

December 2013

GTL: Why Bigger is not Always Better

The available published information for both Shell and Sasol suggests that their large-scale plants cost more than \$100,000 per barrel of daily capacity to construct. Only Shell and Sasol know for sure what their true costs are.

Shell has received a lot of criticism in the press for the significant cost overruns of their project. The original 2003 estimate of \$5 Billion ballooned to \$20 Billion (or more depending on who you ask). We believe these comparisons are both unfair and misleading for a number of reasons:

Shell announced an agreement with Qatar in July 2004. The project was not approved for construction by Shell's board until July of 2006. The plant came on line in 2012. Here are just a few challenges Shell had to deal with.

During that time:

- the cost of steel alone almost doubled
- the cost of concrete rose 30%
- the Producer Price Index for Petroleum Support Activities rose from 140 to 200
- the IHS CERA Upstream Capital Costs Index rose from 105 to 230

The project includes:

- 22 offshore wells from two permanent platforms 60 Km offshore
- Two 30 inch lines to transport the gas to shore
- A sulfur removal plant to handle 1.6 BCF per day of sour gas
- A natural gas liquids plant to extract 120,000 BPD of NGLs and ethane
- A 170 acre "village" capable of housing the 52,000 workers who were brought in from 50 different countries
- A 140,000 BPD GTL plant that produces a wide variety of specialty products as well as fuels. (The additional refining equipment to make specialty products can add easily be double the cost of refining equipment for fuels only).
- All utilities including 100% power generation and water treatment facilities
- Product transportation (dock and loading facilities)

Shell has never broken out the cost of the GTL plant from the total project. An "apples to apples" comparison cannot be made from the available data.

That said, here are some reasons why small modular GTL plant designs can be lower in total installed cost per barrel of daily capacity than a large facility even though they are significantly smaller:

Location – Plants built in the lower 48 have significant cost advantages over almost any other place on earth. Taking advantage of existing infrastructure (transportation of natural gas and finished products, cooling water, waste water treatment, electricity,), shorter distances to transport equipment and readily available work force can make a significant

September, 2012

difference in total project cost. Not all US locations offer the same benefits, which is why project costs will vary some even with standardized plants.

Different construction strategy – Plants that are custom built at the site are dependent on availability of highly skilled labor and cooperative weather conditions. A properly designed small modular GTL plant will be mostly shop-built in standardized modules that are shipped to the site for installation and interconnection with the balance of plant. This approach also allows for a certain level of “mass production” which provides further cost reductions and improvements in overall project schedules. Savings of as much as 20% (for the Nth module) are common within the modular industry.

Lower engineering cost – When a “design once and build many,” approach is taken much of the engineering cost is spread over multiple plants. Site-specific engineering and erection costs can also be reduced. Foundation requirements can be simplified.

Lower labor cost – Labor costs are lower because the bulk of the labor occurs in a shop where productivity is higher and weather related delays do not exist. Productivity improves even more when plant modules are reproduced multiple times in a shop environment. This is of particular importance when skilled labor is not readily available in some remote locations and must be brought in at significant expense.

Shorter project schedule – Typically, a totally field constructed facility can take 2-3 times longer to assemble versus a modular, shop fabricated facility. Modularization transfers costly, weather dependent field construction man-hours to a less costly, more productive shop environment which, if properly executed, shortens the overall project schedule.

Standard size criteria – EFT’s selected reference design sizes are based, in part, on a close fit with the most economical sizes for key components such as Vacuum Pressure Swing Adsorption (VPSA) air separation technology that have already been modularized by major providers such as Praxair, Air Products and others. The same also holds true for other pre-packaged components such as steam and gas turbines for plant power requirements.

Limited product Slate - Shell’s Pearl project makes a wide variety of products which significantly increases the cost of the upgrading portion of the plant. A modular GTL plant is usually making only two products (sometimes three), diesel and naphtha or diesel, jet and naphtha.

Avoiding “diseconomies of scale” – Sometimes individual components bigger actually make them more expensive per unit of output. Example: A fixed-tube reactor, when the shell diameter is under 12 ft, can be built in numerous shell and tube heat exchanger shop around the world. We have identified almost 100 shops in North America alone that are capable of building up to 12 ft diameter reactors. When the diameter gets bigger than 18 feet, as is the case with Shell’s reactor, the number of shops that can handle the fabrication (and the weight) drops to a handful and the cost per tube (a measure of unit productivity) goes up, not down. We have received quotes for reactors under 12 ft in diameter and compared them to quotes for reactors in the 18+ ft range. The cost per unit of reactor volume actually increased with the larger reactor (18 ft+ diameter). Additional shipping costs and erection costs also follow extremely large and heavy components.

September, 2012

In the end, **the only way to know the cost of any project**, at any given site, is to pay a reputable EPC firm to create a FEED (Front End Engineering Design) package that fully defines the project and cost (usually +/- 5%) for the given location.