Prepared for Senate Finance Committee Juneau, Alaska > February 21, 2014

Janak Mayer, Partner > janak.mayer@enalytica.info Nikos Tsafos, Partner > nikos.tsafos@enalytica.info

http://enalytica.info





JANAK MAYER Partner *en*alytica JANAK.MAYER@ENALYTICA.INFO Before co-founding *en*alytica, Janak led the Upstream Analytics team at PFC Energy, focusing on fiscal terms analysis and project economic and financial evaluation, data management and data visualization.

Janak has modeled upstream fiscal terms in all of the world's major hydrocarbon regions, and has built economic and financial models to value prospective acquisition targets and develop strategic portfolio options for a wide range of international and national oil company clients. He has advised Alaska State Legislature for multiple years on reform of oil and gas taxation, providing many hours of expert testimony to Alaska's Senate and House Finance and Resources Committees.

Prior to his work as an energy consultant, Janak advised major minerals industry clients on a range of controversial environmental and social risk issues, from uranium mining through to human rights and climate change. He has advised bankers at Citigroup and policy-makers at the US Treasury Department on the management and mitigation of environmental and social impacts in major projects around the world, and has undertaken macroeconomic research with senior development economists at the World Bank and the Peterson Institute for International Economics.

Janak holds an MA with distinction in international relations and economics from from the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS), and a BA with first-class honors from the University of Adelaide, Australia.





NIKOS TSAFOS Partner *en*alytica NIKOS.TSAFOS@ENALYTICA.INFO Nikos Tsafos has a diverse background in the private, public and non-profit sectors. He is currently a founding partner at *en*alytica. In his 7 ½ years with PFC Energy, Nikos advised the world's largest oil and gas companies on some of their most complex and challenging projects; he also played a pivotal role in turning the firm into one of the top natural gas consultancies in the world, with responsibilities that included product design, business development, consulting oversight and research direction.

Prior to PFC Energy, Nikos was at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) in Washington, DC where he covered political, economic, and military issues in the Gulf, focused on oil wealth, regime stability and foreign affairs. Before CSIS, he was in the Greek Air Force, and prior to his military service, Nikos worked on channeling investment from Greek ship-owners to Chinese shipyards.

Nikos has also written extensively on the domestic and international dimensions of the Greek debt crisis. His blog (Greek Default Watch) was listed as one of "Europe's Top Economic Blogs" by the Social Europe Journal, and his book "Beyond Debt: The Greek Crisis in Context" was published in March 2013.

Nikos holds a BA with distinction in international relations and economics from Boston University and an MA with distinction in international relations from the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS).



enalytica

AK LNG IS COMPETING IN A WORLD WITH MANY CHOICES





COMPETITIVENESS > PROJECT PATHWAY > ALIGNMENT prospective suppliers > but not all prospective supply works out

BUT WE'VE BEEN HERE BEFORE IN THE MID/LATE 2000S





LNG PROJECTS EVOLVE: QC LNG (AUSTRALIA) CASE STUDY

	FEED (JULY 2008)	FID (OCTOBER 2010)	JANUARY 2014
Size	One train: 3-4 mmtpa Expandable to 12 mmtpa	Two trains 8.5 mmtpa	Two trains 8.5 mmtpa
Upstream	BG owned 9.9% of QGC and 20% of QGC's coal-bed methane in Surat Basin	All BG except CNOOC 5% and Tokyo Gas 1.25% in parts of Surat Basin	Gas from AP LNG; Same as FID plus CNOOC 25% in Surat and Bowen Basin
Liquefaction	T1: BG 70%, QGC 30%	T1: BG 90%, CNOOC 10% T2: BG 97.5%, Tokyo Gas 2.5%	T1: BG 50%, CNOOC 50% T2: BG 97.5%, Tokyo Gas 2.5% T3: CNOOC option for 25%
Off-take*	BG Group: 100%	CNOOC: 3.6 mmtpa* Tokyo Gas: 1.2 mmtpa* BG Group: balance	CNOOC: 8.6 mmtpa* Tokyo Gas: 1.2 mmtpa* Chubu Electric: ~0.6 mmtpa*
External Financing			JBIC: 175 mn to Tokyo Gas US EX-IM: \$1.8 billion

* Off-take is supplemented by BG's global portfolio-not all LNG will come from Australia

SOURCE: BG GROUP DATABOOK 2008-2013 EDITIONS, INDUSTRY PRESS



	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
Project Stage	tage Pre-FEED		FEED		Construction			Online					
Project Milestones	Project Milestones Move to FEED		FID								bottlene expansio	-	
Marketing MOU/HOA SOA Plan		HOA/SPAs SOA Plan			SPAs for any unsold LNG				G				
Financing	ng Initial talks		Defining terms / singing loans		Possible additional financing			cing		Refinanc	:e		
Project Structure & Ownership		e initial Icture		New partners / redefine ownership			partner	s / rede	fine own	iership	New p	artners	possible
Investment (Project)		-\$500 nm	\$1,50	\$1,500—\$2,000 mm (Equity)			\$45–65 billion (Debt and equity)				Met	O&M from cas	sh flow
Investment (SOA)		—\$125 nm	\$20	\$200—\$500 mm (Equity)				6—\$15 bi bt and e			Met	0&M from cas	sh flow



LNG projects evolve: case study > where are we now? > SOA options

	<u>System</u>	SOA ownership percent			<u>SOA sh</u>	are of CAPEX 8	<u>a opex</u>	SOA cash commitments		
	Value / Kind	Upstream	GTP & Pipe	LNG	Upstream	GTP & Pipe	LNG	Debt	Tariffs	
Status Quo	in value	0%	0%	0%	Indirect (taxes)	0%	0%	No debt	Tariff matters for valuation	
HOA	in kind	0%	25 %	25%	Indirect (taxes)	25 %	25%	Principal and interest	Tariff only notional	
MOU Option 1	in kind	0%	10% (40% x 25%)	25%	Indirect (taxes)	10% (40% x 25%)	25%	Principal and interest	Tariff payable to T/C	
MOU Option 2	in kind	0%	0%	25 %	Indirect (taxes)	0%	25%	Principal and interest	Tariff payable to T/C	



oil netback > oil vs. gas prices > oil vs. gas midstream > LNG netback > LNG with lower oil price > LNG with higher costs > conclusion



SOURCE: DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE, REVENUE SOURCES BOOK, FALL 2013, P. 106



oil netback > oil vs. gas prices > oil vs. gas midstream > LNG netback > LNG with lower oil price > LNG with higher costs > conclusion

FY 2015 PRODUCTION TAX ESTIMATE USING	INCOME STAT	PRICE FOR ALASKAN GAS WILL BE:		
	Price	Barrels (Theorem de)	Value	
Avg ANS Oil Price (\$/bbl) & Daily Production	\$105.06	(Thousands) 498	(\$ million) \$52.4	
Annual Production Total		181,912	\$19,111.7	Less transparent
Royalty, Federal & other barrels		(23,301)	(\$2,448.0)	no readily available published price like ANS WC
Taxable bbls from companies w/ tax liability		158,611	\$16,663.7	IIU I GAUIIY AVAIIADIG PUDIISIIGU PI IGG IING AN S N G
Downstream (Transportation) Costs (\$/bbl) ANS Marine Transporation TAPS Tariff Other Total Transportation Costs Deductable Lease Expenditures Deductible Operating Expenditures Deductible Capital Expenditures Total Lease Expenditures	(\$3.46) (\$6.18) (\$0.40) (\$10.03) (\$17.91) (\$28.08) (\$45.99)	158,611	(\$1,591.0) (\$2,840.3) (\$4,453.4) (\$7,293.7)	Less consistent by destination contract-by-contract differences can be large Likely link to Japan Crude Oil Cocktail, JCC in 2004-2013, JCC traded at \$0.22/bbl discount to ANS Lower value vs. oil (thermal equivalency) $e.g. $100/bbl \neq $100/boe of LNG$ $$100/bbl \neq $78-$90/boe (13\%-15\% "slope")$
iulai Lease Expendicues	(343.33)	1J0,011	(\$1,233.1)	\$100/ WW — \$70-\$90/ WUC (13/0-13/0 STUPE /
Production Tax Gross Value Reduction Production Tax Value (PTV) Base Tax (35%*PTV)	\$48.64		(\$63.8) \$7,715.2 \$2,700.3	
Total Tax before credits			\$2,700.3	

SOURCE: DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE, REVENUE SOURCES BOOK, FALL 2013, P. 106



oil netback > oil vs. gas prices > oil vs. gas midstream > LNG netback > LNG with lower oil price > LNG with higher costs > conclusion

FY 2015 PRODUCTION TAX ESTIMATE USING	INCOME STAT	MIDSTREAM COSTS WILL BE:		
	Price	Barrels (Thousands)	Value (\$ million)	WIDSTILAW UUSIS WILL DL.
Avg ANS Oil Price (\$/bbl) & Daily Production	\$105.06	498	\$52.4	
Annual Production				
Total		181,912	\$19,111.7	
Royalty, Federal & other barrels		(23,301)	(\$2,448.0)	
Taxable bbls from companies w/ tax liability		158,611	\$16,663.7	
Downstream (Transportation) Costs (\$/bbl)				
ANS Marine Transporation	(\$3.46)			
TAPS Tariff	(\$6.18)			
Other	(\$0.40)			
Total Transportation Costs	(\$10.03)	158,611	(\$1,591.0)	
-				Order of magnitude higher
Deductable Lease Expenditures				• •
Deductible Operating Expenditures	(\$17.91)		(\$2,840.3)	Gas is significantly more expensive to transport
Deductible Capital Expenditures	(\$28.08)		(\$4,453.4)	Tariff not regulated by FERC
Total Lease Expenditures	(\$45.99)	158,611	(\$7,293.7)	
-				FERC will regulate permitting, not rate-setting
Production Tax				Tariff highly consistive to conital structure
Gross Value Reduction			(\$63.8)	Tariff highly sensitive to capital structure
Production Tax Value (PTV)	\$48.64		\$7,715.2	return on equity and /or assumed debt/equity ratio
Base Tax (35%*PTV)			\$2,700.3	
Total Tax before credits			\$2,700.3	

SOURCE: DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE, REVENUE SOURCES BOOK, FALL 2013, P. 106



oil netback > oil vs. gas prices > oil vs. gas midstream > LNG netback > LNG with lower oil price > LNG with higher costs > conclusion



SOURCE: ENALYTICA ANAL OF REVENUE, REVENUE SOURCES BOOK, FALL 2013, P. 106



oil netback > oil vs. gas prices > oil vs. gas midstream > LNG netback > LNG with lower oil price > LNG with higher costs > conclusion

INDICATIVE TAX BEFORE CREDITS FOR ALAS	SKA LNG PROJ	INDICATIVE LNG CHAIN: \$89/BBL ANS		
	Price	Barrels (Thousands)	Value (\$ million)	
Avg LNG Price (\$/boe) & Daily Production	\$ 72.18	(Thousands) 384	(\$ million) \$27.7	
Annual Production				
Total		140,306	\$10,127.3	A drop to \$89/bbl ANS
Royalty, Federal & other barrels		(19,643)	(\$1,417.8)	
Taxable bbls from companies w/ tax liability		120,664	\$8,709.5	
Downstream (Transportation) Costs (\$/boe)				
Marine Transporation	(\$6.00)		(\$724.0)	
Pipeline & GTP Tariff	(\$24.18)		(\$2,917.6)	
Liquefaction Tariff	(\$36.00)		(\$4,343.9)	
Total Transportation Costs	(\$66.18)	120,664	(\$7,985.5)	
Deductable Lease Expenditures				
Deductible Operating Expenditures	(\$3.00)		(\$362.0)	
Deductible Capital Expenditures	(\$3.00)		(\$362.0)	
Total Lease Expenditures	(\$6.00)	120,664	(\$724.0)	
				wipes out any production tax value
Production Tax				
Gross Value Reduction			\$0.0	
Production Tax Value (PTV)	\$0.00		\$0.0	
Base Tax (35%*PTV)			\$0.0	
Total Tax before credits			\$0.0	



oil netback > oil vs. gas prices > oil vs. gas midstream > LNG netback > LNG with lower oil price > LNG with higher costs > conclusion

INDICATIVE TAX BEFORE CREDITS FOR ALAS	KA LNG PROJI	INDICATIVE LNG CHAIN: HIGHER COSTS		
	Price	Barrels (Thousands)	Value (\$ million)	INDIGATIVE ENG OTTAIN. INOTIEN 00313
Avg LNG Price (\$/boe) & Daily Production	\$81.00	384	\$31.1	
Annual Production				
Total		140,306	\$11, 364.8	
Royalty, Federal & other barrels		(19,643)	(\$1,591.1)	
Taxable bbls from companies w/ tax liability		120,664	\$9,773.8	
Downstream (Transportation) Costs (\$/boe)				
Marine Transporation	(\$6.73)		(\$812.4)	
Pipeline & GTP Tariff	(\$27.13)		(\$3,274.2)	
Liquefaction Tariff	(\$40.40)		(\$4,874.7)	
Total Transportation Costs	(\$74.27)	120,664	(\$8,961.3)	
				A 12.2% hike in costs / tariffs
Deductable Lease Expenditures				
Deductible Operating Expenditures	(\$3.37)		(\$406.2)	
Deductible Capital Expenditures	(\$3.37)		(\$406.2)	
Total Lease Expenditures	(\$6.73)	120,664	(\$812.4)	
				wipes out any production tax value
Production Tax				
Gross Value Reduction			\$ 0. 0	
Production Tax Value (PTV)	\$0.00		\$0.0	
Base Tax (35%*PTV)			\$0.0	
Total Tax before credits			\$0.0	

enalytica

oil netback > oil vs. gas prices > oil vs. gas midstream > LNG netback > LNG with lower oil price > LNG with higher costs > conclusion





http://enalytica.info

