ABOUT THIS SUMMARY

This sector summary is one of a series of six sector fact sheets to be used in conjunction with the guide for investors titled, *Could boosting energy productivity improve your investment performance?* These companion pieces are the result of analysis under the *Energy Productivity Index for Companies* project, designed to help investors identify key sectors and portfolio companies within those sectors, where improving energy productivity can deliver significant benefits to companies and their value as investments.

RESULTS SNAPSHOT

> Energy costs and profit margins varied in this sector, so exposure to energy-related risks varies across companies

> Solvay S.A. demonstrated the best overall energy performance by delivering the highest weighted average score across all measures

> Owing to the diverse product mix between companies, there is a wide range of energy productivity (when measured as revenue per gigajoule of final energy used - as per table on page 3), so this metric has not been taken into account in calculating each company’s general rating

> Changes in energy productivity of companies in recent years varied, showing improvements of up to 20% or deteriorations of up to -25% per annum

> Solvay and Ercros achieved the highest energy savings in the sector, equivalent to 1.4% and 0.7% of their annual energy costs per year, respectively

> Achieving energy savings equivalent to the average of those two companies (top 20%) could deliver up to 18% boost to lower performing chemical companies’ annual profits

> US $366 million annual savings were achieved across the sector through energy efficiency improvements

> Sector improvements required an estimated US $389 million in capital investment. When annualised, this is approximately equivalent to 17% of annual cost savings

> Improvements implemented by reporting companies also achieved significant emissions reductions. For each 1% reduction in energy costs achieved, emissions were reduced by 2.1%.

---

**Summaries available for six sectors**

- Airlines
- Automobiles
- Chemicals
- Construction Materials
- Paper
- Steel
## Comparing Companies in the Chemicals Sector

The Energy Productivity Index compares companies in each sector based on three measures – Resilience to energy cost, Energy productivity outcome, and Energy efficiency performance.

### Chemical company scores against key measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>General Rating</th>
<th>Energy cost resilience</th>
<th>Energy productivity outcome</th>
<th>Energy efficiency performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solvay S.A.</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumitomo Chemical Co., Ltd.</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuraray Co., Ltd.</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemira Corporation</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotte Chemical</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wacker Chemie AG</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitsubishi Chemical Holdings Corporation</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linde AG</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitsui Chemicals, Inc.</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teijin Ltd.</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ercros</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toray Industries, Inc.</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanwha Chemical</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22 companies


### Satisfactory data
- Positive results; could discuss potential to optimise
- Request clarification of results and discuss potential to improve

### Insufficient data
- Results provisional due to data uncertainty. Request additional data to confirm rating
- Data provided is insufficient to conduct analysis; require more information

### Not included in analysis
- Out of scope; different type of activity, or low energy cost making analysis too uncertain

For further details on identifying companies to engage with and how to measure a company’s performance against its competitors, refer to section 03 of the Guide for Investors.

### A note about project scope and limitations:

Analysis undertaken was limited by the availability and quality of company data. Energy data used in the analysis was primarily sourced from CDP, complemented with other voluntary company reporting where required. This leads to potential limitations as outlined on page 2 of the Guide for Investors.

Guide for Investors and Technical Report available at energyproductivity.net.au
Using data from CDP, companies were scored and ranked based on their performance against seven metrics [presented in the table below] which underpin the measures shown on the previous graph.

**Performance against each metric**
Data is sourced from 2013-15 CDP responses and financial reports for corresponding years unless otherwise specified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>General Rating</th>
<th>Energy cost resilience</th>
<th>Energy productivity outcome</th>
<th>Energy efficiency performance</th>
<th>Additional information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solvay S.A.</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>10-15%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumitomo Chemical Co., Ltd.</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>-19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuraray Co., Ltd.</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemira Corporation</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>10-15%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ Lotte Chemical</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>20-25%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wacker Chemie AG</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitsubishi Chemical Holdings Corporation</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linde AG</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>25-30%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitsui Chemicals, Inc.</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>10-15%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tejin Ltd.</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15-20%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>#</strong> Ercros</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>20-25%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toray Industries, Inc.</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanwha Chemical</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10-15%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>-3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance legend**
Cells colour-coded based on 0-100% scores attributed to companies for each metric*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>High &gt; 75%</th>
<th>&gt; 50%</th>
<th>&gt; 25%</th>
<th>Low &lt; 25%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy cost resilience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy productivity outcome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy efficiency performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** ** OPEX not available, estimate based on industry average OPEX/Revenue ratio
$ Excluded from quintile analysis (outlier)
# EBIT averaged over latest 4 years
* Detailed translation of metrics into scores is presented in the Technical Report (energyproductivity.net.au/resources)
ENGAGING WITH COMPANIES

1. Seek clarification on a company’s performance
Start with metrics that are incomplete or appear to indicate lower performance. As an indication of a company’s current efforts, energy efficiency activities that have been implemented by others in this sector are presented below to help identify whether a company is considering all areas worth investigating.

2. What to ask of companies where low performance is identified
Once a company’s performance has been confirmed (or re-assessed after additional information), investors can suggest a range of internal energy management practices which could improve that company’s performance.

3. Ways to engage with underperforming companies
Where further engagement with companies is required, refer to section 04 of the Guide for Investors which suggests questions that companies could be asked and internal energy management practices they might consider.

Nearly 75% of the energy efficiency opportunities implemented by companies in the chemicals sector have a less than 3 year payback, or an equivalent of about 50% internal rate of return.

Energy savings shown as percentage of energy cost, coloured by payback period
Energy efficiency improvements detailed in callout boxes

- **Lotte Chemical**
  - Energy audits for processing and manufacturing sites, hydrogen recovery\(^*\), chemical processes improvement, mercury to membrane conversion.

- **Solvay S.A.**
  - Process improvements, waste heat recovery, equipment upgrades, optimisation of controls.

- **Ercros**
  - Process control changes, update of process manuals, employee training, equipment upgrades.

- **Kemira Corporation**
  - Optimisation of controls and product requirements, Equipment upgrades, Waste heat recovery.

- **Kuraray Co., Ltd.**
  - Equipment upgrades, process improvements.

- **Sumitomo Chemical Co., Ltd.**
  - Company-wide energy management project, equipment upgrades, heat recovery.

- **Toray Industries, Inc.**
  - Equipment upgrades, process improvements.

- **Hanwha Chemical**
  - Waste heat recovery.

- **Mitsui Chemicals, Inc.**
  - Waste heat recovery.

- **Mitsubishi Chemical Holdings Corporation**
  - Payback period of energy efficiency improvements:
    - <1 year
    - 1-3 years
    - 4-10 years
    - >10 years
    - Unspecified

- **Teijin Ltd.**
  - *Excluded from quintile analysis
  - *Energy recovery process included as energy efficiency, 7.5% of total savings (0.18% of energy cost)

// Truncated data
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