraeus for some €15.8 million. The claims are being examined by the Fund and are detailed below.

Other issues

The shipowner and the insurance policy of the *Alfa I*

The *Alfa I* had P&I cover including pollution risks with Aigaion Insurance Company, a fixed premium insurance provider. The policy is subject to English law and practice. The terms of that policy provided for trading in Greek waters only and contained a limit of liability as follows:

‘Euro 2 000 000 combined single limit each vessel for all claims any one accident or occurrence’

It also includes the following express warranty:

‘Warranted non-persistent cargoes only’

The shipowner's insurer issued certificates (blue cards) to the Central Port Authority of Piraeus in respect of liability under the Bunkers Convention and liability under the 1992 CLC. The 1992 CLC certificate provided:

‘Certificate furnished as evidence of insurance pursuant to Article VII of the International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage 1969, and Article VII of the International Convention for Oil Pollution Damage 1992...

This is to certify that there is in force in respect of the above named ship while in the above ownership a policy of insurance satisfying the requirements of (A) Article VII of the International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage 1969, and (B) Article VII of the International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage 1992 where and when applicable.’

Date submitted	Category of claim	Claim amount (€)
June 2012	Clean up by Greek authorities	0.26 million
August 2012	Clean up contractor's claim for period from 5 March to 30 June 2012	13.3 million
November 2012	Clean up contractor's claim for period from 1 July to 31 October 2012	1.05 million
January 2013	Clean up contractor's claim period from 1 November to 31 December 2012	0.54 million
January 2013	Clean up contractor's claim for period from 1 January to 15 January 2013	0.13 million
May 2013	Clean up contractor's claim for period from 16 January to 28 April 2013	0.82 million
	Total claims submitted	16.10 million

On the basis of the blue card, the Greek authorities as the flag State issued a certificate of insurance in the form specified in the Annex of the 1992 CLC specifying, *inter alia*, Aigaion Insurance Company as the insurer.

There was a contradiction between the terms of the insurance policy and the certificate (blue card) issued to the Greek State by the shipowner's insurer, Aigaion Insurance Company, because the insurance policy was limited to some €2 million with an express warranty that only non-persistent mineral oils would be covered. However, the certificate (blue card) provided to the Central Port Authority of Piraeus stated that an insurance policy was in place which complied with Article VII of the 1992 CLC 'where and when applicable'.

Considerations

In respect of the *Alfa I* insurance coverage there is a contradiction in the terms of the policy and the certificate (blue card) issued to the Greek State by the shipowner's insurer, Aigaion Insurance Company, because the insurance policy is limited to some €2 million, with an express warranty permitting the carriage of non-persistent mineral oils only. However, the certificate (blue card) provided to the Central Port Authority of Piraeus, states that an insurance policy was in place which complied with Article VII of the 1992 CLC 'where and when applicable'.

The Director is of the view that if the shipowner's insurer were to refuse payment of compensation for pollution damage either on the grounds that the policy of insurance contained a warranty ('warranted non-persistent cargoes only') or that the policy was limited to €2 million, the 1992 Fund might wish to consider whether to contest the terms of the insurance provided.

Following discussions with the 1992 Fund's Greek and English lawyers, the Director is of the view that Aigaion Insurance Company would be *prima facie* liable to pay compensation for the damages caused by the spill. Aigaion Insurance Company is the insurer identified in the Certificate of Insurance issued by the Greek authorities in the form specified in the Annex to the

1992 CLC. Furthermore, the tanker was allowed to trade in Greek waters on the basis of the representation made on the certificate of insurance (blue card) issued by Aigaion Insurance Company.

However, the Director is also aware that in accordance with Article 4(1)(b) of the 1992 Fund Convention, the 1992 Fund shall pay compensation to any person suffering pollution damage if such person has been unable to obtain full and adequate compensation for the damage under the terms of the 1992 CLC from the owner, after having taken all reasonable steps to pursue the legal remedies available to him.

As suggested during the October 2012 session of the 1992 Fund Executive Committee, the Director submitted the matter of the possible consequences of discrepancies between insurance policies, blue cards and certificates issued under the 1992 CLC to the IMO Legal Committee. As at October 2013, the views expressed on the matter by the IMO Legal Committee are being analysed by the Director and the 1992 Fund's lawyers.

Boom deployed around the sunken Alfa I.



Nesa R3

Date of incident	19 June 2013
Place of incident	About 1.4 nautical miles off the Port Sultan Qaboos, Muscat, Sultanate of Oman
Cause of incident	Sinking
Quantity of oil spilled (approximate)	In excess of 250 tonnes
Area affected	Some 40 kilometres of Omani shoreline
Flag State of ship	Saint Kitts and Nevis
Gross tonnage	856 GT
P&I insurer	Indian Ocean Ship Owners Mutual P&I Club, Sri Lanka
CLC limit	4.51 million SDR (£4.2 million)
STOPIA/TOPIA applicable	No
CLC + Fund limit	203 million SDR (£190 million)
Total compensation paid	None

Conversion into Pounds sterling has been made on the basis of the exchange rate as at 31 December 2013.



Map data ©2014 AutoNavi, Google

Incident

The 856 GT tanker *Nesa R3*, built in 1981, sank approximately 1.4 nautical miles off the Port Sultan Qaboos, Muscat, Oman on 19 June 2013. The Saint Kitts and Nevis flagged ship had arrived in the Port Sultan Qaboos on 19 June 2013 to make a routine delivery of bitumen from Bandar Abbas, Islamic Republic of Iran.

While awaiting the arrival of a pilot, the master signalled that the ship was in distress and requested urgent assistance from the port. Crew statements reported that a loud bang was heard followed by vibration through the ship, immediately after which the ship began to list to starboard. Action was taken to attempt to correct the list but was not successful and the order to abandon ship was given. The exact nature of the problems encountered and the sequence of events are unknown; they are being investigated by the Omani authorities, the shipowner and the Flag State.

The port immediately deployed its available resources, supplemented by local fishing craft operating nearby, which identified that the vessel was in distress. The vessel's situation deteriorated quickly and, even with additional resources on site, its sinking could not be prevented. Less than twenty minutes passed between the request for assistance and the sinking of the vessel. The rescue operations managed to rescue nine of the ten crew members from the vessel before it sank about 1.4 nautical miles from the port.

After ensuring the safe evacuation of his crew, the master of the vessel re-entered his accommodation to retrieve the ship's documents and tragically lost his life when the ship sank.

Impact

At the time of the incident, the ship was carrying 840 tonnes of bitumen as cargo and five tonnes of diesel bunkers. During the incident and the subsequent sinking of the vessel, some cargo and diesel bunkers were spilled and spread by wind and currents along some 40 kilometres of the Omani coast. As at October 2013, the exact amount of cargo and bunkers lost had not been determined.

The cargo on the *Nesa R3* was grade 60/70 bitumen and was loaded at a temperature of 122°C in order to make it easier for handling and pumping. The specific gravity of this bitumen is in the range 1.01 to 1.06. It is therefore greater than that of fresh water and may be greater than that of sea water (1.025) meaning the product may sink or submerge.

Immediately after the spill, the bitumen spread quickly but, because of the rapid cooling due to the contact with sea water, it became very viscous and rapidly formed thick patches which were moved by wind and current along the coastline. Due to the higher specific gravity of the bitumen some patches were partially submerged, making detection more difficult.

Observations on site during clean-up operations also found that in areas of shallow water, sunken and submerged oil had remobilised due to high daytime temperatures resulting in re-contamination of areas previously cleaned of stranded oil.

Since the *Nesa R3* sank at a depth of approximately 65 metres, it is very likely that any bitumen still on-board the vessel or spilled in the vicinity would have solidified and therefore be immobile. The Omani authorities conducted a survey of the wreck in September 2013 to establish the quantities and condition of the bitumen remaining on board.

Response operations

Immediately after the spill, the Government of Oman set up a National Technical Committee tasked with identifying and deploying the necessary resources to survey the vessel and determine its condition, the cause of the incident and the status and condition of the cargo. The Omani Government also requested the Marine Emergency Mutual Aid Centre to provide technical advice and to support the National Technical Committee which is expected to continue its work until the removal of the oil.

Resources were deployed by both the Port Sultan Qaboos and the central Government to recover the oil at sea. When it was clear that some oil would still reach the shoreline, the Government engaged two specialist oil spill clean-up contractors based in Oman to undertake the shoreline clean up under the direction of the National Technical Committee. Clean-up operations were conducted not only from land, where access was available, but also from sea using specialist vessels and local fishing boats to transport personnel and equipment.

As at October 2013, some 250 tonnes of bitumen had been recovered and operations were on-going to deal with the remaining identified concentrations of oil. The bitumen recovered represented the bulk of the floating and beached oil. Subsequent clean-up operations were focussed on recovering submerged oil in the near shore areas and monitoring beaches for secondary contamination. The possible impact of the spilled oil on fisheries and tourism activities, as well as turtle breeding, was also being studied.

In August 2013, the National Technical Committee issued a tender to carry out a survey of the wreck to identify the quantity of oil and bunkers left on board and whether any further removal operations were needed. The survey took place in September 2013.

Based on the results of the underwater survey conducted on the wreck, the Omani Government estimated that about 5 000 litres of diesel oil and 1 500 litres of other lubricants remained on board, in addition to some 500 tonnes of solidified bitumen. Oman regarded the remaining bunker fuels and lubricants as potentially hazardous pollutants which would need to be removed from the wreck. However, the government informed the 1992 Fund that it was not considering removal of the cargo or the wreck.

The Omani authorities requested the 1992 Fund's support in dealing with the incident from the very early stages. The 1992 Fund has provided technical expertise and support with regard to the reasonableness of the operations undertaken so far. The 1992 Fund's Head of Claims Department/Technical Advisor and an external fisheries expert travelled to Oman in July 2013.

Applicability of the Conventions

Oman is Party to the 1992 CLC and the 1992 Fund Convention.

The tonnage of the *Nesa R3* was 856 GT. The limitation amount applicable under the 1992 CLC is therefore 4.51 million SDR.

The *Nesa R3* is owned by Welance Marine Inc of Charlestown, Saint Kitts and Nevis. The vessel was bareboat chartered to Cyrus Transportation located in the United Arab Emirates, which managed the technical and commercial operations and the crewing of the vessel to transport and deliver bitumen to the Cyrus Group bitumen depot in Muscat.

The *Nesa R3* carried less than 2 000 tonnes of persistent oil as cargo and as such was not required to maintain compulsory insurance under the 1992 CLC. The owner of the *Nesa R3* had nonetheless taken out insurance with the Indian Ocean Ship Owners Mutual P&I Club, based in Sri Lanka. However, as at October 2013, it had not been established if the shipowner's insurer had issued certificates (blue cards) for the vessel or if the tanker carried a 1992 CLC certificate. The insurer had also indicated that, in any case, the insurance policy of the *Nesa R3* would not apply in this case as the oil originated from Iran.

The Omani Government informed the 1992 Fund that it had contacted the owner and charterers through their legal representative in Oman and requested them to either establish a limitation fund or provide other types of financial guarantee to cover their obligations under the 1992 CLC and for the inspection and potential removal of the wreck and its cargo. As at October 2013, the vessel owner had not established any such fund or provided any other financial guarantee. The Omani authorities are pursuing measures to encourage the shipowner to establish a limitation fund or deposit a suitable guarantee at an appropriate level.

Investigation into the cause of the incident

Investigations into the cause of the incident were initiated by the competent authorities in Oman, the owner and by the ship's Flag State administration in Saint Kitts and Nevis. As at October 2013, these inquiries were still in progress.

Claims for compensation

Two claims for costs incurred by the two companies involved in the clean-up operations have been forwarded to the 1992 Fund by the Oman Ministry of Environment. The two claims amount to OMR 205 315 and OMR 101 939. The 1992 Fund is examining the claims.

Further claims are expected for clean-up operations as well as for economic damages to fisheries and tourism businesses. A claim for the costs of the survey of the wreck is also expected.

Since all the attempts made by the Omani authorities to obtain a financial commitment by the shipowner have been so far unsuccessful, there are strong indications that the shipowner will not meet his obligations under the 1992 CLC to pay compensation in full to persons suffering pollution damage arising out of the incident.

As a consequence, although as at October 2013 it is unknown whether the total amount of the admissible claims will fall below the limitation amount applicable to the *Nesa R3*, it is anticipated that the 1992 Fund will in any case be liable to pay compensation for this incident in accordance with Article 4.1 (b) of the 1992 Fund Convention.

At its October 2013 session, the 1992 Fund Executive Committee authorised the Director to make payments of compensation in respect of admissible losses arising out of the *Nesa R3* incident and to claim reimbursement from the shipowner.

Weathered bitumen stranded on a beach in Oman following the Nesa R3 incident.



1992 Fund: Summary of Incidents

Ship	Date of incident	Place of incident	Flag State of ship	Gross tonnage (GT)	
Incident in Germany	20.06.1996	North Sea coast, Germany	Unknown	Unknown	
<i>Nakhodka</i>	02.01.1997	Oki Islands, Japan	Russian Federation	13 159	
<i>Osung N°3</i>	03.04.1997	Tunggado, Republic of Korea	Republic of Korea	786	
Incident in United Kingdom	28.09.1997	Essex, United Kingdom	Unknown	Unknown	
<i>Santa Anna</i>	01.01.1998	Devon, United Kingdom	Panama	17 134	
<i>Milad 1</i>	05.03.1998	Bahrain	Belize	801	
<i>Mary Anne</i>	22.07.1999	Philippines	Philippines	465	
<i>Dolly</i>	05.11.1999	Martinique	Dominican Republic	289	
<i>Erika</i>	12.12.1999	Brittany, France	Malta	19 666	
<i>Al Jaziah 1</i>	24.01.2000	Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates	Honduras	681	
<i>Slops</i>	15.06.2000	Piraeus, Greece	Greece	10 815	
Incident in Spain	05.09.2000	Spain	Unknown	Unknown	
Incident in Sweden	23.09.2000	Sweden	Unknown	Unknown	
<i>Natuna Sea</i>	03.10.2000	Indonesia	Panama	51 095	
<i>Baltic Carrier</i>	29.03.2001	Denmark	Marshall Islands	23 235	
<i>Zeinab</i>	14.04.2001	United Arab Emirates	Georgia	2 178	
Incident in Guadeloupe	30.06.2002	Guadeloupe	Unknown	Unknown	
Incident in United Kingdom	29.09.2002	United Kingdom	Unknown	Unknown	
<i>Prestige</i>	13.11.2002	Spain	Bahamas	42 820	
<i>Spabunker IV</i>	21.01.2003	Spain	Spain	647	

* All Annual and Incident Reports dating back to 1978 are available on the Publications page of the IOPC Funds' website, www.iopcfunds.org.

** All costs borne by the Funds in this incident were divided in proportion to the respective liabilities of the 1971 and 1992 Funds (43.268% to the 1971 Fund and 56.732% to the 1992 Fund).

*** The liabilities in this incident were distributed between the 1971 Fund and 1992 Fund on a 50:50 basis.

	Limit of shipowner's liability under CLC	Cause of incident	Estimated quantity of oil spilled (tonnes)	Compensation paid by the 1992 Fund up to 31.12.13	Year last featured in Annual/Incident Report*
	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	€1 413 522	2007
	1 588 000 SDR	Breaking	6 200	¥10 389 169 285**	2002
	104 500 SDR	Grounding	Unknown	Nil	2001
	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Nil	2002
	10 196 280 SDR	Grounding	280	Nil	1999
	Unknown	Damage to hull	Unknown	BD21 168	1999
	3 million SDR	Sinking	Unknown	Nil	2002
	3 million SDR	Sinking	Unknown	€1 457 753	2007
	€12 843 484	Breaking	19 800	€116.9 million	2012
	3 million SDR	Sinking	100-200	US\$1 089 574*** Dhs 1 000 000	2010
	8.2 million SDR	Fire	1 000-2 500	€4 022 099	2008
	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Nil	2003
	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Nil	2006
	22 400 000 SDR	Grounding	7 000	Nil	2003
	DKr 118 million	Collision	2 500	Nil	2003
	3 million SDR	Sinking	400	US\$422 000*** Dhs 1 240 000	2004
	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Nil	2003
	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	£5 949	2003
	€22 777 986	Breaking	63 200	€120.6 million	2012
	3 million SDR	Sinking	Unknown	Nil	2003

Ship	Date of incident	Place of incident	Flag State of ship	Gross tonnage (GT)	
Incident in Bahrain	15.03.2003	Bahrain	Unknown	Unknown	
<i>Buyang</i>	22.04.2003	Geoje, Republic of Korea	Republic of Korea	187	
<i>Hana</i>	13.05.2003	Busan, Republic of Korea	Republic of Korea	196	
<i>Victoriya</i>	30.08.2003	Syzran, Russian Federation	Russian Federation	2 003	
<i>Duck Yang</i>	12.09.2003	Busan, Republic of Korea	Republic of Korea	149	
<i>Kyung Won</i>	12.09.2003	Namhae, Republic of Korea	Republic of Korea	144	
<i>Jeong Yang</i>	23.12.2003	Yeosu, Republic of Korea	Republic of Korea	4 061	
<i>N°11 Hae Woon</i>	22.07.2004	Geoje, Republic of Korea	Republic of Korea	110	
<i>N°7 Kwang Min</i>	24.11.2005	Busan, Republic of Korea	Republic of Korea	161	
<i>Solar 1</i>	11.08.2006	Guimaras Strait, Philippines	Philippines	998	
<i>Shosei Maru</i>	28.11.2006	Seto Inland Sea, Japan	Japan	153	
<i>Volgoneft 139</i>	11.11.2007	Strait of Kerch, between Russian Federation and Ukraine	Russian Federation	3 463	
<i>Hebei Spirit</i>	07.12.2007	Off Taean, Republic of Korea	China	146 848	
Incident in Argentina (<i>Presidente Illia</i>)	26.12.2007	Caleta Córdova, Argentina	Argentina	35 995	
<i>King Darwin</i>	27.09.2008	Port of Dalhousie, New Brunswick, Canada	Canada	42 010	
<i>Redfferm</i>	30.03.2009	Tin Can Island, Lagos, Nigeria	Nigeria	430	
<i>JS Amazing</i>	06.06.2009	Ijala, Warri River, Delta State, Nigeria	Nigeria	3 384	
<i>Haekup Pacific</i>	20.04.2010	Yeosu, Republic of Korea	Republic of Korea	1 087	
<i>Alfa I</i>	05.03.2012	Elefsis Bay, Piraeus, Greece	Greece	1 648	
<i>Nesa R3</i>	19.06.2013	Port Sultan Qaboos, Muscat, Sultanate of Oman	Saint Kitts and Nevis	856	


* All Annual and Incident Reports dating back to 1978 are available on the Publications page of the IOPC Funds' website, www.iopcfunds.org.

	Limit of shipowner's liability under CLC	Cause of incident	Estimated quantity of oil spilled (tonnes)	Compensation paid by the 1992 Fund up to 31.12.13	Year last featured in Annual/Incident Report*
	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	US\$153 654 BD 407 300	2006
	3 million SDR	Grounding	35-40	Nil	2004
	3 million SDR	Collision	34	Nil	2004
	3 million SDR	Fire	Unknown	Nil	2004
	3 million SDR	Sinking	300	Nil	2004
	3 million SDR	Stranding	100	KRW 3 328 451 732	2004
	4 510 000 SDR	Collision	700	Nil	2004
	4 510 000 SDR	Collision	12	Nil	2004
	4 510 000 SDR	Collision	37	KRW 2 044 694 541	2010
	4 510 000 SDR	Sinking	2 100	PHP 595 761 725 (STOPIA applicable)	2012
	4 510 000 SDR	Collision	60	¥161 064 193	2009
	4 510 000 SDR	Breaking	1 200-2 000	RUB 76 247 635	2012
	KRW 186.8 billion	Collision	10 900	Nil	2012
	24 067 845 SDR	Unknown	50-200	Nil	2012
	27 863 310 SDR	Discharge	64	Nil	2012
	4 510 000 SDR	Barge sinking	Unknown	Nil	2012
	4 510 000 SDR	Unknown	Unknown	Nil	2012
	4 510 000 SDR	Collision and subsequent sinking	0.02	Nil	2013
	4 510 000 SDR	Collision with submerged object	Unknown	Nil	2012
	4 510 000 SDR	Sinking	>250	Nil	2013

Vistabella

Date of incident	7 March 1991
Place of incident	Caribbean
Cause of incident	Sinking
Quantity of oil spilled (approximate)	Unknown
Area affected	Guadeloupe and the British Virgin Islands
Flag State of ship	Trinidad and Tobago
Gross tonnage	1 090 GRT
P&I insurer	Maritime General Insurance Company Limited
CLC limit	144 970 SDR (£135 562)
CLC + Fund limit	60 million SDR (£56 million)
Total compensation paid	€1.3 million (£1 million)

Conversion into Pounds sterling has been made on the basis of the exchange rate as at 31 December 2013.



Map data ©2011 Europa Technologies, Google, LeadDog Consulting

Incident

While being towed, the sea-going barge *Vistabella* (1 090 GRT), registered in Trinidad and Tobago, sank to a depth of over 600 metres, 15 miles south-east of Nevis. An unknown quantity of heavy fuel oil cargo was spilled as a result of the incident and the quantity that remained in the barge is not known. Strong winds and currents led the oil to spread and, as a result, a number of locations in the Caribbean were impacted, including Guadeloupe (France) and the British Virgin Islands (United Kingdom).

Applicability of the Conventions

At the time of the incident France and the United Kingdom were Parties to both the 1969 Civil Liability Convention (1969 CLC) and the 1971 Fund Convention and had extended the application to include the affected islands. The *Vistabella* was not entered in any P&I Club but was covered by third party liability insurance with a Trinidad insurance company. The insurer argued that the insurance did not cover this incident. The limitation amount applicable to the ship was estimated at FFr2 354 000 or €359 000. No limitation fund was established. It was considered unlikely that the shipowner would be able to meet his obligations under the 1969 CLC without effective insurance cover. The shipowner and his insurer did not respond to invitations to cooperate in the claims settlement process.

Claims for compensation

The 1971 Fund paid compensation amounting to some FFr8.2 million (€1.3 million) to the French Government in respect of clean-up operations. Compensation was paid to private claimants of the British Virgin Islands and to the UK Government for a total of £14 250.

Civil proceedings Guadeloupe

The French Government brought legal action against the owner of the *Vistabella* and his insurer in the Court of First Instance in Basse-Terre (Guadeloupe) claiming compensation for clean-up operations carried out by the French Navy. The 1971 Fund intervened in the proceedings and acquired by subrogation the French Government's claim. The French Government subsequently withdrew from the proceedings.

In a judgement rendered in 1996 the Court of First Instance accepted that, on the basis of subrogation, the 1971 Fund had a right of action against the shipowner and a right of direct action against his insurer and awarded the Fund the right to recover the total amount which it had paid for damage caused in the French territories. The insurer appealed against the judgement.

The Court of Appeal rendered its judgement in March 1998. The Court held that the 1969 CLC applied to the incident and that the Convention applied to the direct action by the 1971 Fund against the insurer, even though in this particular case the shipowner had not been obliged to take out insurance since the ship was carrying less than 2 000 tonnes of oil in bulk as cargo. The case was referred back to the Court of First Instance.

In a judgement rendered in March 2000, the Court of First Instance ordered the insurer to pay FFfr8.2 million or €1.3 million to the 1971 Fund plus interest. The insurer appealed against the judgement.

The Court of Appeal rendered its judgement in February 2004 in which it confirmed the judgement of the Court of First Instance of March 2000. As at October 2013 the insurer had not appealed to the Court of Cassation.

Trinidad and Tobago

In 2006, in consultation with the 1971 Fund's lawyers in Trinidad and Tobago, the 1971 Fund commenced summary proceedings against the insurer in Trinidad and Tobago to enforce the judgement of the Court of Appeal in Guadeloupe.

The 1971 Fund submitted an application for a summary execution of the judgement to the High Court in Trinidad and Tobago. The insurer filed defence pleadings opposing the execution of the judgement on the grounds that it was issued in application of the 1969 CLC to which Trinidad and Tobago was not a Party.

The 1971 Fund submitted a reply arguing that it was not requesting the Court to apply the 1969 CLC, but that it was seeking to enforce a foreign judgement under common law.

In March 2008, the Court delivered a judgement in the 1971 Fund's favour. The insurer appealed against this judgement in the Court of Appeal in Trinidad and Tobago, arguing that the enforcement of foreign judgements was contrary to public policy as the applicable French law was repugnant to the law of Trinidad and Tobago on four grounds, namely:

- a. it allowed for a direct action against the insurer and deprived the insurer of defences that would ordinarily be open to it under its contract of insurance with its insured;
- b. it imposed strict liability on the insurer without the possibility of mounting an effective defence;
- c. it overrode the contractual limitation on liability of TT\$3 000 000 (€380 000) which was expressed in the contract of insurance with its insured; and
- d. the application of French law was in breach of the legislative choice of law and jurisdiction as set out in the Insurance Act of Trinidad and Tobago and so violated the public policy as determined by Parliament.

In a judgement rendered in July 2012, the Court of Appeal dismissed the first three grounds of appeal but found that the fourth ground required further consideration. Noting that the Insurance Act of Trinidad and Tobago stated that 'Every policy issued in Trinidad and Tobago through a person or an office in Trinidad and Tobago shall, notwithstanding any agreement to the contrary, be governed by the laws of Trinidad and Tobago and shall be subject to the jurisdiction of the Courts of Trinidad and Tobago', the Judge held that this was an example of an overriding statute which laid down a mandatory rule as to the applicable law of the policy or contract of insurance and the relevant jurisdiction and this was to be regarded as laying down or crystallising a rule of public policy.

Noting further that insurance companies fulfilled an important role in the national financial and economic systems, the Judge stated that the State had an obvious interest in protecting and regulating those systems and that the Insurance Act of Trinidad and Tobago was designed to serve that interest. The Judge therefore held that it was contrary to public policy to apply to a policy of insurance issued in Trinidad and Tobago or through a person or an office in Trinidad and Tobago, a law other than the law of Trinidad and Tobago.

The 1971 Fund had argued that it was not sufficient to rely on one statutory provision to claim that foreign judgements were contrary to public policy when a direct action by an injured party against an insurer was a recognised concept under the domestic legislation of Trinidad and Tobago. Additionally, the 1971 Fund had argued that Trinidad and Tobago had acceded to

the 1992 Protocols to the 1969 CLC and 1971 Fund Convention which reflected a broad international consensus as to the appropriate manner in which to respond to the problems of oil spills which, by acceding to the Conventions, Trinidad and Tobago had chosen to support.

Noting that it was true that an example could be found in the Trinidad and Tobago domestic law which provided a direct action against the insurer and which limited the contractual defences it could raise, the Judge however concluded that it would be contrary to the rule of public policy found within the Insurance Act of Trinidad and Tobago to enforce a judgement pursuant to French law in which the French courts had assumed jurisdiction and applied French law.

Furthermore, the Judge noted that the 1992 Protocols to the Conventions had been acceded to several years after the insurance policy was issued and the sinking of the *Vistabella* which had given rise to the claim against the insurer. Moreover, the Judge noted that the Conventions had not been enacted into domestic law and the policy as laid down by the Insurance Act of Trinidad and Tobago therefore remained unchanged.

In these circumstances, the Judge therefore refused enforcement of the judgement of the Court of Appeal in Guadeloupe. In its judgement the Court argued that the Insurance Act of Trinidad and Tobago set out a rule of public policy that provided that a contract of insurance issued in that jurisdiction should be governed by the law of Trinidad and Tobago and be subject to the jurisdiction of the Courts of Trinidad and Tobago. The Court therefore concluded that to enforce a judgement under French law in which the French courts had assumed jurisdiction and applied French law would be contrary to public policy.

United Kingdom

The 1971 Fund was granted leave to appeal the judgement to the Privy Council. The 1971 Fund's lawyers filed a formal Notice of Appeal to the Privy Council in May 2013 and negotiated an agreed Statement of Facts and Issues with the insurer's lawyers. The 1971 Fund has applied for the first available date for a hearing before the Privy Council in England, which has been set for June 2014.

Recent developments

At its October 2013 session the 1971 Fund Administrative Council, with a view to deciding to dissolve the 1971 Fund at its October 2014 session, instructed the Director to resolve this outstanding case and to report to the Administrative Council at its next session.

Aegean Sea

Date of incident	3 December 1992
Place of incident	La Coruña, Spain
Cause of incident	Grounding
Quantity of oil spilled (approximate)	73 500 tonnes of crude oil
Area affected	North-west coast of Spain
Flag State of ship	Greece
Gross tonnage	57 801 GRT
P&I insurer	United Kingdom Mutual Steamship Assurance Association (Bermuda) Limited (UK Club)
CLC limit	Pts 1 121 219 450 or €6.7 million (£5.6 million)
CLC + Fund limit	60 million SDR or €57.2 million (£47.6 million)
Total compensation paid	Pts 9 000 million or €54 million (£45 million)

Conversion into Pounds sterling has been made on the basis of the exchange rate as at 31 December 2013.



Map data ©2012 Google, Tele Atlas

Incident

During heavy weather, the *Aegean Sea* (57 801 GRT) ran aground while approaching La Coruña harbour in the north-west of Spain. The ship, which was carrying approximately 80 000 tonnes of crude oil, broke in two and burnt fiercely for about 24 hours. The forward section sank some 50 metres from the coast. The stern section remained largely intact.

Impact

The quantity of oil spilled was not known, since most of the cargo was either dispersed in the sea or consumed by the fire on board the vessel, but it was estimated at some 73 500 tonnes. Several stretches of coastline east and north-east of La Coruña were contaminated, as well as the sheltered Ria de Ferrol.

Response operations

The oil remaining in the aft section of the *Aegean Sea* was removed by salvors working from the shore. Extensive clean-up operations were carried out at sea and on shore.

Applicability of the Conventions

The maximum amount of compensation payable in respect of the *Aegean Sea* incident under the 1969 Civil Liability Convention (1969 CLC) and the 1971 Fund Convention is 60 million SDR. When converted into pesetas using the rate applied for the conversion of the shipowner's limitation, the maximum amount of compensation payable is Pts 9 513 473 400 or €57.2 million.

Claims for compensation

Claims totalling Pts 48 187 million or €289.6 million were submitted before the criminal and civil courts. A large number of claims were settled out of court but many claimants pursued their claims in court.

Criminal proceedings

In a judgement rendered in 1997 the Criminal Court of Appeal in La Coruña held that the master of the *Aegean Sea* and the pilot were directly liable for the incident and that they were jointly and severally liable, each on a 50% basis, to compensate victims of the incident. It was also held that the UK Club and the 1971 Fund were directly liable for the damage caused by the incident and that this liability was joint and several. In addition, the Courts held that the owner of the *Aegean Sea* and the Spanish State were subsidiarily liable.

Civil proceedings

One claim by a fish pond owner, totalling €799 921, is still pending in the civil proceedings. The Court of First Instance issued a judgement in December 2005 ordering the Spanish Government and the 1971 Fund to pay €363 746 to the claimant. The Spanish Government and the 1971 Fund appealed against the judgement. The Court of Appeal returned the file to the Court of First Instance ordering that the proceedings be re-started also against the pilot, in order to correct an error by the Court of First Instance.

The Court of First Instance gave time to the claimant to pursue their claim against the pilot as decided by the Court of Appeal. However, the claimant decided not to continue the claim against the pilot. The Court of First Instance ordered that the proceedings continue only against the Fund, on the basis of technical defence called lack of *litis consortium*, ie the pilot was not a defendant in the proceedings and therefore the vicarious liability of the State could not come into effect.

In a judgement delivered in July 2012 the Court of First Instance decided to award the claimant the amount awarded in its prior decision in 2005, ie €363 746, but since the claimant had not included the pilot/Spanish Government in the proceedings, the 1971 Fund would only be liable in respect of 50% of the awarded amount, ie €181 873.

In accordance with the agreement with the Spanish Government, the 1971 Fund notified the Spanish Government of the above judgement and lodged an appeal.

In January 2013, at a meeting with the Director, the Spanish Government agreed that the Government would not object if the 1971 Fund tried to settle the claim with the remaining claimant. An initial discussion with the remaining claimant took place, however no agreement was possible.

In May 2013, the Court of Appeal (Audiencia Provincial) decided to hear the declarations of the experts acting on behalf of the parties. According to this decision the experts appeared before the Court in October 2013.

In a judgement delivered in October 2013, and corrected in November 2013, the Court of Appeal reduced the amount awarded to the claimant to €163 439 plus interest, of which the 1971 Fund would be liable for 50% plus interest and costs.

The Spanish State will, under the agreement with the 1971 Fund, pay any amounts awarded by the courts.

Global settlement

In June 2001, the 1971 Fund Administrative Council authorised the Director to conclude, on behalf of the 1971 Fund, an agreement with the Spanish State, the shipowner and the UK Club on a global solution to all outstanding issues in the *Aegean Sea* case.

On 30 October 2002 an agreement was concluded between the Spanish Government, the 1971 Fund, the shipowner and the UK Club whereby the total amount due to the victims from the owner of the *Aegean Sea*, the UK Club and the 1971 Fund as a result of the distribution of liabilities determined by the Court of Appeal in La Coruña amounted to Pts 9 000 million or €54 million. As a consequence of the agreement, the Spanish State undertook to compensate all the victims who might obtain a final judgement in their favour by a Spanish court, which condemned the shipowner, the UK Club or the 1971 Fund to pay compensation as a result of the incident. The 1971 Fund, in turn, also undertook to notify the Spanish State of any proceedings to which the Spanish State was not a party and not to accept the claims brought in the proceedings.

On 1 November 2002, pursuant to the agreement, the 1971 Fund paid €38 386 172 corresponding to Pts 6 386 921 613 to the Spanish Government.

Considerations

At its October 2013 session the 1971 Fund Administrative Council, with a view to deciding to dissolve the 1971 Fund at its October 2014 session, instructed the Director to continue his discussions with the Spanish Government in order to resolve this outstanding case and to report to the Administrative Council at its next session.

Iliad

Date of incident	9 October 1993
Place of incident	Pylos, Greece
Cause of incident	Grounding
Quantity of oil spilled (approximate)	287 tonnes of Syrian light crude oil
Area affected	Sfaktiria Island and vicinity
Flag State of ship	Greece
Gross tonnage	32 511 GRT
P&I insurer	North of England Protection and Indemnity Association Limited
CLC limit	DRS 1 496 533 000 or €4.4 million (£3.7 million)
CLC + Fund limit	60 million SDR (£56 million)
Total compensation paid	€1 105 344 (£919 587)

Conversion into Pounds sterling has been made on the basis of the exchange rate as at 31 December 2013.



Map data ©2011 Basarsoft, Google, Tele Atlas

Incident

On 9 October 1993, the Greek tanker *Iliad* (32 511 GRT) grounded on rocks close to Sfaktiria Island after leaving the port of Pylos (Greece), resulting in a spill of some 287 tonnes of Syrian light crude oil.

Response operations

The Greek national contingency plan was activated and the spill was cleaned up relatively rapidly.

Applicability of the Conventions

At the time of the incident Greece was Party to the 1969 Civil Liability Convention (1969 CLC) and the 1971 Fund Convention.

The *Iliad* was insured with the Newcastle P&I Club, which is now merged with the North of England P&I Club.

Claims for compensation

Claims for costs incurred in respect of clean up and preventive measures submitted by the Ministry of Merchant Marine, a clean-up contractor and the shipowner were settled and paid by the shipowner's insurer for a total of €1 105 344.

The majority of the claimants whose claims are still pending did not prove that they had suffered pollution damage due to the incident.

The table below summarises the claims situation as at October 2013.

Limitation proceedings

In March 1994, the shipowner's liability insurer established a limitation fund amounting to Drs 1 496 533 000 or €4 391 880 with the Court in Nafplion through the deposit of a bank guarantee. The Court decided that claims should be lodged by 20 January 1995. By that date, 527 claims had been presented in the limitation proceedings, totalling €10.8 million.

The Court appointed a liquidator to examine the claims in the limitation proceedings. The liquidator submitted his report to the Court in March 2006. In his report, the liquidator assessed the 527 claims at €2 217 755.34. A subrogated claim by the shipowner's insurer for €1.1 million in respect of amounts paid by it for claims related to clean up was accepted in full by the Court-appointed liquidator. The largest claim is that of a fish farm, totalling €3 million. However, the Court-appointed liquidator assessed the claim at €296 000.

Four hundred and forty-six claimants, including the shipowner and his insurer and the owner of the fish farm mentioned above, filed objections to the report and the assessed amounts.

The 1971 Fund also filed pleadings to the Court, referring to the criteria for the admissibility of claims for compensation under the 1969 CLC and the 1971 Fund Convention. The Fund, in its pleadings, argued that all claims except those submitted by the shipowner, his insurer and the owner of the fish farm were time-barred *vis-à-vis* the 1971 Fund.

The shipowner and his insurer had taken legal action against the 1971 Fund in order to prevent their rights to reimbursement from the Fund for any compensation payments in excess of the shipowner's limitation amount, and their rights to indemnification

under Article 5.1 of the 1971 Fund Convention, from becoming time-barred. The hearing of these proceedings is scheduled for December 2014.

The owner of the fish farm had initially interrupted the time bar period by taking legal action against the 1971 Fund. However, this action has now been abandoned and the claimant has decided to continue his action solely against the shipowner and his insurer in the limitation proceedings. As a consequence, it can be considered that this claim is now time-barred against the 1971 Fund.

Jurisdictional issues

In October 2007, the Court in Nafplion decided that it did not have jurisdiction in respect of the proceedings and referred the case to the Court of Kalamata as the court closest to the area where the incident took place. A number of claimants appealed against the decision. The 1971 Fund, following advice received from its Greek lawyer, joined in the appeal.

In April 2010, the Court of Kalamata decided that the Court of Nafplion had jurisdiction in respect of the limitation proceedings and that therefore these proceedings should be referred back to that Court.

Recent developments in the limitation proceedings

The shipowner and his insurer have filed objections in the limitation proceedings against the lodged claims. In July 2013 the shipowner and his insurer informed the 1971 Fund that all the claimants had been duly summoned to the limitation proceedings. At a hearing at the Court of Nafplion in November 2013 the proceedings were adjourned to December 2013. The 1971 Fund filed an intervention supporting the shipowner and his insurer's objections and disputing the claims in their entirety.

Claims submitted in the Limitation Court	Claimed amount (€)	Amount assessed by the Court-appointed liquidator (€)	Paid by shipowner's insurer (€)
Clean-up claims (settled)	1 105 502	1 105 344	1 105 344
Other claims (pending) – objections filed to the liquidator's report by claimants	8 739 527	1 030 541	0
Other claims (pending) – no objections filed to the liquidator's report by claimants	979 162	81 870	0
Total	10 824 191	2 217 755	1 105 344

Considerations

In the Director's view, all claims filed in the limitation proceedings against the 1971 Fund are time-barred, except for the claim from the shipowner and his insurer in respect of reimbursement for any compensation payments in excess of the shipowner's limitation amount and for indemnification under Article 5.1 of the 1971 Fund Convention.

Taking into account the total claimed amount approved by the liquidator (€2 217 755.34) and applicable interest, it seems unlikely that the final adjudicated amount will exceed the limitation sum of €4.4 million. Moreover, all claims other than the claim by the shipowner and his insurer may well be found to be time-barred by the Court. However, although the likelihood of the 1971 Fund having to pay compensation appears to be slim, 446 claimants have filed objections against the liquidator's report and as at October 2013 the total claimed amount of €10.8 million had not been assessed by the Court. The 1971 Fund will therefore continue monitoring the legal proceedings.

Recent developments

At its October 2013 session the 1971 Fund Administrative Council, with a view to deciding to dissolve the 1971 Fund at its October 2014 session, instructed the Director to continue his discussions with the North of England P&I Club, with the assistance of the International Group of P&I Associations, and to resolve this outstanding case and to report to the Administrative Council at its next session.

The port of Pylos.



Nissos Amorgos

Date of incident	28 February 1997
Place of incident	Maracaibo, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela
Cause of incident	Grounding
Quantity of oil spilled (approximate)	3 600 tonnes of crude oil
Area affected	Lake Maracaibo
Flag State of ship	Greece
Gross tonnage	50 563 GRT
P&I insurer	Assuranceföreningen Gard (Gard Club)
CLC limit	5 244 492 SDR (Bs3 473 million or BsF 3.5 million) (US\$7.3 million)
CLC + Fund limit	60 million SDR (Bs39 738 million or US\$83 221 800)
Total compensation paid	Bs288 476 394 (£27 700) and US\$24 397 612 (£14.7 million).
Legal proceedings	The <i>Nissos Amorgos</i> incident gave rise to both criminal and civil proceedings. The criminal proceedings refer not only to criminal liability, but also to civil liability arising from the criminal action. This is summarised in the table opposite.

Conversion into Pounds sterling has been made on the basis of the exchange rate as at 31 December 2013.^{<10>}



Map data ©2012 Europa Technologies, Google, INEGI, LeadDog Consulting.

Incident

On 28 February 1997, the Greek tanker *Nissos Amorgos* (50 563 GRT), carrying approximately 75 000 tonnes of Venezuelan crude oil, ran aground whilst passing through the Maracaibo Channel in the Gulf of Venezuela. Venezuelan authorities have maintained that the actual grounding occurred outside the Channel itself. An estimated 3 600 tonnes of crude oil were spilled. The incident has given rise to legal proceedings in a Criminal Court in Cabimas, civil courts in Caracas and Maracaibo, the Criminal Court of Appeal in Maracaibo and the Supreme Court.

Applicability of the Conventions

At the time of the incident the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela was Party to the 1969 Civil Liability Convention (1969 CLC) and the 1971 Fund Convention. In June 1997, the Cabimas Criminal Court held that the shipowner's liability was limited to Bs3 473 million and that the 1971 Fund's limit of liability was 60 million SDR (Bs39 738 million or US\$83 million). The shipowner provided to the Court a bank guarantee in the sum of Bs3 473 million. In 1997 the Court accepted the guarantee as establishing a limitation fund under Article V of the 1969 CLC.

^{<10>} In January 2008 the Bolívar Fuerte (BsF) replaced the Bolívar (Bs) at the rate of 1 BsF = 1000 Bs. Until December 2011 the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela used the term Bolívar Fuerte (BsF) to distinguish the new currency from the old currency or Bolívar (Bs). However, since the old currency was taken out of circulation in January 2012, the Venezuelan Central Bank decided that the use of the word 'Fuerte' was no longer necessary. Therefore, the name of the actual Venezuelan currency is now Bolívar (Bs). To avoid any confusion, we will continue to use the term Bolívar Fuerte (BsF) to distinguish the actual Venezuelan currency (from 2008) from the previous currency (pre 2008).

Liability	Issues/claimants	Claimed amount (US\$)	Defendants	1971 Fund's position	Status of proceedings
Criminal	Criminal liability of the master of the <i>Nissos Amorgos</i>	-	Master	-	Criminal Court of Appeal decided the criminal action against the master was time-barred
Civil	Claim by the Republic of Venezuela in criminal proceedings	60 million	Master, shipowner and Gard Club	The 1971 Fund is a notified third party and has intervened in the proceedings	The Supreme Court's (Criminal section) judgement accepted the Claim by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela in full. The 1971 Fund is not a defendant and has no liability to pay any amounts according to this judgement
Civil	Claim by the Republic of Venezuela in civil proceedings	60 million	Shipowner, Master and Gard Club.	The 1971 Fund was not notified of this action	No developments for several years. Duplication of the claim above, but not withdrawn
Civil	Three fish processors	30 million	1971 Fund and Instituto Nacional de Canalizaciones	Defendant	No developments for several years.

This decision was subsequently rendered null and void by the Maracaibo Criminal Court of First Instance in a judgement of February 2010. That judgement was subsequently upheld by the Maracaibo Criminal Court of Appeal in March 2011.

Claims for compensation

Settled and paid claims

In April 1997, the Gard Club and the 1971 Fund set up a claims handling office in Maracaibo. Between 1997 and 2002, claims received by the office were settled for a total of Bs288.5 million plus US\$24 397 612 and these amounts were paid to the claimants.

The table below summarises the settled claims, which have all been paid in full.

Outstanding claims

Three claims for compensation totalling US\$150.5 million, summarised in the table on page 80, are pending before the courts in Venezuela.

Detailed information regarding the three pending claims is given in the criminal and civil proceedings sections below.

Criminal proceedings

Criminal proceedings were brought against the master of the *Nissos Amorgos*. In his pleadings to the Criminal Court in Cabimas the master maintained that the damage was substantially caused by deficiencies in Lake Maracaibo's navigation channel, amounting to negligence imputable to the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

Claimant	Category of claim	Settled and paid amount (Bs)	Settled and paid amount (US\$)
Petroleos de Venezuela SA (PDVSA)	Clean up		8 364 223
Instituto para el Control y la Conservación de la Cuenca del Lago de Maracaibo (ICLAM)	Preventive measures	70 675 468	
Shrimp fishermen and processors	Loss of income		16 033 389
Others	Property damage and loss of income	217 800 926	
Total		288 476 394	24 397 612

Claimant	Category of claim	Claimed amount (US\$)	Court	Fund's position
Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela	Environmental damage	60 250 396	Supreme Court (Criminal section)	Time-barred and not admissible
Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela	Environmental damage	60 250 396	Supreme Court (Political administrative section)	Time-barred and not admissible
Three fish processors	Loss of income	30 000 000	Supreme Court (Political administrative section)	No loss proven
Total		150 500 792		

In a judgement rendered in May 2000, the Criminal Court dismissed the arguments made by the master and held him liable for the damage arising as a result of the incident and sentenced him to one year and four months in prison. The master appealed against the judgement before the Criminal Court of Appeal in Maracaibo.

In September 2000 the Criminal Court of Appeal decided not to consider the appeal but ordered the Criminal Court in Cabimas to send the file to the Supreme Court due to the fact that the Supreme Court was considering a request for ‘avocamiento’^{<11>}.

In August 2004 the Supreme Court decided to remit the file on the criminal action against the master to the Criminal Court of Appeal in Maracaibo.

In a judgement rendered in February 2005, the Criminal Court of Appeal in Maracaibo held that it had been proved that the master had incurred criminal liability due to negligence causing pollution damage to the environment. The Court decided, however, that, in accordance with Venezuelan procedural law, since more than four and a half years had passed since the date of the criminal act, the criminal action against the master was time-barred. In its judgement the Court stated that this decision was without prejudice to the civil liabilities which could arise from the criminal act dealt with in the judgement. In October 2006 the public prosecutor requested the Supreme Court (Constitutional section) to revise the judgement of the Criminal Court of Appeal on the grounds that the Court had not decided in respect of the claim for compensation submitted by the public prosecutor on behalf of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

In a judgement rendered in March 2007 the Supreme Court (Constitutional section) decided to annul the judgement of the Court of Appeal and send back the criminal file to the Court of Appeal where a different section would render a new judgement. In its judgement, the Supreme Court stated that the judgement of the Court of Appeal was unconstitutional since it had not decided on the claim for compensation submitted by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela that had been presented to obtain compensation for the Venezuelan State for the damage caused.

A different section of the Criminal Court of Appeal issued a new judgement in February 2008, confirming that the criminal action against the master was time-barred but preserving the civil action arising from the criminal act.

The developments concerning the civil action in the criminal proceedings, submitted by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela are detailed in the section on civil liability below.

Claim by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela in the criminal proceedings

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela presented a claim for environmental damage for US\$60 250 396 against the master, the shipowner and the Gard Club in the Criminal Court in Cabimas.

The claim was based on a report on the economic consequences of the pollution, written by a Venezuelan university, in which the amount of damage had been calculated by the use of theoretical models. Compensation was claimed for:

- damage to the communities of clams living in the inter-tidal zone affected by the spill (US\$37 301 942);
- the cost of restoring the quality of the water in the vicinity of the affected coasts (US\$5 000 000);

^{<11>} Under Venezuelan law, in exceptional circumstances, the Supreme Court may assume jurisdiction, ‘avocamiento’, and decide on the merits of a case. Such exceptional circumstances are defined as those which directly affect the ‘public interest and social order’ or where it is necessary to re-establish order in the judicial process because of the great importance of the case. If the request for ‘avocamiento’ is granted, the Supreme Court would act as a court of first instance and its judgement would be final.

- the cost of replacing sand removed from the beach during the clean-up operations (US\$1 000 000); and
- damage to the beach at a tourist resort (US\$16 948 454).

The 1971 Fund was notified of the criminal action and submitted pleadings in the proceedings. The progress of this action is detailed below.

In March 1999 the 1971 Fund, the shipowner and the Gard Club presented to the Court a report prepared by their experts on the various items of the claim by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela which concluded that the claim had no merit.

At the request of the shipowner, the Gard Club and the 1971 Fund, the Criminal Court appointed a panel of three experts to advise the Court on the technical merits of the claim presented by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela. In its report presented in July 1999, the panel unanimously agreed with the findings of the 1971 Fund's experts that the claim had no merit.

Judgement by the Criminal Court of Appeal in February 2008

In the February 2008 judgement the Criminal Court of Appeal decided to send the file to a Criminal Court of First Instance, where the claim submitted by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela would be decided.

Master's plea of lack of jurisdiction

The master submitted pleadings to the Criminal Court of First Instance in Maracaibo in which he argued that the Court did not have jurisdiction and that the case should be transferred to the Maritime Court in Caracas.

In March 2009 the Criminal Court of First Instance issued a decision rejecting the plea of lack of jurisdiction. This decision was notified to the master, but not to the shipowner and his insurer or the 1971 Fund.

The 1971 Fund submitted pleadings arguing that, by not notifying the 1971 Fund of the decision, the Court had denied the Fund a proper defence. In its pleadings the Fund also submitted its conclusions, as follows:

- The claims by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela were time-barred in respect of the 1971 Fund;
- All admissible claims for pollution damage had already been compensated by the Club and the Fund; and
- The claim by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela was not admissible under the 1969 CLC and 1971 Fund Convention and the alleged damage was not proved.

Judgement by the Criminal Court of First Instance in Maracaibo in February 2010

In February 2010, the Maracaibo Criminal Court of First Instance held that the master, the shipowner and the Gard Club had incurred a civil liability derived from the criminal action and ordered them to pay to the Venezuelan State BsF 29 220 620 (US\$60 million) plus indexation, interests and costs. In its judgement the Court denied the shipowner the right to limit his liability, stating that the Criminal Court of Cabimas had been wrong in its decision delivered in 1997 since, at that time, it was not certain that a criminal offence had been committed and the damage had not been quantified.

In its judgement, the Maracaibo Criminal Court of First Instance also stated that the 1971 Fund had a responsibility, as provided in Articles 2 and 4 of the 1971 Fund Convention, to intervene in those cases in which the compensation available under the 1969 CLC was insufficient. It was also ordered in the judgement that the 1971 Fund be notified.

The master, the shipowner and the Gard Club and the 1971 Fund appealed against the judgement.

Judgement by the Maracaibo Criminal Court of Appeal in March 2011

In March 2011, the Maracaibo Criminal Court of Appeal upheld the judgement of the Maracaibo Criminal Court of First Instance and dismissed the appeals by the master, the shipowner, the Gard Club and the submission by the 1971 Fund. In its judgement the Maracaibo Criminal Court of Appeal dealt mainly with the issues set out below.

The master, shipowner and the Gard Club appealed to the Supreme Court requesting again that the Court recognise the shipowner's right to limit his liability

Shipowner's limitation of liability

In its appeal, the master, shipowner and the Gard Club had requested that the Court recognise the shipowner's right to limit its liability, as set out in Article V, paragraph 1 of the 1969 CLC.

In its judgement, the Maracaibo Criminal Court of Appeal upheld the judgement of the Maracaibo Criminal Court of First Instance, stating that the Criminal Court of Cabimas was not a suitable forum for admitting a liability limitation fund since, at that time, it was not certain that a criminal offence had been committed and the damage had not been quantified. The judgement rejected the shipowner's request to limit its liability but decided that it would be for the shipowner and his insurer to obtain reimbursement of the amount paid in compensation to the Venezuelan State from the 1971 Fund.

Time bar

In its appeal, the 1971 Fund pointed out that, under Article 6.1 of the 1971 Fund Convention, rights to compensation became time-barred unless an action had been brought under Article 4, or a notification made pursuant to Article 7.6, within three years of the date when the damage occurred but that in no case should an action be brought after six years from the date of the incident. The 1971 Fund further pointed out that no action had been brought against the 1971 Fund within six years and that the claim by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela was, therefore, time-barred.

The Maracaibo Criminal Court of Appeal dismissed this argument on the grounds that the 1971 Fund had been given notice within three years of the date when the damage occurred. The Court also pointed out that the lawyers of the 1971 Fund had attended hearings of the Criminal Court of Cabimas in 1997 and that it had been in a position to effectively intervene throughout the entire proceedings.

Implementation of the Conventions

The 1971 Fund appealed the judgement of the Maracaibo Criminal Court of First Instance on the grounds that those persons and organisations (private individuals, companies and State organisations) who had suffered a loss as a result of the pollution had been compensated for their losses by the Gard Club and the 1971 Fund. The Venezuelan State itself did not have an admissible claim since it had not suffered any loss and was not, therefore, entitled to compensation as claimed and as awarded by the Criminal Court of First Instance in Maracaibo. The 1971 Fund also appealed on the grounds that the amounts of compensation paid to victims had not been taken into consideration.

In its judgement, the Maracaibo Criminal Court of Appeal pointed out that the Maracaibo Criminal Court of First Instance had differentiated between 'direct' and 'indirect' victims, as established by the Environmental Criminal Law of Venezuela (Ley Penal del Ambiente), which provided that the Venezuelan State was the direct victim whereas those natural or corporate persons affected by the pollution were indirect victims. The Court stated that the Venezuelan State, as a direct victim, should be compensated for the

environmental damage caused without making any pronouncement with respect to the indirect victims, since their claims had already been satisfied.

Award of compensation to Instituto para el Control y la Conservación de la Cuenca del Lago de Maracaibo (ICLAM)

In 1998, ICLAM, a Venezuelan State organisation responsible for monitoring and environmental control of Lake Maracaibo, submitted a claim in court for the cost incurred in carrying out a programme of water, sediment and marine animal life inspection, sampling and testing following the spill. The claim was assessed by the Gard Club and 1971 Fund at Bs70 675 467 and that amount was paid by the 1971 Fund. Following payment of the claim, ICLAM withdrew their claim from court and in 2005 the court confirmed ('homologación') the withdrawal.

Notwithstanding the payment made to ICLAM by the 1971 Fund and the subsequent withdrawal of its claim from the Court, the Maracaibo Criminal Court condemned the master, shipowner and Gard Club to pay Bs57.7 million. The 1971 Fund appealed on the grounds that ICLAM had already been compensated.

The Maracaibo Criminal Court of Appeal rejected this appeal stating that a certain amount of money should be paid for the systematic monitoring of the affected area as, even though it was for the same purpose (as the payments made by the 1971 Fund), it was not for the same item, since one sum was paid in a transaction made in civil proceedings and the other for estimated court costs relating to the reparation of damages arising from the committing of a criminal offence.

The calculation of losses

The 1971 Fund appealed on the grounds that the method of calculation of losses was not applicable under the 1969 CLC and 1971 Fund Convention in that, even if changes in the ecology of the area had occurred, it had not been demonstrated that these were due to the spill and that an abstract mathematical formula had been used in the calculation of the amount claimed and awarded.

The 1971 Fund Administrative Council discussing developments in the Nissos Amorgos case in October 2013.



The Maracaibo Criminal Court of Appeal stated that this argument constituted a strategy to transfer the civil proceedings derived from a criminal offence to one of purely maritime scope ignoring the pre-eminence of criminal law and the civil proceedings which arose from the establishment of criminal liability as a result of the committing of a crime.

The Maracaibo Criminal Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal on the grounds that the 1971 Fund should have indicated at the right time its disagreement with the methodology employed by the experts in whose report the amount of the alleged loss had been calculated. It should, however, be noted that the report submitted by the Public Prosecutor had been contested at the time by the 1971 Fund when the Fund had presented its expert's report at the Criminal Court in Cabimas.

The failure to examine the evidence submitted by the 1971 Fund

The 1971 Fund additionally appealed on the grounds that the Maracaibo Criminal Court of First Instance had not examined the evidence submitted by the defendants and the 1971 Fund but had taken into account only the experts' report submitted by the Public Prosecutor in 1997.

The Maracaibo Criminal Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal on the grounds that the Maracaibo Criminal Court of First Instance had examined all the elements on the record and that the judgement was in keeping with the law.

Judgement by the Supreme Court (Criminal section) in May 2013

In May 2013 the Supreme Court (Criminal section) upheld the judgement of the Maracaibo Criminal Court of Appeal and the Maracaibo Criminal Court of First Instance, dismissing the appeals by the master, the shipowner, the Gard Club and the 1971 Fund. This judgement is now final.

Civil proceedings Claim by the Republic of Venezuela in the civil proceedings

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela has also presented a claim against the shipowner, the master of the *Nissos Amorgos* and the Gard Club before the Civil Court of Caracas for an estimated amount of US\$20 million, later increased to US\$60 250 396. The 1971 Fund has not been notified of this civil action.

The two claims presented by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela were duplications since they were based on the same university report and relate to the same items of damage. The Procuraduria General de la Republica (Attorney General) admitted this duplication in a note submitted to the 1971 Fund's Venezuelan lawyers in August 2001.

Considerations by the 1971 Fund Administrative Council on the claims by the Republic of Venezuela

At the 1971 Fund Administrative Council's eighth session held in June 2001, the Venezuelan delegation stated that the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela had decided to withdraw its claim that had been presented in the Civil Court of Caracas and that the withdrawal would take place as soon as the necessary documents had been signed by the shipowner and his insurer. It was stated that the withdrawal of that claim had been decided for the purpose of contributing to the resolution of the *Nissos Amorgos* case and to assist the victims, especially the fishermen, who had suffered and were still suffering the economic consequences of the incident. As at October 2013, this claim had not been withdrawn.

In July 2003, the 1971 Fund Administrative Council recalled the position taken by the governing bodies of the 1971 and 1992 Funds as regards the admissibility of claims relating to damage to the environment. In particular it was recalled that the IOPC Funds had consistently taken the view that claims for compensation for damage to the marine environment calculated on the basis of theoretical models were not admissible, that compensation could be granted only if a claimant had suffered a quantifiable economic loss and that damages of a punitive nature were not admissible. The 1971 Fund Administrative Council considered that the claims by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela did not relate to pollution damage falling within the scope of the 1969 CLC and the 1971 Fund Convention and that these claims should therefore be treated as not admissible.

The 1971 Fund Administrative Council noted that the two claims presented by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela were duplications and that the Procuraduria General de la Republica (Attorney General) had accepted that this duplication existed, as stated above.

At its October 2005 session the 1971 Fund Administrative Council endorsed the Director's view that the claims by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela were time-barred in respect of the 1971 Fund since Article 6.1 of the 1971 Fund Convention requires that, in order to prevent a claim from becoming time-barred in respect of the 1971 Fund, a legal action has to be brought against the Fund within six years of the date of the incident and no legal action had been brought against the 1971 Fund by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela within the six-year period, which expired in February 2003.

Claims by fish processors

Three fish processors presented claims totalling US\$30 million in the Supreme Court against the 1971 Fund and the Instituto Nacional de Canalizaciones. The claims were presented in the Supreme Court because one of the defendants is an agency of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela and, under Venezuelan law, claims against the Republic have to be presented before the Supreme Court.

In November 2002, the Supreme Court decided to consolidate all civil claims pending in relation to the *Nissos Amorgos* incident. Therefore the civil claim by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela is now in the Supreme Court (Political administrative section), together with the claims by the three fish processors. The Supreme Court will act as a Court of First Instance and its judgement will be final.

In August 2003 the 1971 Fund submitted pleadings to the Supreme Court arguing that, as the claimants had submitted and subsequently renounced claims in the Criminal Court in Cabimas and the Civil Court in Caracas against the master, the shipowner and the Gard Club for the same damage, they had implicitly renounced any claim against the 1971 Fund. The 1971 Fund also argued that not only had the claimants failed to demonstrate the extent of their loss, but the evidence they had submitted indicated that the cause of any loss was not related to the pollution. As at October 2013 there had been no developments in respect of these claims.

At its October 2013 session the 1971 Fund Administrative Council decided that since the loss of income had not been proven the 1971 Fund should not pay compensation in respect of this claim.

Other issues

Meetings with the Gard Club and the International Group of P&I Associations in 2013

A meeting took place with the Gard Club in Arendal, Norway in June 2013, between the Chief Legal Counsel and the Head of Claims from the Gard Club, Mr Alfred Popp, Chairman of the Consultation Group on the winding up of the 1971 Fund, Mr Gaute Sivertsen, Chairman of the 1992 Fund Assembly who had kindly facilitated the arrangement of the meeting, and the Director of the IOPC Funds on behalf of the 1971 Fund.

During the meeting it was mentioned that the Club would look to the Fund for reimbursement of any sum above the limitation amount. The Director stated, however, that the 1971 Fund could only pay compensation arising from a legal obligation and, in this case, the judgement by the Supreme Court of Venezuela had not ordered the 1971 Fund to pay compensation.

A further meeting with the International Group of P&I Associations, the Gard Club, the Chairman of the Consultation Group and the Director took place in September 2013. The parties did not reach an agreement, however, all parties considered that it was important to continue the discussions.

Considerations

Considerations by the 1971 Fund Administrative Council in October 2013

Statement by the International Group of P&I Associations

At the October 2013 session of the 1971 Fund Administrative Council the International Group of P&I Associations (International Group) stated that the first consequence of the judgement of the Supreme Court was that steps were being taken to draw down on the limitation fund guarantee and that in its judgement, the Maracaibo Criminal Appeal Court had stated that the bank guarantee provided by the Club did not constitute a limitation fund but a simple security for the claim by the Venezuelan State, and that the judgement could therefore be enforced against it. In the view of the Gard Club the Court had wrongly appropriated a properly constituted limitation fund in favour of one party alone, to the exclusion of other parties with claims against it. The International Group stated that execution proceedings were in progress to satisfy the judgement and it appeared that account would not be taken of the Club having already paid claims up to the limitation amount, those claims having been paid by the Club according to the practice agreed between the Club and the Fund and that as a result, it was likely the Club would have to bear at least twice the limitation amount and would therefore be faced with having paid over the CLC limit through no fault of the Club. It was also stated that this was exactly one of the scenarios that this delegation had been explaining to States in the context of the interim payments debate in the 1992 Fund sixth intersessional Working Group.

The International Group also stated that in its view the ruling in Venezuela could have no bearing on the accounting position between the Club and the Fund since there had never been any dispute between the Club and the Fund that the shipowner is entitled to limit liability.

The International Group also stated that another possible consequence of the judgement of the Supreme Court was that the Court might look to the shipowner and the Club to satisfy the remainder of the judgement and that if this were to happen the Club would seek reimbursement from the Fund for the sum in excess of the shipowner's limitation amount. Reference was made to the fact that the judgement of the Venezuelan Criminal Court in 2010, upheld by both the Criminal Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court, had stated that the Fund was legally liable to pay.

Director's considerations

The Director sympathises with the situation in which the Gard Club finds itself. In 1997, the Criminal Court in Cabimas held that the shipowner's liability was limited to some US\$7.3 million. Now, fourteen years later, this decision has been overturned and the shipowner has been denied the right to limit his liability. In the Director's view, this decision by the Venezuelan Courts is wrong since there are no grounds to hold that the shipowner is not entitled to limit his liability.

The judgement by the Court of First Instance, confirmed by the Court of Appeal and Supreme Court, rejected the shipowner's request to limit his liability and stated that it would be for the shipowner and his insurer to obtain reimbursement of the amount paid in compensation to the Venezuelan State from the 1971 Fund. However, the judgement by the Venezuelan Courts is not against the 1971 Fund.

The Director considers that it would be very difficult for the 1971 Fund to agree to pay compensation in excess of the shipowner's limitation amount since the judgement is not against the 1971 Fund. In the Director's view, the 1971 Fund can only pay compensation based on a legal obligation to do so and, in this case, a legal obligation does not exist.

1971 Fund Administrative Council decisions

The 1971 Fund Administrative Council, whilst expressing sympathy for the shipowner and the Club in this case, decided that the 1971 Fund should not reimburse the Club of any payments made as a consequence of the Supreme Court judgement (Criminal section) in respect of the claim by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

The 1971 Fund Administrative Council also decided:

- a. with respect to the *Nissos Amorgos* incident, to continue discussions with the Gard Club relating to the accounting position in respect of joint costs and to report to the Administrative Council at its next session;
- b. that the 1971 Fund had no legal obligation to reimburse the Gard Club any amounts paid as a consequence of the judgement by the Supreme Court of Venezuela, as already decided by the 1971 Fund Administrative Council in respect of the *Nissos Amorgos* incident;
- c. that the claim submitted by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela before the Supreme Court (Political administrative

section) in respect of the *Nissos Amorgos* incident was time-barred in respect of the 1971 Fund and not admissible for compensation, and instructed the Director not to pay any compensation or reimbursement in respect of this claim and to discontinue the defence of the 1971 Fund before the courts; and

- d. that the claim submitted by three fish processors before the Supreme Court (Political administrative section) for loss of income in respect of the *Nissos Amorgos* incident had not been proven, and instructed the Director not to pay any compensation in respect of this claim and to discontinue the defence of the 1971 Fund before the courts.

Recent developments

In accordance with the decisions taken by the 1971 Fund Administrative Council at the October 2013 session, the 1971 Fund has discontinued its defence in the legal proceedings in relation with this case in Venezuela.

Timeline of key events following the *Nissos Amorgos* incident




Plate Princess

Date of incident	27 May 1997
Place of incident	Puerto Miranda, Lake Maracaibo, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela
Cause of incident	Leakage of crude oil cargo into ballast during loading operation
Quantity of oil spilled (approximate)	3.2 tonnes of crude oil
Area affected	Unknown
Flag State of ship	Malta
Gross tonnage	30 423 GRT
P&I insurer	The Standard Steamship Owner's Protection & Indemnity Association (Bermuda) Ltd (the Standard Club)
CLC limit	3.6 million SDR or BsF 2 844 983 (£273 000)
CLC + Fund limit	60 million SDR or BsF 403 473 005 (£39 million)
Total compensation paid	None

Conversion into Pounds sterling has been made on the basis of the exchange rate as at 31 December 2013.^{<12>}



Map data ©2012 Europa Technologies, Google, INEGI, LeadDog Consulting, MapLink

Incident

On 27 May 1997, the *Plate Princess* spilled some 3.2 tonnes of crude oil, contained within 8 000 tonnes of ballast water, whilst loading cargo at an oil terminal in Puerto Miranda (Venezuela). A report from a Maraven/Lagoven helicopter over-flight less than three hours after the spill had been detected on the vessel stated that no oil was seen at or near the terminal.

An expert from the International Tanker Owners Pollution Federation Ltd (ITOPF) attended the site on 7 June 1997, 11 days after the spill, on behalf of the 1971 Fund and the Standard Club. The expert informed the 1971 Fund that there were no signs of oil pollution in the immediate vicinity of where the *Plate Princess* had been berthed at the time of the incident.

Impact

The ITOPF expert was informed that oil was observed drifting towards the north-west, in the direction of a small stand of mangroves approximately one kilometre away. Oil was observed coming ashore in an area that was uninhabited.

Response operations

No clean-up work was carried out and it is understood that no fishery or other economic resources were known to have been contaminated.

^{<12>} In January 2008 the Bolívar Fuerte (BsF) replaced the Bolívar (Bs) at the rate of 1 BsF = 1000 Bs. Until December 2011 the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela used the term Bolívar Fuerte (BsF) to distinguish the new currency from the old currency or Bolívar (Bs). However, since the old currency was taken out of circulation in January 2012, the Venezuelan Central Bank decided that the use of the word 'Fuerte' was no longer necessary. Therefore, the name of the actual Venezuelan currency is now Bolívar (Bs). To avoid any confusion, we will continue to use the term Bolívar Fuerte (BsF) to distinguish the actual Venezuelan currency (from 2008) from the previous currency (pre 2008).

At the time of the incident, and for several years afterwards, the 1971 Fund had a claims-handling office open in Maracaibo, not far from the allegedly affected area, dealing with claims arising out of the *Nissos Amorgos* incident. Throughout that time, the staff of the office had extensive contact with the local fishermen and their union representatives. At no time were the staff of the claims-handling office or the 1971 Fund informed that extensive, or indeed any, losses had been suffered by the fishermen as a result of the spill from the *Plate Princess*.

Applicability of the Conventions

At the time of the incident Venezuela was Party to the 1969 Civil Liability Convention (1969 CLC) and the 1971 Fund Convention. In June 1997, the 1971 Fund Executive Committee considered that if it were confirmed that the spilled oil was the same Lagotrecro crude oil as was being loaded on to the *Plate Princess*, then it would appear that the oil, which apparently escaped into the ballast tanks via a defective coupling in the ballast line, had first been loaded into the cargo tanks. The Executive Committee took the view that the incident would in principle, therefore fall within the scope of the Conventions, as the oil was carried on board as cargo.

Claims for compensation

In June 1997, two fishermen's trade unions, namely FETRAPESCA and the Sindicato Unico de Pescadores de Puerto Miranda (Puerto Miranda Union), presented claims in the Civil Court of Caracas against the shipowner and the master of the *Plate Princess* for estimated amounts of US\$10 million and US\$20 million respectively. Neither claim provided details of the losses covered. The claimed amounts were described in both claims as being included for procedural purposes, solely to comply with the requirements of Venezuelan legislation.

In their claims, both FETRAPESCA and the Puerto Miranda Union requested the Court to officially notify the Director of the 1971 Fund of the action in court. No such notification was made at that time and there were no developments in respect of these claims between 1997 and 2005. In view of the passage of time and the lack of developments, the 1971 Fund instructed its Caracas lawyers to close their file.

Limitation proceedings

The limitation amount applicable to the *Plate Princess* under the 1969 CLC was estimated in 1998 to be 3.6 million SDR or Bs 2 845 million.

In 1997, a bank guarantee for this amount was provided to the Criminal Court of Cabimas. In a judgement delivered in February 2009, the Maritime Court of First Instance in Caracas decided that the shipowner was entitled to limit his liability under the 1969 CLC to the amount of BsF 2.8 million, being the amount of the bank guarantee provided. This judgement was upheld

by the Maritime Court of Appeal in September 2009 and the Venezuelan Supreme Court in 2010.

Civil proceedings Claims by FETRAPESCA

In June 1997, FETRAPESCA presented a claim in the Criminal Court of Cabimas on behalf of 1 692 fishing boat owners, claiming an estimated US\$10 060 per boat, ie a total of US\$17 million. The claim was for alleged damage to fishing boats and nets and for loss of earnings. As at October 2013, there had been no developments on this claim.

In June 1997, FETRAPESCA also presented a claim against the shipowner and the master of the *Plate Princess* before the Civil Court of Caracas for an estimated amount of US\$10 million. The claim was for the fishermen's loss of income as a result of the spill.

There were no developments in respect of this claim between 1997 and October 2005, when the 1971 Fund was formally notified through diplomatic channels of the claim presented in the Civil Court in Caracas. No information was provided with the notification as to the nature or extent of the losses alleged.

In view of the notification received, the 1971 Fund Administrative Council reviewed the details of the incident at its May 2006 session, ie nine years after the incident took place. Whilst expressing sympathy to the victims of the incident and regretting that the time bar provisions had worked to their detriment, the Administrative Council stated that it was necessary to adhere to the text of the Conventions and decided that the claim by FETRAPESCA was time-barred in respect of the 1971 Fund.

In December 2006, the claim was transferred to the Maritime Court in Caracas.

In July 2008, the shipowner and the master of the *Plate Princess* requested the Maritime Court of Caracas to declare that the claim by FETRAPESCA had lapsed (*perención de instancia*) since the plaintiffs had not taken steps to duly pursue their claim in court. In a decision published later that month, the Court decided that the claim had not lapsed. The shipowner and the master appealed against this decision but, in October 2008 the Maritime Court of Appeal upheld the judgement of the Maritime Court of Caracas.

First Instance judgement in respect of claim by FETRAPESCA

In February 2009, the Maritime Court of First Instance accepted the claim by FETRAPESCA against the shipowner and the master of the *Plate Princess* even though no documentation had been provided in support of the claim and the losses had not been quantified. The Court ordered the payment of the damages suffered by the claimant, to be quantified by court experts.

In October 2011 FETRAPESCA requested the withdrawal of its claim from the Maritime Court of First Instance (first request to withdraw the claim). The Court however rejected FETRAPESCA's request.

In September 2012, the 1971 Fund was formally notified for the first time of the judgement. The judgement comprised two documents. The first document contained the decision imposing liability on the shipowner and master and requested the 1971 Fund to be notified of this decision. It also stated that the quantum of compensation would be assessed by court experts to be appointed at a later date. The second document, which also formed part of the judgement, contained a decision which condemned the 1971 Fund to pay compensation to the claimants in excess of the shipowner's liability.

In October 2012, the 1971 Fund filed an appeal against the February 2009 judgement.

Also in October 2012, FETRAPESCA filed an application to withdraw its claim (second request to withdraw the claim). This application again was refused by the Court.

Claim by the Puerto Miranda Union

In June 1997, the Puerto Miranda Union presented a claim in the Civil Court of Caracas against the shipowner and the master of the *Plate Princess* for an estimated amount of US\$20 million.

There were no developments in respect of this claim between 1997 and October 2005, when the 1971 Fund was formally notified through diplomatic channels of the claim presented by Puerto Miranda Union. No information was provided with the notification as to the nature or extent of the losses alleged.

As with the claim by FETRAPESCA, the 1971 Fund Administrative Council decided in May 2006 that the claim by the Puerto Miranda Union was time-barred in respect of the 1971 Fund, according to the 1971 Fund Convention, since the Puerto Miranda Union had not taken legal action against the 1971 Fund nor had it notified the Fund within the time period provided in the Convention of its legal action against the shipowner.

In December 2006, the claim was transferred to the Maritime Court of First Instance, also in Caracas.

Amendment of Puerto Miranda Union claim

In April 2008 the Puerto Miranda Union submitted an amended claim against the master and the shipowner. The 1971 Fund was not named as a defendant. The lawyers representing the claimants in connection with the amended claim were not those who had been involved in the formulation of the original claim. At that time there were a number of submissions by the lawyers acting for the Puerto Miranda Union attempting to notify the shipowner and master.

The amended claim set out in detail the nature, extent and quantification of the losses alleged. The claim was for the cost of cleaning 849 boats and replacing some 7 814 packs of nets and two outboard motors. The nets were alleged to have been contaminated by oil to the extent that they were no longer usable. The claimant also alleged that the owners of the 849 boats and 304 foot-fishermen had suffered a total loss of income for a period of 187 calendar days (six months) as a result of being unable to fish because of a lack of equipment. The amended claim was for BsF 53.5 million. The Maritime Court of First Instance of Caracas accepted the amended claim on 10 April 2008.

The amended claim made reference to a large number of documents submitted as evidence of the alleged loss and damage. Without access to these documents it was not possible for the 1971 Fund to review the claim. Through its Caracas lawyers, the 1971 Fund requested that the Court provide copies of the documents submitted by the claimants. However, the number of documents involved was such that it was beyond the capacity of the Court to copy them and the Court put the work in the hands of an outside contractor.

Venezuelan legislation provides time limits for the submission of a defence and, to comply with these requirements, the 1971 Fund was forced to submit defence pleadings on 12 June 2008, despite not having received the copies of the documents submitted by the claimants. The defence submitted by the 1971 Fund stated that the claim was time-barred in respect of the 1971 Fund.

Tankers loading crude oil in Lake Maracaibo



On 4 August 2008 copies of the documents (16 bundles in total) were received by the 1971 Fund. The 1971 Fund appointed experts to examine the claim and the supporting documents. On the basis of the report issued by its experts, the 1971 Fund submitted further pleadings in November 2008. In these pleadings the 1971 Fund argued that the documentation provided by the claimants did not demonstrate that damage allegedly suffered by the fishermen had been caused by the spill from the *Plate Princess* and that the documentation provided in support of the claim was of doubtful accuracy and had in many instances been falsified. The 1971 Fund also requested that the report by its experts be accepted as evidence. The Court rejected the request on the grounds that the report had not been submitted within the time limit provided by Venezuelan law. The 1971 Fund appealed against this decision on the grounds that the time limit was not sufficient for the Court to provide copies of the documentation and for the Fund's experts to review them. The appeal was rejected.

Hearing in respect of the claim by the Puerto Miranda Union

In January 2009 the hearing in connection with the revised claim took place. At the hearing, verbal evidence was provided by a number of witnesses who were called by the plaintiffs to verify documents submitted as evidence with the amended claim and, in particular, receipts provided to support quantities of fish caught and prices of fish sold. During the hearing, the witnesses accepted that the receipts, which were dated February 1997, were not genuine and had in fact been created after the spill. The majority of witnesses nominated by the plaintiffs in their pleadings to support documents submitted in evidence did not appear at the hearing. This prevented the master, shipowner and 1971 Fund from either challenging or obtaining confirmation of that evidence.

Court decisions on liability

First Instance judgement in respect of claim by the Puerto Miranda Union

In February 2009, the Maritime Court of First Instance issued its judgement in which it accepted the claim and ordered the master, shipowner and 1971 Fund, although not a defendant, to pay the damages suffered by the claimant, to be quantified by court experts. The Venezuelan Court, in its interpretation of the Conventions, assumes that the 1971 Fund, having been notified, is obliged automatically to pay compensation. The master, the shipowner and the 1971 Fund appealed against the judgement to the Maritime Court of Appeal.

Judgement by the Maritime Court of Appeal in respect of the claim by the Puerto Miranda Union

In September 2009, the Maritime Court of Appeal of Caracas dismissed the appeal by the master, shipowner and 1971 Fund and ordered the defendants to pay compensation to the fishermen affected by the oil spill, to be quantified by three court experts to be appointed. The method to be followed by the experts was set out in detail in the judgement. The method was based on data obtained from the receipts presented by the claimants to support their losses. The judgement also ordered the defendants to pay interest and costs. The master, the shipowner and the 1971 Fund appealed against the judgement to the Supreme Tribunal ^{<13>}.

Judgement by the Supreme Tribunal

In October 2010, the Supreme Tribunal rendered its judgement, rejecting the 1971 Fund's appeal and confirming the judgement of the Maritime Court of Appeal. Of the five judges comprising the Supreme Tribunal, four voted to reject the appeal and one abstained. The Supreme Tribunal judgement confirmed the decision that the losses should be determined by three court experts to be appointed.

Appeal to the Constitutional Section of the Supreme Tribunal

In February 2011, the 1971 Fund submitted an appeal to the Constitutional Section of the Supreme Tribunal. In its appeal the 1971 Fund requested that the decisions of the Supreme Tribunal and the Maritime Court of Appeal be overturned on the grounds that they contravened the applicable Venezuelan Law, principles and constitutional doctrine with regards to the time bar of the action against the 1971 Fund, the time bar due to the claim lapsing for lack of prosecution and the evaluation of the evidence.

Judgement of the Constitutional Section of the Supreme Tribunal

In June 2011, the Constitutional Section of the Supreme Tribunal dismissed the 1971 Fund's appeal against the judgement of the Supreme Tribunal on liability.

The issues dealt with in the judgement of the Constitutional Section of the Supreme Tribunal can be subdivided as follows:

- Time bar;
- The requirement for the courts to use logic and judgement (*sana critica*); and
- Other issues considered in the judgement

^{<13>} For a summary of the considerations of the decision of the Maritime Court of Appeal at the 1971 Fund Administrative Council's October 2010 session, reference is made to Incidents involving the IOPC Funds 2010, pages 66-67.

Time bar

The Constitutional Section of the Supreme Tribunal upheld the interpretation by the Supreme Tribunal of the time bar provisions of the 1971 Fund Convention. The Constitutional Section of the Supreme Tribunal argued as follows:

“...analysing the content of Article 6.1 of the 1971 Fund Convention as well as the reasoning of the Supreme Court, this Constitutional Court notes that the Article referred to allows three different possibilities to be presented for the time bar of the claim and, at least as far as the first of these is concerned, its content is not so clear as to proceed with its automatic application – as the appellant suggests in its appeal – since there is an inconsistency as to against whom the time bar operates.

In effect, the Article referred to indicates in its first part that the right to obtain indemnification or compensation will expire ‘...unless an action is brought thereunder or a notification has been made pursuant to such Articles within three years from the date when the damage occurred ...’, but does not state against whom this is referring, if it is the owner of the ship, its guarantor or the Fund, so that to consider that it refers to the latter is not correct, since, had it been the intention of the States Party at the time of drafting the Article referred to, this would have been expressly established.

In view of this lack of precision, and since there is no other provision in the 1971 Fund Convention that defines the time bar point, it was reasonable to proceed – as the Supreme Court rightly considered – to interpret the Article concerned considering, in the first instance, the content of Articles 2, 4 and 7 of the Convention, due to the mention that these make to that provision, as well as the contents of Articles III and VII (1) of the CLC, since the payment of compensation anticipated in the Fund Convention originates from the situation that the victims of an oil spill at sea have not obtained full compensation from those obliged to pay under the CLC, in this case the shipowner, its insurer or any person that provided a financial guarantee.

This being the case, and seeing that the right of compensation provided in Article 4 of the Fund Convention relates to the right of the victim to obtain from the Fund full compensation when this has not been provided by those who caused the damage (the shipowner or the insurer), and taking into consideration that Article 6.1 *eiusdem* indicates that the time bar on the right to compensation occurs if the legal action in the application of those Articles has not been taken within three (3) years of the damage occurring; it is logical to conclude – as the Supreme Court and lower courts rightly indicated – that the time bar referred to in the Article

concerned operates only if the victim had not taken any action against the shipowner or his insurer within three (3) years of the damage occurring in which case the Fund would not be responsible for the complementary compensation required by the lack of financial capacity or reduced compensation obtained from the party that directly caused the damage.

Consequently, if the victim takes its action within the three (3) years counting from the occurrence of the incident (oil spill) against the shipowner or his insurer, the Fund will not be able to use the time bar as a defence against the action taken for full payment of compensation for the damage suffered.

In view of the reasoning set out, this Constitutional Court concludes that the Supreme Tribunal’s interpretation of Article 6.1 of the 1971 Fund Convention, was correct in law. For that reason, the allegation of supposed violation of the rights to the defence, to due process and the principle of safe law used by the appellant, lacks foundation.”

In its appeal to the Constitutional Section of the Supreme Tribunal, the 1971 Fund had also argued that, in addition to being time-barred under the provisions of the 1971 Fund Convention, the claim by the Puerto Miranda Union was in any event time-barred under Venezuelan law as a result of lack of action by the claimant for a period of twelve months (*perención de instancia*).

The Constitutional Section of the Supreme Tribunal stated that the analysis of this argument was unnecessary since the use of time bar was inadmissible in the type of legal process concerned on the grounds that the action concerned environmental matters. In this connection, the Constitutional Section of the Supreme Tribunal stated:

“... taking into consideration that spillage of oil in the sea is an undoubted factor in upsetting the ecological balance which totally changes the biodiversity of the various species which inhabit that environment, in the majority of cases causing irreparable damage to the ecosystem concerned, this Constitutional Section considers that legal proceedings instituted for the purpose of obtaining compensation or indemnification for the damage suffered on the occasion of such incidents, in essence involve judgements which concern aspects relating to the environment, which touches on a human right recognized in the Constitution.

In this respect, Article 95 (ex Article 19, paragraph 16 of the Act of 2004) of the Organic Law of the Supreme Court of Justice states, as one of the grounds for inadmissibility of the time bar, proceedings which involve environmental matters. In this respect, the provision in question states: ➤

Article 95. Proceedings shall not be declared time-barred in cases involving environmental matters; or in the cases of claims which are intended to punish offences against human rights, public assets or trafficking in narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances.

This being the case, and taking into consideration that the subject of the claim in these proceedings derives from an incident in which environmental matters are involved (spillage of oil in the sea) this Constitutional Section considers it unnecessary to analyse the claim for time bar argued by the requesting party, since in this type of proceedings, this form of time bar of the proceedings, as an anomalous mechanism for terminating the proceedings, is inadmissible.”

The requirement for the courts to use ‘logic and judgement’ (*sana critica*)

The 1971 Fund appealed to the Constitutional Section of the Supreme Tribunal on the grounds that its right to the protection of the courts had been violated since the Court had ignored the requirement under Venezuelan maritime procedural law for the Court to exercise logic and judgement (*sana critica*) when evaluating the evidence, since documents had been accepted as valid when clearly they were not, while other documents had been rejected on technicalities when clearly they were valid.

The Constitutional Section of the Supreme Court dismissed this argument on the grounds that the system of evaluating the evidence using logic and judgement (*sana critica*) was not the only system that should be used. The Court stated that the Judge, at the time of examining a particular item of evidence, should abide by any special regulations concerning the evaluation of the particular form of evidence or, in the absence of a special regulation, follow the requirements set out in the Civil Procedure Code. Only in the absence of an express rule for its evaluation is the system of logic and judgement (*sana critica*) applicable.

The Court went on to say that the Supreme Tribunal acted correctly when rejecting the appeal in this connection since the public documents, the private administrative documents and the documents emanating from third parties accepted during the process did not have to be evaluated by the rules of logic and judgement (*sana critica*) alluded to in maritime procedural law, but by the specific rules established in the Civil Procedure Code, which were applicable in preference to maritime procedural law.

Other issues considered in the judgement

The 1971 Fund also appealed on the grounds that the lower instance courts had accepted information contained in certain documents presented by the claimants as evidence without question, had failed to take into account the oral evidence given by witnesses who had appeared at the hearing of the Maritime Court of First Instance in February 2009 and had evaluated the losses in an amount exceeding the amount claimed.

The Constitutional Section of the Supreme Tribunal dismissed these arguments on the grounds that it considered that there had not been any ‘grotesque infractions’ of interpretation of the Constitution. It stated further that it considered that the requested revision of the judgement of the Supreme Tribunal would not contribute to the uniformity of the interpretation of the rules and principles of the Constitution.

Court decisions on quantum

Appointment of court experts

At a hearing in November 2010, the Maritime Court of First Instance appointed three experts to carry out the quantification of compensation to be paid to the claimant using the method established by the Maritime Court of Appeal. At the hearing, the master and shipowner nominated one expert and the claimant a second expert. The Court nominated the third expert. Since it was not a defendant, the 1971 Fund could not nominate an expert. The nomination by the master and shipowner was rejected by the Maritime Court of First Instance. The master and shipowner nominated an alternative expert; this nomination was also rejected. The master and shipowner appealed against this decision.

Item	Assessed amount (BsF)
Cost of replacing 7 540 nets	8 713 150
Cost of replacing one outboard motor	17 000
Loss of income fin-fish boat fishermen	704 664 482
Loss of income shrimp boat fishermen	21 624 680
Loss of income shrimp foot fishermen	6 708 064
Interest on cost of replacing nets and motor	28 164 709
Total	769 892 085

The appeal was rejected. The Court then nominated the expert who should have been nominated by the master and shipowner.

Report by the court experts

In January 2011, the court experts presented their report in which they concluded that the compensation to be paid to the claimants was BsF 769 892 085, including interest. This is summarised in the table on page 92.

The experts also stated that the total amount available for compensation under the Conventions (60 million SDR) was equivalent to BsF 403 473 005. This was calculated on the basis of the exchange rate applicable on 8 October 2010. The experts further noted that, in its judgement, the Maritime Court of Appeal had fixed the limit of liability of the shipowner at BsF 2 844 983, this being the amount of the Civil Liability limitation fund established in 1997. On that basis, the experts declared that the compensation payable by the 1971 Fund was BsF 400 628 022.

The 1971 Fund requested the Maritime Court of First Instance to reconsider the court experts' report on the grounds that the assessed compensation was excessive and exceeded the limits set in the judgement of the Maritime Court of Appeal. In January 2011, the Maritime Court of First Instance upheld the request and appointed two new experts to review the first experts' report.

In March 2011, the new experts appointed by the Maritime Court of First Instance issued their report. In that report they confirmed the findings of the three original experts.

Judgement of Maritime Court of First Instance on quantum

Also in March 2011, the Maritime Court of First Instance issued its judgement on the quantum of the loss. In that judgement the Maritime Court of First Instance dismissed the appeals by the master, shipowner and the 1971 Fund against the reports issued by the three experts originally appointed by the Court and fixed the quantum of the loss at BsF 769 892 085. The Court ordered the master, as agent of the shipowner, to pay BsF 2 844 983 and the 1971 Fund to pay BsF 400 628 022. The Court also ordered the master and the 1971 Fund to pay costs. The master and the 1971 Fund appealed against this judgement to the Maritime Court of Appeal.

Judgement of Maritime Court of Appeal on quantum

In July 2011, the Maritime Court of Appeal dismissed the appeals submitted by the master and 1971 Fund against the judgement

of the Maritime Court of First Instance on the quantum of compensation. The 1971 Fund had argued in its appeal that the quantum was excessive in relation to the normal income earned by fishermen in 1997 and violated Venezuelan procedural law (time bar arising from lack of prosecution (*perención de instancia*)). The Maritime Court of Appeal rejected the arguments, stating that the experts had followed the parameters specified in its decision of September 2009, and instead confirmed the March 2011 judgement of the Maritime Court of First Instance, which had ordered the 1971 Fund to pay BsF 400 628 022 ^{<14>}, plus costs.

The master, shipowner and the 1971 Fund applied to the Maritime Court of Appeal for leave to appeal to the Supreme Court. This was denied. The 1971 Fund appealed this decision.

Judgement of the Supreme Court on quantum

In November 2011 the Supreme Court rejected the 1971 Fund's request for leave to appeal the July 2011 judgement of the Maritime Court of Appeal in connection with the quantum of the loss.

In March 2012 the 1971 Fund appealed to the Constitutional Section of the Supreme Court against the judgement of the Supreme Court regarding the quantum of the loss.

Judgement of Constitutional Section of the Supreme Court on quantum

In August 2012 the Constitutional Section of the Supreme Court rejected the 1971 Fund's appeal against the judgement of the Supreme Court regarding the quantum of the loss. In its judgement, the Court decided that the awarded amount should be paid to each fisherman individually, according to the Court experts' assessment.

Enforcement of the Court of Appeal's judgement

In March 2012 the Puerto Miranda Union submitted requests to the Maritime Court of First Instance to order the shipowner and the 1971 Fund to pay in accordance with the judgement of the Court of Appeal, and to order the Banco Venezolano de Credito to transfer to the Court the amount of the bank guarantee establishing the shipowner's limitation fund. The Maritime Court of First Instance accepted the request of Puerto Miranda Union concerning the enforcement of the judgement and fixed a date for the shipowner and 1971 Fund to pay the amounts awarded by the Court of Appeal.

In April 2012 the 1971 Fund submitted pleadings to the Maritime Court of First Instance requesting the Court to stay the enforcement of the judgement. In the pleadings the Fund argued ➤

^{<14>} The court experts calculated that the total amount available for compensation under the 1969 CLC and the 1971 Fund Convention (60 million SDR) was equivalent to BsF 403 473 004.80 and that the compensation payable by the 1971 Fund should be BsF 400 628 022 (BsF 403 473 004.80 minus BsF 2 844 983).

that, according to Article 4.5 of the 1971 Fund Convention, the amount of compensation corresponding to the 1971 Fund should be distributed to all recognised victims of the incident in accordance with the accepted amounts of the damage. Therefore, on the basis of the principle of equal distribution of the shipowner's limitation fund between all claimants contained in the 1969 CLC, no payments can be made until the claim by FETRAPESCA has reached a final stage in the proceedings.

In August 2012 the master submitted pleadings also requesting the Court to stay the enforcement of the judgement on the basis of the distribution of the shipowner's limitation fund between all claimants under the 1969 CLC.

In September 2012 the Maritime Court of First Instance rejected the request by the master and the 1971 Fund to stay the enforcement of the judgement.

Also in September 2012, Puerto Miranda Union requested the Constitutional Section of the Supreme Court to amend its judgement rendered in August 2012 and to issue a new decision ordering the defendants to make payment not to the fishermen themselves, but to the Puerto Miranda Union. The 1971 Fund opposed this request.

In December 2012, the Banco Venezolano de Credito filed a cheque at Court for BsF 2 844 983 corresponding to the amount of the guarantee issued to cover the limitation fund.

Embargo over Fund assets

In addition, the Puerto Miranda Union lawyers filed pleadings at Court requesting an embargo over the Fund's assets, specifically over the contributions owed to the 1992 Fund by Petróleos de Venezuela SA (PDVSA), Venezuela's State-owned oil company. The 1971 Fund filed pleadings to oppose the measures requested by the Puerto Miranda Union on the basis that the *Plate Princess* incident related solely to the 1971 Fund, not the 1992 Fund, and that any amounts owed by PDVSA were in respect of monies owed to the 1992 Fund, not the 1971 Fund.

In January 2013, the Maritime Court of First Instance rejected the 1971 Fund's arguments on the basis that the 1971 Fund, as an international compensation body should respond in relation to compensation matters and that the 1992 Fund was an interested party in relation to the eventual decision regarding any contribution from PDVSA.

In February 2013, the Puerto Miranda Union requested a clarification of the judgement of the Maritime Court of First Instance arguing that the previous judgement, which imposed liability on the 1971 Fund, should refer to the 1992 Fund because Venezuela was now a member of the 1992 Fund only. The 1971 Fund filed pleadings in opposition highlighting that it was only the 1971 Fund, and not the 1992 Fund, that was involved in the *Plate Princess* incident.

Later that month, the Maritime Court of First Instance accepted the request filed by the Puerto Miranda Union for an embargo over the Fund's assets, and ordered the embargo of contributions owed by PDVSA to the Fund up to a limit of BsF 412 646 863, which corresponded to the amount awarded against the 1971 Fund, ie BsF 400 628 022 plus execution costs. The Court did not specify whether it referred to the 1971 Fund or the 1992 Fund or both.

The Maritime Court of First Instance also issued an order of embargo of any assets the Fund might have in Venezuela, up to a limit of BsF 921 444 450 ie double the amount awarded against the 1971 Fund plus 30%. The Court referred expressly to the ratification by Venezuela not only of the 1971 Fund Convention but also of the 1992 Protocol. The 1971 Fund appealed against this order but as at October 2013, there have been no developments in respect of the appeal.

Considerations

Director's considerations

At the 1971 Fund Administrative Council's October 2011 session, the Director submitted a document in which he commented upon the most significant issues addressed in the judgement by the Constitutional Section of the Supreme Court Tribunal, which had been given in June 2011, and on the enforceability of that judgement (document IOPC/OCT11/3/4). In the document, the Director informed the Administrative Council as set out below.

Time-bar issue

In its judgement, the Constitutional Section of the Supreme Tribunal had rejected the appeal by the 1971 Fund concerning the time bar on the same grounds as those employed by the Supreme Tribunal and the Maritime Court of Appeal, namely that, to avoid the time bar, it was necessary only to take a legal action against the shipowner or his insurer within three years from the date of the damage.

The Director maintained his view that the action to which Article 6, paragraph 1 of the 1971 Fund Convention referred, could be taken either against the 1971 Fund or against the shipowner. If the action was against the shipowner then the claimant, to prevent the claim becoming time-barred, must formally notify the 1971 Fund of that action within three years.

In the Director's opinion, the interpretation of Article 6 of the 1971 Fund Convention established by the Venezuelan courts could not be correct since, if all a claimant had to do to avoid the time bar was take an action against the shipowner within three years of the damage occurring, there would have been no need to include a clause requiring him to formally notify the 1971 Fund of that action within the same time period.

The Director accepted that Article 6, paragraph 1 of the 1971 Fund Convention did not stipulate against whom the action referred to must be taken. However, since the 1969 CLC set out the relationship between the victim of pollution damage and the shipowner and his insurer, it was logical that any legal action required under that Convention would be actions against the shipowner and/or his insurer. Similarly, since the 1971 Fund Convention set out the relationship between the victim of pollution damage and the 1971 Fund, it was logical that any legal action required under that Convention would be against the 1971 Fund.

The Director agreed with the view of the Administrative Council that the correct interpretation of Article 6, paragraph 1 of the 1971 Fund Convention was that the action to be brought within three years was an action against the 1971 Fund and that the notification to be made was of the action against the shipowner or its insurer referred to in Article 7, paragraph 6.

The application by the courts of 'logic and judgement' (*sana critica*)

In his document, the Director noted with concern that the Constitutional Section of the Supreme Tribunal considered that logic and judgement (*sana critica*) should only be employed by the Court when determining the quantum of the loss in the absence of any special regulations concerning the evaluation of evidence or, in the absence of any special regulations, those set out in the Civil Procedure Code.

The quantum of the assessment

The court experts appointed by the Maritime Court of First Instance assessed the compensation to be paid to the fishermen represented by the Puerto Miranda Union as BsF 769 892 085. Of this amount, BsF 726.3 million concerned six months' loss of catch income from 849 boats. The Director noted that this was equivalent to an income for each boat of BsF 1 669 756 per year. Assessment of the claims in the *Nissos Amorgos* incident indicated that, in 1997, the average annual catch sale income per shrimp boat was US\$17 400. The amount calculated by the Court experts in the *Plate Princess* was therefore 22 times higher than in the *Nissos Amorgos*. Since the fishing concerned was an artisanal activity (the boats are small (in the majority less than 10m in length) and are normally crewed by two persons), the Director considered that the assessed loss far exceeded any real loss that could have occurred, even if activity had been suspended.

Calculation of the amount to be paid by the 1971 Fund

The limit of liability of the shipowner and the total amount available for compensation under the Conventions had been calculated by the Maritime Court using SDR/Bolivar exchange rates applicable on dates differing by 14 years. Since the

Bolivar had depreciated relative to the SDR by some 750% in the intervening period, the amounts ordered by the Court to be paid by the shipowner or his insurer and the 1971 Fund differed substantially from the amounts that would have applied had the shipowners' limitation amount and the amount of compensation available under the Conventions been converted from SDR to the national currency using exchange rates applicable on the same date.

The provision of reasonable notice and a fair opportunity for the 1971 Fund to present its case

The Director is of the view that the 1971 Fund had not been given reasonable notice and a fair opportunity to present its case, as required under Article X of the 1969 CLC. He considered that this is not only because the documents provided as evidence by the claimants in support of their claim were not available to the 1971 Fund prior to the time limit for submission of defence pleadings but because it would have been impossible to adequately investigate and defend a claim submitted in detail some 11 years after the damage occurred even if sufficient time had been allowed by the Court for the documentary evidence to be analysed prior to submission of defence pleadings. The Director considered this to be particularly the case since, in the view of the expert who had examined the documentation, it was clear that many of those documents submitted in evidence had been falsified.

Considerations by the 1971 Fund Administrative Council March 2011

At the March 2011 session of the 1971 Fund Administrative Council, the Director submitted a document reporting on developments in the *Plate Princess* incident and requesting the 1971 Fund Administrative Council to give the Director such instructions as it deemed appropriate. The Venezuelan delegation also submitted two documents requesting the Director to make prompt payments. A decision was therefore required from the Administrative Council as to whether the Director should be instructed to make prompt payment of compensation.

Concern was expressed by a large majority of delegations who considered that due process of law had not been followed in arriving at the judgements reached by the Venezuelan courts, and furthermore that the 1971 Fund had not been given reasonable notice and a fair opportunity to present its case in accordance with Article 8 of the 1971 Fund Convention and Article X of the 1969 CLC.

The 1971 Fund Administrative Council decided to instruct the Director not to make any payments in respect of the *Plate Princess* incident and to keep the Administrative Council advised of developments in the legal proceedings in the Venezuelan courts.

October 2011

At its October 2011 session the 1971 Fund Administrative Council decided to confirm its instructions given in March 2011 not to make any payments in respect of the *Plate Princess* incident and instructed the Director to continue to monitor the outcome of the legal actions in Venezuela.

The 1971 Fund Administrative Council also instructed the Director to prepare a report on the points raised in the intervention by the Venezuelan delegation and a report on the legal basis for the 1971 Fund to refuse payment under Article X of the 1969 CLC and to report back to the 1971 Fund Administrative Council at its next session.

April 2012

At its April 2012 session the 1971 Fund Administrative Council instructed the Director to conduct a further analysis on the legal basis for the 1971 Fund to refuse payment under Article X of the 1969 CLC and to examine the points raised by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela in their third intervention at that meeting (see document IOPC/APR12/12/1, paragraph 3.2.55) with the Legal Affairs and External Relations Division of the International Maritime Organization (IMO).


October 2012

The Director engaged Dr Thomas A Mensah, who is an expert on matters relating to the Law of the Sea, Maritime Law, International Environmental Law and Public International Law, to conduct the legal analysis on Article X of the 1969 CLC and also to examine the points raised by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, in consultation with IMO. Dr Mensah's legal opinion was attached at Annex II to document IOPC/OCT12/3/4/1, which was presented to the 1971 Fund Administrative Council at its October 2012 session.

Dr Mensah had concluded that, in his view, the decision of the courts in Venezuela on the issue of time bar was patently incorrect as the rights of the claimants to compensation under Article 4 of the 1971 Fund Convention had been extinguished because no action had been brought under Article 4 within three years from the date when the damage occurred, and no notification of action against the owner or his guarantor for compensation under the 1969 CLC had been given to the 1971 Fund within that period, as required under Article 7, paragraph 6 of the 1971 Fund Convention.

Dr Mensah had also concluded that there was strong support for the contention that the judgement of the Venezuelan Court relating to the quantum of damages was based on evidence that was not genuine and which had been falsified for the purpose of obtaining

Timeline of key events following the *Plate Princess* incident



compensation, and that accordingly the 1971 Fund had a very strong case for challenging the enforcement of the judgement in the courts of other contracting states based on the grounds that the judgement had been obtained by fraud. Dr Mensah concluded that before an English court, it would be open to the 1971 Fund to challenge the enforcement of the judgement both under the 1971 Fund Convention and also under English common law.

In respect of the issue of the due process of law, Dr Mensah concluded that the 1971 Fund was fully entitled to challenge the enforcement of the judgement of the Venezuelan Court by asserting that it had not been afforded a fair opportunity to present its case before the Venezuelan Court, both under Article 8 of the 1971 Fund Convention coupled with Article X of the 1969 CLC, and by reference to the English common law which also recognised the right of a party to contest the enforcement of the judgement of a foreign court on the grounds that it had not been given a reasonable opportunity to present its case.


In response to the third intervention of the delegation of Venezuela at the April 2012 session of the 1971 Fund Administrative Council, Dr Mensah had concluded that the intervention was not supported in fact or in law and that the claim that Venezuela ‘automatically became a party to the 1992 Protocol’ when the 1971 Fund Convention entered into force for Venezuela was factually incorrect.

Venezuela did not become a Party to the 1992 Fund Convention until July 1999, and the claim of Venezuela that 1992 Fund Member States were under any liability in respect of incidents that occurred when the 1971 Fund Convention was in force, even when they were not members of the 1971 Fund, had no basis in law, and was in fact in direct conflict with the express provisions of the 1971 Fund Convention and the principles of the general international law of treaties.

October 2013 decision by the 1971 Fund Administrative Council

At its October 2013 session the 1971 Fund Administrative Council, with a view to deciding to wind up the 1971 Fund as soon as possible, decided that no loss had been proven with regard to the claim submitted by FETRAPESCA and instructed the Director to discontinue the defence of the 1971 Fund before the courts. It was noted in the Record of Decisions of that session that the Director had already received instructions from the 1971 Fund Administrative Council not to make any payment in respect of the *Plate Princess* incident and to oppose the enforcement of the judgement.

In accordance with the instruction received from the 1971 Fund Administrative Council, the 1971 Fund withdrew its defence from the legal proceedings brought by the Puerto Miranda Union and FETRAPESCA before the Venezuelan Courts.



I97I Fund: Summary of Incidents

Ship	Date of incident	Place of incident	Flag State of ship	Gross register tonnage (GRT)	Limit of shipowner's liability under 1969 CLC	
<i>Irving Whale</i>	07.09.1970	Gulf of St. Lawrence, Canada	Canada	2 261	Unknown	
<i>Antonio Gramsci</i>	27.02.1979	Ventspils, USSR	USSR	27 694	RUB 2 431 584	
<i>Miya Maru N°8</i>	22.03.1979	Bisan Seto, Japan	Japan	997	¥37 710 340	
<i>Tarpenbek</i>	21.06.1979	Selsey Bill, United Kingdom	Germany	999	£63 356	
<i>Mebaruzaki Maru N°5</i>	08.12.1979	Mebaru, Japan	Japan	19	¥845 480	
<i>Showa Maru</i>	09.01.1980	Naruto Strait, Japan	Japan	199	¥8 123 140	
<i>Unsei Maru</i>	09.01.1980	Akune, Japan	Japan	99	¥3 143 180	
<i>Tanio</i>	07.03.1980	Brittany, France	Madagascar	18 048	FFr11 833 718	
<i>Furenäs</i>	03.06.1980	Oresund, Sweden	Sweden	999	SEK 612 443	
<i>Hosei Maru</i>	21.08.1980	Miyagi, Japan	Japan	983	¥35 765 920	
<i>Jose Marti</i>	07.01.1981	Dalarö, Sweden	USSR	27 706	SEK 23 844 593	
<i>Suma Maru N°11</i>	21.11.1981	Karatsu, Japan	Japan	199	¥7 396 340	
<i>Globe Asimi</i>	22.11.1981	Klaipeda, USSR	Gibraltar	12 404	RUB 1 350 324	
<i>Ondina</i>	03.03.1982	Hamburg, Germany	Netherlands	31 030	DM10 080 383	
<i>Shiota Maru N°2</i>	31.03.1982	Takashima Island, Japan	Japan	161	¥6 304 300	
<i>Fukutoko Maru N°8</i>	03.04.1982	Tachibana Bay, Japan	Japan	499	¥20 844 440	
<i>Kifuku Maru N°35</i>	01.12.1982	Ishinomaki, Japan	Japan	107	¥4 271 560	
<i>Shinkai Maru N°3</i>	21.06.1983	Ichikawa, Japan	Japan	48	¥1 880 940	
<i>Eiko Maru N°1</i>	13.08.1983	Karakuwazaki, Japan	Japan	999	¥39 445 920	
<i>Koei Maru N°3</i>	22.12.1983	Nagoya, Japan	Japan	82	¥3 091 660	
<i>Tsunehisa Maru N°8</i>	26.08.1984	Osaka, Japan	Japan	38	¥964 800	
<i>Koho Maru N°3</i>	05.11.1984	Hiroshima, Japan	Japan	199	¥5 385 920	
<i>Koshun Maru N°1</i>	05.03.1985	Tokyo Bay, Japan	Japan	68	¥1 896 320	

* All Annual and Incident Reports dating back to 1978 are available on the Publications page of the IOPC Funds' website, www.iopcfunds.org.

	Cause of incident	Estimated quantity of oil spilled (tonnes)	Compensation paid by the 1971 Fund up to 31.12.13	Indemnification paid by the 1971 Fund	Year last featured in Annual/Incident Report*
	Sinking	Unknown	Nil		1998
	Grounding	5 500	SEK 95 707 157		1980
	Collision	540	¥140 110 582	¥9 427 585	1980
	Collision	Unknown	£363 550		1986
	Sinking	10	¥10 188 335	¥211 370	1981
	Collision	100	¥103 104 874	¥2 030 785	1981
	Collision	<140	Nil		1982
	Breaking	13 500	FFr222 140 643		1988
	Collision	200	SEK 3 187 687 DKr 418 589	SEK 153 111	1982
	Collision	270	¥213 322 865	¥8 941 480	1982
	Grounding	1 000	Nil		1987
	Grounding	10	¥6 426 857	¥1 849 085	1984
	Grounding	>16 000		US\$467 953	1982
	Discharge	200-300	DM11 345 174		1984
	Grounding	20	¥72 671 789		1982
	Collision	85	¥363 731 755	¥5 211 110	1984
	Sinking	33	¥598 181		1983
	Discharge	3.5	¥1 005 160	¥470 235	1984
	Collision	357	¥24 735 109	¥9 861 480	1988
	Collision	49	¥26 982 248	¥772 915	1986
	Sinking	30	¥16 610 200	¥241 200	1985
	Grounding	20	¥94 111 818	¥1 346 480	1986
	Collision	80	¥26 124 589	¥474 080	1990

Ship	Date of incident	Place of incident	Flag State of ship	Gross register tonnage (GRT)	Limit of shipowner's liability under 1969 CLC	
<i>Patmos</i>	21.03.1985	Strait of Messina, Italy	Greece	51 627	LI 13 263 703 650	
<i>Jan</i>	02.08.1985	Aalborg, Denmark	Germany	1 400	DKr 1 576 170	
<i>Rose Garden Maru</i>	26.12.1985	Umm al Qaiwain, United Arab Emirates	Panama	2 621	US\$364 182	
<i>Brady Maria</i>	03.01.1986	Elbe Estuary, Germany	Panama	996	DM324 629	
<i>Take Maru N°6</i>	09.01.1986	Sakai-Senboku, Japan	Japan	83	¥3 876 800	
<i>Oued Gueterini</i>	18.12.1986	Algiers, Algeria	Algeria	1 576	Din 1 175 064	
<i>Thuntank 5</i>	21.12.1986	Gävle, Sweden	Sweden	2 866	SEK 2 741 746	
<i>Antonio Gramsci</i>	06.02.1987	Borgå, Finland	USSR	27 706	RUB 2 431 854	
<i>Southern Eagle</i>	15.06.1987	Sada Misaki, Japan	Panama	4 461	¥93 874 528	
<i>El Hani</i>	22.07.1987	Indonesia	Libya	81 412	£7 900 000	
<i>Akari</i>	25.08.1987	Dubai, United Arab Emirates	Panama	1 345	£92 800	
<i>Tolmiros</i>	11.09.1987	West coast, Sweden	Greece	48 914	SEK 50 million	
<i>Hinode Maru N°1</i>	18.12.1987	Yawatahama, Japan	Japan	19	¥608 000	
<i>Amazzone</i>	31.01.1988	Brittany, France	Italy	18 325	FFr13 860 369	
<i>Taiyo Maru N°13</i>	12.03.1988	Yokohama, Japan	Japan	86	¥2 476 800	
<i>Czantoria</i>	08.05.1988	St. Romuald, Canada	Canada	81 197	Unknown	
<i>Kasuga Maru N°1</i>	10.12.1988	Kyoga Misaki, Japan	Japan	480	¥17 015 040	
<i>Nestucca</i>	23.12.1988	Vancouver Island, Canada	United States of America	1 612	Unknown	

* All Annual and Incident Reports dating back to 1978 are available on the Publications page of the IOPC Funds' website, www.iopcfunds.org.

	Cause of incident	Estimated quantity of oil spilled (tonnes)	Compensation paid by the 1971 Fund up to 31.12.13	Indemnification paid by the 1971 Fund	Year last featured in Annual/Incident Report*
	Collision	700	Nil		1994
	Grounding	300	DKr 9 455 661	DKr 394 043	1988
	Mishandling of oil discharge	Unknown	Nil		1987
	Collision	200	DM3 220 511		1988
	Discharge	0.1		¥104 987	1987
	Discharge	15	US\$1 133 FFr708 824 Din 5 650 £126 120	Din 293 766	1990
	Grounding	150-200	SEK 23 217 632	SEK 685 437	1992
	Grounding	600-700	FM1 849 924		1990
	Collision	15	Nil		1989
	Grounding	3 000	Nil		1988
	Fire	1 000	Dhs 864 292 US\$187 165		1992
	Unknown	200	Nil		1992
	Mishandling of cargo	25	¥1 847 225	¥152 000	1989
	Storm damage to tanks	2 000	FFr1 286 977		1992
	Discharge	6	¥6 134 885	¥619 200	1989
	Collision with berth	Unknown	Nil		1991
	Sinking	1 100	¥425 365 167	¥4 253 760	1992
	Collision	Unknown	Nil		1991

Ship	Date of incident	Place of incident	Flag State of ship	Gross register tonnage (GRT)	Limit of shipowner's liability under 1969 CLC	
<i>Fukkol Maru N°12</i>	15.05.1989	Shiogama, Japan	Japan	94	¥2 198 400	
<i>Tsubame Maru N°58</i>	18.05.1989	Shiogama, Japan	Japan	74	¥2 971 520	
<i>Tsubame Maru N°16</i>	15.06.1989	Kushiro, Japan	Japan	56	¥1 613 120	
<i>Kifuku Maru N°103</i>	28.06.1989	Otsuji, Japan	Japan	59	¥1 727 040	
<i>Nancy Orr Gaucher</i>	25.07.1989	Hamilton, Canada	Liberia	2 829	Can\$473 766	
<i>Dainichi Maru N°5</i>	28.10.1989	Yaizu, Japan	Japan	174	¥4 199 680	
<i>Daito Maru N°3</i>	05.04.1990	Yokohama, Japan	Japan	93	¥2 495 360	
<i>Kazuei Maru N°10</i>	11.04.1990	Osaka, Japan	Japan	121	¥3 476 160	
<i>Fuji Maru N°3</i>	12.04.1990	Yokohama, Japan	Japan	199	¥5 352 000	
<i>Volgoneft 263</i>	14.05.1990	Karlskrona, Sweden	USSR	3 566	SEK 3 205 204	
<i>Hato Maru N°2</i>	27.07.1990	Kobe, Japan	Japan	31	¥803 200	
<i>Bonito</i>	12.10.1990	River Thames, United Kingdom	Sweden	2 866	£241 000	
<i>Rio Orinoco</i>	16.10.1990	Anticosti Island, Canada	Cayman Islands	5 999	Can\$1 182 617	
<i>Portfield</i>	05.11.1990	Pembroke, Wales, United Kingdom	United Kingdom	481	£39 970	
<i>Vistabella</i>	07.03.1991	Caribbean	Trinidad and Tobago	1 090	144 970 SDR	
<i>Hokunan Maru N°12</i>	05.04.1991	Okushiri Island, Japan	Japan	209	¥3 523 520	
<i>Agip Abruzzo</i>	10.04.1991	Livorno, Italy	Italy	98 544	LIt 22 525 million	
<i>Haven</i>	11.04.1991	Genoa, Italy	Cyprus	109 977	LIt 23 950 220 000	
<i>Kaiko Maru N°86</i>	12.04.1991	Nomazaki, Japan	Japan	499	¥14 660 480	
<i>Kumi Maru N°12</i>	27.12.1991	Tokyo Bay, Japan	Japan	113	¥3 058 560	
<i>Fukkol Maru N°12</i>	09.06.1992	Ishinomaki, Japan	Japan	94	¥2 198 400	

* All Annual and Incident Reports dating back to 1978 are available on the Publications page of the IOPC Funds' website, www.iopcfunds.org.

	Cause of incident	Estimated quantity of oil spilled (tonnes)	Compensation paid by the 1971 Fund up to 31.12.13	Indemnification paid by the 1971 Fund	Year last featured in Annual/Incident Report*
	Overflow from supply pipe	0.5	¥492 635	¥549 600	1990
	Mishandling of oil transfer	7	¥19 159 905	¥742 880	1991
	Discharge	Unknown	¥273 580	¥403 880	1990
	Mishandling of cargo	Unknown	¥8 285 960	¥431 761	1990
	Overflow during discharge	250	Nil		1990
	Mishandling of cargo	0.2	¥2 160 610	¥1 049 920	1991
	Mishandling of cargo	3	¥5 490 570	¥623 840	1992
	Collision	30	¥49 443 626	¥869 040	1991
	Overflow during supply operation	Unknown	¥96 431	¥1 338 000	1991
	Collision	800	SEK 16 849 328		1992
	Mishandling of cargo	Unknown	¥1 087 700	¥200 800	1991
	Mishandling of cargo	20	Nil		1993
	Grounding	185	Can\$12 831 891		1995
	Sinking	110	£259 509	£17 155	1995
	Sinking	Unknown	€1 255 803		2012
	Grounding	Unknown	¥6 144 829	¥880 880	1993
	Collision	2 000	Nil	Lit 1 666 031 931	1995
	Fire and explosion	Unknown	Lit 71 584 970 783 FFr23 510 228	£2 500 000	1999
	Collision	25	¥93 067 813	¥3 665 120	1993
	Collision	5	¥1 056 518	¥764 640	1995
	Mishandling of oil supply	Unknown	¥4 243 997	¥549 600	1993

Ship	Date of incident	Place of incident	Flag State of ship	Gross register tonnage (GRT)	Limit of shipowner's liability under 1969 CLC	
<i>Aegean Sea</i>	03.12.1992	La Coruña, Spain	Greece	57 801	Pts 1 121 219 450	
<i>Braer</i>	05.01.1993	Shetland, United Kingdom	Liberia	44 989	£4 883 840	
<i>Kihnu</i>	16.01.1993	Tallinn, Estonia	Estonia	949	113 000 SDR	
<i>Sambo N°11</i>	12.04.1993	Seoul, Republic of Korea	Republic of Korea	520	KRW 77 786 224	
<i>Taiko Maru</i>	31.05.1993	Shioyazaki, Japan	Japan	699	¥29 205 120	
<i>Ryoyo Maru</i>	23.07.1993	Izu Peninsula, Japan	Japan	699	¥28 105 920	
<i>Keumdong N°5</i>	27.09.1993	Yeosu, Republic of Korea	Republic of Korea	481	KRW 77 417 210	
<i>Iliad</i>	09.10.1993	Pylos, Greece	Greece	32 511	Drs 1 496 533 000	
<i>Seki</i>	30.03.1994	Fujairah, United Arab Emirates and Oman	Panama	153 506	14 million SDR	
<i>Daito Maru N°5</i>	11.06.1994	Yokohama, Japan	Japan	116	¥3 386 560	
<i>Toyotaka Maru</i>	17.10.1994	Kainan, Japan	Japan	2,960	¥81 823 680	
<i>Hoyu Maru N°53</i>	31.10.1994	Monbetsu, Japan	Japan	43	¥1 089 280	
<i>Sung Il N°1</i>	08.11.1994	Onsan, Republic of Korea	Republic of Korea	150	KRW 23 million	
Spill from unknown source	30.11.1994	Mohammédia, Morocco	-	-	-	
<i>Boyang N°51</i>	25.05.1995	Sandbaeg Do, Republic of Korea	Republic of Korea	149	19 817 SDR	
<i>Dae Woong</i>	27.06.1995	Kojung, Republic of Korea	Republic of Korea	642	KRW 95 million	
<i>Sea Prince</i>	23.07.1995	Yosu, Republic of Korea	Cyprus	144 567	KRW 18 308 275 906	
<i>Yeo Myung</i>	03.08.1995	Yosu, Republic of Korea	Republic of Korea	138	KRW 21 465 434	

* All Annual and Incident Reports dating back to 1978 are available on the Publications page of the IOPC Funds' website, www.iopcfunds.org.

	Cause of incident	Estimated quantity of oil spilled (tonnes)	Compensation paid by the 1971 Fund up to 31.12.13	Indemnification paid by the 1971 Fund	Year last featured in Annual/Incident Report*
	Grounding	73 500	Pts 9 169 589 477	Pts 278 197 307	2012
	Grounding	84 000	£51 938 938		2007
	Grounding	140	FM543 618		1997
	Grounding	4	KRW 219 714 755		1994
	Collision	520	¥1 093 185 055	¥7 301 280	1995
	Collision	500	¥8 433 001	¥7 026 480	1996
	Collision	1 280	KRW 16 275 151 969	KRW 12 857 130	2004
	Grounding	200	Nil		2012
	Collision	16 000	Nil		1996
	Overflow during loading operation	0.5	¥1 187 304	¥846 640	1995
	Collision	560	¥695 736 817	¥20 455 920	1996
	Mishandling of oil supply	Unknown	¥4 157 715	¥272 320	1995
	Grounding	18	KRW 37 780 112		1996
	Unknown	Unknown	Mor Dhr 2 600 000		1997
	Collision	160	Nil		1998
	Grounding	1	KRW 43 517 127		1998
	Grounding	5 035	KRW 50 227 315 595	KRW 7 410 928 540	2003
	Collision	40	KRW 1 553 029 739		2005

Ship	Date of incident	Place of incident	Flag State of ship	Gross register tonnage (GRT)	Limit of shipowner's liability under 1969 CLC	
<i>Shinryu Maru N°8</i>	04.08.1995	Chita, Japan	Japan	198	¥3 967 138	
<i>Senyo Maru</i>	03.09.1995	Ube, Japan	Japan	895	¥20 203 325	
<i>Yuil N°1</i>	21.09.1995	Busan, Republic of Korea	Republic of Korea	1 591	KRW 351 924 060	
<i>Honam Sapphire</i>	17.11.1995	Yosu, Republic of Korea	Panama	142 488	14 million SDR	
<i>Toko Maru</i>	23.01.1996	Anegasaki, Japan	Japan	699	¥18 769 567	
<i>Sea Empress</i>	15.02.1996	Milford Haven, Wales, United Kingdom	Liberia	77 356	£7 395 748	
<i>Kugenuma Maru</i>	06.03.1996	Kawasaki, Japan	Japan	57	¥1 175 055	
<i>Kriti Sea</i>	09.08.1996	Agioi Theodoroi, Greece	Greece	62 678	€6 576 100	
<i>N°1 Yung Jung</i>	15.08.1996	Busan, Republic of Korea	Republic of Korea	560	KRW 122 million	
<i>Nakhodka</i>	02.01.1997	Oki Islands, Japan	Russian Federation	13 159	1 588 000 SDR	
<i>Tsubame Maru N°31</i>	25.01.1997	Otaru, Japan	Japan	89	¥1 843 849	
<i>Nissos Amorgos</i>	28.02.1997	Maracaibo, Venezuela	Greece	50 563	BsF 3.5 million	
<i>Daiwa Maru N°18</i>	27.03.1997	Kawasaki, Japan	Japan	186	¥3 372 368	
<i>Jeong Jin N°101</i>	01.04.1997	Busan, Republic of Korea	Republic of Korea	896	KRW 246 million	
<i>Osung N°3</i>	03.04.1997	Tunggado, Republic of Korea	Republic of Korea	786	104 500 SDR	

* All Annual and Incident Reports dating back to 1978 are available on the Publications page of the IOPC Funds' website, www.iopcfunds.org.

** All costs borne by the Funds in this incident were divided in proportion to the respective liabilities of the 1971 and 1992 Funds (43.268% to the 1971 Fund and 56.732% to the 1992 Fund).

	Cause of incident	Estimated quantity of oil spilled (tonnes)	Compensation paid by the 1971 Fund up to 31.12.13	Indemnification paid by the 1971 Fund	Year last featured in Annual/Incident Report*
	Mishandling of oil supply	0.5	¥9 634 576 US\$5 663		1996
	Collision	94	¥366 578 453		1997
	Sinking	Unknown	KRW 27 177 996 728		2004
	Contact with fender	1 800	KRW 10 259 000 000		1999
	Collision	4	Nil		1996
	Grounding	72 360	£36 806 484	£1 835 035	2003
	Mishandling of oil supply	0.3	¥2 278 468		1997
	Mishandling of oil supply	30	€3 774 000		2009
	Grounding	28	KRW 771 208 587		2000
	Breaking	6 200	¥9 971 613 596**		2002
	Overflow during loading operation	0.6	¥8 131 327		1998
	Grounding	3 600	US\$18 315 064 Bs75 418 926	US\$1 804 893	2012
	Mishandling of oil supply	1	¥415 600 000	¥865 406	1998
	Overflow during loading operation	124	KRW 418 000 000	KRW 58 000 000	1998
	Grounding	Unknown	KRW 7 674 268 000 ¥851 039 365	KRW 37 963 635	2001

Ship	Date of incident	Place of incident	Flag State of ship	Gross register tonnage (GRT)	Limit of shipowner's liability under 1969 CLC	
<i>Plate Princess</i>	27.05.1997	Puerto Miranda, Venezuela	Malta	30 423	3.6 million SDR	
<i>Diamond Grace</i>	02.07.1997	Tokyo Bay, Japan	Panama	147 012	14 million SDR	
<i>Katja</i>	07.08.1997	Le Havre, France	Bahamas	52 079	€7.3 million	
<i>Evoikos</i>	15.10.1997	Strait of Singapore	Cyprus	80 823	8 846 942 SDR	
<i>Kyungnam N°1</i>	07.11.1997	Ulsan, Republic of Korea	Republic of Korea	168	KRW 43 543 015	
<i>Pontoon 300</i>	07.01.1998	Hamriyah, Sharjah, United Arab Emirates	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	4 233	Not available	
<i>Maritza Sayalero</i>	08.06.1998	Carenero Bay, Venezuela	Panama	28 338	3 million SDR	
<i>Al Jaziah 1</i>	24.01.2000	Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates	Honduras	681	3 million SDR	
<i>Alambra</i>	17.09.2000	Estonia	Malta	75 366	7 600 000 SDR	
<i>Natuna Sea</i>	03.10.2000	Indonesia	Panama	51 095	6 100 000 SDR	
<i>Zeinab</i>	14.04.2001	United Arab Emirates	Georgia	2 178	3 million SDR	
<i>Singapura Timur</i>	28.05.2001	Malaysia	Panama	1 369	102 000 SDR	

* All Annual and Incident Reports dating back to 1978 are available on the Publications page of the IOPC Funds' website, www.iopcfunds.org.

*** The liabilities in this incident were distributed between the 1971 Fund and 1992 Fund on a 50:50 basis.

	Cause of incident	Estimated quantity of oil spilled (tonnes)	Compensation paid by the 1971 Fund up to 31.12.13	Indemnification paid by the 1971 Fund	Year last featured in Annual/Incident Report*
	Overflow during loading operation	3.2	Nil		2012
	Grounding	1 500	Nil		1999
	Striking a quay	190	Nil		2008
	Collision	29 000	Nil		2010
	Grounding	15-20	KRW 272 033 170		2000
	Sinking	8 000	Dhs 7 978 483		2008
	Ruptured discharge pipe	262	Nil		2001
	Sinking	100-200	US\$1 089 574*** Dhs 1 000 000		2010
	Corrosion	300	Nil		2009
	Grounding	7 000	Nil		
	Sinking	400	US\$422 000*** Dhs 1 240 000		2004
	Collision	Unknown	US\$846 396 ¥11 436 000	US\$25 000	2004

List of Currencies

Currency	Symbol	Unit of currency per £ as at 31 December 2013, where applicable
Algerian Dinar	Din	
Argentine Peso	AR\$	10.7955
Canadian Dollar	Can\$	1.7598
Danish Krone	DKr	
Euro	€	1.2020
French Franc*	FFr	
German Mark*	DM	
Greek Drachma*	Drs	
Italian Lira*	Lit	
Japanese Yen	¥	
Malaysian Ringgit	RM	
Moroccan Dirham	Mor Dhr	
Nigerian Naira	NGN	
Philippines Peso	PHP	73.5085
Republic of Korea Won	KRW	1747.92
Rial Omani	OMR	0.6377
Russian Rouble	RUB	52.4244
Spanish Peseta*	Pts	
Special Drawing Rights	SDR	1.0694
Swedish Krona	SKr	
UAE Dirham	Dhs	
UK Pound Sterling	£	
US Dollar	US\$	1.6563
Venezuelan Bolivar Fuerte**	BsF	10.4213

* Replaced by the Euro (€) on 1 January 2002.

** In January 2008 the Bolivar Fuerte (BsF) replaced the Bolivar (Bs) at the rate of 1 BsF = 1000 Bs. Until December 2011 the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela used the term Bolivar Fuerte (BsF) to distinguish the new currency from the old currency or Bolivar (Bs). However, since the old currency was taken out of circulation in January 2012, the Venezuelan Central Bank decided that the use of the word 'Fuerte' was no longer necessary. Therefore, the name of the actual Venezuelan currency is now Bolivar (Bs). To avoid any confusion, the term Bolivar Fuerte (BsF) has been used throughout this publication to distinguish the actual Venezuelan currency (from 2008) from the previous currency (pre 2008).

Acknowledgements

Photographs	
Cover (<i>Nesa R3</i>)	Omani Government
Page 11 (<i>Erika</i>)	Centre of Documentation, Research and Experimentation on Accidental Water Pollution (CEDRE)
Page 15 (<i>Prestige</i>)	Press Association Images
Page 18 (<i>Prestige</i>)	Press Association Images
Page 22 (<i>Solar 1</i>)	International Tanker Owners Pollution Federation (ITOPF)
Page 27 (<i>Volgoneft 139</i>)	Press Association Images
Page 33 (<i>Hebei Spirit</i>)	IOPC Funds
Page 37 (<i>Hebei Spirit</i>)	IOPC Funds
Page 42 (Incident in Argentina)	IOPC Funds
Page 45 (<i>King Darwin</i>)	Port of Dalhousie
Page 50 (<i>Redferrm</i>)	Nigerian Government
Page 62 (<i>Alfa I</i>)	IOPC Funds
Page 65 (<i>Nesa R3</i>)	Omani Government
Page 77 (<i>Iliad</i>)	Istockphoto.com
Page 82 (<i>Nissos Amorgos</i>)	You Inspire Photography
Page 89 (<i>Plate Princess</i>)	Getty Images

Published by the International Oil Pollution Compensation Funds

Copyright ©IOPC Funds 2014

Permission is granted to reproduce for personal and educational use only but acknowledgement is requested.

Commercial copying, hiring or lending is prohibited.

All other rights are reserved.

Pre-press by The Circus



This report has been printed on recycled paper.

Notes

[illegible]

**International Oil Pollution
Compensation Funds**

Portland House
Bressenden Place
London SW1E 5PN
United Kingdom

Telephone: +44 (0)20 7592 7100

Telefax: +44 (0)20 7592 7111

E-mail: info@iopcfunds.org

Website: www.iopcfunds.org