S.F. CUSTOS GLOBAL REACH LTD.

SECURITY · INTELLIGENCE · PROTECTION

SPECIAL REPORT

2026-07-20

SPECIAL REPORT · MIDDLE EAST / MARITIME SECURITY / IRAN

Iran, Hormuz and the Cost of Maritime Control

Author: Benjamin Traunecker

Executive summary

The Strait of Hormuz is again the pressure point in the U.S.-Iran confrontation. The immediate issue is not whether a wider war is inevitable. The practical issue is whether Iran can keep enough missile, drone, mine and small-boat pressure near the waterway to make commercial transit feel unreliable, even when U.S. forces are striking military targets ashore.

Open-source reporting reviewed by SFC Global indicates that Iran has attacked commercial vessels in the Strait of Hormuz and that U.S. Central Command has conducted further strikes against Iranian military targets connected to threats to shipping. Those reports point to a contest over maritime control rather than a single incident cycle. Iran does not need to close the strait completely to create strategic effect. It only needs to make insurers, charterers, crews and energy buyers doubt whether regular movement can be sustained.

The most important near-term question is whether U.S. strikes can suppress enough of the threat system along Iran's southern coast to allow a credible protected-transit posture. Expert commentary from the U.S. defence-policy community argues that continued pressure would be needed against launch sites, assembly areas and support networks around the Strait. That judgement is plausible, but it should be treated as an assessment, not as proof that the route is safe.

For companies, the main risk is operational uncertainty. A few successful or even credible attacks can affect routing, premiums, port-call timing, crew confidence, sanctions exposure and crisis-management decisions far beyond the specific vessel involved. Organisations with Gulf exposure should plan for a prolonged period in which transit is possible, but not routine.

What changed

The reported pattern has shifted from deterrent signalling to a contest over usable maritime space. ISW and CTP reported on 14 July that Iran had attacked at least three commercial vessels in the Strait of Hormuz in the preceding 24 hours, and that CENTCOM had announced another wave of strikes against Iranian military targets used to threaten shipping in the strait. That combination matters because it links commercial shipping, U.S. military action and Iranian coercive leverage into one operating picture.

This does not prove that Iran can sustain a full closure. It does show that Iran retains enough capability and intent to generate uncertainty for civilian shipping. From a business-risk perspective, uncertainty is enough. Shipping companies and energy buyers do not require a formal blockade before they adjust route selection, insurance assumptions or exposure limits.

The second change is political. Iran's ability to threaten traffic through Hormuz remains part of its negotiating leverage. If Tehran can present itself as the actor that decides whether ships move normally, it can convert military pressure into diplomatic bargaining power. That is why the wording of any maritime arrangement, side understanding or temporary de-escalation matters. A formula that appears to restore traffic while conceding Iranian control would not solve the security problem. It would institutionalise it.

The operating mechanism

The pressure system has four parts.

First, Iran can threaten ships directly through missiles, drones, mines, armed craft or boarding pressure. Not every threat has to succeed. Even an attempted attack can change the behaviour of a master, operator, insurer or flag state.

Second, Iran can force the United States and partners to spend resources on protection. Air cover, surveillance, route clearance and naval presence all reduce risk, but they also create tempo, fatigue and escalation pressure. The more protection is required for normal commercial movement, the less normal the route becomes.

Third, Iran can exploit ambiguity. If ships are attacked because of flag, ownership, cargo, routing or alleged violation of Iranian instructions, commercial actors face a compliance and exposure problem, not only a security problem. The question becomes which vessels are acceptable to whom, and under what conditions.

Fourth, Iran can connect Hormuz to the wider maritime picture. Red Sea and Bab al-Mandab risk remains relevant because pressure on one corridor changes dependence on another. If Houthi activity rises again while Hormuz remains contested, operators face a two-corridor planning problem across energy, container, bulk and specialist cargo movements.

U.S. military pressure and its limits

U.S. strikes can reduce immediate threat output if they disrupt launch infrastructure, storage areas, command nodes, radar support and small-boat assembly. That is the military logic behind continued pressure on sites near the Strait. It is also why a one-night strike package is unlikely to be decisive. The threat system is distributed, and Iran can shift launch points, hide mobile systems and use proxies or irregular maritime assets.

The operational goal is therefore not a clean victory signal. It is a risk-management threshold: enough suppression that commercial traffic can move with a credible protection plan and tolerable insurance assumptions. That threshold may be reached before the political dispute is settled, but it can be lost again if Iran proves it can still hit or intimidate selected ships.

There is also a political limit. If U.S. strikes expand too widely, Iran may seek to widen the conflict through allied militias, attacks on regional bases, or pressure in the Red Sea. If U.S. strikes remain too narrow, they may not reduce the threat enough to reassure shipping. The space between those two outcomes is narrow.

Commercial and corporate implications

The most exposed organisations are not only vessel operators. Energy traders, port users, companies with Gulf staff, insurers, executive-protection teams, aviation planners and crisis managers all face secondary effects.

For maritime operators, the immediate questions are practical: vessel profile, ownership exposure, cargo sensitivity, flag, AIS behaviour, crew confidence, reporting rhythm and availability of naval guidance. A generic “transit or do not transit” answer is not enough. Exposure differs between a large crude carrier, an LNG carrier, a container ship and a smaller support vessel.

For corporates with staff in the region, the route risk can translate into air disruption, fuel-price movement, protest dynamics, local security measures, reduced government bandwidth and harder evacuation planning. The Strait of Hormuz is a maritime choke point, but the impact does not stop at the waterline.

For executive-protection and travel-risk planning, the priority is not to predict the next strike. The priority is to define triggers: confirmed attacks on commercial vessels, new government shipping advisories, visible insurance-market reaction, port restrictions, airspace changes, embassy movement notices and credible signs of Houthi reactivation.

Operational posture for exposed organisations

Companies with direct or indirect exposure to Hormuz should separate three decisions that are often mixed together.

The first decision is whether a specific vessel should transit. That decision should be based on vessel profile, cargo, flag, ownership exposure, route timing, naval guidance and insurance terms. A low-profile vessel and a high-profile energy carrier do not carry the same risk, even if they move through the same waterway.

The second decision is whether the organisation can tolerate disruption. If the answer depends on a single shipment, a narrow fuel window, a critical spare part, or a small executive team in the region, the risk is higher than the maritime incident map alone suggests.

The third decision is whether escalation indicators are being watched by someone with authority to act. Reports that arrive after a vessel has already committed to transit are not useful. Security, logistics, legal, insurance and leadership teams need one shared trigger list before movement is authorised.

Scenarios to watch

Managed transit under pressure. U.S. and partner forces suppress enough of the threat that major vessels resume controlled movement. Risk remains elevated, but commercial traffic becomes possible under stricter guidance. This is the most workable near-term scenario, but it depends on continued protection and rapid information sharing.

Intermittent disruption. Iran avoids a full closure but periodically attacks or threatens selected vessels. This scenario creates the worst planning environment for companies because movement is technically possible, but timing, premiums and crew acceptance become unstable.

Regional spillover. Iran-linked actors increase pressure in the Red Sea, Iraq, Syria or the Gulf to dilute U.S. focus. This would turn Hormuz from a choke-point problem into a regional continuity problem.

Negotiated ambiguity. A political arrangement lowers the strike tempo but leaves unclear who controls traffic conditions through the Strait. That may calm markets temporarily while leaving the underlying leverage problem unresolved.

Indicators for decision-makers

Watch for confirmed vessel incidents rather than claims alone. Vessel name, location, damage pattern, flag, ownership and cargo matter more than broad rhetoric.

Watch CENTCOM and UKMTO-style maritime notices for changes in route guidance, threat category or reporting requirements. Those notices are more useful for operators than political commentary.

Watch insurance and chartering behaviour. If premiums, exclusions or charter willingness change, the commercial market is treating the risk as real even before governments issue stronger warnings.

Watch Iranian messaging around “arrangements” or “control” of the Strait. That language is an indicator of whether Tehran is seeking merely de-escalation or a longer-term recognition of coercive leverage.

Watch for Houthi maritime activity and Iranian logistics into Yemen. A renewed Bab al-Mandab threat would compound Hormuz risk and reduce routing flexibility.

SFC Global assessment

The Strait of Hormuz is not simply a passageway at risk. It is the instrument through which Iran can convert military pressure into economic and diplomatic leverage. The United States can reduce that leverage through sustained suppression and protected transit, but it cannot remove the business risk quickly unless commercial actors believe the route is dependable again.

For now, the prudent corporate assumption is that Hormuz remains usable but contested. Companies should avoid binary planning. The better posture is conditional movement: transit decisions tied to vessel profile, live maritime advisories, insurance terms, route timing and clear escalation triggers.

The decisive indicator will not be the next public threat. It will be whether large commercial vessels move through the strait at meaningful volume without repeated attacks, insurance shock or emergency route changes. Until that pattern is visible, the operating environment remains fragile.

Selected sources

- Institute for the Study of War and Critical Threats Project, Iran Update Special Report, 14 July 2026.

- SFC Global knowledge-base summary of ISW/CTP Iran Update Special Report, 14 July 2026.
- U.S. defence-policy expert commentary reviewed by SFC Global, 16 July 2026.
- SFC Global cross-source synthesis and maritime-risk monitoring, 20 July 2026.

Disclaimer