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NGI’s LNG Insight Methodology & “How to Read” Guide

Natural Gas Intelligence’s (NGI) LNG Insight is a daily pricing, data and news service targeting the North American Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) market. With more than 30 years of adding transparency to natural gas markets through its reports and services, NGI aims to shed light on the evolving LNG market with its newest offering.

Developed in collaboration with the North American LNG and natural gas markets and first published in October 2019, NGI’s LNG Insight aims to provide a global perspective on the North American natural gas market, particularly as the United States assumes a larger role in the worldwide LNG industry.

This document serves as both a methodology and a “how to read” guide for the various LNG-related charts, graphs and tables we publish each business day. For more information, please contact us at lng@naturalgasintel.com.

Previous 5 Trading Days
Summary Table

The Summary Table on page 1 provides a quick snapshot of key data from the 20 different charts and data tables we publish in each day in LNG Insight. Our goal in providing data from the previous 5 trading days is to allow readers to pick up on trends and relationships that may be forming in the marketplace in one concise, easy to read format.
North America Focused Content

**NGI’s U.S. Gulf Coast LNG Netback Prices (12-Month Strip)**

Our **U.S. Gulf Coast Netback Prices** table aims to measure the value of LNG sold on a Free On Board (FOB) basis in the U.S. Gulf Coast by starting with the futures prices of natural gas in both Asia and Europe, and deducting from that shipping costs to move LNG from Sabine Pass to those respective markets. The highest netback from the three individual routes we consider is the resulting netback price for each month.

For example, in the chart below, the November Japan/Korea futures price is $5.820/MMBtu, and the estimated round-trip cost to transport LNG from Sabine Pass to, and back from, that part of the world is $2.551/MMBtu. The resulting netback from that route is therefore $3.269/MMBtu. Applying the same formula to the National Balancing Point (U.K.) and the Title Transfer Facility (Netherlands) yields respective netbacks of $4.046/MMBtu and $3.865/MMBtu. $4.046 is the highest of the three – or maximum as we call it in the chart - and thus is the November Gulf Coast netback price for that day.

**Example Calculation of NGI’s U.S. Gulf Coast LNG Netback Price**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Figures in $US/MMBtu</th>
<th>JPN/KOR</th>
<th>National Balancing Point (NBP)*</th>
<th>Title Transfer Facility (TTF)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November Futures Price</td>
<td>$5.820</td>
<td>$5.340</td>
<td>$5.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Round Trip Shipping Costs from Sabine Pass</td>
<td>$2.551</td>
<td>$1.294</td>
<td>$1.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Gulf Coast Netback</td>
<td>$3.269</td>
<td>$4.046</td>
<td>$3.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Netback (&amp; therefore the overall November Gulf Coast Netback Price):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4.046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Because the NBP and TTF contracts trade in pence/therm and Euro/MWh, respectively, we convert them to $US/MMBtu, based on the current forex futures strip for each currency. We list actual NBP and TTF prompt month futures settles in a different table, as shown in the Prompt Month Global NatGas Futures Settlements section below.

We calculate the U.S. Gulf Coast LNG netback prices in the same manner for the next 11 months, using relevant futures contract prices, shipping rate assumptions and exchange rates for each listed month.

Higher Gulf Coast netback prices certainly indicate stronger international LNG demand, but we also believe they could lead to increased pipeline gas flows into the Gulf Coast region, which in turn could impact U.S. regional natural gas basis differentials.

One of the key inputs we use to calculate months 2-12 shipping costs is the **West of Suez LNG Vessel Rate Curve**, a chart we describe in more detail on page 5. Since these shipping costs are based on historical seasonality, the resulting netback curve may not necessarily reflect what current conditions the market may be discounting. However, we believe this chart offers the industry a comparative baseline as to where the next 12 months of Gulf Coast netback prices likely would be, assuming current market vessel rates and historical vessel rate seasonality hold.
Understanding the LNG Production Margin

Subtracting current Henry Hub futures contracts from our Gulf Coast Netback prices yields an estimated LNG production margin at Sabine Pass, which is another measure used by the industry to estimate relative global demand for LNG. The higher this difference/margin, the more U.S. LNG is in demand, and the more robust LNG liquefaction gross margins in the Gulf Coast become, everything else being equal. We believe this is similar to the “cryo-spread” figure Tellurian Inc. publishes each day.

How Does NGI Calculate Shipping Costs?

Each of our shipping costs represents the estimated round-trip cost to transport LNG from Sabine Pass to Asia and Europe, and are based on the following assumptions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NGI Shipping Route Calculation Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Routes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessel Size (m³)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessel Propulsion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assume cold vessel?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spot &amp; Yr West of Suez Vessel Headline Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballast Leg Discount?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes ballast bonus/repositioning fees?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoots (both Laden &amp; Ballast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolloff/Fuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolloff (both Laden &amp; Ballast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolloff (in port)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heav</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Port Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunker Fuel (mt/d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spot Houston 380 Candtstoke Bunker Fuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m³ to MMbtu Conversion Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ship broker fees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Routes</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>JPN/KOR</th>
<th>NBP</th>
<th>TTF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receiving Port</td>
<td>Corp</td>
<td>Milford Haven</td>
<td>Gate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipping Days (one-way)</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Shipping Days*</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal Fees</td>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Fees</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes port days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Forward Vessel Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Based on current spot market and 1-year TC rates for a 174,000 m³ XDF/MEGI vessel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* First month of curve equals the spot price, simple average of all curves equals the one-year rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Months 2-12 shaped based on historical seasonality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Calculations for months 2-12 include relevant commodity prices and exchange rates for each of those months, along with our estimate of what a 12-month forward strip may look like, based on the current $USD spot market and 1-year time charter rates for a 174,000 m³ (cubic meters) two-stroke vessel published by Fearnleys AS, along with historical seasonality. For more information, please see the Spot Vessel Rate Forward Curve section below.

Please also be advised that our other assumptions, such as knots, boiloff percentages, number of days in port, etc. differ somewhat from those used by Fearnleys, so the various Sabine Pass-based shipping costs they calculate may also differ from our figures.

**Defining the Spot Month**

In our calculations, the spot month changes to the next month after the 15th of each month since that is the approximate date when the Asian futures contract expires.

For example, on the first trading day after Oct. 15, the spot month would become December for all the futures contracts in the table, even though some of those other contracts would still be trading for November. This allows a way to remain consistent in the months measured.

In this example, the actual spot month Henry Hub contract (November) does not expire until the third to last trading day of the month, and the two European contracts go off the board one trading day later. In order to fill this coverage gap, we continue to list the actual spot market contracts for each of the futures prices in our separate Prompt Month Global NatGas Futures Settlements table, as shown on Page 8.

**Spot Month Sabine Pass Export Landed Price Arbitrage Continuation Chart**

The Spot Month Sabine Pass Export Landed Price Arbitrage Continuation Chart represents what the spreads have been over the last year to ship LNG from Sabine Pass to the Gate Terminal in the Netherlands, and to the Futtsu Terminal in Japan.

These calculations incorporate feed gas and variable liquefaction charges, which we assume to be 115% of the current Henry Hub futures contract (in accordance with the Cheniere Energy Inc. methodology for some of its contractual arrangements), along with the total shipping charges (variable and the fixed cost of the charter vessel) we list in the Gulf Coast Netback table. Comparing the two calculations also suggests how much more advantageous it is to send LNG from Sabine Pass to Europe vs. Asia, although that of course depends on the actual terminal to which the LNG is shipped.
For example, if the spot TTF futures contract is $5.235/MMBtu, the spot Henry Hub futures contract is $2.214/MMBtu, and the shipping cost between Sabine Pass and the Gate Terminal in the Netherlands is $1.370/MMBtu, then the spread between Sabine Pass and Gate is $5.235 - $1.370 – ($2.214*1.15) = $1.319/MMBtu.

Our calculations only assume landed prices, or delivery to the respective regasification terminals, and include neither regasification fees nor any charges to access the pipeline grid. This is an important consideration, since JPN/KOR is a pure LNG price, whereas NBP and TTF are delivered-to-pipeline prices. As a result, one should also include the variable costs of regasification and variable charges to access the pipeline grids in the UK (NBP) and the Netherlands (TTF), to get a better measure for the true arbitrage spread to those European nations. We believe such variable charges tend to range between US$0.10-$0.50/MMBtu. Such an adjustment is not necessary for cargoes to Asia, once again because JPN/KOR futures are a pure LNG price.

West of Suez LNG Vessel Rate Curve

The spot market vessel rate curve we publish each day serves two main functions. First, it is a major component in our monthly shipping rates calculations, which we need to fill out months 2-12 of our Gulf Coast Netback table. Second, it indicates what spot market LNG vessel rates could look like for the next 12 months, based on current LNG vessel rates and historical seasonality.

Our West of Suez LNG Vessel Rate Curve is not an actual traded curve. Rather, it is something we impute based on the current one-month spot market rate for a 174,000 m³ XDF/MEGI vessel in the Atlantic Basin, the 1-yr term contract rate for the same vessel, and historical spot market rate seasonality. Said differently, our spot LNG vessel rate curve indicates what the expected Atlantic Basin spot rate should be for the next 12 months if current LNG spot vessel rates, current LNG 1-year term charter rates and historical vessel rate seasonality all hold.

The average of our individual 12-month rates will equal the current 1-year term contract rate.

We also list absolute prices for the curve in the table on the lower righthand corner on page 5.
Other North America LNG Netback Prices

In addition to our signature Gulf of Mexico LNG netback price, we also calculate netback prices to Cove Point, MD; Kitimat, BC; and Costa Azul, MX. Our methodology for these three locations is exactly the same as that described above for the Gulf of Mexico, in that we start with gas prices in Asia and Europe, and deduct LNG shipping costs from those to determine the maximum netback price at each location for the next twelve months. We then compare that forward LNG netback strip to the forward curve for the nearest physical market index in order to determine the LNG production margin at each location. We also include Waha forward prices in a separate column, because we believe more U.S. LNG purchases will be tied to this index in the coming years.


As of this writing (May 2020), the LNG Canada facility in Kitimat, BC, was scheduled to enter service by 2025, and Sempra Energy had yet to reach its final investment decision on building export capability at the exiting Costa Azul import terminal. Obviously, the netback prices we publish for these two locations are not based on any actual LNG flows. However, we believe these figures will allow the industry to monitor the theoretical profitability of these two locations over time, and will help the market understand how seasonal physical market price movements in Western Canada and near the California/Mexico border could impact the economics of these two locations over the coming years.
NGI’s U.S. LNG Export Tracker

Our **U.S. LNG Export Tracker** is created each trading morning and shows the number of dekatherms (Dth) that have been nominated via the pipelines serving each of the six U.S. LNG liquefaction facilities in the lower 48 (L48) states for that gas day. Because we create the tracker in the morning (U.S. Eastern Time), the flows are based on the best nomination cycle at the time, which tends to be the evening cycle.

However, we realize more gas may be nominated during the subsequent three intraday cycles, so we also perform another scrape of the various pipeline electronic bulletin boards the next day, to ensure we bank the final total. For example, in the chart above, the 3.61 million Dth for July 16 represent flows based on the evening cycle, whereas the 9 days before that are all adjusted figures taken after the final intraday 3 nomination cycles for those flow days. However, if that 3.61 million Dth preliminary figure for July 16 were to change, we would show the updated and final number in following versions of that table.

**NGI’s Daily Henry Hub Spot Index vs. Prompt (CME) Futures Contract**

The Henry Hub in Erath, LA, continues to gain prominence as a global natural gas pricing benchmark, especially as U.S. sourced LNG increases its global market share. The prompt Henry Hub futures contract expires three trading days before the start of the next calendar month, and while laws of market arbitrage dictate that cash and futures prices must converge at the moment the futures contract goes off the board, those two prices can vary greatly in the days prior to expiration. Our Daily Henry Hub Spot Index vs. Prompt (CME) Futures Contract table compares the percentage difference in NGI’s day-ahead Henry Hub spot market index found in our **NGI’s Daily Gas Price Index** service to the prompt month Henry Hub CME futures contract for each trading day during the previous 12 months. Any historically wide percentage difference suggests that one (or both) of the two markets may be in for a significant price change, especially if that wide differential still exists closer to the final trading day of the futures contract.

For more information about our daily, weekly and monthly North American natural gas price indexes, please visit our [website](#).
General/Global Focused Content

Prompt Month Global NatGas Futures Prices

Daily settlement prices in this table appear in both local currency/measurement units and $USD/MMBtu, based on the current spot market exchange rate for the two European futures contracts.

Note these prompt month contracts all settle at different points throughout the month. For example, the JPM/KOR futures contract tends to settle on or around the 15th of each month, while Henry Hub futures expire on the third to last trading day before the start of the next month. The two European contracts go off the board on the penultimate trade day of the month.

After the expiration of all four prompt month futures contracts listed in this chart, we will start listing prices for the next prompt futures month on the first trading day of that next calendar month. For example, assume the November JPN/KOR futures expires October 15th, the November Henry Hub futures contract expires October 29, and the two November European contracts expire October 30. We would begin listing December futures contract information (the next prompt futures month) on the first trading day of November (the next calendar month).
Global Natural Gas Futures Settles

Our global natural gas futures settle table expands upon our Prompt Month Global NatGas Futures Price table by providing next 12-month and next complete three-year calendar strips for the Henry Hub, JPN/KOR and TTF futures contracts. Each curve is expressed in $US/MMbtu. Both the Henry Hub and JPN/KOR contracts trade in $US/MMbtu, but because TTF trades in Euro/MWh, we convert those to $US/MMBtu by bootstrapping a Euro/USD foreign exchange forward curve for each relevant month.

Please note these curves only list futures prices, and do not incorporate any shipping costs to move gas between the U.S. and Asia/Europe. As a result, these curves should not be taken as a direct proxy for the economics of shipping gas from the U.S to Asia/Europe, or between Asia & Europe. However, the wider these spreads, the more in the money such transactions are likely to be. This is particularly relevant for the so-called 2nd wave of proposed North American LNG export facilities, as many of those projects have yet to reach FID.

Fearnleys LNG Freight Costs & Spot LNG Vessel Rates

Each day, we republish with permission certain key LNG shipping data provided by Fearnleys, one of the world’s most prominent shipbrokers.

The Fearnleys charts provide spot market vessel rates and related charges for steam turbine, TFDE and two stroke vessels (XDF & MEGI) in both the Atlantic (West) and Pacific (East) Basins.
In addition, Fearnleys provides NGI with LNG freight cost calculations for certain key routes throughout the world and breaks those down by the three propulsion classes.

We believe these charts provide an excellent reference point for shipping costs around the world. As noted before, our Sabine Pass route calculations may differ a bit from those in the Fearnleys charts, because our assumptions are somewhat different (see page 3 for our assumptions).

For more information about these Fearnleys data, please go to www.fearnleys.com.

Europe & Asia Weather Data

According to data from the International Group of Liquefied Natural Gas Importers (GIIGNL), Europe and Asia accounted for 93% of global LNG imports in 2019, and weather is a key driver of consumption in both regions. Our daily Europe & Asia Weather Data chart shows actual and normal average temperatures for the trailing 365 days in Northwest Europe, Beijing, Seoul, and Tokyo.

Weather is certainly not the only determinant of demand in these two continents, but we believe the historical normal temperature curve, which is based on data from the previous 30 years, is a good approximation for the load profile and seasonality in each of these markets. Notice the shape of the 30-year normal curve is different for each of these areas. For example, Northwest Europe tends to have cooler summers than those in Asia, while winters in Beijing are typically colder than they are in Seoul and Japan. All these regions have a somewhat different load profile from that in the United States. So, to the extent that these areas are having an atypically mild or cold winter/summer, that could impact demand for U.S. cargoes that runs counter to historical U.S.-only seasonal consumption.
Asia Focused Content

While Europe serves as the market of “last resort” for LNG, thanks in large part to its ample underground storage capacity, Asia’s high demand for the fuel often times makes it the market of “first resort” for LNG shippers. According to GLIGNL, Asia accounted for 69% of global LNG imports in 2019, led by Japan, China, and South Korea. Moreover, we believe overall LNG demand tends to be less price sensitive in Asia than in Europe, because several key Asian energy consuming countries have relatively low to no access to pipeline gas and other fuel sources.

Estimated Sabine Pass / Asia 12-Month Forward Arbitrage Curve

This chart shows the economics of shipping LNG from Sabine Pass to Asia (specifically, to the Futtsu import facility near Tokyo, Japan) for the next twelve months. Our methodology is similar to the calculation we use in our Sabine Pass / Gate (Europe) 12-month arbitrage curve chart, in that we start by taking 115% of the Henry Hub price, and add to that our estimate of shipping costs between Sabine Pass and Japan for each month in the forward curve. We also calculate separate variable cost only and total cost curves, for the reasons explained on pages 13-14.

However, there are two main differences between Asia and Europe one should keep in mind when comparing our Asian and European Arbitrage Curves. First, LNG delivered into Asia tends to change hands at sea, which means the JPN/KOR futures prices are much more of an LNG price than the TTF price in Europe. One does not have to factor in any regasification or pipeline access fees for Asian deliveries, as is the case for LNG cargoes shipped to Europe. Second, negative portions of this Asia arbitrage curve are...
not necessarily a signal that U.S. cargo shut-ins may be forthcoming, because those cargoes could still be injected into underground storage facilities in Europe, the so-called market of last resort. But a deeply negative curve does potentially eliminate Asia as a destination for U.S. cargoes, and that could place downward pressure on both the Henry Hub and U.S. Gulf of Mexico FOB LNG prices.

**Daily Prompt Oil Linked Asia Parity Prices**

Our Daily Prompt Oil Linked Asia Parity Prices chart lists the current spot market value of LNG delivered to Asia, the current actual slope of that Asian LNG price, the theoretical maximum 17.2% slope vs. the current spot Brent crude price, and the estimated cost of coal in Japan. We also calculate the 17.2% slope vs. the trailing three-month average of the Japan Crude Cocktail price, as that is a common reference point as well.

According to GIIGNL, which we believe is one of the most referred to sources in the LNG industry, Asia represented 69% of global LNG demand in 2019, and the majority of LNG contracts in that region are linked to Brent crude oil prices. As a result, Brent prices tend to serve as a cap on Asian LNG prices.

The percentage of Brent at which LNG is priced, also called the slope, can vary. Historically, it has tended to be more than 14%, but as of this writing, we believe new contracts were being signed more in the 11%-12% range.

Our oil parity price uses a slope of 17.2% of Brent, which we believe is a bit more conservative, since it is based on the reciprocal of the 5.8-to-1 heating value equivalent to a
barrel of crude oil to one MMBtu of natural gas. As such, this should be the theoretical maximum slope at which Asian LNG should trade against crude, something that occurred two times in the chart below.

We also show the estimated price of coal in Japan, which is based on the prompt month Australia Newcastle Coal futures price, plus the current cost of transport to ship coal from Australia to Japan. Unlike how Brent Oil Price Parity tends to serve as a hard cap on JKM prices, coal prices do not necessarily serve as an absolute floor on LNG prices in Asia, but they do show the area in which coal becomes more economic relative to gas fired generation in the region.

Europe Focused Content

Europe tends to be the “market of last resort” for LNG cargoes, because of its extensive underground storage network and well-established physical pipeline network. As a result, if U.S. sourced LNG cannot work its way into Europe, then there is an increased probability that these American cargoes may be cancelled, or “shut in,” everything else being equal.

There are a number of reasons that U.S. LNG cargoes may not be able to discharge in Europe, including realized prices in Europe that are less than the variable transportation costs between those two markets, otherwise profitable U.S. LNG cargoes are still more expensive than local European prices, or storage in the European Union (EU) could be full. We assess these various factors via the following charts:

**Estimated Sabine Pass / Gate 12-Month Forward LNG Arbitrage Curve**

This chart shows the potential for U.S. LNG shut-ins by subtracting the landed price of Sabine Pass sourced LNG versus the TTF price for each of the next twelve months. We calculate the various landed prices by taking 115% of the monthly Henry Hub futures price and adding our estimate of shipping costs between Sabine Pass and the Gate Terminal in the Netherlands for those the next twelve months.

Those shipping costs can have both a fixed (sunk) and a variable (incremental) component to them, depending on how one treats the expense of procuring an LNG vessel. Similar to the obligations faced by firm transportation take-or-pay pipeline shippers in the United States, who must pay those fees regardless of whether they use that capacity, LNG shippers are on the hook for vessel charter fees no matter their usage. As a result, these are sunk, or non-incremental costs, and existing holders of LNG
vessels will be more concerned about covering the variable, or incremental costs of transporting LNG. We show this via our **variable cost only arbitrage curve**, in which we only include boil-off, fuel, port fees, and canal charges (where applicable) in our calculated shipping costs.

Our **total cost arbitrage curve** includes all shipping costs, including the variable costs mentioned above, and the expense of chartering an LNG vessel. Such a curve is more appropriate for entities who do not already have an LNG vessel, because for them, chartering a vessel is a variable cost.

Said differently, our variable cost-only arbitrage curve should be used by existing shippers who have LNG vessel capacity already, while our total cost arbitrage curve is more appropriate for 1.) entities who are considering entering the LNG space, and 2.) analysts who are looking at the long-term competitiveness of U.S. sourced LNG. The higher the total cost-only arbitrage window, the greater the potential threat for other LNG players to enter the market.

Complicating this analysis is the fact that the TTF is a pipeline price, so one should also include the variable costs of LNG regasification and accessing the Dutch pipeline grid in order to create a true apples-to-apples comparison. We have elected to exclude such fees from our arbitrage window calculations, for the sake of simplicity, and because actual variable costs can differ greatly among shippers. We believe a representative range of them is somewhere between $0.10 and $0.50 per MMBtu, depending on the regasification facility. So, those looking for “fully loaded” arbitrage window calculations should add another $0.10 to $0.50 to both the variable only and total cost arbitrage curves.
U.S. Landed vs. European Prices

U.S. LNG competes with natural gas delivered via pipeline in Europe, so even if the Sabine Pass-TTF arbitrage window is positive, meaning U.S. LNG is cheaper than gas in the Netherlands, it could still be the case that U.S. LNG is more expensive than gas prices in other European countries.

Our U.S. Landed vs European Prices chart compares the landed price of U.S. LNG at the Gate Terminal in the Netherlands (“Gate Landed Price,” or GLP) to the prompt futures price in Belgium, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Slovakia, Spain, and the U.K. Negative values in the “Diff to GLP” column indicate that imported U.S. LNG from the Gulf of Mexico is more expensive than the local price.

Note our GLP calculation only includes variable shipping costs and does not include the charter cost of the vessel. We also exclude any additional European variable costs from this calculation, such as regasification and pipeline access fees. For more on these costs, please see the Estimated Sabine Pass / Gate 12-Month Forward Arbitrage Curve section above.

European Spark/Dark Spreads

The combination of coal and natural gas fired generation typically accounts for between 30%-40% of European Union electricity generation, not an insignificant figure. However, the relative percentage use of those two competing fuels at any particular time depends heavily on just how economic each is in producing electricity.

Each day, we calculate the gross margin of producing power in Europe by natural gas via the spark spread, and the comparative gross margin for generating European electricity by coal by way of the dark spread.
Dirty spark and dark spreads only consider the input fuel cost of generating electricity, while clean spark and dark spreads also include the cost of emissions in Europe (and in the case of the United Kingdom, the local Carbon Support levy).

The more economic the clean spark spread is to the clean dark spread, the more likely Europe will burn natural gas in favor of coal in generating electricity.

Our daily European Spark/Dark Spreads table features clean and dirty spark/dark spreads that we calculate for Belgium, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Slovakia, Spain, and the United Kingdom, based on applicable prompt month electricity, natural gas, and coal contracts for each country, and subject to the assumptions and formulas shown above.
Spanish PVB vs. Dutch TTF Futures

The Dutch Title Transfer Facility (TTF) is one of the most liquid natural gas pricing points in the world, and as a result, it tends to be used as a proxy for LNG prices in Europe. Because of this, we use TTF as the main European pricing point in our various LNG arbitrage calculations. However, TTF is a pipeline price, and therefore is likely more reflective of regional fundamentals rather than those in the global market.

We believe the emerging Punto Virtual de Balance (PVB) in Spain is a more representative price indicator of European LNG, because the Iberian peninsula receives a greater percentage of its total supply from cargoes than the rest of the continent. Spain also has an abundance of storage capacity and a relatively large number of regasification facilities with reloading capability, making it a more of an “LNG friendly” destination.

As of May 2020, the TTF futures contract had more than 100x the open interest of its nascent PVB counterpart, meaning it will likely be quite some time before the PVB gains broader market acceptance. However, the PVB still provides useful price signals, as the contract tends to trade at a premium to TTF. The greater the premium, the greater the price advantage LNG enjoys over pipeline gas in Europe.

European Union Gas Storage

Another potential shut-in signal for U.S. (and globally sourced) LNG cargoes is the amount of gas in storage in Europe since the continent tends to serve as a last resort destination for LNG shipments. The fuller European gas storage, the less likely Europe will be able or willing to accept additional cargoes, among other considerations.

Each day, we run the following European Union Gas Storage chart, based on information furnished by Gas Infrastructure Europe. The top graph displays gas in storage relative to the high, low and average levels over the previous five years, the middle drills down into where current storage levels are compared to a year-ago, and to the previous five-year average, and the bottom display is a running total of gas in storage over the previous six-years, including where storage stood on the current chart date in
each of those years. That latter chart not only gives readers a sense of historical seasonality, but also highlights where current storage levels are compared to normal.

Note: Our EU storage figures do not include the Ukraine, which is a non-EU country. We list Ukrainian storage in a separate table, as described below.

**Ukraine Gas Storage**

Historically, the sizable natural gas storage capacity in the Ukraine existed primarily to serve Gazprom, but that has changed dramatically in recent months. In April 2019, Ukrtransgaz, which manages storage and the country’s transmission system operator, began to open its system and incentive non-Gazprom buyers and sellers with discounted transportation tariffs and exemptions from customs duties.

The Ukraine is not part of the European Union, and as such, GIE does not include Ukrainian storage in its main Europe storage count, hence our decision to publish a separate Ukraine storage table each day. However, we believe the new accessibility of storage in the Ukraine provides a significant secondary
source of storage capacity in Europe, which should help extend and build upon Europe’s existing role as the global LNG market of last resort.

**European Union LNG Regas Terminal Gas Storage**

Our European Union LNG Regas Terminal Storage table shows daily changes in on-site storage levels at a number of key LNG import facilities in the region. Storage capacity at the various European regasification terminals represents a very small fraction of total European underground storage, and therefore does not act as a substitute for or complement to our European Union Gas Storage table described above.

However, we believe monitoring the daily percentage of storage utilization at these regasification facilities can help yield clues about their collective ability to receive more cargoes in the short-term. Between January 2013 and April 2020, the average storage capacity utilization of the European regasification facilities listed in the adjacent table was 48.7%, so any current figure close to this total indicates recent European regasification activity has been operating close to normal. The maximum utilization since 2013 is 80%, meaning any utilization approaching that figure indicates these facilities may be effectively full. Similarly, storage at these regasification terminals was never lower than 22.7% during this time period, which suggests any capacity figure close to 23% means more cargoes are needed.

![European Union LNG Regas Terminal Storage Table](chart.png)

Source: NGI calculations, GIE
Latin America Focused Content

Latin America DES Prices

Our Latin America DES Prices table aims to measure the price of LNG for the next three months that is delivered ex-ship to Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Chile, Mexico East (Altamira), Mexico West (Manzanillo), and Panama. These prices are essentially cost-plus, or net forward prices, that start with cost of LNG from a source country on an FOB basis and include estimated shipping costs to transport LNG from the source to the destination country. Our calculations are based on the following assumptions:

1.) The shipping routes we consider are heavily influenced by the source country of recent LNG imports into each nation. In most cases, those have been primarily from the U.S. or Trinidad & Tobago, especially since more L48 liquefaction capacity has come online, but we also consider reloaded cargoes from Europe.

2.) For U.S. and Trinidad-based cargoes, we use the netbacks we calculate in our U.S. Gulf Coast LNG Netback Prices table as the starting FOB price, and for Europe FOB prices, we use Spanish PVB futures prices, since as explained earlier in this document, we believe PVB prices are a closer representation of the LNG market than are the more commonly referred to TTF prices.

3.) The shipping costs we add to our U.S. netback and PVB futures prices are based on a 160,000 m³ DFTE/TFTE vessel, as opposed to our U.S. GOM calculations, which are based on a 174,000 m³ XDF/MEGI sized ship.

4.) Our published DES prices are the minimum delivered price from the U.S. GOM and Spain for each location.
LNG Data Suite

NGI provides a portion of the data featured in this methodology in both Microsoft Excel format, as part of our datafeeds via API, and through our channel partners. The data suite offers daily netback prices, arbitrage curves, U.S. LNG export flow data, shipping costs, vessel rate curves (West of Suez), landed prices, Latin America DES Prices, and Slope-to-Brent Prices (Slopes). For more information about this service and the data series included, click here.

For more information on how to download/scrape these data, please see our Data Spec & Automation page.

When Are the Various LNG Insight Tables Updated Each Day?

NGI’s LNG Insight is available in both pdf and html (website) formats. While we generally send out the PDF by 6 p.m. Eastern Time each business day, we do update the html versions of our content continuously throughout the day, according to the following schedule (charts/tables listed in order of appearance in the daily .pdf file):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chart/Table</th>
<th>Update Time (U.S. Eastern Time)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LNG Related News/Analysis</td>
<td>Throughout the day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prompt Month Statistics – Previous 5 Trading Days</td>
<td>Afternoon (usually after 4:00p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Gulf Coast LNG Netback Prices (12-Month Strip)</td>
<td>Afternoon (usually after 4:00p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spot Month Sabine Pass Export Landed Price Arbitrage Continuation Chart</td>
<td>Afternoon (usually after 4:00p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other North America LNG Netback Prices</td>
<td>Afternoon (usually after 4:00p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. LNG Export Tracker</td>
<td>Morning (usually by 10:00a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGI’s Daily Henry Hub Spot Index vs. Prompt (CME) Futures Contract</td>
<td>Morning (usually by 10:00a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearnleys LNG Freight Costs &amp; Spot LNG Vessel Rates</td>
<td>Morning (usually by 10:00a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of Suez LNG Vessel Rate Curve</td>
<td>Afternoon (usually after 4:00p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prompt Month Global LNG &amp; NatGas Futures Prices</td>
<td>Afternoon (usually after 4:00p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Sabine Pass / Asia 12-Month Forward LNG Arbitrage Curves</td>
<td>Afternoon (usually after 4:00p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Prompt Oil Linked Asia Parity Prices</td>
<td>Afternoon (usually after 4:00p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe &amp; Asia Weather Data</td>
<td>Afternoon (usually after 4:00p)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Disclaimers, Limitation of Warranty & Liability

The Information contained in this newsletter (our Content) is intended as a professional reference tool. You are responsible for using professional judgment and for confirming and interpreting the data reported in our Content before using or relying on such information. OUR CONTENT IS PROVIDED "AS IS" AND WE DISCLAIM ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING THE IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY AND FITNESS FOR YOUR PARTICULAR PURPOSE. Although we believe our Content to be complete and accurate as described therein, we make no representations regarding completeness or accuracy. We will not be liable for any damage or loss of any kind arising out of or resulting from access or lack of access to or use of our Content, including but not limited to your reliance on it, errors in the data it contains, and data loss or corruption, regardless of whether such liability is based in tort, contract or otherwise. NGI’s full Subscriber Agreement is available here: naturalgasintel.com/TOC

For more information, please contact us at

lng@naturalgasintel.com