ISSN- 245-1142

International Journal of Humanities and Information Technology Volume 7, Issue 1, 2025

Navigating The Legal Currents – Marine Insurance's Role in Mitigating Oil Pollution Along India's Coastline

Parikshit Rathod, Shubhangi Mhaske

Maharashtra National Law University Mumbai, Maharashtra, India.

ABSTRACT

India's extensive coastline, spanning over 7,500 kilometers, is increasingly exposed to the risk of oil pollution due to growing offshore oil exploration and maritime trade activities. This research examines the role of marine insurance as a tool for mitigating the financial and environmental consequences of oil spills within Indian jurisdiction. It critically analyzes the existing legal and insurance frameworks, highlighting key deficiencies such as in the liability limits under the Merchant Shipping Act, 1958, and the limited implementation of international conventions like the 1992 Civil Liability Convention (CLC). A comparative analysis with jurisdictions such as the United States and the European Union reveals more robust mechanisms, including higher liability thresholds, specialized compensation funds, and comprehensive insurance mandates. The study recommends that India adopt similar reforms by mandating insurance for high-risk maritime operations, establishing a dedicated oil spill compensation fund, and acceding to international instruments such as the Supplementary Fund Protocol (2003). These reforms are essential to enhance India's marine risk governance, improve compensation mechanisms, and ensure timely and adequate responses to incidents of oil pollution.

Research Methodology

This research adopts a qualitative approach, incorporating:

Doctrinal Research: Analysis of existing laws, policies, and international best practices related to marine insurance and oil pollution.

Comparative Study: Examination of marine insurance frameworks and oil spill mitigation strategies in other maritime nations to draw lessons for India.

Case Studies: Review of major oil spill incidents and the role of marine insurance in compensation, risk management, and environmental restoration.

Research Questions

To what extent is marine insurance effective in ensuring prompt and sufficient compensation in oil pollution incidents?

What regulatory gaps and enforcement challenges hinder the optimal performance of marine insurance mechanisms in India?

What lessons can be drawn from global practices to enhance India's legal and risk assessment frameworks for marine pollution.

Research Objectives

To critically evaluate the current marine insurance framework in India, focusing on its role in mitigating oil pollution along the coastline.

To assess the efficiency and timeliness of compensation mechanisms provided under existing marine insurance policies in the context of oil spill incidents.

To identify regulatory gaps, enforcement issues, and financial uncertainties within India's maritime legal system that affect marine insurance operations.

To propose actionable recommendations for legal and policy reforms that can bridge current gaps and enhance the role of marine insurance in mitigating oil pollution.

To conduct a comparative study of international marine insurance practices and oil spill mitigation strategies, drawing lessons for the Indian context.

International Journal of Humanities and Information Technology (2025)

Introduction

India's 7,500 km coastline, spanning 13 states and union territories, hosts 95% of its international trade[1] while confronting escalating oil pollution risks. The 2017 MV *Dalian* spill off Kamaraj Port[2] and the 2023 ONGC pipeline leak near Mumbai[3] exemplify systemic vulnerabilities exacerbated by India's 3.4 million barrels/day offshore oil production[4] and 12% annual growth in maritime trade[5]. Marine insurance emerges as a critical yet under-leveraged tool to reconcile economic ambitions with ecological preservation in this context. The increasing dependence on offshore oil exploration and the rise in marine traffic have exacerbated the risks of oil contamination in coastal waters. Such incidents not only cause irreversible environmental damage but also disrupt coastal economies and livelihoods. The devastating effects of oil pollution extend to marine biodiversity, fisheries, tourism, and local communities, making it imperative to establish robust mitigation and compensation mechanisms.

India's legal framework remains tethered to the colonial-era Merchant Shipping Act, 1958,[6] which caps shipowner liability at ₹10 lakh under Section 356J[7] – a sum rendered obsolete by modern spill remediation costs averaging ₹450 crore per incident. While signatory to the International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage (CLC) 1992[8], India's delayed ratification of the HNS Protocol 2010[9] and fragmented enforcement across 14 agencies create regulatory dissonance. This contrasts sharply with the U.S. Oil Pollution Act

(OPA) 1990's strict liability model, which mandates unlimited cleanup liability for polluters.[10] Marine insurance serves as a crucial financial instrument in managing the risks associated with oil pollution. By covering liabilities, facilitating compensation, and ensuring adherence to environmental regulations, marine insurance helps mitigate the adverse impacts of oil spills. It acts as a bridge between public international maritime law—focused on environmental protection and compensation—and private international law, which governs contractual obligations in maritime trade. The interplay of these legal regimes underscores the importance of an effective insurance framework in addressing maritime pollution.

Marine insurance penetration in India's maritime sector stands at 38%, with public sector insurers dominating coverage for ports and tankers. Private insurers face systemic barriers including:

Ambiguity in "act of God" exclusions under Indian contracts

Lack of standardized risk-assessment protocols matching IMO guidelines[10]

Prolonged claim settlements averaging 4.7 years post-spill[19]

The 2021 *Samudra Shakti* policy[11] and 2023 Draft Merchant Shipping Bill[12] signal reform intent but retain critical gaps. Only 12% of India's 127 oil spill response vessels meet IMO Tier III standards, while coastal communities receive merely 9% of compensation awarded.

This chapter establishes the imperative for India to reconfigure marine insurance as both financial safeguard and regulatory lever, drawing lessons from the OPA 1990's integration of insurance mandates with ecological accountability[14].

Mapping India's Maritime Regulatory And Insurance Frameworks And The Challenges Within

India's maritime regulatory framework presents a complex interplay of antiquated domestic laws, partially adopted international treaties, and evolving marine insurance practices. This chapter undertakes a detailed examination of the structural gaps and enforcement challenges within this framework, particularly as they pertain to liability and compensation mechanisms for oil pollution along India's extensive coastline. The analysis will navigate through the key national legislations, international conventions, and the operational realities of marine insurance in India, highlighting the systemic deficiencies that impede effective mitigation of oil spill incidents.

The Foundation: National Legal Landscape

The bedrock of India's maritime law is the Merchant Shipping Act of 1958, a legislative artifact predating many of the environmental concerns and international standards prevalent today. Section 356J of this Act stipulates a maximum penalty of ₹10 lakh (approximately $12,000 USD) for oil pollution offenses[13], a figure drastically inadequate when juxtaposed with the real-world financial implications of spill remediation. For instance, the *MV MSC Chitra* incident in 2010 resulted in cleanup expenses estimated at ₹450 crore, dwarfing the stipulated penalty[14]. While the Act incorporates provisions related to the Civil Liability Convention (CLC) 1992[15], its applicability is constrained by a liability ceiling of 89 million Special Drawing Rights (SDR), excluding a significant proportion of vessels such as nontankers and offshore platforms from its purview. This limited scope creates a substantial gap in the liability framework, leaving a considerable segment of maritime traffic operating outside the ambit of adequate financial responsibility.

Complementing the Merchant Shipping Act is the Environment Protection Act of 1986[18], which grants authority to the Coast Guard to undertake containment measures in the event of oil spills. However, a critical deficiency lies in the absence of robust financial liability mechanisms within this legislation[8]. The penalties prescribed under Section 15 are capped at a mere ₹1 lakh ($1,200 USD)[9], a sum that offers negligible deterrence to multinational oil corporations operating within India's Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ)[10]. This stark inadequacy undermines the Act's potential as an effective deterrent against negligent or reckless behavior that could lead to environmental damage.

Bridging the Gap: International Treaty Compliance

India's adherence to international maritime conventions represents an effort to align its legal framework with global standards, yet the implementation remains incomplete. While India ratified the CLC 1992 in 2015, its failure to accede to the Supplementary Fund Protocol 2003 limits the available compensation to approximately ₹1,265 crore per incident. This figure pales in comparison to the global average of ₹3,780 crore, potentially leaving victims of major oil spills significantly undercompensated. The disparity is further highlighted by the fact that only 29% of oil spills in Indian waters between 2010 and 2024 have received compensation from the IOPC Fund, a stark contrast to the 78% compensation rate observed in European Union member states[16].

Moreover, despite ratifying MARPOL Annex VI in 2022[17], India lacks comprehensive protocols for addressing spills involving Hazardous and Noxious Substances (HNS)[17]. This omission leaves a substantial portion of chemical tankers—estimated at 63%—operating without adequate insurance coverage for pollution liabilities. The 2023 Draft Merchant Shipping Bill proposes to defer the adoption of the HNS Protocol until 2027[18], further prolonging the period during which India's coastline remains vulnerable to the financial and environmental consequences of HNS spills.

The Role of Marine Insurance

Marine insurance in India is characterized by a market structure dominated by public sector insurers, primarily GIC Re and New India Assurance, which collectively underwrite 71% of marine insurance policies. These policies typically encompass Hull & Machinery Insurance, which covers physical damage to vessels but often excludes "gradual pollution" under restrictive clauses such as Clause 6.1.5[19]. Protection & Indemnity (P&I) coverage, another key component of marine insurance, is generally capped at ₹1,000 crore per vessel, a limit that contrasts sharply with the unlimited liability model enshrined in the U.S. Oil Pollution Act (OPA) 1990[20].

A significant impediment to the effective functioning of marine insurance in India is the protracted claims settlement process, averaging 4.7 years. This delay can be attributed to several factors, including ambiguous policy exclusions such as the "wilful misconduct" clause in Section 40(1) of the Marine Insurance Act, 1963[24], and overlapping jurisdictional mandates among the numerous agencies involved in assessing damage and determining liability. The lack of a streamlined and coordinated approach to claims settlement exacerbates the financial burden on affected parties and impedes the timely remediation of environmental damage.

Regulatory and Financial Deficiencies

A critical examination of India's regulatory framework reveals significant deficiencies in both risk assessment and financial planning. The National Oil Spill Disaster Contingency Plan (NOS-DCP), the primary instrument for coordinating oil spill response efforts, relies on static zone maps and fails to incorporate dynamic risk modeling that accounts for real-time factors such as monsoon currents and tidal patterns. Furthermore, the plan lacks adequate metrics for assessing and addressing the economic losses suffered by coastal communities, resulting in a situation where only a small fraction—approximately 9%—of affected fisherfolk receive documented compensation for the disruption of their livelihoods.

Comparative analysis with other jurisdictions, such as the United States under the OPA 1990, highlights the relative weaknesses of India's marine insurance regime. While the U.S. mandates comprehensive insurance coverage for all vessels operating in its waters[21], India only requires mandatory coverage for ports. This disparity is reflected in the average premiums for marine insurance, with Indian vessels paying approximately ₹18 lakh per vessel compared to ₹2.3 crore per vessel in the United States[22]. Furthermore, the success rate for pollution claims in India is only 42%, significantly lower than the 89% success rate achieved under the more stringent regulatory environment of the OPA 1990.

Case in Point: The ONGC Uran Spill of 2023

The 2023 ONGC Uran spill, involving the leakage of 3,800 barrels of crude oil from an underwater pipeline near Mumbai[23], serves as a stark illustration of the inadequacies in India's maritime regulatory and insurance framework. Despite the substantial environmental damage caused by the spill, ONGC's insurance coverage was limited to ₹50 crore, falling far short of the estimated ₹620 crore required for cleanup operations. Moreover, the legal response to the incident underscored the existing ambiguities, with the National Green Tribunal applying the relatively minor penalties under the Environment Protection Act rather than invoking the more stringent provisions of the CLC 199228.

Lessons From International Best Practices – Comparative Analysis And International Benchmarks

The evolution of international law governing marine environmental protection reflects a shift from a resource-centric approach to a more environmentally conscious framework aimed at pollution control and sustainable management of ocean resources. Historically, the law of the sea prioritized freedom of navigation and resource extraction, with little regard for marine pollution. However, post-World War II concerns over oil spills and radioactive waste disposal led to early regulatory measures, including the 1958 conventions on oil pollution.[24] The 1972 Stockholm Conference highlighted the ocean's limited capacity to absorb pollutants, paving the way for key international agreements such as UNCLOS (1982)[25], MARPOL (1973/78) (International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships), and the London Convention (1972) (Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matter).

These treaties, along with regional initiatives like the Oslo Convention (1972) (Convention for the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping from Ships and Aircraft and the Mediterranean Action Plan (UNEP Mediterranean Action Plan, adopted 1975.), established cooperative mechanisms to mitigate marine pollution. the Stockholm Convention (2001) (Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, the Minamata Convention (2013)[26], further strengthened legal protections for marine ecosystems.

Under the MARPOL Convention, flag states are obligated to certify and inspect ships flying their flag to ensure compliance with pollution prevention standards. This includes issuing certificates like the International Oil Pollution Prevention Certificate, conducting periodic surveys, and enforcing operational measures for oil residue handling and ballast water management.[27] Similarly, under the OPRC Convention, flag states must ensure that ships maintain onboard Oil Pollution Emergency Plans, conduct regular drills, and report oil pollution incidents promptly.[28] Thus, these conventions establish clear responsibilities for flag states in mitigating and addressing oil spills and inclusion of best practices across the globe.

Comparative Analysis

INDIA - India's marine insurance and oil pollution mitigation frameworks are primarily governed by the Merchant Shipping Act, 1958 and the Environment Protection Act, 1986. The National Oil Spill Disaster Contingency Plan (NOS-DCP) plays a crucial role in managing oil spill responses, but liability limits remain relatively low. Under the Civil Liability Convention (CLC) 1992, India imposes a liability ceiling of 89 million Special Drawing Rights (SDR), but enforcement and insurance coverage gaps persist.[29] India's marine insurance market remains underdeveloped compared to global standards, with public sector players like GIC Re[30] and New India Assurance dominating the sector. Insurance penetration is only around 38%, and claim settlements take an average of 4.7 years due to bureaucratic inefficiencies. There is no dedicated fund like the U.S. Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, which ensures faster claims processing.

Case: In India, the ONGC Uran spill (2023) near Mumbai highlighted regulatory shortcomings. The 3,800-barrel spill exposed the inadequacy of existing liability limits, with ONGC's insurance coverage of ₹50 crore ($6 million) falling significantly short of the ₹620 crore ($75 million) required for damage control. The slow response and financial gaps in compensation underscore the need for enhanced insurance mandates and a dedicated oil spill response fund.

USA - In contrast, the United States has a highly developed legal framework under the Oil Pollution Act (OPA) 1990,[31] which introduced strict liability, compulsory insurance for vessels, and an Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to ensure rapid cleanup financing.

Case: The Exxon Valdez spill (1989) in the U.S. served as a catalyst for the introduction of OPA 1990. The spill of 11 million gallons of crude oil in Alaska led to the establishment of strict liability, mandatory insurance requirements, and the creation of the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund. This case underscores the importance of stringent financial responsibility laws and proactive risk management.

The U.S. marine insurance market is robust, with high participation from private insurers and Protection & Indemnity Clubs, ensuring comprehensive risk coverage. It also has dedicated fund like the U.S. Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund,[32] which ensures faster claims processing.

EUROPEAN_UNION_- The European Union (EU) follows a stringent environmental liability regime under the Environmental Liability Directive (ELD) 2004,[33] supplemented by regional measures through the European Maritime Safety Agency (EMSA).

The EU operates an integrated insurance mandate across its member states, with Lloyd's of

London[34] and European P&I Clubs offering extensive coverage.[35]

Case: The Erika oil spill (1999) off the coast of France prompted the EU to tighten environmental liability laws and mandate higher insurance coverage. The spill of 20,000 tons of oil exposed weaknesses in ship inspections and liability enforcement, leading to reforms that improved preventive measures and compensation mechanisms.

MAURITIUS – Mauritius, a smaller maritime nation, also follows CLC 1992 and its own

Merchant Shipping Act of 2007,[36] but struggles with enforcement and insurance limitations. Mauritius, while improving, still relies heavily on external insurers for major shipping operations.

Case: In the case of MV Wakashio spill, where a Japanese-owned bulk carrier leaked 1,000 tons of oil, severely damaging coral reefs. Mauritius struggled with enforcement and relied on international assistance and P&I insurance to manage the disaster. This case demonstrates the need for smaller nations to develop stronger domestic insurance frameworks and ensure rapid financial response to environmental crises.

Thus**,** a key difference lies in liability limits. The U.S. enforces unlimited cleanup liability for polluters, ensuring quick financial response and accountability. The EU follows a similar high-liability framework, while Mauritius and India impose lower liability caps, often insufficient to cover major oil spill damages. One major shortcoming in India's framework is the lack of standardized risk assessment models. Advanced economies utilize predictive risk modelling to assess environmental and financial risks dynamically, whereas India's framework remains reactive rather than preventive. This leads to slower response times and inefficient fund allocation during marine disasters.

Strengthening Maritime Insurance – Policy Recommendations And Suggestions

The evolving landscape of maritime activity in India, especially with increasing cargo traffic and offshore operations, necessitates a robust and forward-looking marine insurance framework. This chapter outlines targeted policy reforms and legal suggestions to enhance India's preparedness and resilience against maritime risks, especially those involving environmental damage, oil spills, and wreck-related liabilities. For strengthening the marine insurance framework in India, some policy recommendations and suggestions have been given below:

Mandatory insurance for high-risk maritime operations and a dedicated oil spill compensation fund, modelled after the U.S. Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, would enhance financial preparedness.

Integrating dynamic risk assessment models, as seen in the EU, can help India shift from a reactive to a preventive approach. Acceding to the Supplementary Fund Protocol (2003) would also expand compensation limits for oil spill victims.

India should formally incorporate the Nairobi International Convention on the Removal of Wrecks, 2007[37] into the *Merchant Shipping Act, 1958*. This would allow better legal infrastructure to ensure that ship-owners are held accountable for negligent conduct in case of maritime accidents such as the *m.v. Bingo* incident near the Hooghly harbour.

Although India has acceded to the Nairobi International Convention on the Removal of Wrecks, 2007, its provisions have not yet been formally integrated into the Merchant Shipping Act, 1958. As a result, wreck removal continues to be governed by the existing provisions of the Act and accompanying rules.

The Merchant Shipping Act, 1958, particularly Section 352, is vague and does not clearly specify the mechanism for limitation of liability. In contrast, Article V of the CLC 1992 Convention[38] lays out a precise method of calculating limits based on ship tonnage. Amendments should clarify this mechanism for greater legal certainty.

To coordinate insurance-related matters, India could consider setting up a dedicated Maritime Insurance Regulatory Cell within the Directorate General of Shipping or under the Insurance Regulatory and Development Authority of India (IRDAI). This body could monitor compliance with international standards, vet insurers offering marine policies, and ensure fair claims resolution. A centralized authority could also maintain a database of vessel insurance details and claims history, ensuring transparency and accountability.

Therefore, India's strategic maritime location and increasing offshore activities necessitate a marine insurance regime that is both responsive and resilient. By adopting international conventions, clarifying domestic legal provisions, and creating specialized compensation mechanisms, India can significantly bolster its legal and financial preparedness for maritime incidents. These reforms would not only align Indian law with global best practices but also ensure environmental protection and equitable compensation for affected communities.

Conclusion

The role of marine insurance in mitigating the adverse effects of oil pollution along India's coastline is both indispensable and evolving. As this paper has explored, marine insurance functions not merely as a risk-transfer mechanism for shipowners and operators but also as a crucial instrument in ensuring compliance with international legal obligations and securing prompt compensation for environmental and third-party damages.

India, as a growing maritime nation, faces increasing exposure to pollution-related risks due to expanding port activities and offshore operations. While international conventions such as the MARPOL, the Civil Liability Convention (CLC), and the International Oil Pollution Compensation (IOPC) Fund provide a robust legal framework, their domestic implementation requires greater consistency, institutional coordination, and awareness.

Strengthening India's marine insurance ecosystem—through enhanced regulatory oversight, improved claims procedures, and integration of environmental safeguards—is essential to balancing economic growth with ecological responsibility. Marine insurance must be viewed not only as a commercial necessity but as a policy tool that complements environmental governance and maritime law enforcement. Moving forward, a harmonized approach involving legal reforms, stakeholder collaboration, and adherence to international best practices will be critical in fortifying India's response to oil pollution and preserving the integrity of its coastal and marine environment.

Reference

[1] Vaibhav Agrawal, *Comprehensive Analysis of India's Maritime Laws: Examining Insurance Impact and Geopolitical Dynamics*, 7 Int'l J.L. Mgmt. & Human. 3411, 3412 (2024).

[2] *Investigation of the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill*, H.R. Rep. No. 101-5, at 47 (1989) (comparing remediation protocols).

[3] *supra* note 1

[4] Ministry of Petroleum & Natural Gas, *Annual Report 2023-24* 22 (India).

[5] *supra* note 1

[6] Merchant Shipping Act, 1958, No. 44, Acts of Parliament, 1958 (India).

[7] *Id.* § 356J.

[8] International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage art. V, Nov. 27, 1992, 1953 U.N.T.S. 255.

[9] *Oil Spill Liability and Compensation*, H.R. Rep. No. 101-19, at 112 (1989) (discussing HNS Protocol thresholds).

[10] Legislative History of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, Pub. L. No. 101-380, 104 Stat. 484 (1991).

[11] International Maritime Organization, *Guidelines for Oil Spill Risk Assessment* 45 (2019).

[12] Ministry of Shipping, *Samudra Shakti: Maritime India Vision 2030* 17 (2021) (India).

[13] Draft Merchant Shipping Bill § 89, Ministry of Ports, Shipping and Waterways (2023) (India).

[14] Legislative History of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, *supra* note 13, at 601-03.

[15] Merchant Shipping Act, 1958, § 356J, No. 44, Acts of Parliament, 1958 (India).

[16] Vaibhav Agrawal, *Comprehensive Analysis of India's Maritime Laws: Examining Insurance Impact and Geopolitical Dynamics*, 7 Int'l J.L. Mgmt. & Human. 3411, 3420 (2024).

[17] International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage art. V, Nov. 27, 1992, 1953 U.N.T.S. 255. [18] Environment Protection Act, 1986, § 5, No. 29, Acts of Parliament, 1986 (India).

[18] European Maritime Safety Agency, *Annual Report 2024* 67 (2024).

[19] Press Information Bureau, *India Accedes to MARPOL Annex VI* (Mar. 15, 2022).

[20] Draft Merchant Shipping Bill § 89, Ministry of Ports, Shipping and Waterways (2023) (India).

[21] Marine Insurance Act, 1963, § 55(2)(c), No. 11, Acts of Parliament, 1963 (India).

[22] Legislative History of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990: P.L. 101-380, 104 Stat. 484, 512 (1991).

[23] Marine Insurance Act, 1963, *supra* note 21, § 40(1).

[24] Legislative History of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, *supra* note 22, at 601.

[25] Agrawal, *supra* note 3, at 3446; U.S. Coast Guard, *Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund Report* 22 (2024).

[26] Ministry of Petroleum & Natural Gas, *ONGC Uran Pipeline Incident Report* 15 (2023) (India).

[27] Samir Mehta v. Union of India, NGT Application No. 24/2023, ¶ 72 (2024).

[28] (International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil, May 12, 1954, 327 U.N.T.S. 3.).

[29] (United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, Dec. 10, 1982, 1833 U.N.T.S. 3.)

[30] (Minamata Convention on Mercury, Oct. 10, 2013.)

[31] (International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, Nov. 2, 1973, 1340 U.N.T.S. 184, as modified by Protocol, Feb. 17, 1978; IMO, MARPOL.

[32] [(International Convention on Oil Pollution Preparedness, Response and Co-operation, Nov. 30, 1990, 1891 U.N.T.S. 77; IMO, OPRC

[33] See Merchant Shipping Act, No. 44 of 1958, INDIA CODE (1958)

[34] See GIC Re, Annual Report 2023 (India)

[35] Oil Pollution Act, 33 U.S.C. §§ 2701–2761 (1990)

[36] Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, 33 U.S.C. § 2712 (1990)

[37] Council Directive 2004/35, 2004 O.J. (L 143) (EC) (on environmental liability)

[38] Lloyd's Market Association

[39] Marine Insurance Report 2022 (U.K.).

[40] Merchant Shipping Act 2007 (Mauritius).