

Summary of Questions –Section 1

General questions

1. This methodology seeks to provide a reliable measure of physical market value. How well do you think the ICIS methodology achieves this aim?
2. Are there alternative methodologies you would like ICIS to consider? If so, please describe these methodologies and their strengths and weaknesses as mechanisms for measuring physical market value. Please explain their strengths and weaknesses relative to current methodology.
3. How well do the ICIS prices published in this report serve your business? Are there any additional prices you would like to see?
4. Is there any other information that you believe would be helpful to ICIS in its review of this methodology? If so, please give details.

Questions specific to Phenol Markets

5. Some market participants have proposed that changes should be made to the CFR China Main Port spot price assessment.
 - A. Should ICIS stop normalising CFR China Main Port spot prices? ☒ Yes ☐ No
 - B. For CFR China Main Port, should ICIS keep the current normalised price assessment for CFR China Main Port spot prices, while adding a new de-normalised assessment for CFR China Main Port spot prices, so there are two CFR China Main Port assessments?

☒ Yes ☐ No

6. Some market participants have proposed the introduction of a new assessment that tracks the US dollar-denominated, duty-exempt phenol prices in the domestic market, also commonly known as the "re-export" or "bonded" sector. This price is currently being reported weekly in the Phenol commentary.

Should ICIS add a new US dollar-denominated domestic bonded phenol price assessment?

☒ Yes ☐ No

7. Some market participants have proposed the inclusion of the existing CFR China Main Port quote in a broader CFR Northeast Asia (CFR NE Asia) assessment.

Should ICIS delete the existing CFR China Main Port quote, and replace this with a new CFR NE Asia assessment that includes spot prices into China, Japan, South Korea and Taiwan?

☒ Yes ☐ No

8. Some market participants have proposed the introduction of a new assessment that tracks spot phenol exports from South Korea and Taiwan on a free-on-board (FOB) basis to non-China markets. This will be identified as a FOB northeast Asia (FOB NE Asia) assessment.

Should ICIS introduce a new FOB NE Asia assessment?

☒ Yes ☐ No

9. Do you find the current price range for Asia Phenol assessment too wide? If so, would publishing a mid-point be better or are there alternatives you would like to see?

Yes too wide ☒ No it is not too wide ☐ Yes publish a mid-point

10. From January 2014, the import tariff for phenol of Singapore and Thai origin into India will be reduced to 5% from 6%, while the duty rate for Phenol of any other origin will remain unchanged at 7.5%.

Some market participants proposed that the prices for phenol of Singapore and Thai origin into India should be normalised to reflect the 2.5% duty advantage. For example:

If a Thai cargo is sold at \$1,460/tonne CFR India, the price should be normalised by 2.5% to be \$1,425/tonne CFR India.

Should the prices of Singapore and Thai origin phenol be normalised to reflect the duty difference?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Section 1 – General Questions

This section includes general questions on the ICIS methodology for Methanol Markets. These questions are designed to encourage market participants to feedback to ICIS on how well the current ICIS methodology is achieving its objectives of providing a reliable measure of the market value of the specified commodity.

Q1. This methodology seeks to provide a reliable measure of physical market value. How well do you think the ICIS methodology achieves this aim?

We are seeking views on the efficacy of our methodology and your analysis of its strengths and weaknesses.

Q2. Are there alternative methodologies you would like ICIS to consider? If so, please describe these methodologies and their strengths and weaknesses as mechanisms for measuring physical market value. Please explain their strengths and weaknesses relative to current methodology.

We are interested in understanding if there are alternative or additional methodologies that we should consider. In order to help us to assess whether alternative methodologies are superior to existing methodologies, please clearly explain the relative strengths and weaknesses. Quantifying impacts and benefits, including providing sufficient detail to allow these to be confirmed, would be especially helpful.

Q3. How well do the ICIS prices published in this report serve your business? Are there additional prices you would like to see?

Where possible we want to ensure that our prices are relevant to your business. To help us to do this please provide as much feedback as you can detailing where the ICIS prices are relevant and where greater relevance could be achieved. For example if you believe we are not reporting an important number or are reporting at the wrong level of granularity, Please provide the details here.

Q4. Is there any other information that you believe would be helpful to ICIS in its review of this methodology? If so, please give details.

We would like to ensure that our customers and participants in the market we report on are able to provide any feedback useful to us in achieving our objectives of providing reliable prices and information. If you have any other comments, not covered by the above questions, please provide them here.



Section 2 – Questions specific to global Phenol pricing reports

Q5. Some market participants have proposed that changes should be made to the CFR China Main Port spot price assessment.

A. Should ICIS stop normalising CFR China Main Port spot prices? Yes/No

B. For CFR China Main Port, should ICIS keep the current normalised price assessment for CFR China Main Port spot prices, while adding a new de-normalised assessment for CFR China Main Port spot prices, so there are two CFR China Main Port assessments? Yes/No

The following questions are related to potential new quotes in the Phenol report.

Q6. Some market participants have proposed the introduction of a new assessment that tracks the US dollar-denominated, duty-exempt phenol prices in the domestic market, also commonly known as the "re-export" or "bonded" sector. This price is currently being reported weekly in the Phenol commentary.

Should ICIS add a new US dollar-denominated domestic bonded phenol price assessment?

Yes/No

Q7. Some market participants have proposed the inclusion of the existing CFR China Main Port quote in a broader CFR Northeast Asia (CFR NE Asia) assessment.

Should ICIS delete the existing CFR China Main Port quote, and replace this with a new CFR NE Asia assessment that includes spot prices into China, Japan, South Korea and Taiwan?

Yes/No

Q8. Some market participants have proposed the introduction of a new assessment that tracks spot phenol exports from South Korea and Taiwan on a free-on-board (FOB) basis to non-China markets. This will be identified as a FOB northeast Asia (FOB NE Asia) assessment.

Should ICIS introduce a new FOB NE Asia assessment?

Yes/No

Q9. Do you find the current price range for Asia Phenol assessment too wide? If so, would publishing a mid-point be better or are there alternatives you would like to see?

Yes too wide / No it is not too wide / Yes publish a mid-point

The following questions are related to the India sub-section of the Phenol report.

Q10. From January 2014, the import tariff for phenol of Singapore and Thai origin into India will be reduced to 5% from 6%, while the duty rate for Phenol of any other origin will remain unchanged at 7.5%.

Some market participants proposed that the prices for phenol of Singapore and Thai origin into India should be normalised to reflect the 2.5% duty advantage. For example:

If a Thai cargo is sold at \$1,460/tonne CFR India, the price should be normalised by 2.5% to be \$1,425/tonne CFR India.

Should the prices of Singapore and Thai origin phenol be normalised to reflect the duty difference?

Yes/No