

Senate Finance Committee

Alaska Fiscal System Discussion Slides

March 4 2013 Janak Mayer Manager, Upstream PFC Energy



Regressive and Progressive Regimes



Regressive and Progressive Regimes

- 2 potential reasons to desire a progressive element in Alaska's fiscal regime:
 - To counteract regressive elements in the regime to achieve something close to **neutrality**
 - To go beyond neutrality, to ensure a higher level of take for the state in high price environments
- Regressive and Progressive regimes imply a very different outlooks on risk and reward, for government and the private sector:
 - Regressive regimes limit risk to the state, placing large downside risk on the private sector, protecting the state in low price or high cost environments
 - In return, regressive regimes offer outsized returns in high price environments
 - Progressive regimes involve the state bearing more price and cost risk, in return for a higher share of returns in good times
- Perhaps the single biggest problem with Alaska's current fiscal regime is that it involves elements that are **both strongly regressive and strongly progressive**.
 - It seeks to place downside risk on the private sector, while taking most of the returns in high price environments.
 - It is this combination that makes it particularly unattractive from an investment perspective



Royalty Only Base Production







Economic	Summary
----------	---------

	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	52.09%	5.81		26.27
\$100/bbl	50.37%	8.61		39.1
\$120/bbl	49.46%	11.4		51.93
\$140/bbl	48.90%	14.2		64.76

Even with just a 12.5% royalty on base production, a fixed royalty is regressive at low prices; at \$40/bbl the royalty and property tax consume all divisible income



Royalty Only \$18/bbl New Development, Standalone



16.7% Royalty, \$18/bbl New Development



	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	61.95%	-0.26	11.52%	27.34
\$100/bbl	57.10%	3.88	18.56%	39.0
\$120/bbl	54.90%	7.91	24.44%	50.65
\$140/bbl	53.64%	11.91	29.55%	62.39

With the 16.7% royalty that generally applies to newer leases, an \$18/bbl new development faces more than 70% government take at \$65/bbl

Royalty Only \$25/bbl New Development, Standalone



16.7% Royalty, \$25/bbl New Development



	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	66.93%	-4.08	6.32%	27.03
\$100/bbl	59.37%	0.25	12.33%	40.1
\$120/bbl	56.30%	4.4	17.41%	51.76
\$140/bbl	54.64%	8.45	21.83%	63.42

A high-cost, \$25/bbl development may face more than 70% government take at \$85/bbl



ACES – Base Production



ACES, 12.5% Royalty, Base Production



Economic	Summarv
LCOHOTHIC	Jannary

	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	65.89%	4.18		19.04
\$100/bbl	70.65%	5.26		23.92
\$120/bbl	73.92%	6.0		27.09
\$140/bbl	75.46%	6.97		31.89

ACES layers onto the regressive fixed royalty a highly progressive profit-based production tax. The gross-based minimum tax also increases the regressive nature at the low end. The result is very high levels of government take at both very low and high prices



ACES - \$18/bbl New Development, Standalone



ACES, 16.7% Royalty, \$18/bbl New Development



	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	72.49%	0.63	13.88%	19.94
\$100/bbl	75.08%	2.48	19.07%	25.18
\$120/bbl	77.01%	3.98	22.94%	28.63
\$140/bbl	78.10%	5.46	26.44%	32.33

Standalone new developments face particularly high government take – although this is partly offset by the significant downside risk the state takes through reimbursable credits

ACES - \$25/bbl New Development, Standalone



ACES, 16.7% Royalty, \$25/bbl New Development



Economic	Summarv
LCOHOIIIIC	Jannary

	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	74.31%	-1.62	8.31%	20.76
\$100/bbl	75.84%	0.5	13.11%	26.72
\$120/bbl	77.49%	2.11	16.56%	30.66
\$140/bbl	78.49%	3.64	19.58%	34.49

The downside exposure to the state from reimbursable credits to small producers is potentially significant for high-cost projects in low price environments



Alaska Base Production under UK North Sea regime



UK North Sea, Base Production



Economic	Summarv

	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	62.00%	4.63		20.79
\$100/bbl	62.00%	6.62		29.9
\$120/bbl	62.00%	8.6		39.02
\$140/bbl	62.00%	10.59		48.14

By comparison, pure profit-tax based regimes like the UK North Sea can be completely neutral over an indefinite range of prices, with or without some progressivity at low prices



Alaska \$18/bbl Development under UK North Sea regime









		C
Econ	omic	Summary
	UTINC.	Junnary

	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	62.79%	0.62	13.29%	30.66
\$100/bbl	62.46%	3.89	19.64%	38.58
\$120/bbl	62.31%	7.04	25.09%	46.5
\$140/bbl	62.23%	10.11	29.82%	54.42

By comparison, pure profit-tax based regimes like the UK North Sea can be completely neutral over an indefinite range of prices, with or without some progressivity at low prices

Regime Comparisons:

Seeking regime neutrality around the mid-60% government take level



ACES – Base Production







Economic	Summary
LCOHOIIIIC	Junnary

	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	65.89%	4.18		19.04
\$100/bbl	70.65%	5.26		23.92
\$120/bbl	73.92%	6.0		27.09
\$140/bbl	75.46%	6.97		31.89

SB21 Base Production



SB 21, 12.5% Royalty, Base Production



Economic Summary

	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	64.04%	4.35		19.72
\$100/bbl	62.76%	6.44		29.34
\$120/bbl	62.08%	8.54		38.96
\$140/bbl	61.67%	10.63		48.58

Government Take under SB21 and ACES Capex Sensitivity



* All CAPEX figures are in gross bbl terms (\$15 per gross bbl is roughly equivalent to DOR 2014 average North Slope forecast of \$19.6 per bbl net of royalty, when adjusted for gross/net and for capital expenditures by non-taxable entities)

Alaska Hydrocarbons Fiscal Systems | © PFC Energy | Page 15 | 4 March 2013

•As noted in PFC Energy testimony on 1/31/13, at low oil prices, Relative Government Take under SB 21 is higher than under ACES, due to the impact of low or no progressivity, combined with the elimination of the 20% capital credit under SB 21

•The **oil price level** at which this occurs is highly **sensitive to annual levels of capital spending**, since CAPEX both reduces the oil price level at which progressivity kicks in under ACES, and determines the size of the available capital credit under ACES

•Looking at a **single year of production** also slightly raises this neutrality point, since over many years, inflation reduces the real price level at which progressivity starts under ACES

•For mature, producing assets with a low ongoing CAPEX requirement (\$10/bbl), SB21 represents a **reduction in government take at prices above ~\$75**, however for capital intensive new developments in existing units, that neutrality **point can be as high as \$110/bbl**

•It is thus important to understand that one impact of the removal of the 20% capital credit under SB 21 is that for companies with high development costs relative to overall production, it **can represent a tax increase at current prices**



Regimes for comparison: CS SB 21

- CS SB 21:
 - 35% Profit-based Production Tax, \$5/bbl allowance, 30% GRE for certain new production
 - Production-based allowance curves the tax-rate down at lower prices, creating a progressive element that acheives relative overall neutrality
 - Overall relative neutrality removes potential for 'gold-plating incentives'
 - Progressive element being determined on gross basis removes issue of oil vs gas 'decoupling'
 - Gross Revenue Exclusion reduces the overall level of government take for incentivized projects
 - Elimination of capital credit and carryforward of NOL credit reduces downside risk to state, but carries a cost in terms of project economics



\$5 production allowance is like reverse progressivity

Taxable Production	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000
ANS West Coast	60	80	120	140
Transportation	10	10	10	10
Gross Value at Point of Production	2,500,000,000	3,500,000,000	5,500,000,000	6,500,000,000
Lease Expenditures	1,500,000,000	1,500,000,000	1,500,000,000	1,500,000,000
GVPP/bbl	50	70	110	130
Lease Expenditures / bbl	30	30	30	30

PTV	1,000,000,000	2,000,000,000	4,000,000,000	5,000,000,000
PTV/bbl	20	40	80	100
Production Tax without Allowance	350,000,000	700,000,000	1,400,000,000	1,750,000,000
Production Allowance	250,000,000	250,000,000	250,000,000	250,000,000
Production Tax	100,000,000	450,000,000	1,150,000,000	1,500,000,000
Nominal Tax Rate	35%	35%	35%	35%
Rate after Allowance	10.0%	22.5%	28.8%	30.0%
Progressive Tax Rate Deduction	25.0%	12.5%	6.3%	5.0%

GRE increases the price level at which production tax, and 'progressivity', apply

Taxable Production	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000
ANS West Coast	60	80	120	140
Transportation	10	10	10	10
Gross Value at Point of Production	2,500,000,000	3,500,000,000	5,500,000,000	6,500,000,000
Lease Expenditures	1,500,000,000	1,500,000,000	1,500,000,000	1,500,000,000
GVPP/bbl	50	70	110	130
Lease Expenditures / bbl	30	30	30	30
GRE 30%	750,000,000	1,050,000,000	1,650,000,000	1,950,000,000
PTV	250,000,000	950,000,000	2,350,000,000	3,050,000,000
PTV/bbl	20	40	80	100
Production Tax without Allowance	87,500,000	332,500,000	822,500,000	1,067,500,000
Production Allowance	250,000,000	250,000,000	250,000,000	250,000,000
Production Tax	-	82,500,000	572,500,000	817,500,000
Nominal Tax Rate	35%	35%	35%	35%
Rate after Allowance	0.0%	8.7%	24.4%	26.8%
Progressive Tax Rate Deduction	35.0%	26.3%	10.6%	8.2%

Both share similarities with UK Brownfield Allowance

- The UK's fiscal regime is a relatively simple one, with two core components a Corporate Income Tax (CIT) of 30%, and a Supplemental Resource Tax (SRT) of 32%, levied on the CIT tax base
- The UK Brownfield Allowance is an income exclusion, used in calculating the SRT. Up to a total £250mm of income can be excluded, with up to 20% of the exclusion amount allowed in a given year.
 For projects subject to the additional Petroleum Tax (pre-1993 projects), the exclusion is up to £500mm of income
- Because it is a fixed exclusion, it has a greater impact at lower oil prices
- Projects are individually assessed for qualification, and for the total amount of relief available.
 Qualifying projects are incremental projects increasing production from mature fields.
- A 100mmb incremental development, with costs of \$25/bbl, could see its government take reduced by to anywhere from 3 to 11 percentage points, depending on the oil price level



Alaska \$18/bbl Development under UK North Sea regime



UK North Sea, \$18/bbl New Development, with Brownfield Allowance





F	C
Fronomic	Summary
LCOHOTHIC	Jannary

	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	44.85%	2.75	17.04%	38.16
\$100/bbl	51.26%	6.34	23.38%	49.73
\$120/bbl	54.16%	9.64	28.68%	59.14
\$140/bbl	55.83%	12.92	33.60%	69.08

Regimes for comparison: Bracketed Progressivity (Net)

- Bracketed Progressivity (Net):
 - 25% Profit-based Production Tax
 - Bracketed progressivity with the following thresholds and rates:
 - \$30 PTV 5%
 - \$42.5 PTV 10%
 - \$55 PTV 15%
 - 20% capital credit maintained, but carried forward to production for producers with no liability
 - Overall relative neutrality removes potential for 'gold-plating incentives'
 - Progressive element being determined on net basis does not entirely remove issue of oil vs gas 'decoupling', but low degree of progressivity minimizes impact
 - Gross Revenue Exclusion not included in modeling, but could be applied to incentivize new projects
 - Carryforward (without escalation) of credits reduces some downside risk to state, while retaining a cost-progressive element. Escalation could also be included to compensate for time value of money foregone



- Bracketed Progressivity (Net):
 - 20% Profit-based Production Tax lower rate needed to when progressivity on gross to prevent a tax increase at lower price levels for higher cost producers
 - Bracketed progressivity with the following thresholds and rates:
 - \$70 ANS West Coast Crude 5%
 - \$90 ANS West Coast Crude– 10%
 - \$110 ANS West Coast Crude- 15%
 - \$130 ANS West Coast Crude– 20%
 - 20% capital credit maintained, but carried forward to production for producers with no liability
 - Overall relative neutrality removes potential for 'gold-plating incentives'
 - Progressive element being determined on net basis does not entirely remove issue of oil vs gas 'decoupling', but low degree of progressivity minimizes impact
 - Gross Revenue Exclusion not included in modeling, but could be applied to incentivize new projects
 - Carryforward (without escalation) of credits reduces some downside risk to state, while retaining a cost-progressive element. Escalation could also be included to compensate for time value of money foregone



Base Production



Alaska Hydrocarbons Fiscal Systems | © PFC Energy | Page 23 | 4 March 2013

ACES – Base Production



ACES, 12.5% Royalty, Base Production



Fo	onomic	Summary
	.ononne	Junnary

	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	65.89%	4.18		19.04
\$100/bbl	70.65%	5.26		23.92
\$120/bbl	73.92%	6.0		27.09
\$140/bbl	75.46%	6.97		31.89



CS SB21 Base Production







Fo	onomic	Summary
	.ononne	Junnary

	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	64.22%	4.37		19.77
\$100/bbl	64.54%	6.18		28.11
\$120/bbl	64.71%	8.0		36.45
\$140/bbl	64.81%	9.82		44.78

Bracketed Progressivity (Net) Base Production



Bracketed Progressivity (Net), 12.5% Royalty, Base Production



Economic	Summarv
LCOHOINIC	Jannary

	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	63.02%	4.47		20.38
\$100/bbl	64.39%	6.19		28.23
\$120/bbl	65.22%	7.87		35.93
\$140/bbl	65.74%	9.54		43.63

Bracketed Progressivity (Gross) Base Production



Bracketed Progressivity (Gross), 12.5% Royalty, Base Production

F = = = = = = : =	C
Fronomic	Summary
LCOHOIIIIC	Junnary

	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	64.13%	4.36		19.49
\$100/bbl	64.44%	6.17		28.25
\$120/bbl	64.75%	8.0		36.5
\$140/bbl	65.14%	9.75		44.47

\$18/bbl New Development



Alaska Hydrocarbons Fiscal Systems | © PFC Energy | Page 28 | 4 March 2013

ACES - \$18/bbl New Development, Standalone







Economic	Summany
LCONDINIC	Juimary

	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	72.49%	0.63	13.88%	19.94
\$100/bbl	75.08%	2.48	19.07%	25.18
\$120/bbl	77.01%	3.98	22.94%	28.63
\$140/bbl	78.10%	5.46	26.44%	32.33

CS SB21 \$18/bbl New Development, Standalone, no GRE



CS SB 21, 16.7% Royalty, \$18/bbl New Development



Economic	CUIDADAADA
Economic	Summarv

	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	64.41%	-0.4	11.25%	27.34
\$100/bbl	67.20%	2.44	16.61%	36.68
\$120/bbl	67.36%	5.16	21.37%	43.19
\$140/bbl	67.18%	7.88	25.67%	50.4

NPV/boe	IF

400 200 5 0 -200																			 	_			
-400	2012 2013	2014 2015	2016	2017 2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2024	2025	2026	2027 2028	2029	2030	2031	2033	LEOC	2035	2036	2037	2038	2039	2040
			O Ca	pex apex	[Dri Go	llex ver	nm	rear ient	t Tak	e			G AT	ros	ss R F	eve	enu	ıe		



Bracketed Progressivity (Net) \$18/bbl New Development, Standalone



Bracketed Progressivity (Net), 16.7% Royalty, \$18/bbl New Development



	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	61.95%	-0.26	11.52%	27.34
\$100/bbl	61.47%	3.43	18.09%	39.0
\$120/bbl	65.34%	5.94	22.63%	48.76
\$140/bbl	66.41%	8.52	26.84%	54.68

Bracketed Progressivity (Gross) \$18/bbl New Development, Standalone



Bracketed Progressivity (Gross), 16.7% Royalty, \$18/bbl New Development



	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	61.95%	-0.26	11.52%	27.34
\$100/bbl	61.97%	3.37	18.01%	39.0
\$120/bbl	65.03%	6.0	22.68%	48.72
\$140/bbl	65.94%	8.64	26.95%	54.97

CS SB21 \$18/bbl New Development, Standalone, with GRE



CS SB 21, 16.7% Royalty, \$18/bbl New Development with GRE



Economic	Summarv
LCOHOINIC	Jannary

	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	61.95%	-0.26	11.52%	27.34
\$100/bbl	57.10%	3.88	18.56%	39.0
\$120/bbl	59.45%	7.12	23.80%	50.65
\$140/bbl	60.03%	10.25	28.35%	59.02

ACES \$18/bbl New Development, Incremental





ACES, 16.7% Royalty, \$18/bbl New Development, Incremental to Incumbent

Fees a serie	C
Economic	Summary
LCOHOIIIIC	Junnary

	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	66.28%	2.62	21.78%	19.9
\$100/bbl	70.46%	5.08	33.40%	25.29
\$120/bbl	72.43%	7.19	46.62%	28.55
\$140/bbl	75.95%	7.42	38.65%	32.8

CS SB21 \$18/bbl New Development, Incremental







Economic	Summany
LCONDINIC	Juimary

	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	68.44%	1.11	15.08%	19.6
\$100/bbl	67.89%	3.66	21.20%	27.61
\$120/bbl	67.63%	6.22	26.41%	35.63
\$140/bbl	67.48%	8.77	31.01%	43.64

Bracketed Progressivity (Net) \$18/bbl New Development, Incremental





Economic	Summary
----------	---------

	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	65.23%	2.19	18.94%	20.59
\$100/bbl	65.82%	4.97	26.93%	28.33
\$120/bbl	66.78%	7.33	32.24%	35.73
\$140/bbl	67.34%	9.69	36.93%	43.13

Bracketed Progressivity (Net), 16.7% Royalty, \$18/bbl New Development, Incremental to Incumbent



Bracketed Progressivity (Gross) \$18/bbl New Development, Incremental



Bracketed Progressivity (Gross), 16.7% Royalty, \$18/bbl New Development, Incremental to Incumbent



	-
Economic	Summany
LCONDINIC	Juimary

	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	67.63%	1.64	17.00%	19.59
\$100/bbl	66.80%	4.42	24.30%	28.0
\$120/bbl	66.99%	6.97	29.90%	35.94
\$140/bbl	67.21%	9.48	34.88%	43.64

\$25/bbl New Development



Alaska Hydrocarbons Fiscal Systems | © PFC Energy | Page 38 | 4 March 2013

ACES - \$25/bbl New Development, Standalone







	C
ECODOMIC	Summary
LCOHOINIC	Jannary

	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	74.31%	-1.62	8.31%	20.76
\$100/bbl	75.84%	0.5	13.11%	26.72
\$120/bbl	77.49%	2.11	16.56%	30.66
\$140/bbl	78.49%	3.64	19.58%	34.49

CS SB21 \$25/bbl New Development, Standalone, No GRE



CS SB 21, 16.7% Royalty, \$25/bbl New Development, No GRE

2039

 ∞

Gross Revenue

- - ATCF



Fees a serie	C
Economic	Summary
LCOHOIIIIC	Junnary

	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	66.93%	-4.08	6.32%	27.03
\$100/bbl	66.29%	-0.46	11.35%	40.1
\$120/bbl	67.34%	2.4	15.31%	48.48
\$140/bbl	67.50%	5.12	18.87%	54.85

то	NPV/boe	

PFC Energy	nerav	PFC
------------	-------	-----

Drillex

Opex

Capex

9 028 030 031 032 033 035 036

202 Year

Government Take

027 0

Smm

-200

-400 2012 15 16 0,0 0

Bracketed Progressivity (Net) \$25/bbl New Development, Standalone



Bracketed Progressivity (Net), 16.7% Royalty, \$25/bbl New Development



F		C	
FCOD	omic	Summary	1
	011110	o ann an an a	

	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	66.93%	-4.08	6.32%	27.03
\$100/bbl	59.37%	0.25	12.33%	40.1
\$120/bbl	60.71%	3.84	16.94%	51.76
\$140/bbl	64.68%	6.3	20.24%	63.42

PFC Energy

Drillex

030 032

ø 027 028 σ

20 202 Year

Government Take

036

Gross Revenue

 ∞ 040

4 035

- - ATCF

 ∞

Opex

Capex

-400 2012

4 9 σ

Bracketed Progressivity (Gross) \$25/bbl New Development, Standalone



Bracketed Progressivity (Gross), 16.7% Royalty, \$25/bbl New Development



	6
Economic	Summarv
LCOHOIIIIC	Jannary

	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	66.93%	-4.08	6.32%	27.03
\$100/bbl	59.37%	0.25	12.33%	40.1
\$120/bbl	60.58%	3.86	16.96%	51.76
\$140/bbl	64.26%	6.39	20.32%	63.42

PFC Energy

Drillex

030 032

ø 027 028 σ

20 202 Year

Government Take

036

Gross Revenue

 ∞ 040

4 5

- - ATCF

 ∞

Opex

Capex

-400 2012

4 9 σ

CS SB21 \$25/bbl New Development, Standalone, with GRE



CS SB 21, 16.7% Royalty, \$25/bbl New Development, with GRE



Economic	CUIDADAADA
Economic	Summarv

	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	66.93%	-4.08	6.32%	27.03
\$100/bbl	59.37%	0.25	12.33%	40.1
\$120/bbl	56.30%	4.4	17.41%	51.76
\$140/bbl	59.37%	7.48	21.18%	63.42

ACES - \$25/bbl New Development, Incremental



ACES, 16.7% Royalty, \$25/bbl New Development, Incremental to Incumbent



	~	
Economi	CSI	Immany
LCOHOIIII	0.00	anniary

	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	63.66%	1.29	15.81%	20.56
\$100/bbl	68.12%	4.24	26.30%	26.43
\$120/bbl	70.12%	6.82	38.62%	30.02
\$140/bbl	75.08%	6.54	31.02%	33.84

CS SB21 \$25/bbl New Development, Incremental



CS SB 21, 16.7% Royalty, \$25/bbl New Development, Incremental to Incumbent



	-
Economic	Summany
LCONDINIC	Juimary

	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	70.08%	-1.08	9.62%	19.22
\$100/bbl	68.80%	1.47	14.94%	27.23
\$120/bbl	68.25%	4.03	19.46%	35.25
\$140/bbl	67.95%	6.58	23.45%	43.26

Bracketed Progressivity (Net) \$25/bbl New Development, Incremental



Bracketed Progressivity (Net), 16.7% Royalty, \$25/bbl New Development, Incremental to Incumbent



	C
Economic	Summary
LCOHOINIC	Jannary

	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	64.17%	0.44	13.11%	20.88
\$100/bbl	64.66%	3.47	20.34%	28.76
\$120/bbl	66.03%	5.83	24.95%	36.16
\$140/bbl	66.79%	8.19	29.03%	43.56

Bracketed Progressivity (Gross) \$25/bbl New Development, Incremental



Bracketed Progressivity (Gross), 16.7% Royalty, \$25/bbl New Development, Incremental to Incumbent



	-
Economic	Summany
LCONDINIC	Juimary

	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	67.33%	-0.17	11.59%	19.78
\$100/bbl	66.41%	2.66	17.91%	28.19
\$120/bbl	66.70%	5.22	22.77%	36.15
\$140/bbl	66.95%	7.77	27.12%	43.89

CS SB 21 Competitiveness



Regime Competitiveness - \$80/bbl





Regime Competitiveness - \$100/bbl



Regime Competitiveness - \$120/bbl





Regime Competitiveness - \$140/bbl





Targeting Neutrality Directly



Alaska \$18/bbl Development under UK North Sea regime



UK North Sea, \$18/bbl New Development



Feenan	aia	CIIDA	100 O K0 /
ECONOR	1 C	Sum	marv

	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	62.79%	0.62	13.29%	30.66
\$100/bbl	62.46%	3.89	19.64%	38.58
\$120/bbl	62.31%	7.04	25.09%	46.5
\$140/bbl	62.23%	10.11	29.82%	54.42





Alaska \$18/bbl Development under Norway regime



Norway, \$18/bbl New Development



Economic	Summarv

	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	75.12%	-0.53	10.71%	25.65
\$100/bbl	76.44%	1.13	14.53%	29.36
\$120/bbl	77.04%	2.74	17.69%	34.6
\$140/bbl	77.38%	4.34	20.47%	39.93





Targeting Neutrality Directly

- All of the preceding regimes seek to compensate indirectly for the regressive nature of the fixed royalty and ad valorum tax by inserting a roughly equal and opposite progressive element
- Inevitably, the match must be imperfect
- At low prices, government take is still very high and for high cost developments, the fixed royalty can create a high level of price downside risk, particularly in conjunction with the gross minimum tax
- The only way to create a completely neutral regime is to counteract the regressive elements directly – either by eliminating or perfectly opposing them
 - Since royalties are contractual, and ad valorum taxes shared with local government, if this were desired, putting
 in place a perfect offset might be easier than elimination
 - All that would be required to achieve this would be a fully reimbursable tax credit equal to the amount of royalty and ad valorum tax paid
 - A completely neutral regime could increase downside price risk to the state, but would also lead to an even sharing of risk and reward
 - Many major OECD oil producing states with profit-based taxes have chosen to eliminate regressive elements altogether - ie Australia, UK, Norway – because of the distorting impact such elements have on investment
- The following slides model a 42.5% Profit-Based Production Tax rate, combined with a fully reimbursable tax credit equal to the amount of royalty and ad valorum tax paid (or the eventual elimination or one or both of those elements



Profit Tax Only (Royalty and Ad Valorum Reimbursed) Base Production



Profit Tax Only, Base Production



-		-
Econo	mic	Summany
LCONO	LINC.	Juilliary

	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	64.76%	4.23		19.27
\$100/bbl	64.80%	6.06		27.7
\$120/bbl	64.81%	7.9		36.13
\$140/bbl	64.82%	9.74		44.57

Profit Tax Only (Royalty and Ad Valorum Reimbursed) \$18/bbl New Development, Standalone



Profit Tax Only, \$18/bbl New Development



F = = = = = = : =	C
Fronomic	Summary
LCOHOIIIIC	Junnary

	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	65.70%	0.23	12.48%	29.25
\$100/bbl	65.35%	3.21	18.39%	36.41
\$120/bbl	65.20%	6.09	23.42%	43.67
\$140/bbl	65.11%	8.9	27.77%	50.96

Profit Tax Only (Royalty and Ad Valorum Reimbursed) \$18/bbl New Development, Incremental



Profit Tax Only, \$18/bbl New Development, Incremental to Incumbent



-		~
Eco	nomic	Summany
LUU		Juimary

	GT0	NPV/boe	IRR	Cash Margin
\$80/bbl	64.87%	1.85	17.38%	20.75
\$100/bbl	64.87%	4.57	23.92%	29.25
\$120/bbl	64.87%	7.28	29.46%	37.76
\$140/bbl	64.87%	9.99	34.34%	46.27

Notice

This material is protected by United States copyright law and applicable international treaties including, but not limited to, the Berne Convention and the Universal Copyright Convention. Except as indicated, the entire content of this publication, including images, text, data, and look and feel attributes, is copyrighted by PFC Energy. PFC Energy strictly prohibits the copying, display, publication, distribution, or modification of any PFC Energy materials without the prior written consent of PFC Energy.

These materials are provided for the exclusive use of PFC Energy clients (and/or registered users), and may not under any circumstances be transmitted to third parties without PFC Energy approval.

PFC Energy has prepared the materials utilizing reasonable care and skill in applying methods of analysis consistent with normal industry practice, based on information available at the time such materials were created. To the extent these materials contain forecasts or forward looking statements, such statements are inherently uncertain because of events or combinations of events that cannot reasonably be foreseen, including the actions of governments, individuals, third parties and market competitors. ACCORDINGLY, THESE MATERIALS AND THE INFORMATION CONTAINED THEREIN ARE PROVIDED "AS IS" WITHOUT WARRANTY OF ANY KIND, EITHER EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO THE IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY, ACCURACY, OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE. Conclusions presented herein are intended for information purposes only and are not intended to represent recommendations on financial transactions such as the purchase or sale of shares in the companies profiled in this report.

PFC Energy has adjusted data where necessary in order to render it comparable among companies and countries, and used estimates where data may be unavailable and or where company or national source reporting methodology does not fit PFC Energy methodology. This has been done in order to render data comparable across all companies and all countries.

This report reflects information available to PFC Energy as of the date of publication. Clients are invited to check our web site periodically for new updates.

© PFC Energy, Inc. License restrictions apply. Distribution to third parties requires prior written consent from PFC Energy.



NORTH AMERICA

PFC Energy, Washington 1300 Connecticut Avenue, NW Suite 800 Washington, DC 20036, USA Tel +1 202 872 1199 Fax +1 202 872 1219

PFC Energy, Houston 2727 Allen Parkway, Suite 1300 Houston, Texas 77019, USA Tel +1 713 622 4447 Fax +1 713 622 4448

EUROPE

PFC Energy, France 19 rue du Général Foy 75008 Paris, France Tel +33 1 4770 2900 Fax +33 1 4770 5905

RUSSIA

PFC Energy, Moscow 10 Vozdvizhenka Street Voentorg building, Suite 341 Moscow, 125009 Russian Federation Tel +7 (495) 797 3733

ASIA

PFC Energy, Kuala Lumpur

Level 27, UBN Tower #21 10 Jalan P. Ramlee 50250 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia Tel +60 3 2172 3400 Fax +60 3 2072 3599

PFC Energy, China 89 Jianguo Road China Central Place # 4-1602 Chaoyang District, Beijing 100025, China Tel +86 10 6530 7010 Fax +86 10 6530 5093

PFC Energy

PFC Energy, Singapore 15 Scotts Road Thong Teck Building, #08-04 Singapore 228218 Tel +65 6736 4317

www.pfcenergy.com | info@pfcenergy.com