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Wood Mackenzie – Upstream Supply Chain Function

Infrastructure demand/operations & service supply – research & consulting
Upstream Supply Chain Service

• Delivers the industry's most complete set of solutions for drilling/rigs, subsea, marine construction, and facilities and fabrication

• Offers an integrated view of the market with transparent data, analysis and models that link equipment, services, costs and supply chain risk to asset and corporate valuations

• Understand supply and demand, benchmark against peers, assess costs, and confidently guide strategy

Use it to:

Dive deeply into offshore contracting strategies and supplier relationships

Identify future supply chain opportunities and FIDs

Forecast major deep water equipment demand

Track cost trends within major market segments

Strategically compare operator development behaviors

Analyze utilization and capacity of major supply chains

Trusted commercial intelligence
www.woodmac.com
What Upstream Supply Chain can do for you

The industry's most complete set of solutions for drilling/rigs, subsea, marine construction, and facilities and fabrication

- **12,000+** exploration, appraisal and development wells
- **7,000+** subsea trees and associated equipment
- **10,000+** offshore developments
- **1,200+** offshore drilling assets
- **19,000+** fixed and floating production facilities
- **500+** marine construction assets
- **400,000+** kilometres of offshore pipeline

**Use it to:**

- Dive deeply into offshore contracting strategies and supplier relationships
- Identify future supply chain opportunities and FIDs
- Forecast major deep water equipment demand
- Track cost trends within major market segments
- Strategically compare operator development behaviors
- Analyze utilization and capacity of major supply chains

For more information visit: [Wood Mackenzie Upstream Supply Chain](https://www.woodmac.com)
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Companies took drastic action after prices collapsed

Strategies have now moved from “survive” to “thrive”, but in a new state of the world

**US$140 billion**
Development capex cut 2016 vs. 2014 (-47%)

**US$62 billion**
Cuts to shareholder distributions

**US$130 billion**
Asset disposals since mid-2014

**Upstream capex ($ bn): Global**

- **N America yet to drill**
- **Pre-FID conventional**
- **Under development conventional**
- **Onstream**
- **Pre slump projection**

Source: Wood Mackenzie Corporate Benchmarking Tool. Figures relate to 50 largest IOCs only.

Source: Wood Mackenzie
We estimate the sector requires US$54/bbl Brent in 2018 & 2019

But a material uplift in price is required if we are to see significant cash flow generation and ultimately increasing shareholder returns.

Source: Argus, Wood Mackenzie forecast
Phased Offshore EPIC Capex

Pre-booked capital expenditure softens 2015 downturn as backlog burn plays out across the EPIC sector

Offshore Capex by Segment (US$m) (EPIC + Subsea Dev. Drilling)

Source: Wood Mackenzie

Offshore Capex by Region (US$m) (EPIC + Subsea Dev. Drilling)

Source: Wood Mackenzie

2017-2022 % split

Pipeline 37%
Platform 36%
Subsea Development Drilling 15%
Subsea EPIC 7%
Control Line 4%
Single Point Mooring 1%

2017-2022 % split

South America 25%
Asia Pacific/Middle East 25%
Africa/Mediterranean 19%
North Sea/Arctic 15%
North America 11%
Others 5%

Source: Wood Mackenzie
Consolidation Impact on the Supply Chain

Recent consolidation across the sectors constitutes c.22% of the total 2016 Capex related OFS industry. 20% is controlled by the “big three” integrated EPIC contractors – Schlumberger/TechnipFMC/GE-Baker.

2016FY Service Sector Sizing & Market Shares

### Market Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>$40.4bn</th>
<th>$44.0bn</th>
<th>$20.2bn</th>
<th>$13.1bn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schlumberger/Cameron</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flour</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technip</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saipem</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Group</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worley Parsons</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBR</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobs</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weatherford</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atwood</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noble</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halliburton</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE/Baker</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOV</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saipem</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Group</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saipem</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSME</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saipem</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heerema</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHI</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TechnipFMC</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amec Foster Wheeler</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Consolidation Impact

- **Drilling Managers**:
  - Transocean, 10.3%
  - Noble, 5.7%
  - Norwegian, 4.4%
  - Diamond Offshore, 3.8%
  - Atwood, 2.5%
  - Saipem, 2.2%

- **Drilling Equipment, Services & Completion**:
  - Transocean, 10.3%
  - Noble, 5.7%
  - Norwegian, 4.4%
  - Diamond Offshore, 3.8%
  - Atwood, 2.5%

- **Detailed Engineering**:
  - Transocean, 10.3%
  - Noble, 5.7%
  - Norwegian, 4.4%
  - Diamond Offshore, 3.8%
  - Atwood, 2.5%

- **Fixed Structure Fabrication**:
  - Transocean, 10.3%
  - Noble, 5.7%
  - Norwegian, 4.4%
  - Diamond Offshore, 3.8%
  - Atwood, 2.5%
Consolidation Impact on the Supply Chain (Continued)

As of 2016YE: Schlumberger 8%, TechnipFMC 7%, GE/Baker 4%. The current Wood Group/AMEC deal, if successful, will suck up 2% of the total OFS market and 26% of the global engineering sector.

### 2016FY Service Sector Sizing & Market Shares

**Market Value**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Floating Structure Fabrication</th>
<th>Subsea</th>
<th>SURF</th>
<th>Marine T&amp;I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technip FMC</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSME</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sembcorp Marine</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technip/FMC, 23.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technip/FMC, 20.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others, 18.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others, 9.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others, 37.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others, 28.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others, 32.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others, 24.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others, 22.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others, 20.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Technip/FMC, 23.5%**

Technip/FMC, 23.5%

**Floating Structure Fabrication**

Technip/FMC, 31.8%

**Subsea**

Technip/FMC, 23.5%

**SURF**

Technip/FMC, 23.5%

**Marine T&I**

Technip/FMC, 20.8%
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Historical Market Performance

Signs of recovery – Tree orders for 2017YE almost double of the 2016YE figure

Historical Subsea Tree Orderbook 2010-2017Q3

2013: Market Peak with 544 Tree Orders
2014: 239 Tree Orders
2015: 164 Tree Orders
2016: Market crashes 83 Tree Orders

≈2% inflation

33% cost deflation

Source: Wood Mackenzie Subsea Service
Subsea Tree Awards to 2021

The new normal for the subsea OEMs will be in the 250-270 trees/annum range.

Subsea Tree Awards Forecast to 2021

Water Depth %

Source: Wood Mackenzie Subsea Service
Upcoming FIDs in the next 18 months (Key Subsea Projects)

2018 is expected to see a significant uptake in FID activity, with several large delayed projects lined up for the green light.

- Johan Sverdrup Phs 2
- Snorre
- Cheviot
- Penguins A-E
- Skarfjell
- Johan Castberg project (DEC 17-Q4/Q1 order)
- Buzzard
- SNE
- GC Atlantis
- KC Tigris Project
- Geronggong
- Lingshui
- West Cape Three Points
- Tortue [FID Jan18]
- Troll Ph3
- Sea Lion & Sea Lion South
- Sea Lion & Sea Lion South
- Echidna/Kangaroo
- Mero Pilot
- Zinia
- Tigris
- Atlantis
- SNE
- Sea Lion & Sea Lion South
- 10-20 Subsea Trees
- 21-30 Subsea Trees
- +30 Subsea Trees
- Projects with recent FID or LOI

Source: Wood Mackenzie Global Project Tracker
DW rig day rates have remained rock-bottom through the fourth quarter of 2017

Rig managers remain reluctant to disclose fixture rates. However, those that have been announced suggest the bottom has been reached. We expect limited change in 2018.

Many drillers have eliminated their monthly fleet status reports and opted for non-disclosure.
- The drillers have been less inclined to publish many of their day rates as we believe a significant number are signed at or below cost.
- Tremendous pressure to keep rigs active and in service has encouraged drillers to bid unsustainably low rates on short-term contracts.

Leading-edge rates are down c.65% since their peak in 2014.
- All rig types have seen similar declines, though there has been particular softness in the UDW Drillship sector through 2017.
- Continued over-supply will keep a cap on rates for the next 18 months. Pricing power is unlikely to return until the backend of 2019.

Rate recovery will be driven by tightening utilisation and the high costs of reactivation.
- As utilisation begins to increase, the incremental costs associated with reactivating long-term cold-stacked assets will help pricing recover for the fleet of actively marketed rigs.
- We believe the floater market is now bottoming but current trough rates will persist until 2019 at the earliest.

Leading-edge rates: day rates presented by the year (or date/period) they were signed. Rates are sometime presented as ‘earned rates’. Earned rates are the average of all currently active contracts, and are therefore less sensitive to prevailing dynamics. Earned rates lag behind leading edge rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid Water (MW)</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deepwater (DW)</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultra-deepwater (UDW)</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDW Semisub (SS)</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDW Drillship (DS)</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basket Average</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Leading-edge rates: day rates presented by the year (or date/period) they were signed. Rates are sometime presented as ‘earned rates’. Earned rates are the average of all currently active contracts, and are therefore less sensitive to prevailing dynamics. Earned rates lag behind leading edge rates.
Base case rig supply/demand outlook for floating rigs: day rate recovery expected during H2-2019

Current trough rates will persist to H2-2019. Utilisation gains will begin to generate pricing power for active assets. High reactivation costs for cold stacked rigs will drive day rates higher

- Narrowing gap between supply and demand will generate pricing power during H2-2019
  - Current trough rates, with many contracts signed at or below breakeven, will persist until H2-2019
  - A flat demand outlook, driven by an equal quantity of attrition and additions, will lead to utilisation gains as demand recovers from 2019
  - Our base case view sees day rates rebounding above 2016 levels by H2-2019
  - Looking further ahead, day rates will rebound to 2015 levels by 2020, with further growth expected during 2021

- The high reactivation costs associated with long-term stacked floaters will further drive rate recovery
  - As utilisation rebounds, rig managers will turn to stacked assets to service demand. Reactivation and SPS costs for long term stacked rigs will help pricing recover for contract-ready assets

- Key risks to this forecast:
  - Oil prices fail to stabilise, meaning fewer FIDs
  - Lower level of attrition and greater reactivation activity boosts supply and reduces utilisation
  - Drilling efficiency improves more quickly than expected
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## EPIC/Subsea Supply Chain Evolution

Recent supply chain evolution can be categorised into cyclical and systematic reactions to the current oil price squeeze and the lack of development opportunities.

### Cyclical Evolution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bankruptcy, Ch11 &amp; Company Failings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMAS, Hallin, CEONA, Deep Flex, HARKAND, OCEANTEAM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tier 2 & 3 OSV players impacted first**

### Systematic Evolution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M&amp;A - Consolidation</th>
<th>New Business Models</th>
<th>Keywords</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TechnipFMC, FORSYS SUBSEA, GENESIS</td>
<td>iEPIC Model</td>
<td>simplification, execution efficiency, turn-key solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schlumberger, OneSubsea, subsea 7, KBR</td>
<td></td>
<td>reservoir understanding, execution efficiency, LoF services, turn-key solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE Oil &amp; Gas, BAKER HUGHES, Montemar, CBI</td>
<td>financing support</td>
<td>reservoir understanding, LoF services, aggressive pricing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montemar, AkerSolutions, Saipem</td>
<td></td>
<td>MDR – greater engineering, onshore exposure, turn-key solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOOD GROUP, amec foster wheeler, HALLIBURTON, Weatherford</td>
<td></td>
<td>Next consolidation prospect, distressed Tier 2 &amp; 3 EPC players</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Potential for further consolidation

Source: Wood Mackenzie Subsea Service
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Executive Summary

- **Context.** Wood Mackenzie’s 2017 Global Upstream Cost Survey captured industry views from over 170 respondents, representing all key regions, company groups and resource themes.

- **Cost changes over last 12 months.** Across the 8 major spend categories the industry observed cost reductions of 6-11%, compared to 13-23% observed in last year’s survey.

- **Expectations next year.** The industry expects continued cost reductions of ~3% over the next year (2017-18), a lower rate than observed over the last two years.

- **Implementation approaches.** The industry is starting to focus on more strategic (long-term) cost reduction approaches for third party spend and internal operating costs.

- **Cost sustainability.** Sustaining cost reductions across the cycle remains a major challenge for the industry. This year there is close to an even split in views of cost reductions being sustainable vs temporary, an improvement over 2016.

- **Demand expectations.** Expectations on industry demand uplift have been pushed back from last year’s survey, with ~20% of respondents not expecting demand to increase until 2020 at the earliest.
Survey responses – regions and resource themes

Our global survey captured responses from across the globe and across multiple resource themes

**Number of survey respondents by region***

* Job roles of survey respondents may cover multiple regions and resource themes

**Number of survey respondents by resource theme***

* Job roles of survey respondents may cover multiple regions and resource themes
Survey responses – company groups and functions

We surveyed different company groups and multiple functional areas across operators and suppliers.

Survey respondents by company group

Operator respondents by function

Supply Chain respondents by function

OFS – Oilfield services
OEM – Original equipment manufacturer
EPIC – Engineering, Procurement, Installation, Construction
Summary of cost changes – based against 2015 levels

Material cost reduction delivered since the oil price decline of 2014, with expectation of further incremental reductions in 2018

Industry observed (2015-2017) and expected (next 12 months) cost deflation relative to 2015 levels (rebased to 100)

Chart shows compounded observed cost reduction by year relative to 2015 – previous chart show year-on-year observed cost reduction between 2016 and 2017
Cost changes observed over last 12 months (2016-17)

Logistics, Seismic and Rigs had the highest percentage of respondents observing cost reductions over the last 12 months.

Industry observed cost changes in the last 12 months (2016-17)

Survey question: What % change in annual spend / sales did your organisation achieve over the past 12 months?
Wells, Seismic and Subsea had the highest percentage of respondents expecting a combination of unchanged and cost increases over the next 12 months.

Survey question: What % change in annual spend / sales do you expect your organisation to achieve over the next 12 months?
Industry observed approaches to reducing supply chain costs

The last 12 months have continued to see a focus on short-term rather than strategic approaches

Industry observations on ‘very important’ approaches to reduce supply chain costs last year (2016-17)

Survey question: How would you rate the level of importance that your organisation gave to each of the following approaches to reduce supply chain costs over the past 12 months?
Industry expected approaches to reducing supply chain costs

Strategic approaches to reducing costs are being considered more than in 2016

Industry expectations on ‘very important’ approaches to reduce supply chain costs next year (2017-18)

Survey question: What level of importance do you expect your organisation to give each of the following approaches to reduce supply chain costs over the next 12 months?
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Strictly Private & Confidential

- This report has been prepared by Wood Mackenzie Limited. The report is intended solely for the benefit of the SUT and its contents and conclusions are confidential and may not be disclosed to any other persons or companies without Wood Mackenzie’s prior written permission.

- The information upon which this report is based has either been supplied to or comes from our own experience, knowledge and databases. The opinions expressed in this report are those of Wood Mackenzie. They have been arrived at following careful consideration and enquiry but we do not guarantee their fairness, completeness or accuracy. The opinions, as of this date, are subject to change. We do not accept any liability for your reliance upon them.
Wood Mackenzie™, a Verisk Analytics business, is a trusted source of commercial intelligence for the world’s natural resources sector. We empower clients to make better strategic decisions, providing objective analysis and advice on assets, companies and markets. For more information visit: www.woodmac.com
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