

New facts require course correction

IFIEC Energy Forum 5 June 2013

Peter Botschek, Cefic Director Energy & HSE





Used as feedstock AND to power plants

- Global energy demand 42 EJ/yr (two thirds feedstock)
- 10% of global (30% of industrial) demand
- Fastest growing industrial consumer

18 chemical building blocks account for 80% of energy demand

 Average energy costs about 50%, but key building blocks have cost impact of up to 85%

95% of manufacturing require chemistry inputs

 "Competitive Energy" biggest sector concern & growing issue for EU economy's broader manufacturing base

Chemicals Matter for EU Economy

Sustainable Future = MORE High Performance Materials





Source: Ecofys

Avoided emissions (Mtonne)



Impact of US 'Shale Revolution'



Historical and projected net US LNG imports



- US gas production now similar to Russian levels
- US only uses 10% of its LNG import capacity
- More LNG available for Europe → Pressure on prices

US Energy Information Administration, 'Various American Energy Outlooks'

Low Ethylene Costs in the US means big Cost advantage for US Petrochemistry

- Seven years ago Europe was in a comparable cost situation to the United States for the production of ethylene.
- The availability of natural gas as a low-cost energy source has resulted in lower-cost ethane and ethylene. This natural gas price has affected the price of ethylene in the US massively.
- In 2012, the cost difference between the two regions has become 700 \$/ton. On a European market of 20 million tons, this represents a cost advantage for the US of 14 billion USD per year.



Low Ethane Costs in the US make **US Crackers more competitive**



- The cost curve is built on the cumulative petrochemical capacity from the lowest cost producers (in the Middle East) to the highest cost producers (in Northeast Asia).
- US ethane-based ethylene producers have moved to the lower end of the global cost curve, after only the Middle East and Canada.
- Due to cheap ethane there are currently record margins for US producers.
- By comparison, naphtha-based ethylene producers in Europe and Asia are at a competitive disadvantage.
- As recently as 2005, the United States ranked behind Western Europe.



CHANGE IN THE GLOBAL COST CURVE FOR ETHYLENE AND RENEWED US COMPETITIVENESS

Source: ACC: Shale Gas Study, May 2013

Game Changer for US Manufacturing





Comparing Global Electricity Prices

Cost Advantages for US Industry

Average electricity price for industry in \$ per Mwh (Source: BDI)



Energy Prices and Competitiveness



Evolution of end-user electricity prices for industry, taxes excluded (2005 = index 100)



Source: International Energy Agency

Cost Advantages for US Industry

Negative Impact for EU Energy intensive Sectors

Energy cost as % of production costs in energy-intensive industries



- In the chemicals sector, competition with the U.S., with relatively equivalent labour costs, is intensifying due to significant differences in energy prices.
- According to US EIA the industries which are affected mostly by lower gas prices are bulk chemicals and primary metals.
 - Low electricity prices for industry will have an impact on future investment decisions.



Impacts and implications



- US Shale Gas boom challenging European petrochemical industry, especially companies with a strong focus on ethylene and corresponding down stream products.
- Small positive impact for European chemical companies with focus on naphtha by-products (propylene, butadiene).
- Resulting low US electricity prices impact on future investment decisions in energy intensive industry sectors.
- Hope: US re-industrialization could create new markets for European industry.
- Current EU figures regarding EU shale gas reserves imply that an EU shale gas production will not have similar potential as the US exploration.
- Implications for EU energy sourcing, market opening, energy and trade policies.

Policy Choice: Where to Manufacture for this Demand





Summary – Policy Choices – Dialogue Items



Higher Energy Costs = Lower GDP

- Adding Costs & Policy Burdens relative to other Major Regions proven Counterproductive
 - Chemistry building block investments early indicator of manufacturing decline or revival

<u>Chemistry impacts 95% Value</u> <u>Chain</u>

- Manufacturing creates
 - Jobs (25%)
 - R&D (80%)
 - Exports (75%)
- Uncompetitive building blocks undermine full manufacturing chain

Summary – Policy Choices – Dialogue Items



Sustainable Future (Efficiency & Energy Alternatives) needs more Higher Performance Materials

1/3 of Growing EU Consumption
Emissions avoided via Chemistry

 Policies influence what will be future EU Production share

Multiple Workable Alternatives

- Global Actions precondition for further Climate Commitments
- Transition to predictable opportunity driven policy, maintain exemptions while burdens reduced & investments return
- No exclusions for effective energy solutions & focus innovations on tackling cost effectiveness for global leadership

The world changes, EU policy fundamentals outdated...



2007	2013
Economic growth	Economic crisis: EU competence ?
Global agreement by 2009	Fragmented climate policies
Climate Change=EU 'Leadership'	EU marginalised
Depleting fossil energies: surging prices	US shale gas revolution, investment
Liberalising EU Energy market	Regulated Energy markets ?
MS funding RES and efficiency	Energy poverty and loss of competitiveness
Rolling out CCS	No CCS ?
Nuclear energy	Post Fukushima – less/no nuclear ?
ETS as 'flagship' policy tool to achieve target at low cost	ETS backloading, EED, RED, IED = EU / national policy potpourri ?

Facts have changed since 2020 policy package was made: **EU must adapt strategy!**

World changes, EU policy framework to match:



2013	Course correction towards 2030
Economic crisis: EU competence ?	Embracing EU economic growth, jobs
Fragmented climate policies	Priority: major emitting economies
EU marginalised	EU co-leader: in global competition
US shale gas revolution, investment	Competitive energy markets, diversified
Regulated Energy markets ?	Temporary support only, competition, connecting cross-border
Energy poverty and loss of competitiveness	Affordable energy and competitive costs for industry and consumers
No CCS ?	CCS or other tools after 2030?
Post Fukushima – less/no nuclear ?	Use all sources, avoid costly exclusions
ETS backloading, EED, RED, IED = EU / national policy potpourri ?	Keep ETS as low-cost tool, no more multitude of overlapping targets

No more 'high cost policies' to 'drive' EU economy: EU super tanker needs competitive course correction!



Thank you for your attention!

Peter Botschek Director Energy, Health, Safety & Environment European Chemical Industry Council (Cefic)

E-mail: pbo@cefic.be