

TELESP CELLULAR HOLDING CO /ADR/
Form SC 13D/A
January 03, 2005

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20549

SCHEDULE 13D

Under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934

(Amendment No. 3)*

TELESP CELULAR PARTICIPAÇÕES S.A.

(Name of Issuer)

Preferred Shares, without par value
American Depositary Shares (as evidenced by
American Depositary Receipts),
each representing 2,500 preferred shares

(Title of Class of Securities)

87952L1089 (American Depositary Shares)

(CUSIP Number)

Telefónica, S.A.

Gran Via 28

28013 Madrid, Spain

+34 91 584-0306

Aitor Goyenechea

Telefónica Móviles, S.A.

Calle Goya 24,

28001 Madrid, Spain

+34 91 423 4030

(Names, Addresses and Telephone Numbers of Persons Authorized to Receive Notices and Communications)

December 17, 2004

(Date of Event which Requires Filing of this Statement)

If the filing person has previously filed a statement on Schedule 13G to report the acquisition which is the subject of this Schedule 13D, and is filing this schedule because of Rule 13d-1(e), 13d-1(f) or 13d-1(g), check the following box " ".

Note: Schedules filed in paper format shall include a signed original and five copies of the schedule, including all exhibits. See Rule 13d-7 for other parties to whom copies are to be sent.

* The remainder of this cover page shall be filled out for a reporting person's initial filing on this form with respect to the subject class of securities, and for any subsequent amendment containing information which would alter disclosures provided in a prior cover page.

The information required on the remainder of this cover page shall not be deemed to be filed for the purpose of Section 18 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (Act) or otherwise subject to the liabilities of that section of the Act but shall be subject to all other provisions of the Act (however, see the Notes).

CUSIP No.: 87952L1089

SCHEDULE 13D

1 NAME OF REPORTING PERSON:

S.S. OR I.R.S. IDENTIFICATION NO. OF ABOVE PERSON:

TELEFÓNICA, S.A.

2 CHECK THE APPROPRIATE BOX IF A MEMBER OF A GROUP:

(a)

(b)

3 SEC USE ONLY

4 SOURCE OF FUNDS:

WC, OO

5 CHECK BOX IF DISCLOSURE OF LEGAL PROCEEDINGS IS REQUIRED PURSUANT TO ITEM 2(d) OR 2(e):

6 CITIZENSHIP OR PLACE OF ORGANIZATION:

Spain

NUMBER OF	7	SOLE VOTING POWER:
SHARES		
BENEFICIALLY		None
<hr/>		
OWNED BY	8	SHARED VOTING POWER:
EACH		
REPORTING		512,693,071,463 (1) ¹
PERSON		
<hr/>		
WITH	9	SOLE DISPOSITIVE POWER:
		None
<hr/>		

10 SHARED DISPOSITIVE POWER:

512,693,071,463 (1)²

11 AGGREGATE AMOUNT BENEFICIALLY OWNED BY REPORTING PERSON:

512,693,071,463 (1)³

12 CHECK BOX IF THE AGGREGATE AMOUNT IN ROW (11) EXCLUDES CERTAIN SHARES:

13 PERCENT OF CLASS REPRESENTED BY AMOUNT IN ROW (11):

[50.1]%

14 TYPE OF REPORTING PERSON:

CO

- (1) Through its subsidiary Telefónica Móviles, S.A., Telefónica, S.A. holds a 50% interest in Brasilcel N.V. Brasilcel N.V. has sole voting and dispositive power over the preferred shares listed in Row (11). Telefónica Móviles S.A., on the one hand, and Portugal Telecom, SGPS, S.A. and PT Móveis, SGPS, S.A., on the other hand, have equal voting rights in Brasilcel N.V. pursuant to the joint venture arrangement described in Item 6 of Amendment No. 1 to the Statement on Schedule 13D filed on October 13, 2004 by the Reporting Persons. Because Telefónica Móviles, S.A. is its subsidiary, Telefónica, S.A. may be deemed to share voting and dispositive power over the preferred shares listed in Row (11).

¹ *512,693,071,463 plus the total number of preferred shares (including preferred shares underlying ADSs) subscribed or to be subscribed for by Brasilcel, N.V. and Portelcom Participações by the end of the first reoffering round on December 23, 2004.*

² *See footnote 1.*

³ *See footnote 1.*

CUSIP No.: 87952L1089

SCHEDULE 13D

1 NAME OF REPORTING PERSON:

S.S. OR I.R.S. IDENTIFICATION NO. OF ABOVE PERSON:

TELEFÓNICA MÓVILES, S.A.

2 CHECK THE APPROPRIATE BOX IF A MEMBER OF A GROUP:

(a)

(b)

3 SEC USE ONLY

4 SOURCE OF FUNDS:

WC, OO

5 CHECK BOX IF DISCLOSURE OF LEGAL PROCEEDINGS IS REQUIRED PURSUANT TO ITEM 2(d) OR 2(e):

6 CITIZENSHIP OR PLACE OF ORGANIZATION:

Spain

7 SOLE VOTING POWER:

NUMBER OF None

SHARES **8** SHARED VOTING POWER:

BENEFICIALLY

OWNED BY 512,693,071,463 (1)⁴

EACH **9** SOLE DISPOSITIVE POWER:

REPORTING

PERSON None

WITH **10** SHARED DISPOSITIVE POWER:

512,693,071,463 (1)⁵

11 AGGREGATE AMOUNT BENEFICIALLY OWNED BY REPORTING PERSON:

512,693,071,463 (1)⁶

12 CHECK BOX IF THE AGGREGATE AMOUNT IN ROW (11) EXCLUDES CERTAIN SHARES:

13 PERCENT OF CLASS REPRESENTED BY AMOUNT IN ROW (11):

[50.1]%

14 TYPE OF REPORTING PERSON:

CO

- (1) Telefónica Móviles, S.A. holds a 50% interest in Brasilcel N.V., which has sole voting and dispositive power over the preferred shares listed in Row (11). Telefónica Móviles, S.A., on the one hand, and Portugal Telecom, SGPS, S.A. and PT Móveis, SGPS, S.A., on the other hand, have equal voting rights in Brasilcel N.V. pursuant to the joint venture arrangement described in Item 6 of Amendment No. 1 to the Statement on Schedule 13D filed on October 13, 2004 by the Reporting Persons. Telefónica Móviles, S.A. therefore may be deemed to share voting and dispositive power over the preferred shares listed in Row (11).

⁴ See footnote 1.

⁵ See footnote 1.

⁶ See footnote 1.

CUSIP No.: 87952L1089

SCHEDULE 13D

1 NAME OF REPORTING PERSON:

S.S. OR I.R.S. IDENTIFICATION NO. OF ABOVE PERSON:

BRASILCEL N.V.

2 CHECK THE APPROPRIATE BOX IF A MEMBER OF A GROUP:

(a)

(b)

3 SEC USE ONLY

4 SOURCE OF FUNDS:

OO

5 CHECK BOX IF DISCLOSURE OF LEGAL PROCEEDINGS IS REQUIRED PURSUANT TO ITEM 2(d) OR 2(e):

6 CITIZENSHIP OR PLACE OF ORGANIZATION:

The Netherlands

7 SOLE VOTING POWER:

NUMBER OF 512,693,071,463 (1)⁷

SHARES

8 SHARED VOTING POWER:

BENEFICIALLY

OWNED BY

None

EACH

9 SOLE DISPOSITIVE POWER:

REPORTING

PERSON

512,693,071,463 (1)⁸

WITH

10 SHARED DISPOSITIVE POWER:

None

11 AGGREGATE AMOUNT BENEFICIALLY OWNED BY REPORTING PERSON:

512,693,071,463 (1)⁹

12 CHECK BOX IF THE AGGREGATE AMOUNT IN ROW (11) EXCLUDES CERTAIN SHARES:

13 PERCENT OF CLASS REPRESENTED BY AMOUNT IN ROW (11):

50.1%

14 TYPE OF REPORTING PERSON:

CO

- (1) Brasilcel holds or has the right to acquire within 60 days 512,693,071,463¹⁰ preferred shares, and Brasilcel's indirect wholly owned subsidiary Portelcom Participações S.A. holds directly an additional [719,908] preferred shares. A portion of the preferred shares beneficially owned by Brasilcel are held in the form of American Depositary Shares, or ADSs. See Item 5.

⁷ See footnote 1.

⁸ See footnote 1.

⁹ See footnote 1.

¹⁰ See footnote 1.

SCHEDULE 13D

Preliminary Statement

This Amendment No. 3 amends and restates the Schedule 13D filed July 16, 2003, as amended by Amendment No. 1 filed on October 13, 2004 (Amendment No. 1), and Amendment No. 2 filed on October 19, 2004, by the entities identified on the cover pages of this Schedule 13D (collectively, the Reporting Persons). This amendment relates to the preferred shares, no par value (*ações preferenciais*), of Telesp Celular Participações S.A., a corporation organized under the laws of the Federative Republic of Brazil, or TCP. The address of the principal executive office of TCP is Avenida Roque Petroni Júnior, 1,464 Morumbi, 04707-000 São Paulo, SP, Brazil, and the company's phone number is (55) 11-5105-1207.

The Reporting Persons are filing this Amendment No. 3 to report an increase in beneficial ownership of preferred shares of TCP in connection with TCP's previously announced rights offering and to make certain other changes.

Item 2 is hereby amended by amending and restating the portion of Schedule 1 to Amendment No. 1 that sets forth information regarding the board of directors of Brasilcel N.V., or Brasilcel, in its entirety as set forth in Schedule 1 to this document. Items 3, 4 and 5 are hereby amended and restated in their entirety as follows:

Item 3. Source and Amount of Funds or Other Consideration.

In October 2002, in connection with the joint agreement with Portugal Telecom, SGPS, S.A., or Portugal Telecom, and PT Móveis, SGPS, S.A. described in Item 6 to Amendment No. 1, which created Brasilcel (which has operated under the brand name Vivo since April 2003), Telefónica Móviles acquired 172,016,089,469 preferred shares, or 22.6% of TCP's preferred shares (corresponding to 14.7% of TCP's total share capital), from Portugal Telecom for Euro 200,305,535.00. In December 2002, Telefónica Móviles transferred to Brasilcel all of its shares held directly and indirectly in TCP to Brasilcel.

On November 9, 2004, TCP commenced an offering of preemptive rights to holders of its existing preferred shares and common shares. The rights exercise period for holders of ADSs representing preferred shares expired on December 10, 2004, and the rights exercise period for holders of preferred shares in Brazil expired on December 17, 2004. During the rights exercise period, Brasilcel subscribed for 133,077,526,590 new preferred shares of TCP (including 252,369 preferred shares subscribed for on behalf of its wholly owned subsidiary Portelcom Participações S.A., or Portelcom Participações, and 28,543,637,500 preferred shares represented by ADSs) for a total price of R\$665,387,632.95 plus, with respect to the preferred shares represented by ADSs, currency conversion expenses, ADS issuance fees and Brazilian financial transaction taxes. On December 21, 2004, TCP commenced the first reoffering round for holders of ADSs representing preferred shares, and such reoffering round expired on December 23, 2004. During the first reoffering round, Brasilcel subscribed for 2,238,762,424 new preferred shares of TCP (including 5,405 preferred shares subscribed for on behalf of its wholly owned subsidiary Portelcom Participações) for a total price of R\$ 11,193,812.12. Brasilcel obtained the necessary funds from a capital increase from its controlling shareholders Portugal Telecom and Telefónica Móviles. Portugal Telecom obtained the funds for its portion of the capital contribution to Brasilcel from available funds including issuances of commercial paper under an existing commercial paper facility available for general corporate purposes. Telefónica Móviles obtained the funds for its portion of the capital contribution to Brasilcel from Telefónica, which obtained the funds from existing working capital credit lines. The new preferred shares are expected to be delivered by TCP on or about January 12, 2005, and the new ADSs are expected to be delivered promptly thereafter.

Item 4. Purpose of Transaction.

The purpose of the contribution by Telefónica Móviles and Portugal Telecom of their interests in various cellular telecommunications companies in Brazil, including TCP, to Brasilcel (and the purpose of the related acquisition by Telefónica Móviles of shares of TCP in October 2002), was to create the leading cellular telecommunications operator in Brazil.

On October 8, 2004, TCP announced a capital increase in an amount of up to R\$2,054 million, to be effected through offerings of preemptive rights described in Item 3 above. Brasilcel, on behalf of itself and Portelcom Participações, fully exercised the rights it received in the rights offering and acquired additional preferred shares in the first reoffering round in order to participate in the capital increase and to avoid the dilution of their ownership interest in TCP. In addition, Brasilcel and Portelcom Participações have indicated their intention, depending on market conditions, to subscribe for any remaining common shares and preferred shares to which they are entitled in the second reoffering round for direct holders of common shares and preferred shares and have indicated that they may purchase additional common shares and preferred shares in any public auction at the São Paulo Stock Exchange that may be held with respect to shares that remain unsubscribed after the reoffering rounds. Through any such further purchases, the percentage of TCP's preferred shares beneficially owned by the Reporting Persons may increase. However, Brasilcel did not subscribe for additional ADSs that were available in the first reoffering round and will not subscribe for additional ADSs that may be available to ADS holders in connection with the second reoffering round. Neither Brasilcel nor Portelcom Participações is obligated to purchase any shares in the second reoffering round or any public auction, and they may determine not to do so.

Item 5. Interest in Securities of the Issuer.

(a) Each of Brasilcel, Telefónica and Telefónica Móviles may be deemed to be beneficial owners pursuant to the Exchange Act of the 512,692,351,555¹¹ preferred shares of TCP, or 50.1%, of TCP's preferred shares that are held by Brasilcel or that Brasilcel has the right to acquire within 60 days pursuant to the rights offering described in Items 3 and 4 above. For purposes of this calculation, the Reporting Persons have assumed an outstanding preferred share number of 897,716,776,986 (or 762,400,487,973 preferred shares outstanding prior to the rights offering plus 135,316,289,013 preferred shares subscribed for in the initial rights exercise period and in the first reoffering round) because the preferred shares that Brasilcel has the right to acquire within 60 days will be issued only if preferred shares are issued to all shareholders who subscribed for preferred shares in the initial exercise rights period). Of the preferred shares held by Brasilcel or that Brasilcel has the right to acquire within 60 days, 109,966,910,000 of the preferred shares held by Brasilcel or that Brasilcel has the right to acquire within 60 days are in the form of 43,986,764 ADSs, each of which represents 2,500 preferred shares of TCP. Each of Brasilcel, Telefónica and Telefónica Móviles may be deemed to be beneficial owners pursuant to the Exchange Act of the 719,908 preferred shares of TCP held directly by Portelcom Participações. Portugal Telecom, TMN - Telecomunicações Móveis Nacionais S.A., or TMN (a wholly owned subsidiary of Portugal Telecom), and PT Móveis, SGPS, S.A., or PT Móveis, may be deemed to be beneficial owners pursuant to the Exchange Act of the shares of TCP held by Brasilcel and Portelcom Participações and may be deemed, together with Telefónica, Telefónica Móviles, Brasilcel and Portelcom Participações, to comprise a group within the meaning of Section 13(d)(3) of the Exchange Act. However, the Reporting Persons disclaim membership in a group within the meaning of Section 13(d)(3) of the Exchange Act. To the knowledge of the Reporting Persons, none of the persons listed on Schedule 1 hereto beneficially owns any preferred shares of TCP.

(b) Brasilcel has sole power to vote or to dispose of the preferred shares of TCP it holds and will have the sole power to vote or to dispose of the preferred shares of TCP it acquires in the rights offering (subject to customary limitations on voting pursuant to the applicable deposit agreement with respect to preferred shares held in the form of ADSs). Portelcom Participações and its parent Brasilcel each may be deemed to have sole power to vote or to dispose of preferred shares of TCP that Portelcom Participações holds directly. Pursuant to the joint venture arrangement described in Item 6 to Amendment No. 1, Telefónica Móviles, on one hand, and, Portugal Telecom and PT Móveis (and its parent TMN), on the other hand, have equal voting rights in Brasilcel and therefore each may be deemed to share the power to vote or to dispose of preferred shares of TCP held directly and indirectly by Brasilcel. Telefónica, as the parent of Telefónica Móviles, may therefore also be deemed to share the power to vote or to dispose of preferred shares of TCP held directly and indirectly by Brasilcel.

¹¹ *512,692,351,555 plus the total number of preferred shares (including preferred shares underlying ADSs) subscribed or to be subscribed for by Brasilcel N.V. by the end of the first reoffering round on December 23, 2004.*

Pursuant to Item 5(b) of the instructions to Schedule 13D, the Reporting Persons are required to provide certain information regarding Portugal Telecom and PT Móveis, with whom they may be deemed to share the power to vote or to dispose of preferred shares of TCP held directly and indirectly by Brasilcel. The information contained in Item 2 to the Schedule 13D filed by Portugal Telecom, TMN, PT Móveis, Brasilcel and Portelcom Participações on October 13, 2004 with respect to the preferred shares of TCP (except for the information in such Item 2 relating to Brasilcel, Portelcom Participações and their directors and officers), as such information may have been amended on or about the date hereof or may be amended after the date hereof by such persons, is hereby incorporated by reference into this document. However the Reporting Persons have not independently verified that information and take no responsibility therefor.

(c) None of the Reporting Persons has effected any transaction in the preferred shares of TCP in the past 60 days other than those transactions described in Items 3 and 4 above. To the knowledge of the Reporting Persons, none of the persons listed on Schedule 1 hereto has effected any transactions in the preferred shares of TCP in the past 60 days.

(d) No person other than the Reporting Persons is known to have the right to receive or the power to direct the receipt of the dividends from, or the proceeds from the sale of the preferred shares of TCP held directly and indirectly by Brasilcel, except for the rights and powers of Portugal Telecom and PT Móveis under the joint venture arrangement described in Item 6 to Amendment No. 1 and the rights and powers of TMN as the controlling shareholder of PT Móveis.

(e) Not applicable.

SIGNATURE

After reasonable inquiry and to the best of my knowledge and belief, I certify that the information set forth in this statement is true, complete and correct.

BRASILCEL N.V.

By: /s/ Francisco José Azevedo Padinha

Name: Francisco José Azevedo Padinha
Title: Attorney-in-fact

By: /s/ Paulo Cesar Teixeira

Name: Paulo Cesar Teixeira
Title: Attorney-in-fact

Dated: December 30, 2004

[Signature Page to Amendment No. 3 to Schedule 13D]

TELEFÓNICA, S.A.

By: /s/ Antonio J. Alonso Ureba

Name: Antonio J. Alonso Ureba
Title: General Secretary and Secretary of the
Board of Telefónica S.A.

Dated: December 30, 2004

[Signature Page to Amendment No. 3 to Schedule 13D]

TELEFÓNICA MÓVILES, S.A.

By: /s/ Antonio Hornedo Mugi

Name: Antonio Hornedo Mugi
Title: General Counsel

Dated: December 30, 2004

[Signature Page to Amendment No. 3 to Schedule 13D]

SCHEDULE 1

BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF BRASILCEL

BRASILCEL N.V.

Board of Directors (Brasilcel N.V. does not have executive officers.)

- (a) Mr. Zeinal Abedin Mahomed Bava
 - (b) Avenida Fontes Pereira de Melo, 40, 1069-300 Lisbon, Portugal
 - (c) Chief Financial Officer of Portugal Telecom, SGPS, S.A. Member of the Board of Directors of Brasilcel N.V, Telesp Celular Participações S.A., Tele Centro Oeste Celular Participações S.A., Tele Sudeste Celular Participações S.A., Tele Leste Celular Participações S.A. and Celular CRT Participações S.A.
 - (d) Portugal
-
- (a) Mr. Álvaro José Roquette Morais
 - (b) Avenida Fontes Pereira de Melo, 40, 1069-300 Lisbon, Portugal
 - (c) Director and Chief Operating Officer of Portugal Telecom Investimentos Internacionais Consultoria Internacional S.A.
 - (d) Portugal
-
- (a) Mr. Carlos Manuel de Lucena e Vasconcellos Cruz
 - (b) Avenida Fontes Pereira de Melo, 40, 1069-300 Lisbon, Portugal
 - (c) Chief Executive Officer of Portugal Telecom Investimentos Internacionais Consultoria Internacional S.A. and PT Ventures, SGPS, S.A.; Director and Executive Officer of Portugal Telecom, SGPS, S.A. Member of the Board of Directors of Brasilcel N.V, Telesp Celular Participações S.A., Tele Centro Oeste Celular Participações S.A., Tele Sudeste Celular Participações S.A., Tele Leste Celular Participações S.A. and Celular CRT Participações S.A.
 - (d) Portugal
-
- (a) Mr. Harry Dirk Hilbert Moraal
 - (b) Strawinskyiaan, 3105, 1077 ZX, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
 - (c) Head of Client Relations, ABN AMRO Trust (Amsterdam)
 - (d) The Netherlands
-
- (a) Mr. Paul Johannes Antonius Wilbrink
 - (b) Strawinskyiaan, 3105, 1077 ZX, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
 - (c) Senior Client Relationship Manager, ABN AMRO Trust Company (Nederland) B.V.
 - (d) The Netherlands
-
- (a) Mr. Hendrik Justus Wirix
 - (b) Strawinskyiaan, 3105, 1077 ZX, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
 - (c) Deputy Manager and Chief Legal Counsel, ABN AMRO Trust Company (Nederland) B.V.
 - (d) The Netherlands
-
- (a) Ms. Lara Ieka Runne
 - (b) Strawinskyiaan, 3105, 1077 ZX, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
 - (c) Corporate lawyer, ABN AMRO Trust Company (Nederland) B.V.
 - (d) The Netherlands
-
- (a) Mr. Marcus Antonius Joseph Persel
 - (b) Strawinskyiaan, 3105, 1077 ZX, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Edgar Filing: TELESP CELLULAR HOLDING CO /ADR/ - Form SC 13D/A

- (c) Senior Client Relationship Manager, ABN AMRO Trust Company (Nederland) B.V.
- (d) The Netherlands

- (a) Mr. Carlos David Maroto Sobrado
 - (b) Aert van Nesstraat 45, 3012 CA Rotterdam, The Netherlands
 - (c) Executive Managing Director of Telefónica Europe B.V.
 - (d) Spain
-
- (a) Mr. Antonio Pedro de Carvalho Viana Baptista
 - (b) Pº Recoletos, 7-9, 3ª Planta, 28004, Madrid, Spain.
 - (c) Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Telefónica Móviles, S.A. Member of the Board of Directors of Tele Leste Celular Participações S.A.
 - (d) Portugal
-
- (a) Mr. Ignacio Aller Mallo
 - (b) C/ Goya, 24, 28001, Madrid, Spain
 - (c) Member of the Board of Directors of Telefónica Móviles Mexico, S.A. de C.V., Brasilcel N.V, Telesp Celular Participações S.A., Tele Centro Oeste Celular Participações S.A., Tele Sudeste Celular Participações S.A., Tele Leste Celular Participações S.A. and Celular CRT Participações S.A.
 - (d) Spain
-
- (a) Mr. Félix Pablo Ivorra Cano
 - (b) C/ Goya, 24, 28001, Madrid, Spain
 - (c) Executive Vice-President for Brazil and Latin America of Telefónica Móviles, S.A.; Member of the Board of Directors of Brasilcel N.V, Telesp Celular Participações S.A., Tele Centro Oeste Celular Participações S.A., Tele Sudeste Celular Participações S.A., Tele Leste Celular Participações S.A. and Celular CRT Participações S.A.
 - (d) Spain
-
- (a) Mr. Ernesto Lopez Mozo
 - (b) C/ Goya, 24, 28001, Madrid, Spain
 - (c) Chief Financial Officer and General Manager for Finance and Management Control of Telefónica Móviles, S.A. Member of the Board of Directors of Brasilcel N.V, Telesp Celular Participações S.A., Tele Centro Oeste Celular Participações S.A., Tele Sudeste Celular Participações S.A., Tele Leste Celular Participações S.A. and Celular CRT Participações S.A.
 - (d) Spain
-
- (a) Mr. Robertus Hendrikus Lukas de Groot
 - (b) Strawinskyiaan, 3105, 1077 ZX, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
 - (c) Senior Client Relationship Manager ABN AMRO Trust Company (Nederland) B.V.
 - (d) The Netherlands
-
- (a) Mr. Alexander Daniël de Vreeze
 - (b) Strawinskyiaan, 3105, 1077 ZX, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
 - (c) Head of Commercial Organization and member of the management team, ABN AMRO Trust Company (Nederland) B.V.
 - (d) The Netherlands
-
- (a) Mr. Fernando Xavier Ferreira
 - (b) Rua Martiniano de Carvalho, 851, 21 andar, 01321-001 São Paulo, SP, Brazil
 - (c) Chief Executive Officer of Telesp Comunicações S.A. TELESP. Member of the Board of Directors of Brasilcel N.V, Telesp Celular Participações S.A., Tele Centro Oeste Celular Participações S.A., Tele Sudeste Celular Participações S.A., Tele Leste Celular Participações S.A. and Celular CRT Participações S.A.
 - (d) Brazil
-
- (a) Mr. Eduardo Perestrelo Correia de Matos
 - (b) Av. Brigadeiro Faria Lima, 2277, 15º andar, Suite 1503, 01452-000, São Paulo, SP, Brazil
 - (c) President of Portugal Telecom Brasil S.A. Member of the Board of Directors of Brasilcel N.V, Telesp Celular Participações S.A., Tele Centro Oeste Celular Participações S.A., Tele Sudeste Celular Participações S.A., Tele Leste Celular Participações S.A. and Celular CRT Participações S.A.
 - (d) Portugal

- (a) Mr. Pedro Manuel Brandão Rodrigues
 - (b) Avenida Álvaro Pais, 02, 1649-041 Lisbon, Portugal
 - (c) Director and Executive Officer of TMN Telecomunicações Móveis Nacionais, S.A. Member of the Board of Directors of Brasilcel N.V, Telesp Celular Participações S.A., Tele Centro Oeste Celular Participações S.A., Tele Sudeste Celular Participações S.A., Tele Leste Celular Participações S.A. and Celular CRT Participações S.A.
 - (d) Portugal
-
- (a) Mr. Paul Jozef Schmitz
 - (b) Strawinskyiaan, 3105, 1077 ZX, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
 - (c) Senior Account Manger, ABN AMRO Trust Company (Nederland) B.V.
 - (d) The Netherlands
-
- (a) Mr. Benjamin de Koe
 - (b) Strawinskyiaan, 3105, 1077 ZX, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
 - (c) Chief Accounting Officer and Client Relationship Manager, ABN AMRO Trust Company (Nederland) B.V.
 - (d) The Netherlands
-
- (a) Mr. Luis Miguel Gilperez López
 - (b) C/ Goya, 24, 28001, Madrid, Spain
 - (c) Executive Director of International Area of Telefónica Móviles S.A. Member of the Board of Directors of Brasilcel N.V, Telesp Celular Participações S.A., Tele Centro Oeste Celular Participações S.A., Tele Sudeste Celular Participações S.A. and Celular CRT Participações S.A.
 - (d) Spain
-
- (a) Mr. J.C.W. van Burg
 - (b) Strawinskyiaan, 3105, 1077 ZX, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
 - (c) Managing Director, ABN AMRO Trust Company (Netherlands) B.V.
 - (d) The Netherlands
-
- (a) Mr. C.J.P. Kluft
 - (b) Strawinskyiaan, 3105, 1077 ZX, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
 - (c) Assistant to the Head of the Legal Department, ABN AMRO Trust Company (Netherlands) B.V.
 - (d) The Netherlands
-
- (a) Mr. Shakhaf Wine
 - (b) Praia de Botafogo, 501, 22250-040, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil
 - (c) Member of the board of directors of each of Brasilcel N.V., Telesp Celular Participações S.A., Tele Centro Oeste Participações S.A., Tele Sudeste Participações S.A., Celular CRT Participações S.A, Universo Online S.A. and Banco1.Net S.A.
 - (d) Brazil

EXHIBIT INDEX

1. Joint Filing Agreement dated October 12, 2004.*
2. Shareholders Agreement by and among Telefónica Móviles, S.A., Portugal Telecom SGPS, S.A., PT Móveis SGPS, S.A. and Brasilcel B.V. on October 17, 2002, incorporated by reference to Exhibit 4.3 to the Annual Report on Form 20-F of Telefónica, S.A. filed on June 30, 2003 (the 2002 Telefónica 20-F) (SEC file number 001-09531).*
3. Subscription Agreement by and among Telefónica Móviles, S.A., Portugal Telecom SGPS, S.A., PT Móveis SGPS, S.A. and Brasilcel B.V. on October 17, 2002, incorporated by reference to Exhibit 4.4 to the 2002 Telefónica 20-F.*
4. Power of Attorney of Brasilcel N.V.*

* Previously included as an exhibit.

ny declines in container freight rates could negatively affect the liner companies to which we seek to charter our containerships.

The demand for vessels has generally been influenced by, among other factors:

global and regional economic conditions;

developments in international trade;

changes in seaborne and other transportation patterns, such as port congestion and canal closures or expansions;

supply and demand for energy resources, commodities, semi-finished and finished consumer and industrial products;

changes in the exploration or production of energy resources, commodities, semi-finished and finished consumer and industrial products;

supply and demand for products shipped in containers;

changes in global production of raw materials or products transported by containerships;

the distance drybulk cargo or containers are to be moved by sea;

the globalization of manufacturing;

carrier alliances, vessel sharing or container slot sharing that seek to allocate container ship capacity on routes;

weather and crop yields;

armed conflicts and terrorist activities including piracy;

political, environmental and other regulatory developments;

embargoes and strikes; and

technical advances in ship design and construction.

Table of Contents

The supply of vessel capacity has generally been influenced by, among other factors:

the number of vessels that are in or out of service;

the scrapping rate of older vessels;

port and canal traffic and congestion;

the number of newbuilding deliveries;

vessel casualties;

the availability of shipyard capacity; and

the economics of slow steaming.

Charter rates in the drybulk and container shipping industry have decreased from their historically high levels and may decrease further in the future, which may adversely affect our earnings and ability to pay dividends.

The current charter rates for drybulk and container vessels have significantly decreased from their historic highs reached in the second quarter of 2008. If the drybulk shipping industry, which has been highly cyclical, is depressed in the future when our charters expire, our earnings and available cash flow may be adversely affected. We cannot assure you that we will be able to successfully charter our vessels in the future or renew our existing charters at rates sufficient to allow us to operate our business profitably, to meet our obligations, including payment of debt service to our lenders, or to pay dividends to our unitholders. Our ability to renew the charters on our vessels on the expiration or termination of our current charters, or on vessels that we may acquire in the future, the charter rates payable under any replacement charters will depend upon, among other things, economic conditions in the sectors in which our vessels operate at that time, changes in the supply and demand for vessel capacity and changes in the supply and demand for the transportation of commodities.

All of our drybulk time charters are scheduled to expire on dates ranging from March 2015 to September 2022. If, upon expiration or termination of these or other contracts, long-term recharter rates are lower than existing rates, particularly considering that we intend to enter into long-term charters, or if we are unable to obtain replacement charters, our earnings, cash flow and our ability to make cash distributions to our unitholders could be materially adversely affected.

Five of the seven containerships that we own are on long-term time charter for ten years until 2023 with our option to terminate after year seven. The two other owned containerships are on charter until 2018. An additional containership will be delivered into our fleet at the end of the first quarter of 2015. Our ability to re-charter our containerships upon the expiration or termination of their current time charters and the charter rates payable under any renewal options or replacement time charters will depend upon, among other things, the prevailing state of the containership charter

market, which can be affected by consumer demand for products shipped in containers. If the charter market is depressed when our containerships' time charters expire, we may be forced to re-charter our containerships at reduced or even unprofitable rates, or we may not be able to re-charter them at all, which may reduce or eliminate our earnings, make our earnings volatile, affect our ability to generate cash flows and maintain liquidity.

We are focused on employing vessels on long-term charters and we may have difficulties in doing so if a more active short-term or post market develops.

One of our principal strategies is to enter into long-term charters, although we believe it is impractical to determine the typical charter length for vessels in our sectors due to factors such as market dynamics, charter strategy and the private nature of charter agreements. If a market for long-term time charters in the sectors in which we operate does not develop, we may have increased difficulty entering into long-term time charters upon expiration or early termination of the time charters for our vessels. As a result, our revenues and cash flows may become more volatile. In addition, an active short-term or spot charter market may require us to enter into charters based on changing market prices, as opposed to contracts based on fixed rates, which could result in a decrease in our revenues and cash flows, including cash available for distribution to unitholders, if we enter into charters during periods when the market price for shipping drybulk and containerized cargoes is depressed.

An oversupply of drybulk carrier capacity may prolong or further depress the current low charter rates and, in turn, adversely affect our profitability.

The market supply of drybulk carriers has been increasing as a result of the delivery of numerous newbuilding orders over the last few years. Newbuildings have been delivered in significant numbers since the beginning of 2006 and, as of January 1, 2014, newbuilding orders had been placed for an aggregate of more than 21% of the existing global drybulk fleet, with deliveries expected during the next three years. Due to lack of financing many analysts expect significant cancellations and/or slippage of newbuilding orders. While vessel supply will continue to be affected by the delivery of new vessels and the removal of vessels from the global fleet, either through scrapping or accidental losses, an over-supply of drybulk carrier capacity could exacerbate decreases in charter rates or prolong the period during which low charter rates prevail which may have a material adverse effect on our business, results of operations, cash flows, financial condition and ability to pay dividends.

Table of Contents

An oversupply of containership capacity may prolong or further depress the current charter rates and adversely affect our ability to re-charter our existing containerships at profitable rates or at all.

From 2005 through the first quarter of 2010, the containership order-book was at historically high levels as a percentage of the in-water fleet. Although order-book volumes have decreased as deliveries of previously ordered containerships increased substantially, some renewed ordering in 2012 maintained the order-book at average levels. In 2013, ordering of larger vessels continued to increase as liner companies looked to renew and modernize their fleets. An oversupply of newbuilding vessels and/or vessels available for re-charter entering the market, combined with any future decline in the demand for containerships, may result in a reduction of charter rates and may decrease our ability to re-charter our containerships other than for reduced rates or unprofitable rates, or we may not be able to re-charter our containerships at all.

The market values of our vessels, which have declined from historically high levels, may fluctuate significantly, which could cause us to breach covenants in our credit facilities and result in the foreclosure on our mortgaged vessels.

Factors that influence vessel values include:

number of newbuilding deliveries;

prevailing economic conditions in the markets in which containerships operate;

reduce demand for containerships, including as a result of a substantial or extended decline in world trade;

number of vessels scrapped or otherwise removed from the total fleet;

changes in environmental and other regulations that may limit the useful life of vessels;

changes in global dry cargo commodity supply;

types and sizes of vessels;

development of an increase in use of other modes of transportation;

cost of vessel acquisitions;

governmental or other regulations;

prevailing level of charter rates;

general economic and market conditions affecting the shipping industry; and

the cost of retrofitting or modifying existing ships to respond to technological advances in vessel design or equipment, changes in applicable environmental or other regulations or standards, or otherwise.

If the market values of our owned vessels decrease, we may breach covenants contained in our credit facilities. We purchased the majority of our drybulk vessels from Navios Holdings based on market prices that were for certain vessels at historically high levels. If we breach the covenants in our credit facilities and are unable to remedy any relevant breach, our lenders could accelerate our debt and foreclose on the collateral, including our vessels. Any loss of vessels would significantly decrease our ability to generate positive cash flow from operations and therefore service our debt. In addition, if the book value of a vessel is impaired due to unfavorable market conditions, or a vessel is sold at a price below its book value, we would incur a loss. If a charter expires or is terminated, we may be unable to re-charter the vessel at an acceptable rate and, rather than continue to incur costs to maintain the vessel, may seek to dispose of it. Our inability to dispose of a vessel at a reasonable price could result in a loss on its sale and adversely affect our results of operations and financial condition.

A number of third party owners have ordered so-called eco-type vessel designs, which offer substantial bunker savings as compared to older designs. Increased demand for and supply of eco-type vessels could reduce demand for our vessels that are not classified as such and expose us to lower vessel utilization and/or decreased charter rates.

The new vessel designs purport to offer material bunker savings compared to older designs, which include certain of our vessels. Such savings could result in a substantial reduction of bunker cost for charterers compared to such vessels of ours. As the supply of such eco-type vessel increases and if charterers prefer such vessels over our vessels that are not classified as such, this may reduce demand for our non-eco-type vessels, impair our ability to recharter such vessels at competitive rates and have a material adverse effect on our cash flows and operations.

We must make substantial capital expenditures to maintain the operating capacity of our fleet, which will reduce our cash available for distribution. In addition, each quarter our board of directors is required to deduct estimated maintenance and replacement capital expenditures from operating surplus, which may result in less cash available to unitholders than if actual maintenance and replacement capital expenditures were deducted.

We must make substantial capital expenditures to maintain, over the long-term, the operating capacity of our fleet. These maintenance and replacement capital expenditures include capital expenditures associated with drydocking a vessel, modifying an existing vessel or acquiring a new vessel to the extent these expenditures are incurred to maintain the operating capacity of our fleet.

Table of Contents

These expenditures could increase as a result of changes in:

the cost of our labor and materials;

the cost of suitable replacement vessels;

customer/market requirements;

increases in the size of our fleet; and

governmental regulations and maritime self-regulatory organization standards relating to safety, security or the environment.

Our significant maintenance and replacement capital expenditures will reduce the amount of cash we have available for distribution to our unitholders. In each of October 2013, August 2014 and February 2015, Navios Partners amended its existing management agreement with the Manager to fix the fees for ship management services of its owned fleet excluding drydocking expenses which are reimbursed at cost by Navios Partners at: (a) \$4,000 daily rate per Ultra-Handymax vessel; (b) \$4,100 daily rate per Panamax vessel; (c) \$5,100 daily rate per Capesize vessel; (d) \$6,500 daily rate per Container vessel of TEU 6,800; (e) \$7,200 daily rate per Container vessel of more than TEU 8,000; and (f) \$8,500 daily rate per very large Container vessel of more than TEU 13,000 through December 31, 2015. From January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2017, we expect that we will reimburse the Manager for all of the actual operating costs and expenses it incurs in connection with the management of our fleet.

Our partnership agreement requires our board of directors to deduct estimated, rather than actual, maintenance and replacement capital expenditures from operating surplus each quarter in an effort to reduce fluctuations in operating surplus. The amount of estimated capital expenditures deducted from operating surplus is subject to review and change by the conflicts committee of our board of directors at least once a year. If our board of directors underestimates the appropriate level of estimated maintenance and replacement capital expenditures, we may have less cash available for distribution in future periods when actual capital expenditures begin to exceed previous estimates.

If we expand the size of our fleet in the future, we generally will be required to make significant installment payments for acquisitions of vessels even prior to their delivery and generation of revenue. Depending on whether we finance our expenditures through cash from operations or by issuing debt or equity securities, our ability to make cash distributions to unitholders may be diminished or our financial leverage could increase or our unitholders could be diluted.

The actual cost of a vessel varies significantly depending on the market price, the size and specifications of the vessel, governmental regulations and maritime self-regulatory organization standards.

If we purchase additional vessels in the future, we generally will be required to make installment payments prior to their delivery. If we finance these acquisition costs by issuing debt or equity securities, we will increase the aggregate amount of interest payments or minimum quarterly distributions we must make prior to generating cash from the

operation of the vessel.

To fund the remaining portion of these and other capital expenditures, we will be required to use cash from operations or incur borrowings or raise capital through the sale of debt or additional equity securities. Use of cash from operations will reduce cash available for distributions to unitholders. Our ability to obtain bank financing or to access the capital markets for future offerings may be limited by our financial condition at the time of any such financing or offering as well as by adverse market conditions resulting from, among other things, general economic conditions and contingencies and uncertainties that are beyond our control. Our failure to obtain the funds for necessary future capital expenditures could have a material adverse effect on our business, results of operations and financial condition and on our ability to make cash distributions. Even if we successfully obtain necessary funds, the terms of such financings could limit our ability to pay cash distributions to unitholders. In addition, incurring additional debt may significantly increase our interest expense and financial leverage, and issuing additional preferred and common equity securities may result in significant unitholder dilution and would increase the aggregate amount of cash required to meet our quarterly distributions to our preferred unitholders and minimum quarterly distribution to our common unitholders, which could have a material adverse effect on our ability to make cash distributions to all of our unitholders.

Our debt levels may limit our flexibility in obtaining additional financing and in pursuing other business opportunities and our interest rates under our credit facilities may fluctuate and may impact our operations.

As of December 31, 2014, all of our facilities were fully drawn and the total borrowings under our credit facilities amounted to \$583.3 million. We have the ability to incur additional debt, subject to limitations in our credit facilities. Our level of debt could have important consequences to us, including the following:

our ability to obtain additional financing, if necessary, for working capital, capital expenditures, acquisitions or other purposes may be impaired or such financing may not be available on favorable terms;

Table of Contents

we will need a substantial portion of our cash flow to make principal and interest payments on our debt, reducing the funds that would otherwise be available for operations, future business opportunities and distributions to unitholders;

our debt level will make us more vulnerable than our competitors with less debt to competitive pressures or a downturn in our business or the economy generally; and

our debt level may limit our flexibility in responding to changing business and economic conditions. Our ability to service our debt depends upon, among other things, our future financial and operating performance, which will be affected by prevailing economic conditions and financial, business, regulatory and other factors, some of which are beyond our control. Our ability to service debt under our credit facilities also will depend on market interest rates, since the interest rates applicable to our borrowings will fluctuate with the London Interbank Offered Rate, or LIBOR, or the prime rate. We do not currently hedge against increases in such rates and, accordingly, significant increases in such rate would require increased debt levels and reduce distributable cash. If our operating results are not sufficient to service our current or future indebtedness, we will be forced to take actions such as reducing distributions, reducing or delaying our business activities, acquisitions, investments or capital expenditures, selling assets, restructuring or refinancing our debt, or seeking additional equity capital or bankruptcy protection. We may not be able to affect any of these remedies on satisfactory terms, or at all.

Our credit facilities contain restrictive covenants, which may limit our business and financing activities.

We have a credit facility with Commerzbank AG and DVB Bank AG for \$290.45 million (the July 2012 Facility), a term loan facility (the Term Loan B Facility), for \$439.5 million and a credit facility with ABN AMRO Bank N.V. (the September 2014 Credit Facility) for \$56.0 million (divided into two tranches). As of December 31, 2014, the outstanding loan balance under Navios Partners credit facilities was \$583.3 million.

The operating and financial restrictions and covenants in our credit facilities and any future credit facilities could adversely affect our ability to finance future operations or capital needs or to engage, expand or pursue our business activities. For example, our credit facilities require the consent of our lenders or limit our ability to, among other items:

incur or guarantee indebtedness;

charge, pledge or encumber the vessels;

merge or consolidate;

change the flag, class or commercial and technical management of our vessels;

make cash distributions;

make new investments; and

sell or change the ownership or control of our vessels.

Our credit facilities also require us to comply with the International Safety Management Code, or ISM Code, and International Ship and Port Facilities Security Code, or ISPS Code, and to maintain valid safety management certificates and documents of compliance at all times.

In addition, our credit facilities require us to:

maintain a required security amount of over 140%;

maintain minimum free consolidated liquidity of at least the higher of \$25.0 million and the aggregate of interest and principal falling due during the previous six months;

maintain a ratio of EBITDA to interest expense of at least 5.00 : 1.00;

maintain a ratio of total liabilities to total assets (as defined in our credit facilities) of less than 0.65:1.00; and

maintain a minimum net worth (as defined in our credit facilities) of at least \$250.0 million.

The Term Loan B facility is secured by first priority mortgages covering certain vessels owned by subsidiaries of Navios Partners, in addition to other collateral and is guaranteed by each subsidiary of Navios Partners. The Term Loan B Agreement requires maintenance of a loan to value ratio of 0.8 to 1.0, and other restrictive covenants customary for facilities of this type (subject to negotiated exceptions and baskets), including restrictions on indebtedness, liens, acquisitions and investments, restricted payments and dispositions. The Term Loan B Agreement also provides for customary events of default.

Table of Contents

Our ability to comply with the covenants and restrictions that are contained in our credit facilities and any other debt instruments we may enter into in the future may be affected by events beyond our control, including prevailing economic, financial and industry conditions. If market or other economic conditions deteriorate, our ability to comply with these covenants may be impaired. If we are in breach of any of the restrictions, covenants, ratios or tests in our credit facilities, especially if we trigger a cross default currently contained in certain of our loan agreements, a significant portion of our obligations may become immediately due and payable, and our lenders' commitment to make further loans to us may terminate. We may not have, or be able to obtain, sufficient funds to make these accelerated payments. In addition, our obligations under our credit facilities are secured by certain of our vessels, and if we are unable to repay borrowings under such credit facilities, lenders could seek to foreclose on those vessels.

Restrictions in our debt agreements may prevent us from paying distributions to unitholders.

Our payment of principal and interest on the debt will reduce cash available for distribution on our common units. In addition, our credit facilities prohibit the payment of distributions if we are not in compliance with certain financial covenants or upon the occurrence of an event of default.

Events of default under our credit facilities include, among other things, the following:

failure to pay any principal, interest, fees, expenses or other amounts when due;

failure to observe any other agreement, security instrument, obligation or covenant beyond specified cure periods in certain cases;

default under other indebtedness;

an event of insolvency or bankruptcy;

material adverse change in the financial position or prospects of us or our general partner;

failure of any representation or warranty to be materially correct; and

failure of Navios Holdings or its affiliates (as defined in the credit facilities agreements) to own at least 20% of us.

We anticipate that any subsequent refinancing of our current debt or any new debt will have similar restrictions.

We are a holding company, and we depend on the ability of our subsidiaries to dividend funds to us in order to satisfy our financial obligations or pay distributions, if any, in the future.

We are a holding company and our subsidiaries conduct all of our operations and own all of our operating assets. We have no significant assets other than the equity interests in our subsidiaries. As a result, our ability to make

distribution payments, if any, in the future depends on our subsidiaries and their ability to dividend funds to us. If we are unable to obtain funds from our subsidiaries, our board of directors may not exercise its discretion to pay distributions in the future. In addition, the declaration and payment of distributions, if any, in the future will depend on the provisions of Marshall Islands law affecting the payment of dividends to us. Marshall Islands law generally prohibits the payment of dividends if the subsidiary is insolvent or would be rendered insolvent upon payment of such dividend, and our distribution may be declared and paid out of our operating surplus. Dividends may be declared or paid out of net profits for the fiscal year in which the dividend is declared and for the preceding fiscal year. Our ability to pay distributions, if any, in the future will also be subject to our satisfaction of certain requirements in accordance with financial covenants contained in our credit facilities.

We depend on Navios Holdings and its affiliates to assist us in operating and expanding our business.

Pursuant to the Management Agreement between us and the Manager, the Manager provides to us significant commercial and technical management services (including the commercial and technical management of our vessels, vessel maintenance and crewing, purchasing and insurance and shipyard supervision). In addition, pursuant to the Administrative Services Agreement between us and the Manager, the Manager provides to us significant administrative, financial and other support services. Our operational success and ability to execute our growth strategy depends significantly upon the Manager's satisfactory performance of these services. Our business will be harmed if the Manager fails to perform these services satisfactorily, if the Manager cancels either of these agreements, or if the Manager stops providing these services to us. We may also in the future contract with Navios Holdings for it to have newbuildings constructed on our behalf and to incur the construction-related financing. We would purchase the vessels on or after delivery based on an agreed-upon price.

Our ability to enter into new charters and expand our customer relationships will depend largely on our ability to leverage our relationship with Navios Holdings and its reputation and relationships in the shipping industry. If Navios Holdings suffers material damage to its reputation or relationships, it may harm our ability to:

Table of Contents

renew existing charters upon their expiration;

obtain new charters;

successfully interact with shipyards during periods of shipyard construction constraints;

obtain financing on commercially acceptable terms; or

maintain satisfactory relationships with suppliers and other third parties.

If our ability to do any of the things described above is impaired, it could have a material adverse effect on our business, results of operations and financial condition and our ability to make cash distributions.

As we expand our business, we may have difficulty managing our growth, which could increase expenses.

We intend to seek to grow our fleet, either through purchases, the increase of the number of chartered-in vessels or through the acquisitions of businesses. The addition of vessels to our fleet or the acquisition of new businesses will impose significant additional responsibilities on our management. We will also have to increase our customer base to provide continued employment for the new vessels. Our growth will depend on:

locating and acquiring suitable vessels;

identifying and consummating acquisitions or joint ventures;

integrating any acquired business successfully with our existing operations;

enhancing our customer base;

managing our expansion; and

obtaining required financing.

Growing any business by acquisition presents numerous risks such as undisclosed liabilities and obligations, difficulty in obtaining additional qualified personnel, and managing relationships with customers and suppliers and integrating newly acquired operations into existing infrastructures. We cannot give any assurance that we will be successful in executing our growth plans or that we will not incur significant expenses and losses in connection therewith or that our acquisitions will perform as expected, which could materially adversely affect our results of operations and financial condition.

Unlike newbuilding vessels, secondhand vessels typically do not carry warranties as to their condition. While we generally inspect existing vessels prior to purchase, such an inspection would normally not provide us with as much knowledge of a vessel's condition as we would possess if it had been built for us and operated by us during its life. Repairs and maintenance costs for secondhand vessels are difficult to predict and may be substantially higher than for vessels we have operated since they were built. These costs could decrease our cash flows, liquidity and our ability to pay dividends to our unitholders.

Our growth depends on continued growth in demand for drybulk commodities, finished or semi-finished goods, the shipping of drybulk cargoes as well as the shipping of containers.

Our growth strategy focuses on expansion in the drybulk and container shipping sectors. Accordingly, our growth depends on continued growth in world and regional demand for drybulk commodities, finished or semi-finished goods and the shipping of drybulk and containerized cargoes, which could be negatively affected by a number of factors, such as declines in prices for drybulk commodities or containerized cargoes, or general political and economic conditions.

Reduced demand for drybulk commodities and the shipping of drybulk and containerized cargoes would have a material adverse effect on our future growth and could harm our business, results of operations and financial condition. In particular, Asian Pacific economies and India have been the main driving force behind the current increase in seaborne drybulk trade and the demand for drybulk carriers. The Asian Pacific and Indian economies have also been significant suppliers of manufactured goods currently shipped by container to the developed markets of the OECD. A negative change in economic conditions in any Asian Pacific country, but particularly in China, Japan or India, may have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations, as well as our future prospects, by reducing demand and resultant charter rates.

Table of Contents

Our growth depends on our ability to expand relationships with existing customers and obtain new customers, for which we will face substantial competition.

Long-term time charters have the potential to provide income at pre-determined rates over more extended periods of time. However, the process for obtaining longer term time charters is highly competitive and generally involves a lengthy, intensive and continuous screening and vetting process and the submission of competitive bids that often extends for several months. In addition to the quality, age and suitability of the vessel, longer term shipping contracts tend to be awarded based upon a variety of other factors relating to the vessel operator, including:

the operator's environmental, health and safety record;

compliance with International Maritime Organization, or IMO, standards and the heightened industry standards that have been set by some energy companies;

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

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

quality, experience and technical capability of crews;

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

relationships with shipyards and the ability to obtain suitable berths;

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

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

competitiveness of the bid in terms of overall price.

It is likely that we will face substantial competition for long-term charter business from a number of experienced companies. We may not be able to compete profitably as we expand our business into new geographic regions or provide new services. New markets may require different skills, knowledge or strategies that we use in our current markets. Many of these competitors have significantly greater financial resources than we do. It is also likely that we will face increased numbers of competitors entering into our transportation sectors, including in the drybulk sector. Many of these competitors have strong reputations and extensive resources and experience. Increased competition

may cause greater price competition, especially for long-term charters.

As a result of these factors, we may be unable to expand our relationships with existing customers or obtain new customers for long-term charters on a profitable basis, if at all. However, even if we are successful in employing our vessels under longer term charters, our vessels will not be available for trading in the spot market during an upturn in the drybulk and container market cycle, when spot trading may be more profitable. If we cannot successfully employ our vessels in profitable time charters our results of operations and operating cash flow could be adversely affected.

We may be unable to make or realize expected benefits from acquisitions, and implementing our growth strategy through acquisitions may harm our business, financial condition and operating results.

Our growth strategy focuses on a gradual expansion of our fleet. Any acquisition of a vessel may not be profitable to us at or after the time we acquire it and may not generate cash flow sufficient to justify our investment. In addition, our growth strategy exposes us to risks that may harm our business, financial condition and operating results, including risks that we may:

fail to realize anticipated benefits, such as new customer relationships, cost-savings or cash flow enhancements;

be unable to hire, train or retain qualified shore and seafaring personnel to manage and operate our growing business and fleet;

decrease our liquidity by using a significant portion of our available cash or borrowing capacity to finance acquisitions;

significantly increase our interest expense or financial leverage if we incur additional debt to finance acquisitions;

incur or assume unanticipated liabilities, losses or costs associated with the business or vessels acquired; or

incur other significant charges, such as impairment of goodwill or other intangible assets, asset devaluation or restructuring charges.

If we purchase any newbuilding vessels, delays, cancellations or non-completion of deliveries of newbuilding vessels could harm our operating results.

If we purchase any newbuilding vessels, the shipbuilder could fail to deliver the newbuilding vessel as agreed or their counterparty could cancel the purchase contract if the shipbuilder fails to meet its obligations. In addition, under charters we may enter into that are related to a newbuilding, if our delivery of the newbuilding to our customer is delayed, we may be required to

Table of Contents

pay liquidated damages during the delay. For prolonged delays, the customer may terminate the charter and, in addition to the resulting loss of revenues, we may be responsible for additional, substantial liquidated damages. We do not derive any revenue from a vessel until after its delivery and will be required to pay substantial sums as progress payments during construction of a newbuilding. While we expect to have refund guarantees from financial institutions with respect to such progress payments in the event the vessel is not delivered by the shipyard or is otherwise not accepted by us, there is a the potential that we may not be able to collect all portion of such refund guarantees, in which case we would lose the amounts of monies we have advanced to the shipyards for such progress payments.

The completion and delivery of newbuildings could be delayed, cancelled or otherwise not completed because of:

quality or engineering problems;

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

work stoppages or other labor disturbances at the shipyard;

bankruptcy or other financial crisis of the shipbuilder;

a backlog of orders at the shipyard;

political or economic disturbances;

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

requests for changes to the original vessel specifications;

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

inability to finance the construction or conversion of the vessels; or

inability to obtain requisite permits or approvals.

If delivery of a vessel is materially delayed, it could materially adversely affect our results of operations and financial condition and our ability to make cash distributions.

The loss of a customer, charter or vessel could result in a loss of revenues and cash flow in the event we are unable to replace such customer, charter or vessel.

For the year ended December 31, 2014, Navios Partners' customers representing 10% or more of total revenues were Hyundai Merchant Marine Co., Ltd and Navios Corporation, which accounted for approximately 24.4% and 11.0%, respectively of total revenues. For the year ended December 31, 2013, our most significant counterparties were Cosco Bulk Carrier Co. Ltd., Hanjin Shipping Co. Ltd., Navios Corporation and Samsun Logix, which accounted for approximately 23.4%, 11.3%, 10.4% and 10.2%, respectively, of total revenues. For the fiscal year ended December 31, 2012, our most significant counterparties were Cosco Bulk Carrier Co. Ltd., Mitsui O.S.K. Lines, Ltd. and Samsun Logix, which accounted for approximately 22.8%, 16.0% and 13.0%, respectively, of total revenues. No other customers accounted for 10% or more of total revenues for any of the years presented.

The charterers in the containership sector consist of a limited number of liner companies. The five Container vessels acquired and delivered into our fleet in the fourth quarter of 2013, the two Container vessels acquired and delivered into our fleet in the third and fourth quarter of 2014, are respectively chartered out to the same counterparty on long-term charters, which have a significant impact on our revenues. The combination of any surplus of containership capacity and the expected increase in the size of the world containership fleet over the next few years may make it difficult to secure substitute employment for any of our containerships if our counterparty fail to perform their obligations under the currently arranged time charters, and any new charter arrangements we are able to secure may be at lower rates. Furthermore, the surplus of containerships available at lower charter rates and lack of demand for our customers' liner services could negatively affect our charterers' willingness to perform their obligations under our time charters, which in many cases provide for charter rates significantly above current market rates. We expect that a limited number of leading liner companies will continue to generate a substantial portion of our revenues. The cessation of business with these liner companies or their failure to fulfill their obligations under the time charters for our containerships could have a material adverse effect on our financial condition and results of operations.

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

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

the customer exercises certain rights to terminate the charter;

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

Table of Contents

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

If we lose a charter, we may be unable to re-deploy the related vessel on terms as favorable to us due to the long-term nature of most charters and the cyclical nature of the industry or we may be forced to charter the vessel on the spot market at then market rates which may be less favorable than the charter that has been terminated. If we are unable to re-deploy a vessel for which the charter has been terminated, we will not receive any revenues from that vessel, but we may be required to pay expenses necessary to maintain the vessel in proper operating condition. If we lose a vessel, any replacement or newbuilding would not generate revenues during its construction acquisition period, and we may be unable to charter any replacement vessel on terms as favorable to us as those of the terminated charter.

The permanent loss of a customer, time charter or vessel, or a decline in payments under our charters, could have a material adverse effect on our business, results of operations and financial condition and our ability to make cash distributions in the event we are unable to replace such customer, time charter or vessel.

As of March 25, 2014, the Company terminated the amended credit default insurance policy. In connection with the termination, Navios Partners received compensation of \$31.0 million. From the total compensation, \$1.2 million was recorded immediately in the statement of income within the caption of Revenue, which represents reimbursements for insurance claims submitted for the period prior to the date of the termination and the remaining amount of \$29.8 million was recorded immediately in the statement of income within the caption of Other income. The Company has no future requirement to repay any of the lump sum cash payment back to the insurance company or provide any further services.

On November 15, 2012 (as amended in March 2014), Navios Holdings and Navios Partners entered into an agreement by which Navios Holdings will provide supplemental credit default insurance with a maximum cash payment of \$20.0 million. As of December 31, 2014, the Company had not put forth any claims to Navios Holdings in connection with this supplemental insurance. In January 2011, Korea Line Corporation (KLC) which is the charterer of the Navios Melodia filed for receivership. The charter contract was affirmed and will be performed by KLC on its original terms, following an interim suspension period during which Navios Partners trades the vessel directly.

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

As of March 12, 2015, the vessels in our fleet had an average age of approximately 7.7 years and most dry cargo vessels have an expected life of approximately 25-30 years. We may acquire older vessels in the future. Older vessels are typically more costly to maintain than more recently constructed vessels due to improvements in engine technology. In some instances, charterers prefer newer vessels that are more fuel efficient than older vessels. Cargo insurance rates also increase with the age of a vessel, making older vessels less desirable to charterers as well. Governmental regulations, safety or other equipment standards related to the age of the vessels may require expenditures for alterations or the addition of new equipment, to our vessels and may restrict the type of activities in which these vessels may engage. We cannot assure you that as our vessels age, market conditions will justify those expenditures or enable us to operate our vessels profitably during the remainder of their useful lives. If we sell vessels, we may have to sell them at a loss, and if charterers no longer charter out vessels due to their age, it could materially adversely affect our earnings.

Vessels may suffer damage and we may face unexpected drydocking costs, which could affect our cash flow and financial condition.

If our owned vessels suffer damage, they may need to be repaired at a drydocking facility. The costs of drydock repairs are unpredictable and can be substantial. We may have to pay drydocking costs that insurance does not cover.

The loss of earnings while these vessels are being repaired and repositioned, as well as the actual cost of these repairs, could decrease our revenues and earnings substantially, particularly if a number of vessels are damaged or drydocked at the same time. Under the terms of the management agreement with the Manager, the costs of drydocking repairs are not included in the daily management fee, but will be reimbursed at cost upon occurrence.

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

The shipping business and vessel operation are materially affected by government regulation in the form of international conventions, national, state and local laws, and regulations in force in the jurisdictions in which vessels operate, as well as in the country or countries of their registration. Governmental regulations, safety or other equipment standards, as well as compliance with standards imposed by maritime self-regulatory organizations and customer requirements or competition, may require us to make capital and other expenditures. Because such conventions, laws and regulations are often revised, we cannot predict the ultimate cost of complying with such conventions, laws and regulations, or the impact thereof on the fair market price or useful

Table of Contents

life of our vessels. In order to satisfy any such requirements, we may be required to take any of our vessels out of service for extended periods of time, with corresponding losses of revenues. In the future, market conditions may not justify these expenditures or enable us to operate our vessels, particularly older vessels, profitably during the remainder of their economic lives. This could lead to significant asset write downs. In addition, violations of environmental and safety regulations can result in substantial penalties and, in certain instances, seizure or detention of our vessels.

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

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

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

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

When a tanker is carrying clean oil products that do not constitute persistent oil that would be covered under the CLC, liability for any pollution damage will generally fall outside the CLC and will depend on other international

conventions or domestic laws in the jurisdiction where the spillage occurs. The same principle applies to any pollution from the vessel in a jurisdiction which is not a party to the CLC. The CLC applies in over 100 jurisdictions around the world, but it does not apply in the United States, where the corresponding liability laws such as the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (the OPA) discussed below, are particularly stringent.

For vessel operations not covered by the CLC, including those operated under our fleet at present, international liability for oil pollution is governed by the International Convention on Civil Liability for Bunker Oil Pollution Damage (the Bunker Convention). In 2001, the IMO adopted the Bunker Convention, which imposes strict liability on shipowners for pollution damage and response costs incurred in contracting states caused by discharges, or threatened discharges, of bunker oil from all classes of ships not covered by the CLC. The Bunker Convention also requires registered owners of ships over a certain size to maintain insurance to cover their liability for pollution damage in an amount equal to the limits of liability under the applicable national or international limitation regime, including liability limits calculated in accordance with the Convention on Limitation of Liability for Maritime Claims 1976, as amended (the 1976 Convention), discussed in more detail in the following paragraph. The Bunker Convention became effective in contracting states on November 21, 2008 and as of March 10, 2015 had 78 contracting states comprising approximately 91.45% of the gross tonnage of the world s merchant fleet. In non-contracting states, liability for such bunker oil pollution typically is determined by the national or other domestic laws in the jurisdiction where the spillage occurs.

Table of Contents

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

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

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

In the last decade, the EU has become increasingly active in the field of regulation of maritime safety and protection of the environment. In some areas of regulation the EU has introduced new laws without attempting to procure a corresponding amendment to international law. Notably, in 2005 the EU adopted a directive, as amended in 2009, on ship-source pollution, imposing criminal sanctions for pollution not only where pollution is caused by intent or recklessness (which would be an offence under MARPOL), but also where it is caused by serious negligence. The concept of serious negligence may be interpreted in practice to be little more than ordinary negligence. The directive could therefore result in criminal liability being incurred in circumstances where it would not be incurred under international law.

In response to the Deepwater Horizon incident, the European Union has issued Directive 2013/30/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 June 2013 on safety of offshore oil and gas operations. The objective of this Directive is to reduce as far as possible the occurrence of major accidents relating to offshore oil and gas operations and to limit their consequences, thus increasing the protection of the marine environment and coastal economies against pollution, establishing minimum conditions for safe offshore exploration and exploitation of oil and gas and limiting possible disruptions to Union indigenous energy production, and to improve the response mechanisms in case of an accident. The Directive has to be implemented by 19th July 2015. As far as the environment is concerned, in the UK there will be new regulations: the Offshore Petroleum Activities (Offshore Safety Directive) (Environmental

Functions) Regulations 2015 (OSDEF), will amend the Merchant Shipping (Oil Pollution Preparedness, Response and Cooperation Convention) Regulations 1998 (OPRC 1998) and implement other environmental Directive requirements, specifically the Environmental Management System. The Offshore Petroleum Licensing (Offshore Safety Directive) Regulations 2015, will implement the licensing Directive requirements. There will also be changes to the Oil Pollution Emergency Plans Regulations 1998.

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

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

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

We are and will be, directly and indirectly, subject to the effects of climate change and may, directly or indirectly, be affected by government laws and regulations related to climate change. A number of countries have adopted or are considering the adoption of, regulatory frameworks to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, such as carbon dioxide and methane. In the United States, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has declared greenhouse gases to be dangerous pollutants and has issued greenhouse gas reporting requirements for emissions sources in certain industries (which do not include the shipping industry).

In addition, while the emissions of greenhouse gases from international shipping are not subject to the Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which requires adopting countries to implement national programs to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, the IMO intends to develop limits on greenhouse gases from international shipping. It has responded to the global focus on climate change and greenhouse gas emissions by developing specific technical and operational efficiency measures and a work plan for market-based mechanisms in 2011. These include the mandatory measures of the ship energy efficiency management plan (SEEMP), outlined above, and an energy efficiency design index (EEDI) for new ships. The IMO is also considering its position on market-based measures through an expert working group. Among the numerous proposals being considered by the working group are the following: a port state levy based on the amount of fuel consumed by the vessel on its voyage to the port in question; a global emissions trading scheme which would allocate emissions allowances and set an emissions cap; and an international fund establishing a global reduction target for international shipping, to be set either by the UNFCCC or the IMO. At its 64th session in October 2012, the MEPC indicated that 2015 was the target year for Member States

Table of Contents

to identify market-based measures for international shipping. At its 66th session, held from March 31-April 4, 2014, the MEPC continued its work on developing technical and operational measures relating to energy-efficiency measures for ships, following the entry into force, on January 1, 2013, of the mandatory efficiency measures. It adopted the 2014 Guidelines on the Method of Calculation of the Attained EEDI, applicable to new ships. It also established a working group with an instruction to consider development of a data collection system for fuel consumption of ships. Further, it adopted amendments to MARPOL Annex VI concerning the extension of the scope of application of the EEDI to LNG carriers, ro-ro cargo ships (vehicle carriers), ro-ro cargo ships, ro-ro passenger ships and cruise passenger ships with nonconventional propulsion. At MEPC 67 held from October 13-17, 2014. During the session, the MEPC adopted the 2014 Guidelines on survey and certification of the EEDI, updating the previous version to reference ships fitted with dual-fuel engines using LNG and liquid fuel oil. The MEPC also adopted amendments to the 2013 Interim Guidelines for determining minimum propulsion power to maintain the manoeuvrability of ships in adverse conditions, to make the guidelines applicable to phase 1 (starting 1 January 2015) of the EEDI requirements.

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

The EU announced in April 2007 that it planned to expand the EU emissions trading scheme by adding vessels, and a proposal from the European Commission (EC) was expected if no global regime for reduction of seaborne emissions had been agreed to by the end of 2011. As of January 31, 2013 the EC had stopped short of proposing that emissions from ships be included in the EU's emissions-trading scheme. However on October 1, 2012 it announced that it would propose measures to monitor, verify and report on greenhouse-gas emissions from the shipping sector. On June 28, 2013, the EC adopted a Communication setting out a strategy for progressively including greenhouse gas emissions from maritime transport in the EU's policy for reducing its overall GHG emissions. The first step proposed by the EC is an EU Regulation that would establish an EU-wide system for the monitoring, reporting and verification of carbon dioxide emissions from large ships starting in 2018. The draft Regulation is currently working its way through the various stages of the EU legislative process and obtained Council Agreement on December 17, 2014. European Parliament approval will be required before the draft Regulation comes into force. If adopted, the Regulation will take effect on July 1, 2015, with monitoring, reporting and verification requirements beginning on January 1, 2018. This Regulation may be seen as indicative of an intention to maintain pressure on the international negotiating process.

We cannot predict with any degree of certainty what effect, if any possible climate change and government laws and regulations related to climate change will have on our operations, whether directly or indirectly. However, we believe that climate change, including the possible increase in severe weather events resulting from climate change, and government laws and regulations related to climate change may affect, directly or indirectly, (i) the cost of the vessels we may acquire in the future, (ii) our ability to continue to operate as we have in the past, (iii) the cost of operating our vessels, and (iv) insurance premiums, deductibles and the availability of coverage. As a result, our financial condition could be negatively impacted by significant climate change and related governmental regulation, and that impact could be material.

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

We believe that our success depends on the continued contributions of the members of our senior management team, including Ms. Angeliki Frangou, our Chairman and Chief Executive Officer. The loss of the services of Ms. Frangou or one of our other executive officers or those of Navios Holdings who provide us with significant managerial services could impair our ability to identify and secure new charter contracts, to maintain good customer relations and to

otherwise manage our business, which could have a material adverse effect on our financial performance and our ability to compete.

The Manager on our behalf may be unable to attract and retain qualified, skilled employees or crew necessary to operate our business or may have to pay substantially increased costs for its employees and crew.

Our success will depend in part on the Manager's ability to attract, hire, train and retain highly skilled and qualified personnel. In crewing our vessels, we require technically skilled employees with specialized training who can perform physically demanding work. Competition to attract, hire, train and retain qualified crew members is intense, and crew manning costs continue to increase. If we are not able to increase our hire rates to compensate for any crew cost increases, our business, financial condition, results of operations and ability to make cash distributions to our unitholders may be adversely affected. Any inability we experience in the future to attract, hire, train and retain a sufficient number of qualified employees could impair our ability to manage, maintain and grow our business.

Table of Contents

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

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

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

on-board installation of ship security alert systems;

the development of vessel security plans; and

compliance with flag state security certification requirements.

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

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

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

Iran

During the last few years, the scope of sanctions imposed against the government of Iran and persons engaging in certain activities or doing certain business with and relating to Iran has been expanded by a number of jurisdictions, including the United States, the European Union and Canada. In 2010, the U.S. enacted the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions Accountability and Divestment Act (CISADA), which expanded the scope of the former Iran Sanctions Act. The scope U.S. sanctions against Iran were expanded subsequent to CISADA by, among other U.S. laws, the National Defense Authorization Act of 2012 (the 2012 NDAA), the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (ITRA), Executive Order 13662, and the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 (IFCA). The foregoing laws, among other things, expand the application of prohibitions to non-U.S. companies, such as our company, and introduce limits on the ability of companies and persons to do business or trade with Iran when such activities relate to specific activities such as investment in Iran, the supply or export of refined petroleum or refined petroleum products to Iran, the supply and delivery of goods to Iran which could enhance Iran s petroleum or energy sector, and the transportation of crude oil from Iran to countries which do not enjoy Iran crude oil sanctions waivers (tankers owned by an affiliate of ours called in Iran but did not engage in the prohibited activities specifically identified by these sanctions). While certain of these restrictions have been suspended until June 2015 there are still limitations in place with which we need to comply. In addition to foregoing U.S. sanctions against Iran, the sanctions applicable with respect to Iran and transactions involving Iran within U.S. jurisdiction, we must comply with any applicable prohibitions of E.U. sanctions against Iran.

Russia/Ukraine

As a result of the crisis in Ukraine and the annexation of Crimea by Russia earlier in 2014, both the US and EU have implemented sanctions against certain persons and entities. In addition, various restrictions on trade have been implemented which, amongst others, include a prohibition on the import into the EU of goods originating in Crimea or Sevastopol as well as restrictions on trade in certain dual-use and military items and restrictions in relation to various items of technology associated with the oil industry for use in deep water exploration and production, Arctic oil exploration and production, or shale oil projects in Russia.

The U.S. has imposed sanctions against certain designated Russian entities and individuals (U.S. Russian Sanctions Targets). These sanctions block the property and all interests in property of the U.S. Russian Sanctions Targets. This effectively prohibits U.S. persons from engaging in any economic or commercial transactions with the U.S. Russian Sanctions Targets unless the same

Table of Contents

are authorized by the U.S. Treasury Department. While the prohibitions of these sanctions are not directly applicable to us, we have compliance measures in place to guard against transactions with U.S. Russian Sanctions Targets which may involve the United States or U.S. persons and thus implicate prohibitions.

Other U.S. Economic Sanctions Targets

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

Compliance

Although we believe that we are in compliance with all applicable sanctions and embargo laws and regulations, and intend to maintain such compliance, there can be no assurance that we will be in compliance in the future, particularly as the scope of certain laws may be unclear and may be subject to changing interpretations, and the law may change. Moreover, despite, for example, relevant provisions in charter parties forbidding the use of our vessels in trade that would violate economic sanctions, our charterers may nevertheless violate applicable sanctions and embargo laws and regulations as a result of actions that do not involve us or our vessels, and those violations could in turn negatively affect our reputation and be imputed to us. In addition, given our relationship with Navios Maritime Acquisition Corporation (Navios Acquisition) and Navios Holdings, we cannot give any assurance that an adverse finding against Navios Acquisition or Navios Holdings by a governmental or legal authority or others with respect to the matters discussed herein or any future matter related to regulatory compliance by Navios Acquisition, Navios Holdings or ourselves will not have a material adverse impact on our business, reputation or the market price or trading of our common units.

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

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

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

As an international shipping company, we may operate in countries known to have a reputation for corruption. The U.S. Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977 (the FCPA) and other anti-corruption laws and regulations in applicable jurisdictions generally prohibit companies registered with the SEC and their intermediaries from making improper payments to government officials for the purpose of obtaining or retaining business. Under the FCPA, U.S. companies

may be held liable for some actions taken by strategic or local partners or representatives. Legislation in other countries includes the U.K. Bribery Act which is broader in scope than the FCPA because it does not contain an exception for facilitating payments. We and our customers may be subject to these and similar anti-corruption laws in other applicable jurisdictions. Failure to comply with such legal requirements could expose us to civil and/or criminal penalties, including fines, prosecution and significant reputational damage, all of which could materially and adversely affect our business and results of operations, including our relationships with our customers, and our financial results. Compliance with the FCPA, the U.K. Bribery Act and other applicable anti-corruption laws and related regulations and policies imposes potentially significant costs and operational burdens. Moreover, the compliance and monitoring mechanisms that we have in place including our Code of Ethics, and our anti-bribery and corruption policy may not adequately prevent or detect possible violations under applicable anti-bribery and anti-corruption legislation.

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

The operation of ocean-going vessels entails certain inherent risks that may materially adversely affect our business and reputation, including:

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

Table of Contents

the loss of a vessel due to piracy and terrorism;

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

environmental accidents as a result of the foregoing; and

business interruptions and delivery delays caused by mechanical failure, human error, war, terrorism, political action in various countries, labor strikes or adverse weather conditions.

Any of these circumstances or events could substantially increase our costs. For example, the costs of replacing a vessel or cleaning up a spill could substantially lower our revenues by taking vessels out of operation permanently or for periods of time. The involvement of our vessels in a disaster or delays in delivery or damages or loss of cargo may harm our reputation as a safe and reliable vessel operator and cause us to lose business.

The operation of vessels, such as drybulk carriers, has certain unique risks. With a drybulk carrier, the cargo itself and its interaction with the vessel can be an operational risk. By their nature, drybulk cargoes are often heavy, dense, easily shift, and react badly to water exposure. In addition, drybulk carriers are often subjected to battering treatment during unloading operations with grabs, jackhammers (to pry encrusted cargoes out of the hold) and small bulldozers. This treatment may cause damage to the vessel. Vessels damaged due to treatment during unloading procedures may be more susceptible to breach to the sea. Hull breaches in drybulk carriers may lead to the flooding of the vessels holds. If a drybulk carrier suffers flooding in its forward holds, the bulk cargo may become so dense and waterlogged that its pressure may buckle the vessel's bulkheads leading to the loss of a vessel.

The total loss or damage of any of our vessels or cargoes could harm our reputation as a safe and reliable vessel owner and operator. If we are unable to adequately maintain or safeguard our vessels, we may be unable to prevent any such damage, costs, or loss that could negatively impact our business, financial condition, results of operations, cash flows and ability to pay distributions.

Maritime claimants could arrest our vessels, which could interrupt our cash flow.

Crew members, suppliers of goods and services to a vessel, shippers of cargo, and other parties may be entitled to a maritime lien against a vessel for unsatisfied debts, claims or damages against such vessel. In many jurisdictions, a maritime lien holder may enforce its lien by arresting a vessel through foreclosure proceedings. The arrest or attachment of one or more of our vessels could interrupt our cash flow and require us to pay large sums of funds to have the arrest lifted. We are not currently aware of the existence of any such maritime lien on our vessels.

In addition, in some jurisdictions, such as South Africa, under the sister ship theory of liability, a claimant may arrest both the vessel which is subject to the claimant's maritime lien and any associated vessel, which is any vessel owned or controlled by the same owner. Claimants could try to assert sister ship liability against one vessel in our fleet for claims relating to another vessel in the fleet.

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

Our vessels may call in ports where smugglers may attempt to hide drugs and other contraband on vessels, with or without the knowledge of crew members. To the extent our vessels are found with contraband, whether inside or

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

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

The hull and machinery of every commercial vessel must be classed by a classification society authorized by its country of registry. The classification society certifies that a vessel is safe and seaworthy in accordance with the applicable rules and regulations of the country of registry of the vessel and with SOLAS. Our owned fleet is currently enrolled with American Bureau of Shipping, Nippon Kaiji Kiokai, Bureau Veritas and Lloyd's Register. A vessel must undergo an annual survey, an intermediate survey and a special survey. In lieu of a special survey, a vessel's machinery may be on a continuous survey cycle, under which the machinery would be surveyed periodically over a five-year period. Our vessels are on special survey cycles for hull inspection and continuous survey cycles for machinery inspection. Every vessel is also required to be drydocked every two to three years for inspection of the underwater parts of such vessel.

Table of Contents

If any vessel fails any annual survey, intermediate survey or special survey, the vessel may be unable to trade between ports and, therefore, would be unemployable, potentially causing a negative impact on our revenues due to the loss of revenues from such vessel until she is able to trade again.

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

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

We may be unable to procure adequate insurance coverage at commercially reasonable rates in the future. For example, more stringent environmental regulations have led in the past to increased costs for, and in the future may result in the lack of availability of, insurance against risks of environmental damage or pollution. A catastrophic oil spill or marine disaster could exceed our insurance coverage, which could harm our business, financial condition and operating results. Changes in the insurance markets attributable to terrorist attacks may also make certain types of insurance more difficult for us to obtain.

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

Because we obtain some of our insurance through protection and indemnity associations, we may also be subject to calls, or premiums, in amounts based not only on our own claim records, but also the claim records of all other members of the protection and indemnity associations.

We may be subject to calls, or premiums, in amounts based not only on our claim records but also the claim records of all other members of the protection and indemnity associations through which we receive insurance coverage for tort liability, including pollution-related liability. Our payment of these calls could result in significant expenses to us, which could have a material adverse effect on our business, results of operations and financial condition.

Because we generate all of our revenues in U.S. dollars but incur a portion of our expenses in other currencies, exchange rate fluctuations could cause us to suffer exchange rate losses thereby increasing expenses and reducing income.

We engage in worldwide commerce with a variety of entities. Although our operations may expose us to certain levels of foreign currency risk, our transactions are at present predominantly U.S. dollar-denominated. Transactions in currencies other than the functional currency are translated at the exchange rate in effect at the date of each transaction. Expenses incurred in foreign currencies against which the U.S. dollar falls in value can increase thereby

decreasing our income or vice versa if the U.S. dollar increases in value. For example, as of December 31, 2014, the value of the U.S. dollar as compared to the Euro increased by approximately 13.4% compared with the respective value as of December 31, 2013. A greater percentage of our transactions and expenses in the future may be denominated in currencies other than the U.S. dollar.

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

We are an international company and primarily conduct our operations outside the United States. Changing economic, political and governmental conditions in the countries where we are engaged in business or where our vessels are registered will affect us. Terrorist attacks, such as the attacks in the United States on September 11, 2001 and the United States continuing response to these attacks, and in Paris on January 7, 2015, the bombings in Spain on March 11, 2004 and the attacks in London on July 7, 2005, the recent conflicts in Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria, Ukraine and other current and future conflicts, and the continuing response of the United States to these attacks, as well as the threat of future terrorist attacks, continue to cause uncertainty in the world financial markets, including the energy markets. Continuing hostilities in the Middle East may lead to additional armed conflicts or to further acts of terrorism and civil disturbance in the United States or elsewhere, which could result in increased volatility and turmoil in the financial markets and may contribute further to economic instability. Current and future conflicts and terrorist attacks may adversely affect our business, operating results, financial condition, ability to raise capital and future growth. Terrorist attacks on vessels, such as the October 2002 attack on the M/V Limburg, a VLCC not related to us, may in the future also negatively affect our operations and financial condition and directly impact our vessels or our customers.

Table of Contents

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

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

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

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

The shipping industry has historically been affected by acts of piracy in regions such as the South China Sea, the Indian Ocean, the Gulf of Aden off the coast of Somalia and the Red Sea. Although the frequency of sea piracy worldwide decreased during 2013 to its lowest level since its increase in 2009, sea piracy incidents continue to occur, particularly in the Gulf of Aden and towards the Mozambique Channel in the North Indian Ocean and increasingly in the Gulf of Guinea. A significant example of the heightened level of piracy came in February 2011 when the M/V Irene SL, a crude oil tanker which was not affiliated with us, was captured by pirates in the Arabian Sea while carrying crude oil estimated to be worth approximately \$200 million. In December 2009, the Navios Apollon, one of our vessels, was seized by pirates 800 miles off the coast of Somalia while transporting fertilizer from Tampa, Florida to Rozi, India and was released on February 27, 2010. In January 2014, a vessel owned by our affiliate, Navios Maritime Acquisition Corporation, the Nave Atropos, came under attack from a pirate action group in international waters off the coast of Yemen. The crew and the on-board security team successfully implemented the counter piracy action plan and standard operating procedures to deter the attack with no consequences to the vessel or her crew. These piracy attacks resulted in regions (in which our vessels are deployed) being characterized by insurers as war risk zones or Joint War Committee (JWC) war and strikes listed areas. Premiums payable for such insurance coverage could increase significantly and such insurance coverage may be more difficult to obtain. Crew costs, including those due to employing onboard security guards, could increase in such circumstances. While the use of security guards is intended to deter and prevent the hijacking of our vessels, it could also increase our risk of liability for death or injury to persons or damage to personal property. In addition, while we believe the charterer remains liable for charter payments when a vessel is seized by pirates, the charterer may dispute this and withhold charter hire until the vessel is released. A charterer may also claim that a vessel seized by pirates was not on-hire for a certain number of days and it is therefore entitled to cancel the charter party, a claim that we would dispute. We may not be adequately insured to cover losses from these incidents, which could have a material adverse effect on us. In addition, detention hijacking as a result of an act of piracy against our vessels, or an increase in cost, or unavailability of insurance for our vessels, could have a material adverse impact on our business, financial condition, results of operations and cash flows. Acts of piracy on ocean-going vessels could adversely affect our business and operations.

Disruptions in world financial markets and the resulting governmental action in the United States and in other parts of the world could have a material adverse impact on our ability to obtain financing, our results of operations, financial condition and cash flows and could cause the market price of our common units to decline.

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

Cash deposits and cash equivalents in excess of amounts covered by government-provided insurance are exposed to loss in the event of non-performance by financial institutions. We maintain cash deposits and equivalents in excess of government-provided insurance limits at banks in Greece and other European banks, which may expose us to a loss of cash deposits or cash equivalents.

Table of Contents

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Increased competition in technology and innovation could reduce our charter hire income and the value of our vessels.

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

Table of Contents**Navios Holdings, Navios Acquisition, Navios Maritime Midstream Partners L.P (Navios Midstream) and their affiliates may compete with us.**

Pursuant to the omnibus agreement that we entered into with Navios Holdings in connection with the closing of the IPO (the Omnibus Agreement), Navios Holdings and its controlled affiliates (other than us, our general partner and our subsidiaries) generally agreed not to acquire or own Panamax or Capesize drybulk carriers under time charters of three or more years. The Omnibus Agreement, however, contains significant exceptions that allow Navios Holdings or any of its controlled affiliates to compete with us under specified circumstances which could harm our business. In addition, concurrently with the successful consummation of the initial business combination by Navios Acquisition, on May 28, 2010, because of the overlap between Navios Acquisition, Navios Holdings and us, with respect to possible acquisitions under the terms of the Omnibus Agreement, we entered into a business opportunity right of first refusal agreement which provides the types of business opportunities in the marine transportation and logistics industries, we, Navios Holdings and Navios Acquisition must share with the each other.

In connection with the Navios Midstream initial public offering and effective November 18, 2014, Navios Partners entered into the Omnibus Agreement with Navios Midstream, Navios Acquisition and Navios Holdings (the Navios Midstream Omnibus Agreement) pursuant to which Navios Acquisition, Navios Holdings and Navios Partners have agreed not to acquire or own any VLCCs, crude oil tankers, refined petroleum product tankers, LPG tankers or chemical tankers under time charters of five or more years and also providing rights of first offer on certain tanker vessels.

Common unitholders have limited voting rights and our partnership agreement restricts the voting rights of common unitholders owning more than 4.9% of our common units.

Holders of our common units have only limited voting rights on matters affecting our business. We hold a meeting of the limited partners every year to elect one or more members of our board of directors and to vote on any other matters that are properly brought before the meeting. Common unitholders may only elect four of the seven members of our board of directors. The elected directors are elected on a staggered basis and serve for three year terms. Our general partner in its sole discretion has the right to appoint the remaining three directors and to set the terms for which those directors will serve. The partnership agreement also contains provisions limiting the ability of unitholders to call meetings or to acquire information about our operations, as well as other provisions limiting the unitholders ability to influence the manner or direction of management. Unitholders will have no right to elect our general partner and our general partner may not be removed except by a vote of the holders of at least 66 2/3% of the outstanding units, including any units owned by our general partner and its affiliates, voting together as a single class.

Our partnership agreement further restricts common unitholders voting rights by providing that if any person or group owns beneficially more than 4.9% of the common units then outstanding, any such common units owned by that person or group in excess of 4.9% may not be voted on any matter and will not be considered to be outstanding when sending notices of a meeting of unitholders, calculating required votes, except for purposes of nominating a person for election to our board, determining the presence of a quorum or for other similar purposes, unless required by law. The voting rights of any such common unitholders in excess of 4.9% will effectively be redistributed pro rata among the other common unitholders holding less than 4.9% of the voting power of all classes of units entitled to vote. Our general partner, its affiliates and persons who acquired common units with the prior approval of our board of directors will not be subject to this 4.9% limitation except with respect to voting their common units in the election of the elected independent directors.

Our general partner and its affiliates, including Navios Holdings, own a significant interest in us and have conflicts of interest and limited fiduciary and contractual duties, which may permit them to favor their own

interests to the detriment of unitholders.

Navios Holdings indirectly owns the 2.0% general partner interest and a 18.1% limited partner interest in us, and owns and controls our general partner. All of our officers and three of our directors are directors and/or officers of Navios Holdings and its affiliates, and our Chief Executive Officer is also the Chief Executive Officer of Navios Acquisition, Navios Midstream and Navios Holdings. As such these individuals have fiduciary duties to Navios Holdings, Navios Midstream and Navios Acquisition that may cause them to pursue business strategies that disproportionately benefit Navios Holdings, Navios Midstream or Navios Acquisition or which otherwise are not in our best interests or those of our unitholders. Conflicts of interest may arise between Navios Acquisition, Navios Holdings, Navios Midstream and their respective affiliates including our general partner, on the one hand, and us and our unitholders on the other hand. As a result of these conflicts, our general partner and its affiliates may favor their own interests over the interests of our unitholders. These conflicts include, among others, the following situations:

neither our partnership agreement nor any other agreement requires our general partner or Navios Holdings or its affiliates to pursue a business strategy that favors us or utilizes our assets, and Navios Holdings officers and directors have a fiduciary duty to make decisions in the best interests of the stockholders of Navios Holdings, which may be contrary to our interests;

our general partner and our board of directors are allowed to take into account the interests of parties other than us, such as Navios Holdings, in resolving conflicts of interest, which has the effect of limiting their fiduciary duties to our unitholders;

Table of Contents

our general partner and our directors have limited their liabilities and reduced their fiduciary duties under the laws of the Marshall Islands, while also restricting the remedies available to our unitholders, and, as a result of purchasing common units, unitholders are treated as having agreed to the modified standard of fiduciary duties and to certain actions that may be taken by our general partner and our directors, all as set forth in the partnership agreement;

our general partner and our board of directors will be involved in determining the amount and timing of our asset purchases and sales, capital expenditures, borrowings, issuances of additional partnership securities and reserves, each of which can affect the amount of cash that is available for distribution to our unitholders;

our general partner may have substantial influence over our board of directors' decision to cause us to borrow funds in order to permit the payment of cash distributions, even if the purpose or effect of the borrowing is to make incentive distributions.

our general partner is entitled to reimbursement of all reasonable costs incurred by it and its affiliates for our benefit;

our partnership agreement does not restrict us from paying our general partner or its affiliates for any services rendered to us on terms that are fair and reasonable or entering into additional contractual arrangements with any of these entities on our behalf; and

our general partner may exercise its right to call and purchase our common units if it and its affiliates own more than 80% of our common units.

Although a majority of our directors will be elected by common unitholders, our general partner will likely have substantial influence on decisions made by our board of directors.

Our officers face conflicts in the allocation of their time to our business.

Navios Holdings, Navios Acquisition and Navios Midstream conduct businesses and activities of their own in which we have no economic interest. If these separate activities are significantly greater than our activities, there will be material competition for the time and effort of our officers, who also provide services to Navios Acquisition, Navios Holdings, Navios Midstream and its affiliates. Our officers are not required to work full-time on our affairs and are required to devote time to the affairs of Navios Acquisition, Navios Holdings, Navios Midstream and their respective affiliates. Each of our Chief Executive Officer and our Chief Financial Officer is also an executive officer of Navios Holdings, and our Chief Executive Officer is the Chief Executive Officer of Navios Acquisition, Navios Holdings and Navios Midstream.

Our partnership agreement limits our general partner's and our directors' fiduciary duties to our unitholders and restricts the remedies available to unitholders for actions taken by our general partner or our directors.

Our partnership agreement contains provisions that reduce the standards to which our general partner and directors would otherwise be held by Marshall Islands law. For example, our partnership agreement:

permits our general partner to make a number of decisions in its individual capacity, as opposed to in its capacity as our general partner. Where our partnership agreement permits, our general partner may consider only the interests and factors that it desires, and in such cases it has no fiduciary duty or obligation to give any consideration to any interest of, or factors affecting us, our affiliates or our unitholders. Decisions made by our general partner in its individual capacity will be made by its sole owner, Navios Holdings. Specifically, pursuant to our partnership agreement, our general partner will be considered to be acting in its individual capacity if it exercises its call right, pre-emptive rights or registration rights, consents or withholds consent to any merger or consolidation of the partnership;

appoints any directors or votes for the election of any director, votes or refrains from voting on amendments to our partnership agreement that require a vote of the outstanding units, voluntarily withdraws from the partnership, transfers (to the extent permitted under our partnership agreement) or refrains from transferring its units, general partner interest or incentive distribution rights or votes upon the dissolution of the partnership;

provides that our general partner and our directors are entitled to make other decisions in good faith if they reasonably believe that the decision is in our best interests;

Table of Contents

generally provides that affiliated transactions and resolutions of conflicts of interest not approved by the conflicts committee of our board of directors and not involving a vote of unitholders must be on terms no less favorable to us than those generally being provided to or available from unrelated third parties or be fair and reasonable to us and that, in determining whether a transaction or resolution is fair and reasonable, our board of directors may consider the totality of the relationships between the parties involved, including other transactions that may be particularly advantageous or beneficial to us; and

provides that neither our general partner nor our officers or our directors will be liable for monetary damages to us, our limited partners or assignees for any acts or omissions unless there has been a final and non-appealable judgment entered by a court of competent jurisdiction determining that our general partner or directors or our officers or directors or those other persons engaged in actual fraud or willful misconduct.

In order to become a limited partner of our partnership, a common unitholder is required to agree to be bound by the provisions in the partnership agreement, including the provisions discussed above.

Fees and cost reimbursements, which the Manager determines for services provided to us, are significant, are payable regardless of profitability and reduce our cash available for distribution.

Under the terms of our existing Management Agreement, as amended in each of October 2013, August 2014 and February 2015, with the Manager, we pay a fixed daily fee of: (a) \$4,000 per Ultra-Handymax vessel; (b) \$4,100 per Panamax vessel; (c) \$5,100 per Capesize vessel; (d) \$6,500 per Container vessel of TEU 6,800; (e) \$7,200 per Container vessel of more than TEU 8,000; and (f) \$8,500 per very large Container vessel of more than TEU 13,000 through December 31, 2015 for technical and commercial management services provided to us by the Manager. Maintenance for our vessels and expenses related to drydocking expenses under this agreement will be reimbursed at cost upon occurrence. The term of the management agreement is until December 31, 2017.

The fixed daily fee paid to the Manager includes all costs incurred in providing certain commercial and technical management services to us. While this fee is fixed until December 31, 2015, we expect that we will reimburse the Manager for all of the actual operating costs and expenses it incurs in connection with the management of our fleet from January 1, 2016 until December 31, 2017, which may result in significantly higher fees that period. All of the fees we are required to pay to the Manager under the management agreement are payable without regard to our financial condition or results of operations. In addition, the Manager provides us with administrative services, including the services of our officers and directors, pursuant to the Administrative Services Agreement which has a term until December 31, 2017, and we reimburse the Manager for all costs and expenses reasonably incurred by it in connection with the provision of those services. The fees and reimbursement of expenses to the Manager are payable regardless of our profitability and could materially adversely affect our ability to pay cash distributions to unitholders.

Our partnership agreement contains provisions that may have the effect of discouraging a person or group from attempting to remove our current management or our general partner.

Our partnership agreement contains provisions that may have the effect of discouraging a person or group from attempting to remove our current management or our general partner.

The vote of the holders of at least 66 2/3 % of all the then outstanding common units, voting together as a single class is required to remove the general partner. Navios Holdings currently owns approximately 18.0% of the total number of outstanding common units.

Common unitholders elect only four of the seven members of our board of directors. Our general partner in its sole discretion has the right to appoint the remaining three directors.

Election of the four directors elected by unitholders is staggered, meaning that the members of only one of three classes of our elected directors are selected each year. In addition, the directors appointed by our general partner will serve for terms determined by our general partner.

Our partnership agreement contains provisions limiting the ability of unitholders to call meetings of unitholders, to nominate directors and to acquire information about our operations as well as other provisions limiting the unitholders' ability to influence the manner or direction of management.

Table of Contents

Unitholders' voting rights are further restricted by the partnership agreement provision providing that if any person or group owns beneficially more than 4.9% of the common units then outstanding, any such common units owned by that person or group in excess of 4.9% may not be voted on any matter and will not be considered to be outstanding when sending notices of a meeting of unitholders, calculating required votes, except for purposes of nominating a person for election to our board, determining the presence of a quorum or for other similar purposes, unless required by law. The voting rights of any such common unitholders in excess of 4.9% will be redistributed pro rata among the other common unitholders holding less than 4.9% of the voting power of all classes of units entitled to vote. Our general partner, its affiliates and persons who acquired common units with the prior approval of our board of directors will not be subject to this 4.9% limitation except with respect to voting their common units in the election of the elected directors.

We have substantial latitude in issuing equity securities without unitholder approval.

The control of our general partner may be transferred to a third party without unitholder consent.

Our general partner may transfer its general partner interest to a third party in a merger or in a sale of all or substantially all of its assets without the consent of the unitholders. In addition, our partnership agreement does not restrict the ability of the members of our general partner from transferring their respective membership interests in our general partner to a third party.

Our general partner has a limited call right that may require unitholders to sell their common units at an undesirable time or price.

If at any time our general partner and its affiliates, including Navios Holdings, own more than 80% of the common units, our general partner will have the right, which it may assign to any of its affiliates or to us, but not the obligation, to acquire all, but not less than all, of the common units held by unaffiliated persons at a price not less than their then-current market price. As a result, unitholders may be required to sell their common units at an undesirable time or price and may not receive any return on their investment. Unitholders may also incur a tax liability upon a sale of their units.

As of March 12, 2015, Navios Holdings owned 15,344,310 common units and 1,695,509 general partner units, representing a 20.1% interest in us based on all outstanding common units and general partnership units.

Unitholders may not have limited liability if a court finds that unitholder action constitutes control of our business.

As a limited partner in a partnership organized under the laws of the Marshall Islands, unitholders could be held liable for our obligations to the same extent as a general partner if they participate in the control of our business. Our general partner generally has unlimited liability for the obligations of the partnership, such as its debts and environmental liabilities, except for those contractual obligations of the partnership that are expressly made without recourse to our general partner.

We can borrow money to pay distributions, which would reduce the amount of credit available to operate our business.

Our partnership agreement will allow us to make working capital borrowings to pay distributions. Accordingly, we can make distributions on all our units even though cash generated by our operations may not be sufficient to pay such distributions. Any working capital borrowings by us to make distributions will reduce the amount of working capital

borrowings we can make for operating our business.

Increases in interest rates may cause the market price of our common units to decline.

An increase in interest rates may cause a corresponding decline in demand for equity investments in general and in particular for yield-based equity investments such as our common units. Any such increase in interest rates or reduction in demand for our common units resulting from other relatively more attractive investment opportunities may cause the trading price of our common units to decline. In addition, our interest expense will increase, since initially our debt will bear interest at a floating rate, subject to any interest rate swaps we may enter into the future.

Unitholders may have liability to repay distributions.

Under some circumstances, unitholders may have to repay amounts wrongfully returned or distributed to them. Under the Marshall Islands Act, we may not make a distribution to unitholders if the distribution would cause our liabilities to exceed the fair value of our assets. Marshall Islands law provides that for a period of three years from the date of the impermissible distribution, limited partners who received the distribution and who knew at the time of the distribution that it violated Marshall Islands law will be liable to the limited partnership for the distribution amount. Assignees who become substituted limited partners are liable for the obligations of the assignor to make contributions to the partnership that are known to the assignee at the time it became a limited partner and for unknown obligations if the liabilities could be determined from the partnership agreement. Liabilities to partners on account of their partnership interest and liabilities that are non-recourse to the partnership are not counted for purposes of determining whether a distribution is permitted.

Table of Contents

We have been organized as a limited partnership under the laws of the Republic of the Marshall Islands, which does not have a well-developed body of partnership law; as a result, unitholders may have more difficulty in protecting their interests than would unitholders of a similarly organized limited partnership in the United States.

Our partnership affairs are governed by our partnership agreement and by the Marshall Islands Act. The provisions of the Marshall Islands Act resemble provisions of the limited partnership laws of a number of states in the United States, most notably Delaware. The Marshall Islands Act also provides that it is to be applied and construed to make it uniform with the Delaware Revised Uniform Partnership Act and, so long as it does not conflict with the Marshall Islands Act or decisions of the Marshall Islands courts, interpreted according to the non-statutory law (or case law) of the State of Delaware. There have been, however, few, if any, court cases in the Marshall Islands interpreting the Marshall Islands Act, in contrast to Delaware, which has a fairly well-developed body of case law interpreting its limited partnership statute. Accordingly, we cannot predict whether Marshall Islands courts would reach the same conclusions as the courts in Delaware. For example, the rights of our unitholders and the fiduciary responsibilities of our general partner under Marshall Islands law are not as clearly established as under judicial precedent in existence in Delaware. As a result, unitholders may have more difficulty in protecting their interests in the face of actions by our officers or directors than would unitholders of a similarly organized limited partnership in the United States.

Because we are organized under the laws of the Marshall Islands and our business is operated primarily from our office in Monaco, it may be difficult to serve us with legal process or enforce judgments against us, our directors or our management.

We are organized under the laws of the Marshall Islands, and all of our assets are located outside of the United States. Our business is operated primarily from our office in Monaco. In addition, our general partner is a Marshall Islands limited liability company, and our directors and officers generally are or will be non-residents of the United States, and all or a substantial portion of the assets of these non-residents are located outside the United States. As a result, it may be difficult or impossible for you to bring an action against us or against these individuals in the United States if you believe that your rights have been infringed under securities laws or otherwise. Even if you are successful in bringing an action of this kind, the laws of the Marshall Islands, Monaco and of other jurisdictions may prevent or restrict you from enforcing a judgment against our assets or the assets of our general partner or our directors or officers.

Because the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board is not currently permitted to inspect registered public accounting firms in Greece, including our independent registered public accounting firm, you may not benefit from such inspections.

Auditors of U.S. public companies, including our independent registered public accounting firm, are required by the laws of the United States to undergo periodic Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) inspections to assess their compliance with U.S. law and professional standards in connection with performance of audits of financial statements filed with the SEC. The laws of certain European Union countries, including Greece, do not currently permit the PCAOB to conduct inspections of accounting firms established and operating in such European Union countries. Accordingly, the PCAOB is currently prevented from fully evaluating the effectiveness of our independent registered public accounting firm's audit procedures or quality control procedures. Unlike shareholders or potential shareholders of most U.S. public companies, our unitholders would be deprived of the possible benefits of such PCAOB inspections.

Tax Risks

In addition to the following risk factors, you should read **Material U.S. Federal Income Tax Considerations** on page 52 for a more complete discussion of the expected material U.S. federal and non-U.S. income tax considerations relating to us and the ownership and disposition of common units.

We may be subject to taxes, which may reduce our cash available for distribution to our unitholders.

We and our subsidiaries may be subject to tax in the jurisdictions in which we are organized or operate, reducing the amount of cash available for distribution. In computing our tax obligation in these jurisdictions, we are required to take various tax accounting and reporting positions on matters that are not entirely free from doubt and for which we have not received rulings from the governing authorities. We cannot assure you that upon review of these positions the applicable authorities will agree with our positions. A successful challenge by a tax authority could result in additional tax imposed on us or our subsidiaries, further reducing the cash available for distribution. In addition, changes in our operations or ownership could result in additional tax being imposed on us or our subsidiaries in jurisdictions in which operations are conducted.

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

A non-U.S. entity treated as a corporation for U.S. federal income tax purposes will be treated as a passive foreign investment company, or a PFIC, for U.S. federal income tax purposes if at least 75.0% of its gross income for any taxable year consists of certain types of passive income, or at least 50.0% of the average value of the entity's assets produce or are held for the production of those types of passive income. For purposes of these tests, passive income generally includes dividends, interest, gains from the sale or exchange of investment property, and rents and royalties other than rents and royalties that are received from unrelated parties in connection with the active conduct of a trade or business. For purposes of these tests, income derived from the performance of services does not constitute passive income. U.S. unitholders of a PFIC are subject to a disadvantageous U.S. federal income tax regime with respect to the income derived by the PFIC, the distributions they receive from the PFIC, and the gain, if any, they derive from the sale or other disposition of their shares in the PFIC.

Based on our current and projected method of operation, and on opinion of counsel, we believe that we were not a PFIC for our 2014 taxable year, and we expect that we will not become a PFIC with respect to any other taxable year. Our U.S. counsel, Thompson Hine LLP, is of the opinion that (1) the income we receive from time chartering activities and the assets we own that are engaged in generating such income should not be treated as passive income or assets, respectively, and (2) so long as our income from time charters exceeds 25.0% of our gross income from all sources for each taxable year after our initial taxable year and the fair market value of our vessels contracted under time charters exceeds 50.0% of the average fair market value of all of our assets for each taxable year after our initial taxable year, we should not be a PFIC for any taxable year. This opinion is based on representations and projections provided by us to our counsel regarding our assets, income and charters, and its validity is conditioned on the accuracy of such representations and projections. We expect that all of the vessels in our fleet will be engaged in time chartering activities and intend to treat our income from those activities as non-passive income, and the vessels engaged in those activities as non-passive assets, for PFIC purposes. However, no assurance can be given that the Internal Revenue Service, or the IRS, will accept this position.

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

Under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended, or the Code, 50.0% of the gross shipping income of a vessel owning or chartering corporation that is attributable to transportation that either begins or ends, but that does not both begin and end, in the United States is characterized as U.S.-source shipping income. U.S.-source shipping income generally is subject to a 4.0% U.S. federal income tax without allowance for deduction or, if such U.S.-source shipping income is effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business in the United States, U.S. federal corporate income tax (the highest statutory rate presently is 35.0%) as well as a branch profits tax (presently imposed at a 30.0% rate on effectively connected earnings) applies, unless that corporation qualifies for exemption from tax under Section 883 of the Code.

Based on an opinion of counsel, and certain assumptions and representations, we believe that we will qualify for this statutory tax exemption, and we will take this position for U.S. federal income tax return reporting purposes. However, there are factual circumstances, including some that may be beyond our control that could cause us to lose the benefit of this tax exemption. Furthermore, our board of directors could determine that it is in our best interests to take an action that would result in this tax exemption not applying to us in the future. In addition, our conclusion that we qualify for this exemption, as well as the conclusions in this regard of our counsel, Thompson Hine LLP, is based upon legal authorities that do not expressly contemplate an organizational structure such as ours; specifically, although we have elected to be treated as a corporation for U.S. federal income tax purposes, we are organized as a limited partnership under Marshall Islands law. Therefore, we can give no assurances that the IRS will not take a

different position regarding our qualification for this tax exemption.

If we were not entitled to the Section 883 exemption for any taxable year, we generally would be subject to a 4.0% U.S. federal gross income tax with respect to our U.S.-source shipping income or, if such U.S. source shipping income were effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business in the United States, U.S. federal corporate income tax as well as a branch profits tax for those years. Our failure to qualify for the Section 883 exemption could have a negative effect on our business and would result in decreased earnings available for distribution to our unitholders.

You may be subject to income tax in one or more non-U.S. countries, including Greece, as a result of owning our common units if, under the laws of any such country, we are considered to be carrying on business there. Such laws may require you to file a tax return with and pay taxes to those countries.

We intend that our affairs and the business of each of our controlled affiliates will be conducted and operated in a manner that minimizes income taxes imposed upon us and these controlled affiliates or which may be imposed upon you as a result of owning our common units. However, because we are organized as a partnership, there is a risk in some jurisdictions that our activities and the activities of our subsidiaries may be attributed to our unitholders for tax purposes and, thus, that you will be subject to tax in one or more non-U.S. countries, including Greece, as a result of owning our common units if, under the laws of any such country, we are considered to be carrying on business there. If you are subject to tax in any such country, you may be required to file a tax return with and to pay tax in that country based on your allocable share of our income. We may be required to reduce distributions to you on account of any withholding obligations imposed upon us by that country in respect of such allocation to you. The United States may not allow a tax credit for any foreign income taxes that you directly or indirectly incur.

Table of Contents

We believe we can conduct our activities in such a manner that our unitholders should not be considered to be carrying on business in one or more non-U.S. countries including Greece solely as a consequence of the acquisition, holding, disposition or redemption of our common units. However, the question of whether either we or any of our controlled affiliates will be treated as carrying on business in any particular country will be largely a question of fact to be determined based upon an analysis of contractual arrangements, including the management agreement and the administrative services agreement we will enter into with the Manager, and the way we conduct business or operations, all of which may change over time. Furthermore, the laws of Greece or any other country may change in a manner that causes that country's taxing authorities to determine that we are carrying on business in such country and are subject to its taxation laws. Any foreign taxes imposed on us or any subsidiaries will reduce our cash available for distribution.

Item 4. Information on the Partnership

A. History and Development of the Partnership

Navios Partners is an international owner and operator of dry cargo and container vessels, formed on August 7, 2007 under the laws of the Republic of the Marshall Islands. Navios GP L.L.C. (the "General Partner"), a wholly owned subsidiary of Navios Holdings, was also formed on that date to act as the general partner of Navios Partners and received a 2.0% general partner interest in Navios Partners.

Navios Partners is engaged in the seaborne transportation services of a wide range of dry cargo commodities including iron ore, coal, grain and fertilizer and also containers, chartering its vessels generally under medium to long-term charters. The operations of Navios Partners are managed by the Manager from its offices in Piraeus, Greece, Singapore and Monaco.

Pursuant to the initial public offering ("IPO") on November 16, 2007, Navios Partners entered into the following agreements:

- (a) the Management Agreement with the Manager pursuant to which the Manager provides Navios Partners commercial and technical management services;
- (b) the Administrative Services Agreement with the Manager pursuant to which the Manager provides Navios Partners administrative services; and
- (c) the Omnibus Agreement with Navios Holdings, governing, among other things, when Navios Partners and Navios Holdings may compete against each other as well as rights of first offer on certain drybulk carriers.

Equity Offerings and Issuances

2015

On February 11, 2015, Navios Partners completed its public offering of 4,000,000 common units at \$13.09 per unit and raised gross proceeds of approximately \$52.4 million to fund its fleet expansion. The net proceeds of this offering, including the underwriting discount and excluding offering costs estimated at \$0.3 million, were approximately \$50.1 million. Pursuant to this offering, Navios Partners issued 81,633 general partnership units to its general partner. The net proceeds from the issuance of the general partnership units were \$1.1 million. On the same date, Navios Partners completed the exercise of the option previously granted to the underwriters in connection with the offering and issued 600,000 additional common units at the public offering price less the underwriting discount. As a result of

the exercise of the option, Navios Partners raised additional gross proceeds of \$7.9 million and net proceeds, including the underwriting discount, of approximately \$7.5 million and issued 12,245 additional general partnership units to its general partner. The net proceeds from the issuance of the general partnership units were \$0.2 million. In addition, Navios Partners completed a private placement of 1,120,547 common units and 22,868 general partner units at \$13.09 per unit to Navios Holdings, raising additional gross proceeds of \$15.0 million. Following the public offering and the private placement, Navios Holdings currently owns a 20.1% interest in Navios Partners, which includes the 2.0% interest through Navios Partners general partner which Navios Holdings owns and controls.

2014

On February 14, 2014, Navios Partners completed its public offering of 5,500,000 common units at \$17.30 per unit and raised gross proceeds of approximately \$95.2 million to fund its fleet expansion. The net proceeds of this offering, including the underwriting discount and excluding offering costs estimated at \$0.3 million were approximately \$91.1 million. Pursuant to this offering, Navios Partners issued 112,245 general partnership units to its general partner. The net proceeds from the issuance of the general partnership units were \$1.9 million. On February 18, 2014, Navios Partners completed the exercise of the option previously granted to the underwriters in connection with the offering and issued 825,000 additional common units at the public offering price less the underwriting discount. As a result of the exercise of the option, Navios Partners raised additional gross proceeds of \$14.3 million and net proceeds, including the underwriting discount, of approximately \$13.7 million and issued 16,837 additional general partnership units to its general partner. The net proceeds from the issuance of the general partnership units were \$0.3 million.

Table of Contents**2013**

On September 25, 2013, Navios Partners completed its public offering of 5,000,000 common units at \$14.26 per unit and raised gross proceeds of \$71.3 million to fund its fleet expansion. The net proceeds of this offering, including the underwriting discount and excluding offering costs of \$0.2 million were \$68.2 million. Pursuant to this offering, Navios Partners issued 102,041 general partnership units to its general partner. The net proceeds from the issuance of the general partnership units were \$1.5 million. On the same date, Navios Partners completed the exercise of the option previously granted to the underwriters in connection with the offering and issued 750,000 additional common units at the public offering price less the underwriting discount. As a result of the exercise of the option, Navios Partners raised additional gross proceeds of \$10.7 million. The net proceeds, including the underwriting discount, were approximately \$10.2 million and Navios Partners issued 15,306 additional general partnership units to its general partner. The net proceeds from the issuance of the general partnership units were \$0.2 million.

On February 6, 2013, Navios Partners completed its public offering of 4,500,000 common units at \$14.15 per unit and raised gross proceeds of approximately \$63.7 million to fund its fleet expansion. The net proceeds of this offering, including the underwriting discount and excluding offering costs of \$0.2 million were approximately \$60.8 million. Pursuant to this offering, Navios Partners issued 91,837 general partnership units to its general partner. The net proceeds from the issuance of the general partnership units were \$1.3 million. On the same date, Navios Partners completed the exercise of the option previously granted to the underwriters in connection with the offering and issued 675,000 additional common units at the public offering price less the underwriting discount. As a result of the exercise of the option, Navios Partners raised additional gross proceeds of \$9.6 million and net proceeds, including the underwriting discount, of approximately \$9.1 million and issued 13,776 additional general partnership units to its general partner. The net proceeds from the issuance of the general partnership units were \$0.2 million.

Vessel Acquisitions

In December 2014, Navios Partners agreed to acquire from an unrelated third party the MSC Cristina, a 2011 South Korean-built Container vessel of 13,100 TEU, for a purchase price of \$147.8 million estimated to be delivered at the end of the first quarter of 2015. The MSC Cristina has been chartered-out to a high quality counterparty for 12 years at a rate of \$60,275 net per day (with Navios Partners option to terminate after year seven). Navios Partners is expected to finance the acquisition with cash on its balance sheet and bank debt on terms consistent with its credit facilities.

On October 28, 2014, Navios Partners acquired from an unrelated third party the YM Unity, a 2006-built Container vessel of 8,204 TEU, for an acquisition cost of \$59.1 million.

On August 29, 2014, Navios Partners acquired from an unrelated third party the YM Utmost, a 2006-built Container vessel of 8,204 TEU, for an acquisition cost of \$59.1 million.

On January 18, 2014, Navios Partners acquired from an unrelated third party the Navios Sun, a 2005-built Panamax vessel of 76,619 dwt, for an acquisition cost of \$16.2 million.

On January 7, 2014, Navios Partners acquired from an unrelated third party the Navios La Paix, a 2014-built Ultra-Handymax vessel of 61,485 dwt, for an acquisition cost of \$28.5 million.

In December 2013, Navios Partners acquired from an unrelated third party five 2006 South Korean-built Container vessels of 6,800 TEU each, consisting of the Hyundai Hongkong, the Hyundai Singapore, the Hyundai Tokyo, the Hyundai Shanghai and the Hyundai Busan for a total acquisition cost of \$276.5 million.

On October 11, 2013, Navios Partners acquired from an unrelated third party the Navios Harmony, an 82,790 dwt 2006 Japanese-built Panamax vessel, for an acquisition cost of \$18.0 million.

On September 11, 2013, Navios Partners acquired from an unrelated third party the Navios Joy, an 181,389 dwt Japanese new-build Capesize vessel, for an acquisition cost of \$47.5 million.

B. Business Overview

Introduction

We are an international owner and operator of drybulk and container vessels formed by Navios Holdings (NYSE: NM), a vertically integrated seaborne shipping company with over 60 years of operating history in the dry cargo shipping industry. Our vessels are generally chartered-out under medium to long-term time charters with an average remaining term of approximately three years to a strong group of counterparties, including Cosco Bulk Carrier Co. Ltd., Mitsui O.S.K. Lines Ltd., Exelon Corporation (formerly Constellation Energy Group), Rio Tinto, Hyundai Merchant Marine Co., Ltd and Mediterranean Shipping Co. S.A.

Table of Contents**Our Fleet**

Navios Partners controls 12 Panamax vessels, eight Capesize vessels, three Ultra-Handymax vessels and eight Container vessels. Our fleet of high quality dry cargo vessels has an average age of approximately eight years for drybulk and container vessels, which is significantly younger than the current industry average of about nine and eleven years for drybulk and container vessels, respectively (both industry average as of December 31, 2014). Panamax vessels are highly flexible vessels capable of carrying a wide range of dry cargo commodities, including iron ore, coal, grain and fertilizer and of being accommodated in most major discharge ports, while Capesize vessels are primarily dedicated to the carriage of iron ore and coal. Ultra-Handymax vessels are similar to Panamax vessels although with less carrying capacity and generally have self-loading and discharging gear on board to accommodate undeveloped ports. Container vessels are specifically constructed to transport containerized cargo. We may from time to time purchase additional vessels, including vessels from Navios Holdings.

We generate revenues by charging our customers for the use of our vessels to transport their dry cargo commodities. In general, the vessels in our fleet are chartered-out under time charters, which range in length from one to ten years at inception. From time to time, we operate vessels in the spot market until the vessels have been chartered under long-term charters.

The following table provides summary information about our fleet as of March 12, 2015:

Owned Drybulk Vessels	Type	Built	Capacity (DWT)	Charter Expiration Date	Charter-Out Rate ⁽¹⁾
Navios Apollon	Ultra-Handymax	2000	52,073	September 2015	\$ 12,500 ⁽²⁾
Navios Soleil	Ultra-Handymax	2009	57,337	May 2015	\$ 10,688
Navios La Paix	Ultra-Handymax	2014	61,485	January 2016	6TC BSI +10% ⁽³⁾
Navios Gemini S	Panamax	1994	68,636	January 2016	\$ 7,600 ⁽²⁾
Navios Libra II	Panamax	1995	70,136	September 2015	\$ 12,000 ⁽²⁾
Navios Felicity	Panamax	1997	73,867	May 2015	\$ 12,000 ⁽⁴⁾
Navios Galaxy I	Panamax	2001	74,195	February 2018	\$ 21,937
Navios Hyperion	Panamax	2004	75,707	April 2015	4TC BPI ⁽⁵⁾
Navios Alegria	Panamax	2004	76,466	June 2015	\$ 8,550
Navios Orbiter	Panamax	2004	76,602	June 2015	\$ 8,181
Navios Helios	Panamax	2005	77,075	September 2015	\$ 7,790
Navios Sun	Panamax	2005	76,619	July 2015	\$ 7,600
Navios Hope	Panamax	2005	75,397	February 2016	\$ 10,000 ⁽²⁾
Navios Sagittarius	Panamax	2006	75,756	November 2018	\$ 26,125
Navios Harmony	Panamax	2006	82,790	May 2015	\$ 12,350
Navios Fantastiks	Capesize	2005	180,265	June 2015	\$ 4,100
Navios Aurora II	Capesize	2009	169,031	November 2019	\$ 41,325
Navios Pollux	Capesize	2009	180,727	February 2016	\$ 11,400
Navios Fulvia	Capesize	2010	179,263	September 2015	\$ 50,588
Navios Melodia ⁽⁶⁾	Capesize	2010	179,132	September 2022	\$ 29,356 ⁽⁷⁾
Navios Luz	Capesize	2010	179,144	November 2020	\$ 29,356 ⁽⁸⁾
Navios Buena Ventura	Capesize	2010	179,259	October 2020	\$ 29,356 ⁽⁸⁾
Navios Joy	Capesize	2013	181,389	June 2016	\$ 19,000 ⁽⁹⁾

Owned Container Vessels	Type	Built	TEU	Charter Expiration Date	Charter-Out Rate⁽¹⁾
Hyundai Hongkong	Container	2006	6,800	December 2023	\$ 30,119
Hyundai Singapore	Container	2006	6,800	December 2023	\$ 30,119
Hyundai Tokyo	Container	2006	6,800	December 2023	\$ 30,119
Hyundai Shanghai	Container	2006	6,800	December 2023	\$ 30,119
Hyundai Busan	Container	2006	6,800	December 2023	\$ 30,119
YM Utmost	Container	2006	8,204	August 2018	\$ 34,266
YM Unity	Container	2006	8,204	October 2018	\$ 34,266

Container Vessels to be delivered	Type	Built	TEU	Charter Expiration Date	Charter-Out Rate⁽¹⁾
MSC Cristina ⁽¹⁰⁾	Container	2011	13,100	April 2027	\$ 60,275

Charter-in Drybulk Vessels⁽¹¹⁾	Type	Built	Capacity (DWT)	Charter Expiration Date	Charter-Out Rate⁽¹⁾
Navios Prosperity	Panamax	2007	82,535		\$
Navios Aldebaran	Panamax	2008	76,500		\$

Table of Contents

- (1) Daily charter-out rate per day, net of commissions or settlement proceeds, where applicable.
- (2) Profit sharing 50% on the actual results above the period rates.
- (3) The charter rate is based on the Supramax Time Charter Index plus 10% with a minimum rate of \$9,500 net per day.
- (4) Profit sharing: The owners will receive 100% of the first \$1,500 in profits above the base rate and thereafter all profits will be split 50% to each party.
- (5) The charter rate is based on the Panamax Time Charter Index.
- (6) In January 2011, Korea Line Corporation (KLC) filed for receivership. The charter was affirmed and will be performed by KLC on its original terms, following an interim suspension period until April 2016 during which Navios Partners trades the vessel directly. Rate assumes amortization of payment \$13.3 million received upfront covering the interim suspension period.
- (7) Profit sharing 50% above \$37,500/ day based on Baltic Exchange Capesize TC Average.
- (8) Profit sharing 50% above \$38,500/ day based on Baltic Exchange Capesize TC Average.
- (9) The charterer has been granted an option to extend the charter for two optional years, the first at \$22,325 (net) per day and the second at \$25,650 (net) per day.
- (10) Expected to be delivered in the first quarter of 2015.
- (11) On February 11, 2015, Navios Partners and Navios Holdings entered into a novation agreement whereby the rights to the time charter contracts of Navios Aldebaran and Navios Prosperity were transferred to Navios Holdings on February 28, 2015 and March 5, 2015, respectively.

Our Competitive Strengths

We believe that our future prospects for success are enhanced by the following aspects of our business:

Stable and growing cash flows. We believe that the medium to long-term, fixed-rate nature of our charters will provide a stable base of revenue. In addition, we believe that the potential opportunity to purchase additional vessels from Navios Holdings and through the secondary market provides visible future growth in our revenue and distributable cash flow. We believe that our management agreement, which has been extended until December 31, 2017, provides for a fixed management fee until December 31, 2015, will continue to provide us with predictable expenses. From January 2016 to December 2017, we expect that we will reimburse the Manager for all of the actual operating costs and expenses it incurs in connection with the management of our fleet, which may make our cash flows less predictable.

Strong relationship with Navios Holdings. We believe our relationship with Navios Holdings and its affiliates provides us with numerous benefits that are key to our long-term growth and success, including Navios Holdings' expertise in commercial management and Navios Holdings' reputation within the shipping industry and its network of strong relationships with many of the world's dry cargo raw material producers, agricultural traders and exporters, industrial end-users, shipyards, and shipping companies. We also benefit from Navios Holdings' expertise in technical management through its in-house technical manager, which provides efficient operations and maintenance for our vessels at costs significantly below the industry average for vessels of a similar age. Navios Holdings' expertise in fleet management is reflected in Navios Holdings' history of a low number of off-hire days and in its record of no material incidents giving rise to loss of life or pollution or other environmental liability.

High-quality, flexible fleet. Our fleet consists of 12 Panamax vessels, eight Capesize vessels, three Ultra-Handymax vessels and eight Container vessels. The average age of the vessels in our fleet is significantly lower than the average age of the world drybulk fleet. Our combined fleet had an average age of 7.7 years as of March 2014 (average age of 7.8 years for drybulk fleet and 7.5 years for containers fleet), compared to a current industry average age of about 9.1 years for the drybulk fleet and 10.9 years for the containers fleet (both industry averages as of December 31, 2014). Panamax vessels are highly flexible vessels capable of carrying a wide range of drybulk commodities, including iron ore, coal, grain and fertilizer, and of being accommodated in most major discharge ports. Ultra-Handymax vessels are similar to Panamax vessels although with less carrying capacity and generally have self-loading and discharging gear on board to accommodate undeveloped ports. Capesize vessels are primarily dedicated to the carriage of iron ore and coal. Container vessels are designed to carry manufactured, finished or semi-finished goods in steel shipping containers or specific routes. We believe that our high-quality, flexible fleet provides us with a competitive advantage in the drybulk and container time charter market, where vessel age, flexibility and quality are of significant importance in competing for business.

Operating visibility through long-term charters with strong counterparties. All of our vessels are chartered-out under medium to long-term time charters with average remaining charter duration of approximately three years to a strong group of counterparties consisting of, amongst others: Cosco Bulk Carrier Co. Ltd., Mitsui O.S.K. Lines Ltd., Rio Tinto, Exelon Corporation (formerly Constellation Energy) and Hyundai Merchant Marine Co., Ltd. We believe our existing charter coverage with strong counterparties provides us with predictable contracted revenues and operating visibility.

Table of Contents

Business Strategies

Our primary business objective is to increase quarterly distributions per unit over time by executing the following strategies:

Pursue stable cash flows through long-term charters for our fleet. We intend to continue to utilize medium to long-term, fixed-rate charters for our existing fleet. Currently, the vessels in our fleet have average remaining charter duration of approximately three years and have staggered charter expirations. We will seek to opportunistically re-charter our vessels in order to add incremental stable cash flow and improve the long-term charter terms.

Continue to grow and diversify our fleet of owned and chartered-in vessels. We seek to make strategic acquisitions to expand our fleet in order to capitalize on the demand for container and drybulk vessels in a manner that is accretive to distributable cash flow per unit. We have the right to purchase certain additional drybulk vessels currently owned or chartered-in by Navios Holdings when those vessels are fixed under long-term charters for a period of three or more years. In addition, we may seek to expand and diversify our fleet through the open market purchase of owned and chartered-in drybulk vessels with charters of three or more years. We believe that our long-term charters and financial flexibility will assist us to make additional accretive acquisitions.

Capitalize on our relationship with Navios Holdings and expand our charters with recognized charterers. We believe that we can use our relationship with Navios Holdings and its established reputation in order to obtain favorable long-term time charters and attract new customers. We will continue to increase the number of vessels we charter to our existing charterers, as well as enter into charter agreements with new customers, in order to develop a portfolio that is diverse from a customer, geographic and maturity perspective.

Provide superior customer service by maintaining high standards of performance, reliability and safety. Our customers seek transportation partners that have a reputation for high standards of performance, reliability and safety. We intend to use Navios Holdings' operational expertise and customer relationships to further expand a sustainable competitive advantage with consistent delivery of superior customer service.

Our Customers

We provide or will provide seaborne shipping services under long-term time charters with customers that we believe are creditworthy. Currently, our major customers are Hyundai Merchant Marine Co., Ltd and Navios Corporation. For the year ended December 31, 2014, these charterers accounted for 24.4% and 11.0%, respectively, of total revenues. For the year ended December 31, 2013, Cosco Bulk Carrier Co. Ltd., Hanjin Shipping Co. Ltd, Navios Corporation and Samsun Logix, accounted for 23.4%, 11.3%, 10.4% and 10.2%, respectively, of total revenues. For the year ended December 31, 2012, Cosco Bulk Carrier Co. Ltd., Mitsui O.S.K. Lines, Ltd. and Samsun Logix accounted for 22.8%, 16.0% and 13.0%, respectively, of total revenues. No other customers accounted for more than 10% of total revenues for any of the years presented.

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

Competition

The drybulk shipping market is extensive, diversified, competitive and highly fragmented, divided among approximately 1,722 independent drybulk carrier owners. The world's active drybulk fleet consists of approximately 10,300 vessels, aggregating approximately 756 million dwt as of December 31, 2014. As a general principle, the smaller the cargo carrying capacity of a drybulk carrier, the more fragmented is its market, both with regard to charterers and vessel owner/operators. Even among the larger drybulk owners and operators, whose vessels are mainly in the larger sizes, only five companies are known to have fleets of 100 vessels or more: the two largest Chinese shipping companies, China Ocean Shipping and China Shipping Group and the three largest Japanese shipping companies, Mitsui O.S.K. Lines, Kawasaki Kisen and Nippon Yusen Kaisha. There are about 45 owners known to have fleets of between 30 and 100 vessels. However, vessel ownership is not the only determining factor of fleet control. Many owners of bulk carriers charter their vessels out for extended periods, not just to end users (owners of cargo), but also to other owner/operators and to tonnage pools. Such operators may, at any given time, control a fleet many times the size of their owned tonnage. Navios Holdings is one such operator; others include Cargill, Pacific Basin Shipping, Bocimar, Zodiac Maritime, Louis Dreyfus/Cetragpa, Cobelfret, Torvald Klaveness and Swiss Marine.

The container shipping market is extensive, diversified, competitive and fragmented, divided among approximately 615 liner operators and independent owners. The world's active containership fleet consists of approximately 5,100 vessels, aggregating approximately 18.2 million TEU as of December 31, 2014. As a general principle, the smaller the cargo carrying capacity of a containership, the more fragmented is its market, both with regard to charterers and vessel owner/operators. Even among the larger liner companies and containership owners and operators, whose vessels are mainly in the larger sizes, only ten companies are known to control fleets of 80 vessels or more: AP Moller, Mediterranean Shipping Co. (MSC), Peter Dohle, Evergreen, Pacific International Lines, COSCO, CMA CGM, China Shipping Group, Seaspan and Hapag-Lloyd. There are about 40 owners known

Table of Contents

to control fleets of between 24 and 80 vessels. However, vessel ownership is not the only determining factor of fleet control. Liner companies, who control the movement of containers on land and at sea, own vessels directly and charter in vessels on short and long-term charters. Many owners/managers of containerhips charter their vessels out for extended periods but do not control the movement of any containers, the so called tonnage providers. Liner companies may, at any given time, control a fleet many times the size of their owned tonnage. AP Moller and MSC are such liner operators; whereas Peter Dohle, Seaspan and others including Navios Maritime Partners are tonnage providers.

It is likely that we will face substantial competition for long-term charter business from a number of experienced companies. Many of these competitors will have significantly greater financial resources than we do. It is also likely that we will face increased numbers of competitors entering into our transportation sectors, including in the container and drybulk sectors. Many of these competitors have strong reputations and extensive resources and experience. Increased competition may cause greater price competition, especially for long-term charters.

Time Charters

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

Basic Hire Rate

Basic hire rate refers to the basic payment from the customer for the use of the vessel. The hire rate is generally payable semi-monthly, in advance, in U.S. dollars as specified in the charter.

Expenses

In October 2011, Navios Partners extended the duration of its existing Management Agreement with the Manager until December 31, 2017 and fixed the rate for ship management services of its owned fleet through December 31, 2013. The management fees, including drydocking expenses were: (a) \$4,650 daily rate per Ultra-Handymax vessel; (b) \$4,550 daily rate per Panamax vessel; and (c) \$5,650 daily rate per Capesize vessel. In each of October 2013, August 2014 and February 2015, Navios Partners amended its existing Management Agreement with the Manager to fix the fees for ship management services of its owned fleet excluding drydocking expenses which are reimbursed at cost by Navios Partners at: (a) \$4,000 daily rate per Ultra-Handymax vessel; (b) \$4,100 daily rate per Panamax vessel; (c) \$5,100 daily rate per Capesize vessel; (d) \$6,500 daily rate per Container vessel of TEU 6,800; (e) \$7,200 daily rate per Container vessel of more than TEU 8,000; and (f) \$8,500 daily rate per very large Container vessel of more than TEU 13,000 through December 31, 2015. This fixed fee covers vessel operating expenses, which include crewing, repairs and maintenance, insurance. The Manager is directly responsible for providing all of these items and services. Maintenance for our vessels and expenses related to drydocking expenses will be reimbursed at cost under the management agreement. From January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2017, we expect that we will reimburse the Manager for all of the actual operating costs and expenses it incurs in connection with the management of our fleet. The charterer generally pays the voyage expenses, which include all expenses relating to particular voyages, including any bunker fuel expenses, port fees, cargo loading and unloading expenses, canal tolls, agency fees and commissions.

Off-hire

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

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

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

Under some of our charters, the charterer is permitted to terminate the time charter if the vessel is off-hire for an extended period, which is generally defined as a period of 90 or more consecutive off-hire days. Under some circumstances, an event of force majeure may also permit the charterer to terminate the time charter or suspend payment of charter hire.

Termination

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

Table of Contents

Classification, Inspection and Maintenance

Every sea going vessel must be classed by a classification society. The classification society certifies that the vessel is in class, signifying that the vessel has been built and maintained in accordance with the rules of the classification society and complies with applicable rules and regulations of the vessel's country of registry and the international conventions of which that country is a member. In addition, where surveys are required by international conventions and corresponding laws and ordinances of a flag state, the classification society will undertake them on application or by official order, acting on behalf of the authorities concerned.

The classification society also undertakes, on request, other surveys and checks that are required by regulations and requirements of the flag state. These surveys are subject to agreements made in each individual case or to the regulations of the country concerned. For maintenance of the class, regular and extraordinary surveys of hull, machinery (including the electrical plant) and any special equipment classed are required to be performed as follows:

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

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

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

Management of Ship Operations, Administration and Safety

Navios Holdings provides, through its wholly-owned subsidiary, Navios ShipManagement Inc., referred to as the Manager herein, expertise in various functions critical to our operations. Pursuant to the Management Agreement and the Administrative Services Agreement with the Manager, we have access to human resources, financial and other administrative functions, including:

bookkeeping, audit and accounting services;

administrative and clerical services;

banking and financial services; and

client and investor relations.

Technical management services are also provided, including:

commercial management of the vessel;

vessel maintenance and crewing;

purchasing and insurance; and

shipyard supervision.

For more information on the management agreement we have with the Manager and the Administrative Services Agreement we have with the Manager, please read Item 7. Unitholders and Related Party Transactions .

Crewing

The Manager crews its vessels primarily with Filipino, Ukrainian, Polish, Russian, Indian, Georgian and Sri Lankan officers and Filipino, Georgian, and Ukrainian seamen. For these nationalities, officers and seamen are referred to the Manager by local crewing agencies. The Manager is also responsible for travel and payroll of the crew. The crewing agencies handle each seaman's training. The Manager requires that all of its seamen have the qualifications and licenses required to comply with international regulations and shipping conventions.

Table of Contents**Risk of Loss and Liability Insurance****General**

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

Hull and Machinery and War Risk Insurances

We have marine hull and machinery and war risk insurance, which include coverage of the risk of actual or constructive total loss, for all of our owned vessels. Each of the owned vessels is covered up to at least fair market value, with a deductible of \$0.1 million per Handymax and Panamax vessels and \$0.2 million per Capesize vessels for the hull and machinery insurance. We have also extended our war risk insurance to include war loss of hire for any loss of time to the vessel, including for physical repairs, caused by a warlike incident and piracy seizure for up to 270 days of detention / loss of time. There are no deductibles for the war risk insurance or the war loss of hire cover.

Protection and Indemnity Insurance

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

Navios Partners' fleet is currently entered for protection and indemnity insurance with International Group associations where, in line with all International Group Clubs, coverage for oil pollution is limited to \$1.0 billion per event. The 13 P&I Associations that comprise the International Group insure approximately 95% of the world's commercial tonnage and have entered into a pooling agreement to collectively reinsure each association's liabilities. Each vessel that Navios Partners acquires will be entered with P&I Associations of the International Group. Under the International Group reinsurance program for the current policy year, each P&I club in the International Group is responsible for the first \$9.0 million of every claim. In every claim the amount in excess of \$9.0 million and up to \$80.0 million is shared by the clubs under the pooling agreement. Any claim in excess of \$80.0 million is reinsured by the International Group in the international reinsurance market under the General Excess of Loss Reinsurance Contract. This policy currently provides an additional \$2.0 billion of coverage for non-oil pollution claims. Further to this, an additional reinsurance layer has been placed by the International Group for claims up to \$1.0 billion in excess of \$2.08 billion, i.e. \$3.08 billion in total. For passengers and crew claims, the overall limit is \$3.0 billion for any one event on any one vessel with a sub-limit of \$2.0 billion for passengers. With the exception of pollution, passenger or crew claims,

should any other P&I claim exceed Group reinsurance limits, the provisions of all International Group Club s overspill claim rules will operate and members of any International Group Club will be liable for additional contributions in accordance with such rules. To date, there has never been an overspill claim, or one even nearing this level.

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

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

Table of Contents

Uninsured Risks

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

Credit Risk Insurance

As of March 25, 2014, the Company terminated the amended credit default insurance policy. In connection with the termination, Navios Partners received compensation of \$31.0 million. From the total compensation, \$1.2 million was recorded immediately in the statement of income within the caption of Revenue, which represents reimbursements for insurance claims submitted for the period prior to the date of the termination and the remaining amount of \$29.8 million was recorded immediately in the statement of income within the caption of Other income. The Company has no future requirement to repay any of the lump sum cash payment back to the insurance company or provide any further services.

On November 15, 2012 (as amended in March 2014), Navios Holdings and Navios Partners entered into an agreement by which Navios Holdings will provide supplemental credit default insurance with a maximum cash payment of \$20.0 million. As of December 31, 2014, the Company had not put forth any claims to Navios Holdings in connection with this supplemental insurance.

In January 2011, KLC which is the charterer of the Navios Melodia filed for receivership. The charter contract was affirmed and will be performed by KLC on its original terms, following an interim suspension period during which Navios Partners trades the vessel directly.

Regulation

Sources of applicable rules and standards

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

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

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

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

Ship safety regulation

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

An amendment of SOLAS introduced the International Safety Management (ISM) Code, which has been effective since July 1998. Under the ISM Code the party with operational control of a vessel is required to develop an extensive safety management system that includes, among other things, the adoption of a safety and environmental protection policy setting forth instructions and procedures for operating its vessels safely and describing procedures for responding to emergencies. The ISM Code requires that vessel operators obtain a safety management certificate for each vessel they operate. This certificate evidences compliance by a vessel's management with code requirements for a safety management system. No vessel can obtain a certificate unless its

Table of Contents

manager has been awarded a document of compliance, issued by the flag state for the vessel, under the ISM Code. Noncompliance with the ISM Code and other IMO regulations, such as the mandatory ship energy efficiency management plan (SEEMP) which is akin to a safety management plan and came into effect on 1 January 2013, may subject a ship owner to increased liability, may lead to decreases in available insurance coverage for affected vessels, and may result in the denial of access to, or detention in, some ports. For example, the United States Coast Guard and European Union authorities have indicated that vessels not in compliance with the ISM Code will be prohibited from trading in ports in the United States and European Union.

Another amendment of SOLAS, made after the terrorist attacks in the United States on September 11, 2001, introduced special measures to enhance maritime security, including the International Ship and Port Facilities Security Code (ISPS Code).

Our owned fleet maintains ISM and ISPS certifications for safety and security of operations. In addition, the Manager voluntarily implements and maintains certifications pursuant to the International Organization for Standardization, or ISO, for its office and ships covering both quality of services and environmental protection (ISO 9001 and ISO 14001, respectively).

International regulations to prevent pollution from ships

In the second main category of international regulation, the primary instrument is the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, or MARPOL, which imposes environmental standards on the shipping industry set out in Annexes I-VI of MARPOL. These contain regulations for the prevention of pollution by oil (Annex I), by noxious liquid substances in bulk (Annex II), by harmful substances in packaged forms within the scope of the International Maritime Dangerous Goods Code (Annex III), by sewage (Annex IV), by garbage (Annex V), and by air emissions (Annex VI).

These regulations have been and continue to be regularly amended as new and higher standards of pollution prevention are introduced with which we are required to comply.

For example, MARPOL Annex VI, together with the NO_x Technical Code established thereunder, sets limits on sulfur oxide and nitrogen oxide emissions from ship exhausts and prohibits deliberate emissions of ozone depleting substances, such as chlorofluorocarbons. It also includes a global cap on the sulfur content of fuel oil and allows for special areas to be established with more stringent controls on emissions. Originally adopted in September 1997, Annex VI came into force in May 2005 and was amended in October 2008 (as was the NO_x Technical Code) to provide for progressively more stringent limits on such emissions from 2010 onwards. The revised Annex VI provides, in particular, for a reduction of the global sulfur cap, initially to 3.5% (from the previous cap of 4.5%), with effect from January 1, 2012, then progressively reducing to 0.50% effective from January 1, 2020, subject to a feasibility review to be completed no later than 2018 (regarding the availability of compliant fuel which could defer the requirement to January 1, 2025); and the establishment of new tiers of stringent nitrogen oxide emissions standards for marine engines, depending on their date of installation. We anticipate incurring costs in complying with these more stringent standards.

The revised Annex VI further allows for designation, in response to proposals from member parties, of Emission Control Areas (ECAs) that impose accelerated and/or more stringent requirements for control of sulfur oxide, particulate matter, and nitrogen oxide emissions. Thus far, ECAs have been formally adopted for the Baltic Sea area (limits SO_x emissions only); the North Sea area including the English Channel (limiting SO_x emissions only) and the North American ECA (which came into effect from August 1, 2012 limiting SO_x, NO_x and particulate matter emissions). The United States Caribbean Sea ECA entered into force on January 1, 2013 and has been effective since

January 1, 2014, limiting SO_x, NO_x and particulate matter emissions. For the currently-designated ECAs, much lower sulfur limits on fuel oil content are being phased in (0.1% from January 1, 2015). At its 66th Session, the MEPC adopted amendments (expected to enter into force in September 2015) to MARPOL Annex VI, regulation 13, regarding NO_x and the date for the implementation of the Tier III standards within ECAs. These amendments provide, inter alia, that such standards, applicable on January 1, 2016, will be applied to marine diesel engines installed on ships which operate in the North American ECA or the U.S. Caribbean Sea ECA and to installed marine diesel engines which operate in other ECAs which might be designated in the future for Tier III NO_x control. At its 67th Session, the MEPC instructed the correspondence group, which is developing a draft framework for a methodology to determine whether sufficient fuel meeting the requirements of regulation 14 (SO_x and particulate matter) is likely to be available by the effective date, to submit a final report to MEPC 68. These more stringent fuel standards are expected to require measures such as fuel switching, vessel modification adding distillate fuel storage capacity, or addition of exhaust gas cleaning scrubbers, to achieve compliance, and may require installation and operation of further control equipment at significant increased cost.

Table of Contents**Greenhouse gas emissions**

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

In December 2011, UN climate change talks took place in Durban and concluded with an agreement referred to as the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action. In preparation for the Durban Conference, the International Chamber of Shipping (ICS) produced a briefing document, confirming the shipping industry's commitment to cut shipping emissions by 20% by 2020, with significant further reductions thereafter. The ICS called on the participants in the Durban Conference to give the IMO a clear mandate to deliver emissions reductions through market-based measures, for example a shipping industry environmental compensation fund. Notwithstanding the ICS's request for global regulation of the shipping industry, the Durban Conference did not result in any proposals specifically addressing the shipping industry's role in climate change. The European Union announced in April 2007 that it planned to expand the European Union emissions trading scheme by adding vessels, and a proposal from the European Commission was expected if no global regime for reduction of seaborne emissions had been agreed by the end of 2011. As of January 31, 2013, the Commission stopped short of proposing that emissions from ships be included in the EU's emissions-trading scheme (ETS). However, on October 1, 2012, it announced that it would propose measures to monitor verify and report on greenhouse gas emissions from the shipping sector. On June 28, 2013, the European Commission adopted a Communication setting out a strategy for progressively including greenhouse gas emissions from maritime transport in the EU's policy for reducing its overall GHG emissions. The first step proposed by the Commission is an EU Regulation that would establish an EU-wide system for the monitoring, reporting and verification of carbon dioxide emissions from large ships starting in 2018. The draft Regulation is currently working its way through the various stages of the EU legislative process (most recently the European Council reached a political agreement on this issue at the December 17, 2014 following a positive vote in the Parliament's Environmental Committee). The Regulation will now move to legal and linguistic review before moving to the Parliament for final approval. If adopted, the Regulation will take effect on July 1, 2015, with monitoring, reporting and verification requirements beginning on January 1, 2018. This Regulation may be seen as indicative of an intention to maintain pressure on the international negotiating process. Any passage of climate control legislation or other regulatory initiatives by the IMO, European Union, or individual countries where we operate, including the U.S., that restrict emissions of greenhouse gases from vessels could require us to make significant financial expenditures we cannot predict with certainty at this time.

Other international regulations to prevent pollution

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

The BWM Convention will not enter into force until 12 months after it has been adopted by 30 states, the combined merchant fleets of which represent not less than 35% of the gross tonnage of the world's merchant shipping. To date, there has not been sufficient adoption of this standard by member-states representing enough of the gross tonnage of the world's fleet for it to take force. However, as of February 12, 2015, the Convention has been ratified by 44 states, representing 32.86% of the global merchant shipping fleet's gross tonnage, and its entry-into-force with attendant compliance costs may therefore be anticipated in the foreseeable future.

European regulations

European regulations in the maritime sector are in general based on international law. However, since the *Erika* incident in 1999, the European Community has become increasingly active in the field of regulation of maritime safety and protection of the environment. It has been the driving force behind a number of amendments of MARPOL (including, for example, changes to accelerate the time-table for the phase-out of single hull tankers, and to prohibit the carriage in such tankers of heavy grades of oil), and if dissatisfied either with the extent of such amendments or with the time-table for their introduction it has been prepared to legislate on a unilateral basis. It should be noted, for instance, that the EU has its own regime as far as ship emissions are concerned and whilst it does in some respects reflect the IMO regime, this is not always the case. As far as sulfur dioxide emissions are concerned, for example, the EU regulation has not just caught up with the IMO limits for sulfur in ECAs, but it continues to have certain elements that exceed IMO regulations (e.g., the requirement that ships within EU ports, use fuel with a maximum 0.10% sulfur content and the requirement for a limit of 0.50% sulfur content outside EU ECAs from January 1, 2010, regardless of the outcome of the fuel availability review in 2018).

In some instances where it has done so, international regulations have subsequently been amended to the same level of stringency as that introduced in Europe, but the risk is well established that EU regulations may from time to time impose burdens and costs on ship owners and operators which are additional to those involved in complying with international rules and standards.

Table of Contents

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

United States environmental regulations and laws governing civil liability for pollution

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

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

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

OPA currently limits liability of the responsible party for single-hull tank vessels over 3,000 gross tons liability to the greater of \$3,200 per gross ton or \$23.5 million (this amount is reduced to \$6.4 million if the vessel is less than 3,000 gross tons). For tank vessels over 3,000 gross tons, other than a single-hull vessel, liability is limited to \$2,000 per gross ton or \$17.0 million (or \$4.27 million for a vessel less than 3,000 gross tons), whichever is greater. These amounts are periodically adjusted for inflation. On August 19, 2014, the Coast Guard proposed to increase these OPA liability limits but a final rule has not yet been promulgated. These limits of liability do not apply if an incident was directly caused by violation of applicable United States federal safety, construction or operating regulations or by a responsible party's gross negligence or willful misconduct, or if the responsible party fails or refuses to report the incident or to cooperate and assist in connection with oil removal activities.

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

applicable to vessels. While Congressional activity on this topic is expected to continue to focus on offshore facilities rather than on vessels generally, it cannot be known with certainty what form any such new legislative initiatives may take.

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

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

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

Table of Contents

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

The U.S. Coast Guard's regulations concerning certificates of financial responsibility provide, in accordance with OPA, that claimants may bring suit directly against an insurer or guarantor that furnishes certificates of financial responsibility. In the event that such insurer or guarantor is sued directly, it is prohibited from asserting any contractual defense that it may have had against the responsible party and is limited to asserting those defenses available to the responsible party and the defense that the incident was caused by the willful misconduct of the responsible party. Certain organizations, which had typically provided certificates of financial responsibility under pre-OPA laws, including the major protection and indemnity organizations have declined to furnish evidence of insurance for vessel owners and operators if they are subject to direct actions or required to waive insurance policy defenses. This requirement may have the effect of limiting the availability of the type of coverage required by the Coast Guard and could increase our costs of obtaining this insurance as well as the costs of our competitors that also require such coverage.

OPA specifically permits individual states to impose their own liability regimes with regard to oil pollution incidents occurring within their boundaries, and some states' environmental laws impose unlimited liability for oil spills. In some cases, states which have enacted such legislation have not yet issued implementing regulations defining vessels owners' responsibilities under these laws. The United States Clean Water Act (CWA) prohibits the discharge of oil or hazardous substances in U.S. navigable waters and imposes strict liability in the form of penalties for unauthorized discharges. The CWA also imposes substantial liability for the costs of removal, remediation and damages and complements the remedies available under CERCLA. The EPA regulates the discharge of ballast water and other substances incidental to the normal operation of vessels in U.S. waters using a Vessel General Permit, or VGP, system pursuant to the CWA, in order to combat the risk of harmful organisms that can travel in ballast water carried from foreign ports. Compliance with the conditions of the VGP is required for commercial vessels 79 feet in length or longer (other than commercial fishing vessels.) On March 28, 2013 the EPA adopted the 2013 VGP which took effect on December 19, 2013. The 2013 VGP is valid for five years. This new 2013 VGP imposes a numeric standard to control the release of non-indigenous invasive species in ballast water discharges. In addition, through the CWA certification provisions that allow US states to place additional conditions on use of the VGP within state waters, a number of states have proposed or implemented a variety of stricter ballast water requirements including, in some states, specific treatment standards. Compliance with new U.S. federal and state requirements could require the installation of equipment on our vessels to treat ballast water before it is discharged or the implementation of other port facility disposal arrangements or procedures at potentially substantial cost, and/or otherwise restrict our vessels from entering U.S. waters.

The Federal Clean Air Act (CAA) requires the EPA to promulgate standards applicable to emissions of volatile organic compounds and other air contaminants. Our vessels are subject to CAA vapor control and recovery standards (VCS) for cleaning fuel tanks and conducting other operations in regulated port areas, and to CAA emissions standards for so-called Category 3 marine diesel engines operating in U.S. waters. In April 2010, EPA adopted regulations implementing the provision of MARPOL Annex VI regarding emissions from Category 3 marine diesel engines. Under these regulations, both U.S. and foreign-flagged ships must comply with the applicable engine and fuel standards of MARPOL Annex VI, including the stricter North America ECA standards which took effect in August 2012, when they enter U.S. ports or operate in most internal U.S. waters including the Great Lakes. MARPOL

Annex VI requirements are discussed in greater detail above under International regulations to prevent pollution from ships. We may incur costs to install control equipment on our vessels to comply with the new standards.

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

Security Regulations

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

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

Table of Contents

on-board installation of ship security alert systems;

the development of vessel security plans; and

compliance with flag state security certification requirements.

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

International laws governing civil liability to pay compensation or damages

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

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

In 2001, the IMO adopted the International Convention on Civil Liability for Bunker Oil Pollution Damage, or the Bunker Convention, which imposes strict liability on ship owners for pollution damage in jurisdictional waters of ratifying states caused by discharges of bunker oil. The Bunker Convention defines bunker oil as any hydrocarbon mineral oil, including lubricating oil, used or intended to be used for the operation or propulsion of the ship, and any residues of such oil. The Bunker Convention also requires registered owners of ships over a certain size to maintain insurance for pollution damage in an amount equal to the limits of liability under the applicable national or international limitation regime (but not exceeding the amount calculated in accordance with the Convention on Limitation of Liability for Maritime Claims of 1976, as amended, or the 1976 Convention). The Bunker Convention entered into force on November 21, 2008, and as of March 10, 2015 had 78 contracting states comprising approximately 91.46% of the gross tonnage of the world's merchant fleet. In other jurisdictions liability for spills or releases of oil from ships' bunkers continues to be determined by the national or other domestic laws in the jurisdiction

where the events or damages occur.

Outside the United States, national laws generally provide for the owner to bear strict liability for pollution, subject to a right to limit liability under applicable national or international regimes for limitation of liability. The most widely applicable international regime limiting maritime pollution liability is the 1976 Convention. Rights to limit liability under the 1976 Convention are forfeited where a spill is caused by a shipowners' intentional or reckless conduct. Some states have ratified the 1996 LLMC Protocol to the 1976 Convention, which provides for liability limits substantially higher than those set forth in the 1976 Convention to apply in such states. Finally, some jurisdictions are not a party to either the 1976 Convention or the 1996 LLMC Protocol, and, therefore, shipowners' rights to limit liability for maritime pollution in such jurisdictions may be uncertain.

Taxation of the Partnership

United States Taxation

The following is a discussion of the material U.S. federal income tax considerations applicable to us. This discussion is based upon provisions of the Code, final and temporary regulations thereunder (Treasury Regulations), and administrative rulings and court decisions, all as in effect currently and during our year ended December 31, 2014 and all of which are subject to change, possibly with retroactive effect. Changes in these authorities may cause the tax consequences to vary substantially from the consequences described below. The following discussion is for general information purposes only and does not purport to be a comprehensive description of all of the U.S. federal income tax considerations applicable to us.

Table of Contents

Election to be Treated as a Corporation: We have elected to be treated as a corporation for U.S. federal income tax purposes. As such, we are subject to U.S. federal income tax on our income to the extent it is from U.S. sources or otherwise is effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business in the United States as discussed below.

Taxation of Operating Income: Substantially all of our gross income is attributable to the transportation of drybulk and related products. For this purpose, gross income attributable to transportation (Transportation Income) includes income derived from, or in connection with, the use, the hiring for use, or the leasing for use (if any) of a vessel to transport cargo, or the performance of services directly related to the use of any vessel to transport cargo, and thus includes both time charter income and bareboat charter income (if any).

Transportation Income that is attributable to transportation that either begins or ends, but that does not both begin and end in the United States (U.S. Source International Transportation Income) is considered to be 50.0% derived from sources within the United States. Transportation Income attributable to transportation that both begins and ends in the United States (U.S. Source Domestic Transportation Income) is considered to be 100.0% derived from sources within the United States. Transportation Income attributable to transportation exclusively between non-U.S. destinations is considered to be 100.0% derived from sources outside the United States. Transportation Income derived from sources outside the United States generally is not subject to U.S. federal income tax.

We believe that we did not earn any U.S. Source Domestic Transportation Income for our fiscal year ended December 31, 2014 and expect that we will not earn any such income for future years. However, certain of our activities gave rise to U.S. Source International Transportation Income, and future expansion of our operations could result in an increase in the amount of U.S. Source International Transportation Income, which generally would be subject to U.S. federal income taxation, unless the exemption from U.S. federal income taxation under Section 883 of the Code (the Section 883 Exemption) applied.

The Section 883 Exemption: In general, the Section 883 Exemption provides that if a non-U.S. corporation satisfies the requirements of Section 883 of the Code and the Treasury Regulations thereunder (the Section 883 Regulations), it will not be subject to the net basis and branch profit taxes or the 4.0% gross basis tax described below on its U.S. Source International Transportation Income. The Section 883 Exemption applies only to U.S. Source International Transportation Income and does not apply to U.S. Source Domestic Transportation Income. We qualify for the Section 883 Exemption if, among other matters, we meet the following three requirements:

We are organized in a jurisdiction outside the United States that grants an equivalent exemption from tax to corporations organized in the United States with respect to the types of U.S. Source International Transportation Income that we earn (an Equivalent Exemption);

We satisfy the Publicly Traded Test (as described below) or the Qualified Shareholder Stock Ownership Test (as described below); and

We meet certain substantiation, reporting and other requirements.

We are organized under the laws of the Republic of the Marshall Islands. The U.S. Treasury Department has recognized the Republic of the Marshall Islands as a jurisdiction that grants an Equivalent Exemption with respect to the type of income we have earned and are expected to earn. Consequently, our U.S. Source International Transportation Income (including for this purpose, any such income earned by our subsidiaries, that have elected to be

disregarded as entities separate from us for U.S. federal income tax purposes) will be exempt from U.S. federal income taxation provided we meet the Publicly Traded Test or the Qualified Shareholder Stock Ownership Test and we satisfy certain substantiation, reporting and other requirements.

In order to meet the Publicly Traded Test, the equity interests in the non-U.S. corporation at issue must be primarily traded and regularly traded on an established securities market either in the United States or in a jurisdiction outside the United States that grants an Equivalent Exemption. The Section 883 Regulations generally provide, in pertinent part, that a class of equity interests in a non-U.S. corporation will be considered to be primarily traded on an established securities market in a given country if the number of units of such class that are traded during any taxable year on all established securities markets in that country exceeds the number of units in such class that are traded during that year on established securities markets in any other single country. Equity interests in a non-U.S. corporation will be considered to be regularly traded on an established securities market under the Section 883 Regulations provided one or more classes of such equity interests representing more than 50.0% of the aggregate vote and value of all of the outstanding equity interests in the non-U.S. corporation satisfy certain listing and trading volume requirements. These listing and trading volume requirements are satisfied with respect to a class of equity interests listed on an established securities market provided trades in such class are effected, other than in de minimis quantities, on such market on at least 60 days during the taxable year and the aggregate number of units in such class that are traded on such market or markets during the taxable year are at least 10% of the average number of units outstanding in that class during the taxable year (with special rules for short taxable years). In addition, a class of equity interests traded on an established securities market in the United States will be considered to satisfy the listing and trading volume requirements if the equity interests in such class are regularly quoted by dealers making a market in such class (within the meaning of the Section 883 Regulations). Notwithstanding these rules, a class of equity that would otherwise be treated as regularly traded on an established securities

Table of Contents

market will not be so treated if, for more than half of the number of days during the taxable year, one or more 5.0% unitholders (i.e., unitholders owning, actually or constructively, at least 5.0% of the vote and value of that class) own in the aggregate 50.0% or more of the vote and value of that class (the Closely Held Block Exception), unless the corporation can establish that a sufficient proportion of such 5.0% unitholders are Qualified Shareholders (as defined below) so as to preclude other persons who are 5.0% unitholders from owning 50.0% or more of the value of that class for more than half the days during the taxable year.

Because substantially all of our common units are and have been traded on the New York Stock Exchange, which is considered to be an established securities market, our common units are and have been primarily traded on an established securities market for purposes of the Publicly Traded Test.

Further, although the matter is not free from doubt, based upon our expected cash flow and distributions on our outstanding equity interests, we believe that our common units represented more than 50.0% of the total value of all of our outstanding equity interests, and we believe that we satisfied the trading volume requirements described previously for our fiscal year ended December 31, 2014. We believe that we did not lose eligibility for the Section 883 Exemption as a result of the Closely Held Block Exception for such year, and consequently, we believe we satisfied the Publicly Traded Test for our fiscal year ended December 31, 2014.

While there can be no assurance that we will continue to satisfy the requirements for the Publicly Traded Test in the future, and our board of directors could determine that it is in our best interests to take an action that would result in our not being able to satisfy the Publicly Traded Test, we presently expect to continue to satisfy the requirements for the Publicly Traded Test and the Section 883 Exemption for future years. Please see below for a discussion of the consequences in the event we do not satisfy the Publicly Traded Test or otherwise fail to qualify for the Section 883 Exemption.

The Net Basis Tax and Branch Profits Tax: If we earn U.S. Source International Transportation Income and the Section 883 Exemption does not apply, the U.S. source portion of such income may be treated as effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business in the United States (Effectively Connected Income) if we have a fixed place of business in the United States and substantially all of our U.S. Source International Transportation Income is attributable to regularly scheduled transportation or, in the case of bareboat charter income (if any), is attributable to a fixed place of business in the United States.

We believe that, for our fiscal year ended December 31, 2014, none of our U.S. Source International Transportation Income was attributable to regularly scheduled transportation or received pursuant to bareboat charters. As a result, we believe that none of our U.S. Source International Transportation Income for such year would be treated as Effectively Connected Income even in the event we did not qualify for the Section 883 Exemption. However, there is no assurance that we will not earn income pursuant to regularly scheduled transportation or bareboat charters attributable to a fixed place of business in the United States in the future, which would result in such income being treated as Effectively Connected Income. In addition, any U.S. Source Domestic Transportation Income may be treated as Effectively Connected Income. Any income we earn that is treated as Effectively Connected Income would be subject to U.S. federal corporate income tax (the highest statutory rate is currently 35.0%) as well as 30.0% branch profits tax imposed under Section 884 of the Code. In addition, a 30.0% branch interest tax could be imposed on certain interest paid or deemed paid by us.

On the sale of a vessel that has produced Effectively Connected Income, we could be subject to the net basis corporate income tax as well as branch profits tax with respect to the gain recognized up to the amount of certain prior deductions for depreciation that reduced Effectively Connected Income. Otherwise, we would not be subject to U.S. federal income tax with respect to gain realized on the sale of a vessel, provided the gain is not attributable to an

office or other fixed place of business maintained by us in the United States under U.S. federal income tax principles.

The 4.0% Gross Basis Tax: If the Section 883 Exemption does not apply and the net basis tax does not apply, we would be subject to a 4.0% U.S. federal income tax on the U.S. source portion of our gross U.S. Source International Transportation Income, without benefit of deductions.

Marshall Islands Taxation

Based on the opinion of Reeder and Simpson, P.C., our counsel as to matters of the law of the Republic of the Marshall Islands, because we, our operating subsidiary and our controlled affiliates do not, and do not expect to, conduct business or operations in the Republic of the Marshall Islands, neither we nor our controlled affiliates will be subject to income, capital gains, profits or other taxation under current Marshall Islands law. As a result, distributions by our operating subsidiary and our controlled affiliates to us will not be subject to Marshall Islands taxation.

Other Tax Jurisdictions

Certain of Navios Partners' subsidiaries are incorporated in countries which impose taxes, such as Malta, however such taxes are immaterial to Navios Partners' operations.

Table of Contents

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

C. Organizational Structure

Please read exhibit 8.1 to this Annual Report for a list of our significant subsidiaries as of December 31, 2014.

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

In the consolidated financial statements of Navios Partners, Navios Europe Inc. (Navios Europe), in which Navios Partners has an ownership interest of 5.0% is included as an affiliate and is accounted for under the equity method, for such periods during which Navios Europe was an affiliate of Navios Partners. As of December 31, 2014, Navios Partners had no effective voting interest in Navios Europe.

D. Property, plants and equipment

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

Item 4A. Unresolved Staff Comments

Not applicable.

Item 5. Operating and Financial Review and Prospects

Overview

We are an international owner and operator of dry cargo vessels, formed in August 2007 by Navios Holdings, a vertically integrated seaborne shipping company with over 60 years of operating history in the dry cargo shipping industry. We have been a public company since November 2007.

Table of Contents

Equity Offerings and Issuances

On February 11, 2015, Navios Partners completed an equity offering, pursuant to which it issued 4,600,000 common units at \$13.09 per unit and raised gross proceeds of \$60.2 million (excluding the general partner contribution) to fund its fleet expansion. Simultaneously, Navios Partners completed a private placement of 1,120,547 common units and 22,868 general partner units at \$13.09 per unit to Navios Holdings, raising additional gross proceeds of \$15.0 million.

On February 14, 2014, Navios Partners completed an equity offering, pursuant to which it issued 5,500,000 common units at \$17.30 per unit and raised gross proceeds of \$95.2 million (excluding the general partner contribution) to fund its fleet expansion. On February 18, 2014, Navios Partners completed the exercise of the option previously granted to the unitholders in connection with the offering and issued 825,000 common units at \$17.30 per unit and raised additional gross proceeds of \$14.3 million.

On September 25, 2013, Navios Partners completed an equity offering, pursuant to which it issued 5,750,000 common units at \$14.26 per unit and raised gross proceeds of \$82.0 million (excluding the general partner contribution) to fund its fleet expansion.

On February 6, 2013, Navios Partners completed an equity offering, pursuant to which it issued 5,175,000 common units at \$14.15 per unit and raised gross proceeds of \$73.2 million (excluding the general partner contribution) to fund its fleet expansion.

As of March 12, 2015, there were outstanding: 83,079,710 common units and 1,695,509 general partnership units. Navios Holdings owns a 20.1% interest in Navios Partners, which includes the 2.0% general partner interest.

Please see Item 4. Information on the Partnership .

Fleet Development

In December 2014, Navios Partners agreed to acquire from an unrelated third party the MSC Cristina, a 2011 South Korean-built Container vessel of 13,100 TEU, for a purchase price of \$147.8 million estimated to be delivered at the end of the first quarter of 2015. The MSC Cristina has been chartered-out to a high quality counterparty for 12 years at a rate of \$60,275 net per day (with Navios Partners option to terminate after year seven). Navios Partners is expected to finance the acquisition with cash on its balance sheet and bank debt on terms consistent with its credit facilities.

On October 28, 2014, Navios Partners acquired from an unrelated third party the YM Unity, a 2006-built Container vessel of 8,204 TEU, for an acquisition cost of \$59.1 million.

On August 29, 2014, Navios Partners acquired from an unrelated third party the YM Utmost, a 2006-built Container vessel of 8,204 TEU, for an acquisition cost of \$59.1 million.

On January 18, 2014, Navios Partners acquired from an unrelated third party the Navios Sun, a 2005-built Panamax vessel of 76,619 dwt, for an acquisition cost of \$16.2 million.

On January 7, 2014, Navios Partners acquired from an unrelated third party the Navios La Paix, a 2014-built Ultra-Handymax vessel of 61,485 dwt, for an acquisition cost of \$28.5 million.

In December 2013, Navios Partners acquired from an unrelated third party five 2006 South Korean-built Container vessels of 6,800 TEU each, consisting of the Hyundai Hongkong, the Hyundai Singapore, the Hyundai Tokyo, the

Hyundai Shanghai and the Hyundai Busan for a total acquisition cost of \$276.5 million.

On October 11, 2013, Navios Partners acquired from an unrelated third party the Navios Harmony, an 82,790 dwt 2006 Japanese-built Panamax vessel, for an acquisition cost of \$18.0 million.

Table of Contents

On September 11, 2013, Navios Partners acquired from an unrelated third party the Navios Joy, an 181,389 dwt Japanese new-build Capesize vessel, for an acquisition cost of \$47.5 million.

The historical results discussed below, and the historical financial statements and related notes included elsewhere in this annual report, present operating results of the fleet for the periods beginning from January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2014.

Vessel name