



The influence of energy efficiency and carbon indicators on ship prices: early evidence from the tanker and bulk carrier sectors

Pin-Hsuan Lu¹ · Dimitrios Theocharis²

Accepted: 20 February 2025
© The Author(s) 2025

Abstract

This paper examines the effect of Carbon Intensity Indicator (CII), Annual Efficiency Ratio (AER) and Energy Efficiency Existing Ship Index (EEXI) on second-hand ship prices. The relationship between these indices and vessel values is investigated, using unique data from sales transactions of Aframax and Handymax tankers, and Handysize bulk carriers between 2020 and mid-2023, obtained from (VesselsValue 2025. <https://www.vesselsvalue.com/>). Hypothesis testing is conducted, and hedonic price regression models are used to examine the relationship between energy efficiency and ship values. The results suggest that secondhand ships are priced differently, depending on their CII rating. The AER and EEXI are significant determinants of ship prices with varying elasticities, depending on ship type. Ship prices with lower EEXI and AER are valued higher and vice versa. These findings are important for industry stakeholders in the maritime sector and policy makers of environmental regulations in shipping.

Keywords Secondhand ship prices · Carbon intensity indicator · Energy efficiency existing ship index · Aframax tankers · Handymax tankers · Handysize bulk carriers

1 Introduction

Different efficiency profiles of ships can potentially influence the price they command in the secondhand market. For example, a more energy efficient ship or a ship which uses alternative fuels may be valued higher than a less energy efficient ship. The same also holds for the relationship between carbon intensity ratings of ships

✉ Dimitrios Theocharis
Theocharisd@cardiff.ac.uk

¹ Wan Hai Lines Ltd., Taipei City, Taiwan

² Cardiff Business School, Cardiff University, Aberconway Building, Colum Road, Cardiff CF10 3EU, UK



and their values. Energy efficiency of ships has become more important in recent years, driven by technological improvements, operational measures, managerial approaches and most importantly, regulatory and policy changes towards emissions reductions.

The growing emphasis on reducing the environmental impact of shipping puts pressure on shipowners, charterers, banks and institutional investors, viewing and handling climate change as a financial risk. Ships serve as the primary assets in shipping company valuations, and any decline in their values poses a business risk for investors involved in these companies (Drobetz et al. 2016; Alexandridis et al. 2018). Hence, capital providers will more and more play a significant role in financing the construction of low or zero emissions new ships, or in retrofitting second-hand ones (Poseidon Principles 2024).

Most importantly from a regulatory point of view, emissions reduction policies implemented by the International Maritime Organisation (IMO) influence investments in both new and secondhand ships. The organisation recently revised its Initial Strategy on Reduction of Greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) from Ships by adopting the 2023 IMO Strategy on Reduction of GHG Emissions from Ships in the 80th session of the Marine Environment Protection Committee (MEPC) (IMO 2024a). The revised strategy aims at net zero emissions from international shipping around 2050, an increase of lower GHG emissions technologies and fuels, setting specific targets for the reduction of the carbon intensity of international shipping, as well as the carbon intensity of individual ships through improvements in the energy efficiency of new and existing ships (IMO 2024a). To this end, two short-term measures were adopted in 2021 as part of the MEPC 76 session, namely the Energy Efficiency Existing Ship Index (EEXI) and the Carbon Intensity Indicator (CII), which entered into force in 2023.

The EEXI is a technical measure aiming at improving the technical efficiency of a ship compared to certain baselines of the respective Energy Efficiency Design Index (EEDI). The formula of EEXI estimates grammes of carbon dioxide per tonne-mile transported based on specific parameters related to the design and engine characteristics of a ship. The EEXI value is then compared to a required reduction factor equivalent to a certain EEDI value of the specific ship type and size (IMO 2024b). The CII is an operational measure, aiming at rating the operational performance of a ship against specific target rates. The formula of CII estimates grammes of carbon dioxide per tonne-mile transported every year. The calculated value is then compared to a reference value which is converted to a qualitative rating scale from A to E. A ship rated D for three successive years or E for one year will have to improve its rating thereafter (IMO 2024b).

The entry into force of these two measures and the reporting of annual ratings for individual ships will have a direct impact on how ships are operated and the technologies adopted to improve energy efficiency and reduce emissions. Different ship ratings across the various shipping sectors and sub-sectors can potentially lead to multi-tiered secondhand markets, depending on the band of ratings they will attain every year. This is expected to influence ship values through future charter rates and costs, since the present value of a ship's price is a function of present charter rates, costs, age, its residual value and expectations about future charter rates and costs.



For example, a ship with a low CII rating and/or an EEXI value which falls short of the reference EEDI value could command lower charter rates than one with better ratings. This will result in lower earnings and a lower price in the secondhand market, all else being equal. Moreover, the introduction of carbon pricing schemes, such as the EU Emissions Trading Scheme, the FuelEU Maritime regulation and other similar initiatives elsewhere will increase costs for ships that attain relatively low CII ratings and translate into lower values in the secondhand market.

VesselsValue calculated CII values for bulkers, tankers and containerships, using data based on the operational patterns of individual ships during 2019–2022. They observe that the number of transactions in the secondhand markets for ships that attained lower CII ratings was lower than that for ships included in higher bands of the CII index. (VesselsValue 2023).

There is a very small number of studies reporting empirical research on the impact of energy efficiency on ship prices (Adland et al. 2018, 2023). These studies included efficiency-related variables in their analysis, such as speed, fuel consumption at the design speed, a fuel efficiency index and engine-related characteristics. However, the relationship between ship prices and carbon intensity indices adopted by the IMO has not been investigated in the literature so far. On the one hand, there is high volatility in the secondhand markets where ship values change rapidly based on expectations about future market conditions. On the other hand, the mandatory reporting of annual emissions ratings is expected to influence ship values depending on the annual efficiency profile of the individual ships.

To the best of our knowledge, this paper is the first to investigate the relationship between EEXI and CII indices and vessel values in the secondhand market, focusing on the early period of the implementation of this regulation. More specifically, ship prices of Aframax and Handymax oil tankers, and Handysize dry bulk carriers are used in the analysis, given the high number of transactions in those sub-sectors compared to other ship types and sizes during 2020–2023. Two-sample *t*-tests are carried out, and hedonic price regression models are used, including relevant vessel attributes in the analysis to examine these relationships. The results indicate that energy efficiency is factored in the secondhand prices based on CII and EEXI ratings, with EEXI having a greater influence than CII at the initial period of the implementation of the two measures.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. The review of the relevant literature on the impact of energy efficiency in vessel values is provided in Sect. 2. The data and statistical methodology are presented in Sect. 3. The findings are then reported in Sect. 4. The discussion of the findings, as well as conclusions and future research opportunities are provided in Sect. 5.

2 Literature review

The secondhand market, also known as the sale and purchase (S&P) market, is where ships are sold and bought depending on freight market conditions, expectations and the particular stage of the shipping cycle. Moreover, the secondhand market facilitates the entry and exit of investors through leveraging the cyclical nature



of freight markets. The four major factors which determine the value of a vessel are freight rates, age, inflation and expectations about future market conditions (Stopford 2009). Pruyt et al. (2011) undertook a review of the literature on value estimation of secondhand vessels, from 1991 to 2011. Although the majority of studies identified in that review focus on testing for the Efficient Market Hypothesis, there has also been a small number of studies focusing on microeconomic factors of value formation in secondhand markets.

Adland and Koekebakker (2007) examine vessel valuation in the secondhand market for Handysize bulk carriers, using a combination of macroeconomic factors, such as timecharter rates, and vessel-specific factors, such as age and size measured in deadweight tonnes (DWT). They find a negative relationship between age and secondhand prices, especially when moving towards older tonnage where values converge to demolition prices. Conversely, values are found to be an increasing function of ship size and of freight rates.

Adland and Köhn (2019) use the chemical tanker sector as a case to estimate secondhand vessel values. They consider spot market earnings, newbuilding prices and age, as well as several technical vessel-specific variables in the analysis. The latter include size, speed, number of cargo tanks, hull type (single/double), tank coating type, IMO classification type of chemical tankers and country of build. Moreover, two interaction variables consider cargo diversity and flexibility of cargohandling. The authors confirm the relationships between secondhand prices, age and charter rates found in Adland and Koekebakker (2007). When it comes to technical factors, they find non double-hull tankers to command lower prices, whilst there is a positive relationship between the interaction variables and speed and vessel values. Yet, tank coating is found to not affect values significantly, whereas the results on the impact of IMO classification type are mixed. Moreover, the country of build is found to matter as certain countries are perceived to build higher quality tonnage than others.

Adland et al. (2018) is the first study to consider energy efficiency-related variables, along with other vessel-specific explanatory variables and market conditions. More specifically, the relationship between secondhand prices of Handysize bulk carriers and timecharter rates, age, size, capacity of cranes/derricks, speed, fuel consumption, a fuel efficiency index, the number of previous sales, buyer country and country of build is examined. The authors confirm the relationships between ship prices, age and charter rates found in Adland and Koekebakker (2007) and Adland and Köhn (2019). Moreover, a positive relationship is found between ship values and speed, cranes/derricks capacity and the number of sales before the last transaction. The country of build is also found to affect ship prices, with a quality premium considered in the secondhand market, something which is also found in Adland and Köhn (2019) for chemical tankers. When it comes to fuel consumption and the fuel efficiency index, the authors found this to have a negative relationship with ship values. However, the influence of these variables declines during good market conditions. These findings can be linked to results from studies investigating the relationship between energy efficiency and freight rates (Agnolucci et al. 2014; Adland et al. 2017).

Kokosalakis et al. (2021) examined determinants of containership secondhand prices across all size categories in the period 2005 to 2020, and three sub-periods



of this period to capture the effect of different economic and shipping cycles. The authors consider vessel-specific variables, such as age, size, speed, a fuel efficiency index, as in Adland et al. (2018), buyer country and country of build, and relevant timecharter rates as a market-specific factor. Their results are in line with other studies in the literature concerning the effect of timecharter rates, age and size on prices. The effect of the fuel efficiency index on prices depends on the period examined, with that before the financial crisis of 2009 not affecting prices compared to the other two periods in the model. Buyer country is found to influence prices of secondhand ships, whilst the country of build also affects individual ship prices.

Nam et al. (2022) examine the relationship between secondhand ship prices and age, size, timecharter rates and spot market earnings across a wide range of ship sizes in the tanker, bulk carrier and containership sectors. The authors also include the type of main engine and country of build in their analysis. They find a negative relationship between age and ship values and a positive one between values and earnings, with higher coefficients for larger sizes across all sectors and for both explanatory variables. Their results of the effect of tanker and bulk carrier sizes on ship values are mixed, whereas those of containerships are found to have a positive relationship with ship values. The results for timecharter rates indicate a positive and increasing relationship with ship values, although some size categories are found not to be statistically significant, as is the case with the variables *earnings* and *size*. Similar to other studies, the country of build is found to affect ship values, but results differ across ship types and sizes, whilst the same also holds for the *engine type* variable.

Adland et al. (2023) use various statistical techniques to examine secondhand Handysize ship values. They consider various ship-specific variables in the models, similar to the previous studies mentioned here. This study also considers the order-book to fleet ratio as a proxy for future supply expansion, interest rates representing the cost of capital and engine-related variables, including engine manufacturer, main engine horsepower, rpm, as well as fuel type. Almost all variables are found to explain secondhand values, with age and timecharter rate being the most important ones in most of the models. Fuel efficiency and fuel consumption were also found to be important explanatory variables.

Although the current literature considers major macroeconomic and microeconomic factors as vessel value determinants, they mainly focus on age, size and technical specifications. Whilst three studies include energy efficiency factors in their analysis, they use fuel consumption at the design speed as a proxy for fuel efficiency in their analyses. Moreover, environmental regulations, especially with respect to emissions reductions, have not been considered in the literature so far. These are expected to influence secondhand ship prices in many ways. The introduction of the EEXI and CII indices from the IMO in 2023 will ultimately put pressure on shipowners and operators to attain specific ratings every year (IMO 2024b). These developments could lead to multi-tiered secondhand markets, where values will be affected by the energy efficiency status of ships. Against this background, this paper contributes to the literature by investigating the influence of CII, AER and EEXI on secondhand ship prices using a unique dataset from sales transactions in the secondhand market of Aframax and Handymax tankers, and Handysize bulk carriers



during the period 2020 to mid-2023. Hypothesis testing is first conducted to test differences in ship prices depending on their CII ratings, and hedonic price regression models are subsequently used in different specifications to examine the effect of energy efficiency indices, age, size and timecharter rates on ship prices.

3 Methodology

3.1 Two-sample *t*-test

A two-sample *t*-test is first conducted in the analysis to test whether secondhand ship prices for ships with a CII rating between A and C are different compared to secondhand ship prices for ships with a CII rating of D or E. The CII can be considered here as a quality attribute of a ship, similar to ship-specific characteristics that Tamvakis (1995) uses in his *t*-test analysis to compare different classes of ships with different characteristics.¹ The CII entered into force on January 2023, with ratings given in 2024 for the first year of its implementation (IMO 2024b). The CII is an operational measure of the carbon intensity of a ship, and it calculates the total greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) generated over a year, linked with the cargo carried and distance travelled over that year. A carbon intensity between A and C is acceptable, with A being a 'major superior'. A rating of E (inferior) or a rating of D (minor inferior) for three consecutive years requires a shipowner to take measures to achieve at least a rating of C or above the following year (IMO 2024b).

A series of sample pairs are created for the three ship types/sizes considered in this study, namely, Aframax tankers of a cargo capacity between 93,000 and 123,000 deadweight tonnes (dwt); Handymax tankers of a capacity between 32,200 and 53,800 dwt; and Handysize bulk carriers of cargo capacity between 20,200 and 43,500 dwt. The samples of each ship type/size are split into two categories, i.e. CII A-C and CII D-E, respectively. The null and alternative hypotheses are then defined as follows:

The null hypothesis is that there is no difference in secondhand ship prices between ships in A-C and ships in D-E:

$$H_0 : \mu_1 - \mu_2 = 0.$$

The alternative hypothesis is that there is a difference in secondhand ship prices between ships in A-C and ships in D-E:

$$H_1 : \mu_1 - \mu_2 > 0.$$

It is assumed that the variances of the sub-samples are different. The means and variances are then used to calculate the *t*-statistic:

¹ The focus here is on the CII, given its importance on ship performance, which can have a significant impact on vessel values, financing, and chartering alternatives.



$$t = \frac{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{s_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{s_2^2}{n_2}}}. \quad (1)$$

3.2 Hedonic price model of ship values

A hedonic price model is used which includes major factors identified in the literature as attributes of vessel values, as well as the two main energy efficiency variables of our study, that is, the EEXI and AER (the carbon intensity ratio based on which CII is determined) indicators:

$$\begin{aligned} \ln Price_{it} = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 * \ln TCRate_{it} + \beta_2 * \ln AER_{it} + \beta_3 * \ln EEXI_{it} \\ & + Age_{it} + \frac{Age_{it}^2}{100} + Size_{it} + \frac{Size_{it}^2}{100} + \varepsilon_{it}. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

According to this model, the *Price* of a secondhand ship *i* bought and sold at a given point in time *t* depends on the one-year timecharter rate, *TCRate*, the *Age* and *Size* of the ship, the Annual Efficiency Ratio, *AER* and the Energy Efficiency Existing Ship Index of the ship, *EEXI* and the random error term, ε_{it} .

Our Ordinary Least-Squares (OLS) regression develops in six models. First, *TCRate* is used, and then *Age* is added. The third model includes *TCRate*, *Age* and *Size*. These variables are considered important determinants of secondhand prices in maritime economics theory and are also included in other studies in the literature. The variable *AER* is introduced in the fourth model, and the variable *EEXI* in the fifth model. Finally, all variables are included in the sixth model. The relationships among variables are initially examined by performing pairwise correlation analysis for the three ship sizes/types chosen for this study.

The linear model is of the log–log specification. The logarithmic transformation was chosen to conform with the normality and the homoscedasticity assumptions, since the residuals for each fitted model were skewed before the transformation and exhibited patterns of asymmetry. As in Adland et al. (2018), a second-order term (scaled) is included for the variables *Age* and *Size*, to consider non-linear relationships (Albertijn et al. 2016). This choice introduces structural multicollinearity in the model, which is corrected after ‘centering’ the two variables and their respective squared terms.²

3.3 Data description

The microeconomic analysis considers sales transactions occurred between 2020 and mid-2023, focusing on ship types and sizes for which a high number of sales

² ‘Centering’ involves the subtraction of the mean from each value of the dependent variable(s) for which higher order terms are used. The Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) used to detect multicollinearity resulted in values of around 1 to 2 in most of the cases across all models.



Table 1 Descriptive statistics for Aframax tankers

	No of obs	Mean	Std. Dev	Min	Max
Secondhand price (US\$ million)	309	27	15	8	112
Age (years)	309	15	5	0	25
Size (dwt)	309	109,874	4425	93,000	123,000
AER (g CO ₂ /dwt-nm)	309	4.36	1.21	2.50	19.59
EEXI (g CO ₂ /dwt-nm)	309	3.54	0.37	2.15	4.64

Table 2 Descriptive statistics for Handymax tankers

	No of obs	Mean	Std. Dev	Min	Max
Secondhand price (US\$ million)	516	17	8	4	50
Age (years)	516	15	5	0	26
Size (dwt)	516	45,911	5361	32,200	53,800
AER (g CO ₂ /dwt-nm)	516	7.76	16.57	0.71	378
EEXI (g CO ₂ /dwt-nm)	516	5.62	0.72	3.97	7.93

were recorded during that period. Although the requirement for the reporting of CII and EEXI ratings came into effect on January 2023, the two measures have been part of IMO's 2018 Initial Strategy on Reduction of GHG Emissions and entered into force in November 2022 (IMO 2025). Thus, the market expected their implementation before 2023 and any impact of energy efficiency on ship values may have already been reflected in the secondhand market. For this reason, data before 2023 are included in the analysis and more specifically from 2020 as per data availability from VesselsValue. The data provided by VesselsValue include the following characteristics for each ship type/size: the date the sale occurred, vessel name before and after the transaction, IMO number, age in years, size in dwt, the estimated value of the ship one day before the concluded sale by VesselsValue and the actual sale price in US\$ million. Regarding the energy efficiency variables, these included (for every ship): the CII rating (taking a rate from A to E), the attained Annual Efficiency Ratio (AER) in grammes of carbon dioxide (CO₂) per dwt-mile and the EEXI in grammes of CO₂ per dwt-mile. Moreover, the one-year timecharter rates corresponding to each shipping sub-sector in the sample are also included in the dataset.

The initial dataset includes 2,898 transactions between 1 January 2020 and 10 July 2023. More specifically, data for Aframax tankers include transactions from 1 January 2020 to 29 June 2023, data for Handymax tankers include transactions from 9 January 2020 to 10 July 2023, and data for Handysize dry bulk carriers include transactions from 3 January 2020 to 30 June 2023. The final sample includes 1474 observations after removing those with incomplete price data or other ship characteristics. Tables 1, 2, 3 present summary statistics for the variables used in the analysis across all ship types and sizes.



Table 3 Descriptive statistics for Handysize dry bulk carriers

	No of obs	Mean	Std. Dev	Min	Max
Secondhand price (US\$ million)	649	13	6	1	34
Age (years)	649	13	5	1	33
Size (dwt)	649	33,207	4212	20,200	43,500
AER (g CO ₂ /dwt-nm)	649	7.92	2.28	4.59	54.82
EEXI (g CO ₂ /dwt-nm)	649	6.41	0.76	4.43	8.97

The average secondhand price of Aframax tankers is the highest, whereas that of a Handysize bulker is the lowest, with the price of a larger ship size demonstrating higher volatility as indicated by the standard deviation. All ship types in the sample are 15 years old on average with the same standard deviation. The smaller the ship size, the higher both the AER and the EEXI indices on average. This can be expected since the larger the ship size, the lower the emissions generated per amount of transport work. Moreover, the AER being an operational indicator, varies significantly more than the EEXI regardless of the ship type/size, reflecting the changing pattern with which a ship is operated at a certain period of time, especially with respect to operating speeds and distances sailed.

Tables 4, 5, 6 present a breakdown of values, age, AER and EEXI, according to the specific CII rating across all ship types. The higher the CII rating, the

Table 4 Aframax tanker characteristics per CII rating

CII Rating	No of obs	Secondhand price (US\$ million)	Age (years)	AER (g CO ₂ /dwt-nm)	EEXI (g CO ₂ /dwt-nm)
CII A	42	44	6	3.15	3.10
CII B	53	27	15	3.84	3.52
CII C	141	25	17	4.30	3.61
CII D	55	19	19	4.95	3.64
CII E	18	25	16	7.36	3.67

Table 5 Handymax tanker characteristics per CII rating

CII Rating	No of obs	Secondhand price (US\$ million)	Age (years)	AER (g CO ₂ /dwt-nm)	EEXI (g CO ₂ /dwt-nm)
CII A	103	28	8	5.19	4.99
CII B	168	16	15	6.32	5.75
CII C	177	14	17	7.42	5.74
CII D	46	13	18	9.06	5.94
CII E	22	10	19	30.74	5.91

Table 6 Handysize dry bulk carrier characteristics per CII rating

CII Rating	No of obs	Secondhand Price (US\$ million)	Age (years)	AER (g CO ₂ /dwt-nm)	EEXI (g CO ₂ /dwt-nm)
CII A	15	19	8	5.58	5.62
CII B	62	17	10	6.39	5.91
CII C	209	14	12	7.26	6.27
CII D	223	12	14	8.01	6.52
CII E	140	11	15	9.72	6.73

higher the value of a secondhand ship and the lower the age of a ship, respectively. The only exception in the sample is the Aframax tanker category rated at CII E, where the average age is lower than CII D and with a higher secondhand value than CII D. This could be due to the low number of CII E category observations in the sample compared to the rest rating categories. Further, the lower the CII rating, the higher both the AER and EEXI indicators across all ship types, which was expected, as these variables are correlated with each other.

4 Empirical results

4.1 Results from two-sample *t*-tests

A two-sample *t*-test analysis was first conducted, assuming unequal variances, to test whether there are any differences in vessel valuation in the secondhand market between vessels rated with a CII A-C and those rated with a CII D-E. Table 7

Table 7 Two-sample *t*-test results

	Aframax tanker		Handymax Tanker		Handysize dry bulk carrier	
	CII A-C	CII D-E	CII A-C	CII D-E	CII A-C	CII D-E
Mean	29	21	18	12	15	12
No of obs	236	73	448	68	286	363
T Critical (one tail)	1.66		1.66		1.65	
P(T < =t) one tail	0.000		0.000		0.000	
Df*	116		125		511	

The null hypothesis is that there is no difference between the mean of CII A-C and the mean of CII D-E; the alternative hypothesis is that the difference between the means is greater than zero, i.e. a one-tailed test.

*df degrees of freedom. Confidence interval at 95%



Table 8 Correlation analysis for Aframax tankers

	Size	Age	AER	Secondhand Price	TC Rate	EEXI
Size	1					
Age	– 0.31	1				
AER	– 0.23	0.33	1			
Secondhand Price	0.34	– 0.79	– 0.31	1		
TC Rate	– 0.03	0.07	– 0.02	0.40	1	
EEXI	– 0.43	0.50	0.32	– 0.48	0.05	1

Table 9 Correlation analysis for Handymax tankers

	Size	Age	AER	Secondhand Price	TC Rate	EEXI
Size	1					
Age	– 0.30	1				
AER	– 0.17	0.15	1			
Secondhand Price	0.41	– 0.83	– 0.13	1		
TC Rate	– 0.05	0.13	0.05	0.30	1	
EEXI	– 0.51	0.43	0.12	– 0.49	0.06	1

reports the results across all ship types, including mean, critical t values, p -value, number of observations and degrees of freedom.

The null hypothesis is rejected in all cases. In other words, there is significant difference between the secondhand prices of ships rated A-C and those rated D-E in our samples. The results for Aframax tankers ($t(116)=4.21$, $p=0.000$), Handymax tankers ($t(125)=8.28$, $p=0.000$) and Handysize bulk carriers ($t(511)=6.19$, $p=0.000$), give a t -statistic greater than the critical value in each case. Therefore, there is sufficient evidence that higher CII-rated ships are rewarded in the secondhand market across all ship categories.

4.2 Correlation analysis

Correlations between all variables included in the hedonic regressions are presented in Tables 8, 9, 10 for all ship types.³ First, it can be seen that there is a very strong negative correlation between secondhand prices and age across all ship categories, with correlation coefficients ranging from – 0.71 to – 0.83, indicating that age is a very important determinant of secondhand ship values. Second, there is a moderate (0.30 for Handymax tankers) to strong (0.40 for Aframax tankers, 0.49 for Handysize bulkers) positive correlation between timecharter rates and ship values since the freight and timecharter developments drive ship values. Third, size and values are

³ Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients measure linear relationships between variables, and therefore, they do not detect any non-linear relationships.

Table 10 Correlation analysis for Handysize bulk carriers

	Size	Age	AER	Secondhand Price	TC Rate	EEXI
Size	1					
Age	− 0.65	1				
AER	− 0.41	0.47	1			
Secondhand Price	0.65	− 0.71	− 0.39	1		
TC Rate	0.03	− 0.03	− 0.02	0.49	1	
EEXI	− 0.79	0.60	0.38	− 0.65	− 0.04	1

also positively correlated, since the larger the ship size within a ship category, the more expensive its price, with coefficients ranging from 0.34 for Aframax to 0.41 and 0.65 for Handymax tankers and Handysize bulkers, respectively.

When it comes to energy efficiency indicators, both AER and EEXI are found to be negatively correlated with secondhand ship prices. The EEXI shows a higher coefficient than AER across all ship categories, whilst the strength of the relationship between values and EEXI is moderate (− 0.48 and − 0.49 for tankers) to strong (− 0.65 for Handymax bulkers). The coefficients between secondhand prices and AER range from − 0.13 for Handymax tankers to − 0.31 for Aframax tankers and − 0.39 for Handysize bulkers. The AER and EEXI are also positively correlated with each other since they both measure energy efficiency of ships.

Other notable relationships are those between size, age and energy efficiency indicators. The larger the ship size, the lower the AER and EEXI across all ship categories, with coefficients ranging from − 0.17 to a − 0.79, and the EEXI having a stronger negative coefficient than AER regardless of the ship category. The explanation of the negative correlation is due to economies of scale, since a given quantity of fuel consumed and, therefore, of emissions generated is spread over a larger cargo capacity, all else being equal.

Similar to size, age is positively correlated with both AER and EEXI, with the EEXI again found to have higher coefficients than AER across all ships. The coefficients show strong and very strong relationships between age and energy efficiency, since the older a ship is, the lower its energy efficiency, all else being equal. Moreover, size and age are negatively correlated, pointing to the deliveries of new ships with a gradually larger size through time. Finally, there are very weak—almost negligible—coefficients between timecharter rates and size, age, AER and EEXI across all ship categories, with the direction of the relationships varying, depending on ship category.

4.3 Results from hedonic price regression models

The results from the hedonic price regressions for all ship categories are presented in Tables 11, 12, 13. Six models are used to estimate the effect of ship-specific characteristics and market conditions on secondhand ship prices, including the operational and technical efficiency indicators. First, the effect of timecharter rates is



Table 11 Hedonic price regression models for Aframax tankers

Variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
<i>Dependent variable: log of price</i>						
Log of AER				− 0.187*** (0.053)		− 0.141*** (0.054)
Log of EEXI					− 0.455*** (0.101)	− 0.395*** (0.103)
Log of TC Rate	0.780*** (0.084)	0.868*** (0.032)	0.863*** (0.030)	0.861*** (0.029)	0.864*** (0.029)	0.862*** (0.029)
Age		− 0.087*** (0.003)	− 0.084*** (0.002)	− 0.082*** (0.003)	− 0.082*** (0.002)	− 0.080*** (0.002)
Age squared/100		− 0.146*** (0.030)	− 0.151*** (0.028)	− 0.156*** (0.027)	− 0.171*** (0.027)	− 0.172*** (0.027)
Size			0.014*** (0.002)	0.013*** (0.002)	0.011*** (0.002)	0.010*** (0.002)
Size squared/100			0.144*** (0.038)	0.152*** (0.037)	0.143*** (0.037)	0.149*** (0.037)
Intercept	− 4.698*** (0.843)	− 5.548*** (0.325)	− 5.524*** (0.300)	− 5.229*** (0.307)	− 4.950*** (0.318)	− 4.804*** (0.320)
R ²	0.221	0.887	0.904	0.908	0.910	0.912
Number of obs	309	309	309	309	309	309

*Statistical significance at 10% level ** Statistical significance at 5% level *** Statistical significance at 1% level. Standard errors are reported in parentheses

tested in Model 1. The R-squared ranges from 0.13 for Handymax tankers to 0.30 for Handysize bulkers with an elasticity of about 0.60–0.80 on ship prices, meaning that for every 1% increase in the one-year timecharter rates, the secondhand ship price increases by 0.60% to 0.80%. Second, when the variable age is added in Model 2, the R-squared is increased significantly by 0.66 for Aframax tankers to 0.73 for Handymax tankers and 0.52 for Handysize bulkers. Thus, a one unit increase in age reduces the value of a ship by 8.5% (Handymax tankers) to 7.3% (Handysize bulkers). The relationship between age and ship prices is negative, with the second-order terms resulting in negative coefficients for the tankers and a positive coefficient for Handysize bulkers. These relationships and signs are in line with the correlation coefficients of the previous section.

Model 3 includes the timecharter rate, age and size variables. The relationship between price and size is positive as expected, since a larger ship is able to carry more cargo than a smaller ship, all else being equal. R-squared is further increased across all ship types, thus, increasing the explanatory power of the model. As size increases by one unit, the ship price increases by 3.2% (Handysize bulkers) to 1.4% (Aframax tankers). The second-order term for size is found positive for Aframax tankers and Handysize bulkers but negative for Handymax tankers. The negative second-order for the latter means that size increases lead to decreasing asset values. This could be attributed to ‘standard’ cargo quantities which do not utilise the



Table 12 Hedonic price regression models for Handymax tankers

Variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
<i>Dependent variable: log of Price</i>						
Log of AER				− 0.067** (0.031)		− 0.067** (0.031)
Log of EEXI					− 0.250*** (0.068)	− 0.250*** (0.067)
Log of TC Rate	0.623*** (0.073)	0.822*** (0.030)	0.843*** (0.026)	0.843*** (0.026)	0.842*** (0.026)	0.843*** (0.026)
Age		− 0.089*** (0.002)	− 0.082*** (0.002)	− 0.080*** (0.002)	− 0.080*** (0.002)	− 0.078*** (0.002)
Age squared/100		− 0.125*** (0.025)	− 0.084*** (0.021)	− 0.084*** (0.021)	− 0.098*** (0.021)	− 0.098*** (0.021)
Size			0.016*** (0.002)	0.015*** (0.002)	0.013*** (0.002)	0.021*** (0.002)
Size squared/100			− 0.069** (0.031)	− 0.057* (0.031)	− 0.079** (0.031)	− 0.066** (0.031)
Intercept	− 3.304*** (0.705)	− 5.204*** (0.291)	− 5.391*** (0.250)	− 5.269*** (0.256)	− 4.951*** (0.275)	− 4.831*** (0.279)
R ²	0.125	0.857	0.896	0.897	0.898	0.899
Number of obs	516	516	516	516	516	516

*Statistical significance at 10% level ** Statistical significance at 5% level *** Statistical significance at 1% level. Standard errors are reported in parentheses

maximum or near maximum cargo space of a tanker. Similarly, this could also be due to the relationship between the dwt capacity and the volume of various oil products and chemicals typically transported by this tanker type and size. More specifically, oil products of relatively low density require more space in the tanks but have lower weight compared to higher density petroleum products. For example, Aframax tankers carry a wide range of oil commodities, including crude oil, dirty and clean petroleum products, whereas Handymax tankers carry primarily clean oil products, and, in a lesser extent, dirty oil products (Clarksons 2025). It should be noted that results for Models 1 to 3 are highly significant for all ship categories at the 1% level of significance.⁴

The variable AER is introduced in Model 4 and EEXI in Model 5. Finally, all explanatory variables are included in Model 6. Both variables are negatively correlated with secondhand ship prices, with EEXI having a higher regression coefficient than AER in the case of Aframax and Handymax tankers. It should be noted that EEXI is found not statistically significant in the case of Handysize bulkers, with R-squared increased only by adding AER in the model. Yet, explanatory power increases little when introducing AER and EEXI in Models 4 to 6 for tankers. Coefficients for AER are high in the case of Aframax tankers and Handysize bulkers,

⁴ The exception is the second-order term for ship size in Model 3 of Handymax tankers.



Table 13 Hedonic price regression models for Handysize dry bulk carriers

Variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
<i>Dependent variable: log of Price</i>						
Log of AER				− 0.297*** (0.058)		− 0.302*** (0.059)
Log of EEXI					− 0.069 (0.113)	0.048 (0.113)
Log of TC Rate	0.695*** (0.041)	0.638*** (0.021)	0.636*** (0.019)	0.639*** (0.018)	0.636*** (0.019)	0.639*** (0.018)
Age		− 0.076*** (0.002)	− 0.057*** (0.002)	− 0.052*** (0.003)	− 0.056*** (0.003)	− 0.053*** (0.003)
Age squared/100		0.086*** (0.021)	0.021 (0.022)	0.010 (0.022)	0.015 (0.024)	0.013 (0.023)
Size			0.032*** (0.003)	0.027*** (0.003)	0.030*** (0.003)	0.028*** (0.003)
Size squared/100			0.120*** (0.041)	0.111*** (0.040)	0.118*** (0.041)	0.112*** (0.040)
Intercept	− 4.229*** (0.398)	− 3.704*** (0.200)	− 3.694*** (0.180)	− 3.102*** (0.210)	− 3.564*** (0.277)	− 3.182*** (0.282)
R ²	0.304	0.826	0.860	0.865	0.860	0.865
Number of obs	649	649	649	649	649	649

*Statistical significance at 10% level ** Statistical significance at 5% level *** Statistical significance at 1% level. Standard errors are reported in parentheses

whereas coefficients for EEXI are high for tankers only. A 1% increase in the value of EEXI reduces Aframax tanker prices by 0.40–0.46% and Handymax tankers by about 0.25%. A 1% increase in the AER reduces prices for Handysize bulkers by about 0.30% and 0.14–0.19% for Aframax tankers, depending on the model specification, and by 0.07% for Handymax tankers.

5 Discussion and conclusions

The introduction of EEXI and CII indicators by the IMO is expected to affect ship values in secondhand markets at the technical, design and operational levels. Not only will these measures have implications for energy efficiency, but also for values, chartering policies, financing, operations and trading of ships. The results of this paper contribute to the literature by examining the effect of the two newly implemented efficiency measures of CII and EEXI on ship values. Although there are already studies which investigate the impact of fuel and energy efficiency on ship values (Adland et al. 2018, 2023; Kokosalakis et al. 2021), they base their analyses on the fuel consumption at the design speed as a proxy for fuel efficiency. This paper is the first to consider not only the technical (EEXI), but also the operational level (CII and AER). Moreover, the consideration of these two measures is important



from both policy and practice perspectives, since they are the two formal indicators that the industry will use from 2024 onwards to evaluate the energy efficiency of ships. The findings of this study could be used by policy makers to inform their decision making on environmental regulations and industry stakeholders to inform their decisions on investments, operations and chartering policies.

The results are in line with economic theory and the findings of earlier studies. Timecharter rates are positively related with ship prices and are significant factors of values since they determine the earnings potential of a ship. Age has a significant and negative relationship with ship values reflecting the depreciation of a ship as it gets older, and therefore, the gradually lower earnings potential. Ship size is positively related with values, meaning that a larger cargo capacity increases the earnings potential of a ship. However, there are also non-linear relationships between age, size and ship prices in either direction. When it comes to AER and EEXI, these are both significant explanatory variables for almost all ship categories and have a negative relationship with ship values. The EEXI has a higher elasticity than AER in all model specifications for tankers but is found not significant in the case of Handy-size bulk carriers. This could mean that at the initial period of the implementation of the two measures, buyers value more the energy efficiency determined at the technical level of a ship than the way it is operated. It should be noted that the sample includes data up to mid-2023, and therefore, more data are needed to fully assess the impact of CII and AER on asset values.

The results suggest that age is the most important determinant for ship values followed by timecharter rates and ship size, which are in line with findings from other studies which used different model specifications (Adland and Köhn 2019; Adland et al. 2018, 2023).

Moreover, results and coefficients are also in line with Adland et al. (2018) and Adland et al. (2023) when it comes to energy efficiency-related variables, although it should be noted that the samples differ with respect to the period of coverage. The choice of a parametric model which considers non-linear relationships as in Adland et al. (2018) allows a comparison of results for the second-order variables as well. The second-order term of age for Handysize bulkers is found positive as in Adland et al. (2018) who also used the same ship type in their study. Yet, the second-order terms of age for tankers are found negative in this study. On the other hand, the second-order term for size is found positive for Handysize bulkers, in contrast to Adland et al. (2018), which may be attributed to differences in sample size and period of coverage. It is only found negative for Handymax tankers in this study, which can be explained due to lower dwt utilisation of these tankers, depending on the stowage factor of various oil products.

This paper considers the main variables affecting ship values identified in the literature, along with the EEXI and AER, but certain ship-specific variables are not included in the models since they were not provided in the dataset. More specifically, technical specifications of vessels such as engine type and relevant qualities, speed, build country and various other equipment-related specifications are not included here as in earlier studies. Future research could examine the impact of CII, AER and EEXI on ship values by including those variables along with alternative propulsion, fuel type and type and number of energy saving devices. Moreover, the



time period in the dataset could be split on an annual basis or in the period before and after implementation or by including relevant interaction terms in the models also considering interactions between market factors and ship-specific variables. Finally, this study considered only certain types and sizes of ships. Future research could examine the impact of energy efficiency measures on secondhand ship prices of other ship sizes within the same sectors examined in this paper, as well as on other sectors, such as containerships and gas carriers. Although energy efficiency is found more influential at the technical than at the operational level of a ship during the period examined in this paper, data covering the period post-2023 could reveal different trends. Moreover, the introduction of carbon pricing and more stringent emissions regulations, such as the FuelEU maritime, is expected to have an impact on secondhand prices in the future along with CII and EEXI indicators.

Acknowledgements This paper is a revised version of work presented at the International Association of Maritime Economists (IAME) 2024 conference in Valencia, Spain, 26–28 June 2024. The paper received the MEL award of the Best Paper on Shipping and Logistics. The paper derives from the MSc Dissertation of Ms. Pin-Hsuan Lu and an industry-based dissertation project in collaboration with VesselsValue. The authors would like to thank Mr. Peter Edwards from VesselsValue for offering the industry-based project and providing the dataset. We are also indebted to professors N. Nomikos and M. Tsatsaronis, as well as to the two anonymous referees, for their invaluable comments and advice which have led to a substantial improvement of the manuscript.

Data availability The data used in this study are available from the authors with the permission of VesselsValue.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

References

- Adland, R., and S. Koekebakker. 2007. Ship valuation using cross-sectional sales data: A multivariate non-parametric approach. *Maritime Economics & Logistics* 9 (2): 105–118. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.mel.9100174>.
- Adland, R., H. Alger, J. Banyte, and H. Jia. 2017. Does fuel efficiency pay? Empirical evidence from the dry bulk timecharter market revisited. *Transportation Research Part a: Policy and Practice* 95: 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2016.11.007>.
- Adland, R., P. Cariou, and F.-C. Wolff. 2018. Does energy efficiency affect ship values in the second-hand market? *Transportation Research Part a: Policy and Practice* 111: 347–359. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2018.03.031>.
- Adland, R., and S. Köhn. 2019. Semiparametric valuation of heterogeneous assets. In *Asset intelligence through integration and interoperability and contemporary vibration engineering technologies*, ed. J. Mathew, C.W. Lim, L. Ma, D. Sands, and M.E. Cholotte, 23–30. Cham: Springer.
- Adland, R., H. Jia, H.C. Olsen Harvei, and J. Jørgensen. 2023. Second-hand vessel valuation: An extreme gradient boosting approach. *Maritime Policy & Management* 50 (1): 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03088839.2021.1969601>.



- Agnolucci, P., T. Smith, and N. Rehmatulla. 2014. Energy efficiency and time charter rates: Energy efficiency savings recovered by ship owners in the Panamax market. *Transportation Research Part a: Policy and Practice* 66: 173–184. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2014.05.004>.
- Albertijn, S., W. Drobetz, and M. Johns. 2016. Maritime investment appraisal and budgeting. In *The international handbook of shipping finance*, ed. M.G. Kavussanos and I.D. Visvikis, 285–313. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Alexandridis, G., M.G. Kavussanos, C.Y. Kim, D.A. Tsouknidis, and I.D. Visvikis. 2018. A survey of shipping finance research: Setting the future research agenda. *Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review* 115: 164–212. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tre.2018.04.001>.
- Clarksons 2025. Clarksons shipping intelligence network. <https://sin.clarksons.net/>.
- Drobetz, W., R. Haller, and I. Meier. 2016. Cash flow sensitivities during normal and crisis times: Evidence from shipping. *Transportation Research Part a: Policy and Practice* 90: 26–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2016.04.015>.
- IMO. 2024a. 2023 IMO Strategy on Reduction of GHG Emissions from Ships. <https://www.imo.org/en/OurWork/Environment/Pages/2023-IMO-Strategy-on-Reduction-of-GHG-Emissions-from-Ships.aspx?refresh=1>.
- IMO 2024b. Improving the energy efficiency of ships. <https://www.imo.org/en/OurWork/Environment/Pages/Improving%20the%20energy%20efficiency%20of%20ships.aspx>.
- IMO 2025. EEXI and CII - ship carbon intensity and rating system. <https://www.imo.org/en/MediaCentre/HotTopics/Pages/EEXI-CIIFAQ.aspx>
- Kokosalakis, G., and A. Merika. 2021. Energy efficiency and emissions control: The response of the second-hand containerships sector. *Energy Economics* 100: 105378. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2021.105378>.
- Nam, H.-S., N. De Alwis, and E. D’agostini. 2022. Determining factors affecting second-hand ship value: Linkages and implications for the shipbuilding industry. *WMU Journal of Maritime Affairs* 21 (4): 493–517. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13437-022-00272-4>.
- Poseidon Principles. 2024. A global framework for responsible ship finance. <https://www.poseidonprinciples.org/finance/about/>.
- Pruyn, J.F.J., E. van de Voorde, and H. Meersman. 2011. Second hand vessel value estimation in maritime economics: A review of the past 20 years and the proposal of an elementary method. *Maritime Economics & Logistics* 13 (2): 213–236. <https://doi.org/10.1057/mel.2011.6>.
- Stopford, M. 2009. *Maritime economics*, 3rd ed. London: Routledge.
- Tamvakis, M. 1995. An investigation into the existence of a two-tier spot freight market for crude oil carriers. *Maritime Policy & Management* 22 (1): 81–90. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03088839500000034>.
- VesselsValue 2023. Carbon Intensity Indicator (CII): global fleet impact assessment. <https://blog.vesselsvalue.com/carbon-intensity-indicator-cii-global-fleet-impact-assessment/>.
- VesselsValue 2025. VesselsValue. <https://www.vesselsvalue.com/>.

Publisher’s Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

