

International Comparative Legal Guides



Shipping Law 2021

A practical cross-border insight into shipping law

Ninth Edition

Featuring contributions from:

Advokatfirman Vinge KB

AF Legal Law Firm

Ana Cristina Pimentel & Associados,
Sociedade de Advogados, SP, RL

Arias, Fábrega & Fábrega

BIMCO

Bloomfield LP

CF – Maritime Legal Services

Dardani Studio Legale

Dingli & Dingli

Emirates Maritime Arbitration Centre (EMAC)

Fichte & Co

Ganesh & Co.

Harris & Co. Maritime Law Office

Hill Dickinson International

Ince

Incisive Law LLC

IUNO Advokatpartnerselskab

Jurinter Law Firm

Kegels & Co

Kvale Advokatfirma DA

Lee and Li, Attorneys-at-Law

Links & Gains Law Firm

Mattos Filho, Veiga Filho, Marrey Jr. e Quiroga
Advogados

Moon & Song

Mori Hamada & Matsumoto

NAVICUS.LAW

Q.E.D INTERLEX CONSULTING SRL

REMÉ Rechtsanwälte Partnerschaft mbB

RICHEMONT DELVISO

Rosicki, Grudziński & Co.

Seward & Kissel LLP

Shepstone & Wylie Attorneys

SSEK Legal Consultants

Tang & Co (in association with Helmsman LLC,
Singapore)

TCG Fora Law Office

ThomannFischer

Tomasello & Weitz

VdA, in association with ASP Advogados

VdA, in association with GDA Advogados

Zhonglun W&D Law Firm

BIMCO

ICLG.com

Expert Analysis Chapters

- 1** **The Changing Face of Maritime Law and Risk – Cyber, E-Commerce, Automation of Vessels**
Julian Clark, Ince
- 7** **EMAC and the Development of Maritime Arbitration in the UAE**
Jyothi Mani, Emirates Maritime Arbitration Centre (EMAC)
- 11** **The Resilience of Shipping in Portugal in Spite of Global Pandemic Turmoil**
Cátia Fernandes & Marina Pimenta, CF – Maritime Legal Services
- 15** **BIMCO on New Regulations to Curb Emissions**
Mads Wachter Kjærgaard, BIMCO

Q&A Chapters

- 20** **Angola**
VdA, in association with ASP Advogados:
José Miguel Oliveira & Marcelo Mendes Mateus
- 27** **Belgium**
Kegels & Co: André Kegels
- 37** **Brazil**
Mattos Filho, Veiga Filho, Marrey Jr. e Quiroga
Advogados: Nilton Mattos & Flávio Spaccaquerche
Barbosa
- 43** **Chile**
Tomasello & Weitz: Leslie Tomasello Weitz
- 49** **China**
Zhonglun W&D Law Firm: Gary Wu, Hector Fan,
Forrest Zhu & Nick Yuan
- 57** **Cuba**
Q.E.D INTERLEX CONSULTING SRL: Luis Lucas
Rodríguez Pérez
- 64** **Cyprus**
Ince: Marianna Lamari & Vasiliki Malta
- 74** **Denmark**
IUNO Advokatpartnerselskab: Mads Poulsen
- 81** **Dominican Republic**
Q.E.D INTERLEX CONSULTING SRL: Luis Lucas
Rodríguez Pérez
- 88** **Egypt**
Links & Gains Law Firm: Mohamed Mostafa Agamy &
Omar Elzayat
- 95** **France**
RICHEMONT DELVISO: Henri Najjar
- 102** **Germany**
REMÉ Rechtsanwälte Partnerschaft mbB: Jobst von
Werder & Dr. Martin Reußner
- 108** **Gibraltar**
Ince: Anne Rose
- 115** **Greece**
Hill Dickinson International: Maria Moisidou &
Alexander Freeman
- 121** **Hong Kong**
Tang & Co. (in association with Helmsman LLC,
Singapore): Tang Chong Jun
- 128** **India**
Ganesh & Co.: Shivkumar Iyer
- 135** **Indonesia**
SSEK Legal Consultants: Dyah Soewito, Stephen I.
Warokka & Revaldi N. Wirabuana
- 143** **Israel**
Harris & Co. Maritime Law Office: Yoav Harris &
John Harris
- 150** **Italy**
Dardani Studio Legale: Marco Manzone & Lawrence
Dardani
- 158** **Japan**
Mori Hamada & Matsumoto: Hiroshi Oyama &
Fumiko Hama
- 166** **Korea**
Moon & Song: Kwang-Myeong Moon & Hun Song
- 172** **Malta**
Dingli & Dingli: Dr. Tonio Grech & Dr. Fleur Delia
- 178** **Mozambique**
VdA, in association with GDA Advogados: José
Miguel Oliveira & Kenny Laisse
- 185** **Nigeria**
Bloomfield LP: Adedoyin Afun & Ademide Peters
- 193** **Norway**
Kvale Advokatfirma DA: Kristian Lindhartsen
- 199** **Panama**
Arias, Fábrega & Fábrega: Jorge Loaiza III
- 214** **Poland**
Rosicki, Grudziński & Co.: Maciej Grudziński & Piotr
Rosicki
- 221** **Portugal**
Ana Cristina Pimentel & Associados, Sociedade de
Advogados, SP, RL: Ana Cristina Pimentel
- 227** **Russia**
NAVICUS.LAW: Konstantin Krasnokutskiy
- 234** **Senegal**
AF Legal Law Firm: Dr. Aboubacar Fall & Papa
Bassirou Ndiaye

238

Singapore

Incisive Law LLC: Boaz Chan, Justin Seet, Kannan Balakrishnan & Thaddaeus Chan

245

South Africa

Shepstone & Wylie Attorneys: Pauline Helen Kumlehn

252

Sweden

Advokatfirman Vinge KB: Michele Fara, Ninos Aho, Paula Bäckdén & Anders Leissner

259

Switzerland

ThomannFischer: Stephan Erbe

265

Taiwan

Lee and Li, Attorneys-at-Law: Daniel T.H. Tsai

272

Turkey

TCG Fora Law Office: Sinan Güzel

279

Ukraine

Jurinter Law Firm: Oleg Fedotov

284

United Arab Emirates

Fichte & Co: Alessandro Tricoli, Moaz Forawi & Shehab Mamdouh

290

United Kingdom

Ince: Julian Clark & Reema Shour

298

USA

Seward & Kissel LLP: Bruce G. Paulsen, Hoyoon Nam & Brian P. Maloney

Angola



José Miguel Oliveira



Marcelo Mendes Mateus

VdA, in association with ASP Advogados

1 Marine Casualty

1.1 In the event of a collision, grounding or other major casualty, what are the key provisions that will impact upon the liability and response of interested parties? In particular, the relevant law / conventions in force in relation to:

(i) Collision

The following international conventions are enforceable in Angola:

- 1910 International Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules of Law Related to Collision Between Vessels;
- 1952 International Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules concerning Civil Jurisdiction in Matters of Collision;
- 1952 International Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules relating to Penal Jurisdiction in Matters of Collision or other Incidents of Navigation; and
- 1972 International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea (“COLREGS”), as amended in 1981.

The above conventions are supplemented by domestic regulation, notably Article 73 *et seq.* of Law No. 27/12 of 28 August 2012 (the “Merchant Navy Law”) and Article 664 *et seq.* of the Commercial Code.

(ii) Pollution

The following international conventions and relevant protocols have been adopted by Angola:

- 1969 International Convention Relating to Intervention on the High Seas in Cases of Oil Pollution Casualties, as amended in 1973 and 1991;
- 1973 International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Vessels (“MARPOL 73/78”) and Annexes I/II, III, IV and V;
- 1990 International Convention on Oil Pollution Preparedness, Response and Cooperation (“OPRC 90”);
- 1992 Protocol to Amend the 1969 International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage (“CLC 1969”);
- 1992 Protocol to Amend the International Convention on the Establishment of an International Fund for Compensation for Oil Pollution Damage (“FUND”);
- 1996 International Convention on Liability and Compensation for Damage in Connection with the Carriage of Hazardous and Noxious Substances by Sea; and
- 1996 Protocol to Amend the 1972 Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matter, which regulates environmental protection.

At a domestic level, one must consider the relevant provisions of the Merchant Navy Law, the Environmental Law (Law No. 5/98 of 19 June 1998) and its ancillary regulations and related statutes.

(iii) Salvage/general average

Salvage is governed by the 1910 Salvage Convention, the 1979 International Convention on Maritime Search and Rescue (“SAR”) and, where applicable, the provisions named in the Merchant Navy Law (Article 81 *et seq.*), the Regulation on the Sea Search and Rescue System (Presidential Decree No. 89/16 of 21 April of 2016) and in the Commercial Code (Article 676 *et seq.*).

General average is governed by the provisions of the Commercial Code (Article 634 *et seq.*).

(iv) Wreck removal

Angola is not a signatory of the Nairobi International Convention on the Removal of Wrecks, 2007. The removal of wrecks must be dealt with in light of the domestic law, namely the Merchant Navy Law, the Environmental Law and ancillary statutes and regulations.

(v) Limitation of liability

Angola is not a signatory of the Convention on Limitation of Liability for Maritime Claims. Conversely, both the 1924 International Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules relating to the Limitation of the Liability of Owners of Seagoing Vessels and the 1957 International Convention relating to the Limitation of the Liability of Owners of Seagoing Vessels are applicable. Furthermore, it is important to note that domestic law provides some special rules in respect of the limitation and sharing of liability (e.g., where collision was caused due to fault or wilful misconduct of the crew, damages will be computed and shared between owners *pro rata* to the severity of each crew party’s fault, and that if it is not possible to determine which vessel caused the accident, all intervening vessels shall be jointly liable for damages and losses arising therefrom).

(vi) The limitation fund

The limitation fund can be established in any way admitted in the law and is dependent on the filing of a proper application before the relevant court. The application must identify/list:

- the occurrence and damages;
- the amount of the limitation fund;
- how the fund will be established;
- the amount of the reserve; and
- the known creditors and the amount of their claims.

The application must be filed along with the vessel's documents supporting the calculation of the amount of the fund (e.g., a tonnage certificate).

1.2 Which authority investigates maritime casualties in your jurisdiction?

The Port and Maritime Institute of Angola ("IMPA"), in its role as the Maritime Authority, is the governmental body in charge of investigating and responding to any maritime casualty. In performing its duties, the IMPA is assisted by the local port authorities and captaincy with jurisdiction over the area in which the casualty took place. In the event of (eventual) environmental damage, environment authorities may also be called to act, notably the Ministry of Environment.

1.3 What are the authorities' powers of investigation / casualty response in the event of a collision, grounding or other major casualty?

While investigating marine casualties, the IMPA has the power to question witnesses, crew members, passengers or other persons it deems necessary in order to ascertain the facts and to clarify the reasons that lead to the casualty.

In addition, in its role of supervising entity of the National Coordination of the Sea Search and Rescue Service ("SARMAR ANGOLA"), the IMPA is responsible for, *inter alia*: (i) monitoring the carrying out of search, assistance, re-floating and salvage activities; (ii) ensuring the efficient organisation of the means to be employed during the search and salvage operations; and (iii) initiating, performing and coordinating search and salvage operations for ships in distress.

2 Cargo Claims

2.1 What are the international conventions and national laws relevant to marine cargo claims?

The 1924 International Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules of Law relating to Bills of Lading, also known as the Hague Rules, applies. Under the Hague Rules, the carrier is liable *vis-à-vis* the consignee in relation to the loading, handling, stowage, carriage, custody, care and discharge of such goods. Contracts of carriage are therefore governed by the terms of the Hague Rules and the 1888 Commercial Code (Article 538 *et seq.*), in the absence of detailed provisions set out in the relevant contract.

It is important to note that if the shipment (i.e., loading and place of destination) takes place between two countries party to the Hague Rules, these rules shall apply. However, if the country of destination of the goods is not a signatory to the Hague Rules, then the applicable law would be determined by Angolan courts in accordance with the *lex rei sitae* principle.

2.2 What are the key principles applicable to cargo claims brought against the carrier?

As a general principle, any party to a contract of carriage who holds an interest over the cargo and can demonstrate that it has suffered losses or damages arising from the carrier's actions and/or omissions is entitled to sue for losses or damages.

The rights to sue under a contract of carriage assist (1) the shipper, and (2) the rightful holder of the bill of lading. In

this respect, it is noteworthy that when in the presence of: (i) a straight bill of lading, the right to bring a claim remains with the named consignee; (ii) an order bill of lading, only the latest endorsee is eligible to sue; and (iii) a bill of lading to bearer, it is up to the rightful holder at a given moment to sue.

Rights under a contract of carriage may be validly transferred to third parties either by way of assignment of contractual position or subrogation of rights (which is typically the case when insurers indemnify cargo interests and then seek reimbursement from the carrier), as long as the relevant rules provided in the Civil Code are met.

2.3 In what circumstances may the carrier establish claims against the shipper relating to misdeclaration of cargo?

In light of Article 3.5 of the Hague Rules, the shipper shall indemnify the carrier against all loss, damages and expenses arising or resulting from inaccuracies regarding the information (marks, number, quantity and weight) on the cargo to be transported.

2.4 How do time limits operate in relation to maritime cargo claims in your jurisdiction?

The general time bar for claims arising out from contracts is 20 years, although there are certain cases in which this statutory limitation period is shorter. Still, the statute of limitation for cargo claims arising out of contracts ruled by the Hague Rules is one year, counting as from the date of delivery of the goods or of the date when the goods should have been delivered.

3 Passenger Claims

3.1 What are the key provisions applicable to the resolution of maritime passenger claims?

Carrier's liability is mostly fault-based. In the event of delays, unexpected changes of route, damages or loss of carriage, passengers are entitled to claim compensation for losses and damage caused by an action attributed to the carrier, regardless of its wilful misconduct.

3.2 What are the international conventions and national laws relevant to passenger claims?

Angola is not a party to the Athens Convention relating to the Carriage of Passengers and their Luggage by Sea. Generally, the rules applicable to the carriage of passengers are set-forth in the Commercial and Civil Codes and the Consumer Law; this is in addition to the individual terms of the contract of carriage.

3.3 How do time limits operate in relation to passenger claims in your jurisdiction?

As mentioned above in question 2.4, the general time bar for claims arising out of commercial contracts is 20 years. Nevertheless, there are grounds to argue that claims for loss of life or personal injury (including for damages on property) arising out of shipping incidents impose strict liability to the carrier, being, in this case, the applicable limitation period of three years, counting as from the moment that the claimant becomes aware of its rights.

It is worth noting that, in certain cases, the running of the statute of limitation period may be (i) suspended (in which case the period of suspension is not to be counted when assessing if the statute of limitation has expired), or (ii) interrupted (in which case the interruption renders the time already elapsed of no effect and a new statute of limitation will restart counting as from the interruption).

4 Arrest and Security

4.1 What are the options available to a party seeking to obtain security for a maritime claim against a vessel owner and the applicable procedure?

Angola is a party to the 1952 Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules relating to the Arrest of Seagoing Vessels (“1952 Convention”). Under the 1952 Convention, any person alleging that it holds a maritime claim is entitled to seek the arrest of a ship. A “maritime claim” is deemed to be a claim arising out of one or more of the situations named under Article 1.1 of the 1952 Convention.

Outside the scope of the 1952 Convention, i.e., for the purposes of obtaining security for an unlisted maritime claim (e.g., arrest for a ship sale claim, unpaid insurance premiums, protection and indemnity (“P&I”) dues, amongst others) or to seek the arrest of a vessel sailing under the flag of a non-contracting state, the claimant must make use of the provisions of the Angolan Code of Civil Procedure (“CPC”). In this case, and aside from the jurisdiction issue that needs to be properly assessed, in addition to providing evidence on the likelihood of its right/credit, the claimant shall also produce evidence that there is a risk that the debtor/arrestor may remove or conceal the ship (security for the claim) or that the ship may depreciate in such a way that, at the time that the final judgment is handed down in the main proceedings, the ship is no longer available or has substantially decreased in value.

Before ordering the arrest, the arrestee is granted the opportunity to oppose/challenge the arrest application. Please note, however, that if the arrest application is properly filed and duly documented, the court may order the detention of the vessel before summoning the arrestee or granting the arrestee the chance to oppose the arrest application. The arrestee has 10 days to oppose the arrest application/order.

With the arrest in place, the claimant is required to file the initial claim for the main proceedings, of which the injunction will form an integral part, within 30 days of the arrest order. During the proceedings, the parties are free to settle by agreement and withdraw the claim. If the main claim should be filed with a foreign court, then the judge dealing with the arrest application must set out the period within which the claimant must commence proceedings on the merits in the appropriate jurisdiction. The defendant is entitled to post a security before the relevant court in the amount of the claim brought by the claimant, and seek the release of the vessel pending foreclosure and auction.

4.2 Is it possible for a bunker supplier (whether physical and/or contractual) to arrest a vessel for a claim relating to bunkers supplied by them to that vessel?

A claim arising from a bunker supply may be considered as a maritime claim under Article 1.k of the 1952 Convention.

4.3 Is it possible to arrest a vessel for claims arising from contracts for the sale and purchase of a ship?

Claims arising from ship sale and purchase contracts do not qualify as “maritime claims” for the purposes of the 1952 Convention. As such, and as stated in question 4.1, those willing to arrest a vessel for an unlisted maritime claim must make use of the provisions of the CPC (in order for measures to be taken, the claimant must provide evidence of the likelihood of its right and justified fear of irreparable damage or damage that is difficult to repair).

4.4 Where security is sought from a party other than the vessel owner (or demise charterer) for a maritime claim, including exercise of liens over cargo, what options are available?

Assets (e.g., bunkers) belonging to the arrestee may be subject to arrest, provided that it is possible to establish ownership in respect thereof. In addition, the carrier is entitled to exercise a possessory lien over cargo. In this respect, please be advised that pursuant to Angolan law, a lien is only enforceable by operation of the law and not merely by contract. By way of illustration, Article 755 of the Civil Code provides that any debts resulting from shipping services entitle the carrier/creditor to retain goods in its possession until the full discharge of those debts.

4.5 In relation to maritime claims, what form of security is acceptable; for example, bank guarantee, P&I letter of undertaking.

Typically, cash deposits (at the court’s order) and bank guarantees are the most effective forms of security. Letters of undertaking (“LoUs”) are acceptable in very limited situations and their acceptance is always dependent on the other party’s agreement.

4.6 Is it standard procedure for the court to order the provision of counter security where an arrest is granted?

There is no standard practice in this regard (this will ultimately depend on the assessment made by the Judge in charge of the file and the specifics of the claim/parties).

4.7 How are maritime assets preserved during a period of arrest?

While the arrest is pending, a custodian appointed by the court is responsible for ensuring the preservation of the assets.

4.8 What is the test for wrongful arrest of a vessel? What remedies are available to a vessel owner who suffers financial or other loss as a result of a wrongful arrest of his vessel?

According to Article 6, paragraph 1, of the 1952 Convention, all questions whether in any case the claimant is liable in damages for the arrest of a ship or for the costs of the bail or other security furnished to release or prevent the arrest of a ship, shall be determined by the law of the contracting state in whose jurisdiction the arrest was made or applied for. Article 7(1) of the 1952

Convention in turn establishes that the courts of the country in which the arrest was made shall have jurisdiction to determine the case upon its merits if the domestic law of such state gives jurisdiction to such courts, as well as in the specific cases set out therein.

As mentioned in the answer to question 4.1, in order to obtain arrest of a vessel under the CPC, the claimant must provide the court with evidence of the likelihood of its right and justified fear of irreparable damage or damage that is difficult to repair.

In the event that the arrest is found to be inadmissible or unjustified or if it expires (e.g., because the main proceedings are not initiated after the arrest is granted), the claimant is liable for the damage caused to the defendant whenever it has not proceeded with reasonable prudence (as per Article 387 of the CPC and Article 621 of the Civil Code). The arrest may be considered wrongful, *inter alia*, whenever there is a conscious manipulation or omission of facts or imprudence or culpable error in the allegation of facts and in the submission of evidence considered in the decision of arrest taken by the court.

Accordingly, the owner of the vessel can request the payment of compensation by the claimant for any damages suffered as a result of a wrongful arrest, such compensation to be claimed in separate judicial proceedings.

5 Evidence

5.1 What steps can be taken (and when) to preserve or obtain access to evidence in relation to maritime claims including any available procedures for the preservation of physical evidence, examination of witnesses or pre-action disclosure?

Whenever there is a serious risk of loss, concealment or dissipation of property or documents, as well as when it becomes impossible or almost impossible to obtain testimony or certain evidence by way of inspection, parties are free to start an action and file a motion requiring it to be enlisted by the court or taken prior to the hearing. The relevant motion can be lodged whenever deemed suitable, the applicant always being required to provide due grounds for its request.

5.2 What are the general disclosure obligations in court proceedings? What are the disclosure obligations of parties to maritime disputes in court proceedings?

As a general rule, it is up to the parties to establish the object of their claim/proceedings and the judge cannot go beyond the limits of the claim as put forward by the parties. In addition, parties have the burden of presenting the facts of their interest and producing evidence in respect thereof. The court will take into account the evidence produced/requested by the parties, but it is not limited to the same. In fact, the court is also allowed to request and compel the parties to disclose all evidence deemed necessary to the discovery of the truth and/or to the best resolution of the dispute.

No specific rules apply to maritime disputes in this regard.

5.3 How is the electronic discovery and preservation of evidence dealt with?

This topic is generally addressed in Law No. 11/20, of 23 April 2020, which sets forth the regime applicable to cellular identification and localisation and electronic surveillance. According to this new piece of legislation, the use of electronic discovery, either by means of interception of telephonic and telematic

communications, can only take place in very limited situations (criminal-related matters) and is dependent on a judicial authorisation. Moreover, electronic data cannot be collected randomly and shall only be taken and preserved for the specific purpose it refers to. Where wrongly or illegally collected, the discoveries must be destroyed.

6 Procedure

6.1 Describe the typical procedure and timescale applicable to maritime claims conducted through: i) national courts (including any specialised maritime or commercial courts); ii) arbitration (including specialist arbitral bodies); and iii) mediation / alternative dispute resolution.

6.1.1 Which national courts deal with maritime claims?

The Angolan judicial system foresees three categories of courts: (i) the Supreme Court, which is the higher body in the hierarchy of the Angolan courts; (ii) the Courts of Appeal; and (iii) the District Courts. Courts of Appeal have jurisdiction to review and revise the District Court's contested decisions. Likewise, the Supreme Court has a corresponding power as regards contested decisions rendered by the Courts of Appeal. District Courts have jurisdiction over the areas in which they are established and can be divided and organised by expertise under the so-called Room of Expertise. Existing since 1997, the Room of Expertise for Maritime Issues has jurisdiction over any maritime dispute submitted to its jurisdiction, including, to name a few, disputes on shipbuilding and repair contracts, purchase and sale agreements, charterparties and bills of lading, precautionary measures against ships and their cargo, etc.

In general, Angolan courts will find themselves competent to rule on claims where the parties in dispute and the claim itself have a close connection/link to Angola.

With regard to legal procedures before national courts, these can be generally described as follows:

- Proceedings commence with the filing of an initial written complaint before the court. In addition to listing the facts and arguments sustaining the claim, the claimant is required to list its witnesses and request the other evidence proceedings, such as inspections or surveys.
- Service is made by the clerks, in person. Shipping agents represent owners'/disponent owners'/managers' interests and can receive documentation on their behalf.
- Generally, the defendant has 30 days to challenge and oppose the claim. If it fails to present its defence, the facts presented by the claimant are deemed proven (exceptions apply).
- With the opposition lodged, the judge will summon the parties and will try to resolve the dispute amicably or, that not being possible, prepare the final hearing.
- At the final hearing, the witness will be examined and cross-examined by the lawyers representing each party, and the judge may intervene whenever it is deemed necessary. At the end, lawyers are required to issue their final arguments verbally.
- The judge will then prepare and issue the judgment which, depending on the amount of the claim, can entail an appeal.

As for the duration of maritime proceedings, as with any other legal proceedings in Angola, this is highly unpredictable. In our experience, excluding arrests and any other interim measures, it should not be expected to take less than one to two years, as it depends on several variables, such as the court's current caseload.

6.1.2 Which specialist arbitral bodies deal with maritime disputes in your jurisdiction?

For the time being there is no domestic arbitral institution specialised on maritime arbitration. In any event, the Minister of Justice is the entity empowered to authorise the incorporation of arbitration institutions in Angola and there are several arbitral institutions currently in existence in the country, including:

- the Centre for Extrajudicial Dispute Resolution (“CREL”);
- the Angolan Centre for Arbitration of Disputes (“CAAL”);
- the CEFA Arbitration Centre;
- the Harmonia Dispute Resolution Centre;
- the Arbitral Juris; and
- the Mediation and Arbitration Centre of the Angolan Industrial Association (“CAAIA”).

Still in this regard, it is worth mentioning that the primary domestic source of law is Law No. 16/03 of 25 July 2003 (the Voluntary Arbitration Law (“VAL”)). The VAL governs both domestic and international arbitration. According to the VAL, arbitration will be of an international nature when international trade interests are at stake, in particular when: the parties to the arbitration agreement have business domiciles in different countries at the time of the agreement’s execution; the place of performance of a substantial part of the obligations resulting from the legal relationship from which the dispute arises is situated outside the countries where companies have their business domiciles; or the parties have expressly agreed that the scope of the arbitration agreement is connected with more than one state.

The general rule under the VAL is that parties are free to submit their disputes to arbitration, with the exception of disputes that fall under state courts’ exclusive jurisdiction and disputes that relate to inalienable or non-negotiable rights. As such, disputes relating to the following issues, *inter alia*, may be submitted to arbitration: commercial and corporate law; maritime and shipping matters; securities transactions; and intra-company disputes.

The arbitration agreement may consist of either an arbitration clause or a submission agreement. The arbitration clause concerns potential future disputes arising from a given contractual or extra-contractual relationship, whereas the submission agreement arises from existing disputes, whether or not they have already been submitted to a state court. The VAL treats both types of arbitration agreement on an equal footing.

Subject to any special law requiring a more solemn form, the arbitration agreements must be made in writing. An arbitration agreement is considered to be in writing if documented either in a written instrument signed by the parties or in correspondence exchanged between them. The VAL allows arbitration agreements to be incorporated in a contractual document that is not signed by both parties simply by reference to general terms and conditions on another contract.

6.1.3 Which specialist alternative dispute resolution bodies deal with maritime mediation in your jurisdiction?

For the time being there is no domestic alternative dispute resolution institution specialised on maritime mediation. Since the approval of Law No. 12/16 of 12 August 2016, setting forth the rules applicable to the establishment and organisation of mediation and conciliation procedures as alternative dispute mechanisms, all procedures are held in the arbitration and mediation centres named in question 6.1.2 above. This statute allows for disputes in civil, commercial (including maritime), employment, family and criminal matters to be submitted to mediation, provided that they concern waivable rights.

6.2 What are the principal advantages of using the national courts, arbitral institutions and other ADR bodies in your jurisdiction?

Due to the lack of resources and celerity of the judicial system, over the past few years the Angolan Government has been making an effort to support the use of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, such as arbitration and mediation. An example of this is the Private Investment Law (Law No. 10/18 of 26 June 2018, as amended), which states that disputes regarding disposable rights may be resolved through alternative means of dispute resolution, notably negotiation, mediation, conciliation and arbitration, provided that no special law submits those disputes to the exclusive jurisdiction of judicial courts or to mandatory arbitration.

Considering the fact that the use of arbitral institutions and mediation bodies tends to be more flexible, time-effective and efficient, and granting to the parties more control over the proceedings, they are widely regarded as beneficial by comparison to the resort to judicial courts (our experience tells us that judicial claims may drag in courts for years).

6.3 Highlight any notable pros and cons related to your jurisdiction that any potential party should bear in mind.

Angola’s legal framework on shipping and maritime matters is fairly complete and follows the international industry standards (please refer to question 8.1 below). Nevertheless, despite the efforts of the Angolan Government and the achievements reached in the past decade, the country needs to continue developing its infrastructure (courts, registries, notaries, public administration, etc.) and support the training and qualification of its citizens. Although proceedings may drag over long periods of time (years), Angola benefits nowadays from a very capable community of judges, lawyers and other legal professionals.

7 Foreign Judgments and Awards

7.1 Summarise the key provisions and applicable procedures affecting the recognition and enforcement of foreign judgments.

Article 1094 of the CPC sets out that any judgment awarded by a foreign court is, as a rule, subject to review and confirmation by the Supreme Court in order to be valid and enforceable locally (i.e., to obtain the *exequatur*).

The review and confirmation of foreign decisions under the Angolan CPC is mostly formal and should not involve a review on the merits/grounds of the judgment, but a simple re-examination of the relevant judgment and additional judicial procedure requirements. The process must begin with the filing by the interested party of an application to that effect with the Angolan Supreme Court. In order for the foreign decision to be recognised by the Supreme Court, the following set of requirements must be met:

- There are no doubts that the judgment is authentic and its content understandable.
- It must constitute a final decision (not subject to appeal) in the country in which it was rendered.
- The decision must have been rendered by the relevant court according to the Angolan conflict-of-law rules.
- There is no case pending before or decided by an Angolan

court, except if it was the foreign court which prevented the jurisdiction of the Angolan court.

- The defendant was served proper notice of the claim in accordance with the law of the country in which the judgment was rendered, except in cases where, under Angolan law, there is no need to notify the defendant, or in cases where the judgment is passed against the defendant because there was no opposition.
- The judgment is not contrary to the public policy principles of the Angolan state.
- The decision rendered against the Angolan citizen/company does not conflict with Angolan private law, in cases where this law could be applicable according to the Angolan conflict-of-law rules.

After the application is filed, the court must serve notice of the same on the defendant. Once notice is served, the defendant may oppose the *exequatur* if any of the above requirements are not met.

If the defendant opposes the *exequatur*, the applicant may reply to the defendant's arguments. Afterwards, the case follows various procedural steps until the decision is made on whether to grant the *exequatur*. The losing party may still appeal against the court's decision.

7.2 Summarise the key provisions and applicable procedures affecting the recognition and enforcement of arbitration awards.

Angola has acceded to the 1958 New York Convention, by means of Resolution 38/16 of 12 August 2016. Angolan courts are now required to give effect *prima facie* to an arbitration agreement and award rendered in another signatory country to the New York Convention. Where the arbitral award was not granted by another contracting state, to be enforceable it must have previously been reviewed and confirmed by Angola's Supreme Court (see question 7.1 above).

8 Updates and Developments

8.1 Describe any other issues not considered above that may be worthy of note, together with any current trends or likely future developments that may be of interest.

Over the past 10 years Angola has steadily approved a number of statutes aimed at strengthening the legal framework relating

to the shipping sector, these include, to name a few, (i) the Merchant Navy Law – a landmark achievement in terms of shipping and maritime legislation, as this is the first statute that seeks to regulate all maritime and port activities in a consistent manner, (ii) the Shipping Agency Regulations, (iii) the Ship-Management Regulations, (iv) the Ship-Merchants Regulations, (v) the Regulations on Seafarers and Maritime Personnel, (vi) the Regulations on Maximum Safety Capacity of Vessels and Ships and (vii) the Regulations on the Beaconing System for the National Maritime Space and Inland Waterways.

In terms of laws and regulations, there are no major developments to report in 2020: with the approval of the new Penal Code (Law 38/20, of 11 November of 2020), actions related to: (a) the unnecessary or not justified destruction of ships pending armed conflicts; (b) maritime piracy, notably those associated to the illegal detention or diversion of ships; and (c) those capable of endangering ship transportation, qualify as crimes for the first time. And there are rumours that the Ministry of Transport and IMPA engaged a team of legal consultants to reform the outdated legal framework on port's jurisdiction and domain (a hot topic at the moment, as some ports seem to be charging port dues outside the area of their jurisdiction).

As to the future, the Private Investment Law recast, approved in April 2021, is likely to boost investment in the sector (shipping & transportation is one of the sectors benefitting the most from the structural reforms foreseen in the Angola Government's National Development Plan for 2018–2022, as the 20 years concession contract recently awarded to DP World for the multipurpose terminal of the Port of Luanda, illustrates), and one may anticipate that with the enactment of the National Bank of Angola's Order No. 2/21, of 24 March 2021, which, in a nutshell, requires shipping agents, port services providers and owners of foreign flagged vessels calling Angola to settle port charges exclusively in hard currency, is likely to face severe opposition from local industry players, who, in view of existing hurdles and limited access to hard currency, may see their activities at risk.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Filipe Rocha Vieira, managing associate at VdA, and Ivo Mahumane, associate at VdA, for their assistance in preparing this chapter.



José Miguel Oliveira joined VdA in 2015. He is a partner at VdA's Oil & Gas practice. Before joining the firm, he worked for six years at Miranda Correia Amendoeira. In 2008, he was seconded to the Corporate and Commercial Law Department at Eversheds International LLP's London office. From 2002 to 2008 he worked at Barrocas Sarmiento Neves.

Over the years he has amassed extensive experience within the international shipping industry, particularly across African jurisdictions, where he has been particularly active in assisting all sorts of industry players, from owners, charterers, P&I Clubs, shipbrokers, ship managers, ship agents, freight forwarders, port operators and stevedores, to commodities traders on all types of wet and dry shipping matters. In addition, he provides regular advice on regulatory matters to oil companies and service providers to the offshore oil & gas industry, notably in respect of the use and employment of rigs, FPSOs, support and multipurpose vessels. He also holds a deep knowledge of the bunkering industry, having assisted major players in the setting up of their local structures, securing licences and deals (cargo and bunkering contracts).

José is dual-qualified (Portugal and Angola) and his regular presence in Angola and Mozambique allows him to have an in-depth understanding of the local and neighbouring industries and the respective legal environments.

VdA

Rua Dom Luís I, 28
1200-151 Lisbon
Portugal

Tel: +351 21 311 3400
Email: jmo@vda.pt
URL: www.vda.pt



Marcelo Mendes Mateus joined VdA Legal Partners integrating ASP Advogados in 2016. He is Senior Associate of Litigation & Arbitration. Before joining the firm, he worked for four years at SMM, Advogados as an Associate and Trainee Lawyer. In 2016, he worked at ABS Consultus as a legal adviser actively involved in company's incorporation and private investments.

Over the years he has gained deep knowledge on matters of shipping and specialised in maritime litigation.

ASP Advogados

Edifício Dália Plaza - Av. de Portugal
31 - 35, 9.º Andar
Luanda
Angola

Tel: +244 226 430 291
Email: mmm@aspadvogados.co.ao
URL: www.aspadvogados.co.ao

Vieira de Almeida (VdA) is a leading international law firm with more than 40 years of history, recognised for its innovative approach and impressive track record in corporate legal services. The excellence of its highly specialised legal services covering several sectors and practice areas, enables VdA to overcome the increasingly complex challenges faced by its clients.

VdA offers robust solutions grounded in consistent standards of excellence, ethics and professionalism. VdA's recognition as a leader in the provision of legal services is shared with our clients and teams, and is attested by the most relevant professional organisations, legal publications and universities. VdA has successively received the industry's most prestigious international accolades and awards.

Through the VdA Legal Partners network, clients have access to 12 jurisdictions, with a broad sectoral coverage in all Portuguese-speaking and several French-speaking African countries, as well as Timor-Leste.

Angola – Cabo Verde – Cameroon – Chad – Congo – Democratic Republic of the Congo – Equatorial Guinea – Gabon – Mozambique – Portugal – São Tomé and Príncipe – Timor-Leste.

www.vda.pt

VdA VIEIRA DE ALMEIDA
ASP ADVOGADOS

ICLG.com

Other titles in the ICLG series

Alternative Investment Funds
Anti-Money Laundering
Aviation Finance & Leasing
Aviation Law
Business Crime
Cartels & Leniency
Class & Group Actions
Competition Litigation
Construction & Engineering Law
Consumer Protection
Copyright
Corporate Governance
Corporate Immigration
Corporate Investigations
Corporate Tax
Cybersecurity
Data Protection
Derivatives
Designs

Digital Business
Digital Health
Drug & Medical Device Litigation
Employment & Labour Law
Enforcement of Foreign Judgments
Environment & Climate Change Law
Environmental, Social & Governance Law
Family Law
Fintech
Foreign Direct Investment Regimes
Franchise
Gambling
Insurance & Reinsurance
International Arbitration
Investor-State Arbitration
Lending & Secured Finance
Litigation & Dispute Resolution
Merger Control
Mergers & Acquisitions

Mining Law
Oil & Gas Regulation
Patents
Pharmaceutical Advertising
Private Client
Private Equity
Product Liability
Project Finance
Public Investment Funds
Public Procurement
Real Estate
Renewable Energy
Restructuring & Insolvency
Sanctions
Securitisation
Technology Sourcing
Telecoms, Media & Internet
Trade Marks
Vertical Agreements and Dominant Firms