

## 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?*

Reasonably well for European and Asian markets. Seems to lack more depth, hence less broadly accepted for North America.

*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.*

NA

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

Quite well for the global markets for SM, particularly in Europe and Asia.

*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 the Styrene Markets

*5. Is the SE Asia assessment still necessary given the lack of liquidity in this particular sub-region of Asia?*

FOB Singapore price development might be of some use given the SM production hub that exists in this region.

*6. Does the Asia methodology require an assessment for Chinese bonded tank cargoes?*

NA

*7. In the US report, should the spot assessments be split into current and forward months?*

Yes

*8. In the Europe report, is the CIF Rotterdam spot assessment still relevant?*

In speaking to EU colleagues, I believe so.

*9. Does the Europe monthly contract price assessment still need a FOB truck ARA assessment (in addition to the FOB barge ARA contract assessment)?*

NA

