International Journal of Energy, Environment, and Economics ISSN: 1054-853X Volume 26, Number 4 © 2020 Nova Science Publishers, Inc.

# TRANSFORMATION OF REFINERY LOADING AS A RESULT OF STRICTER ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT OF ALTERNATIVE FUELS

V. L. Ulanov<sup>1,\*</sup> and O. N. Skorobogatko<sup>2,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Professor of National Research University "Higher School of Economics," Faculty of International Economics and Foreign Affairs, Department of International Economics, Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor
<sup>2</sup>Intern of National research University "Higher School of Economics," Senior Researcher, Department of Gas Energy Markets Modeling Research Institute "NIIgazekonomika," Russia

# ABSTRACT

The oil refining industry is currently challenged by the energy consumption transformation, which requires adaptation of the petroleum products output programs to the decreased demand for certain types of oil products and disbalancing of markets. The authors identify technological processes and world regions under the greatest risk of excess production capacity and analyze the efficiency of management decisions regarding the optimization of loading oil refining process units. The article presents recommendations for the long term optimization of existing capacities, which are based on the combined approach to the oil refining modeling in the context of the largest regions of oil products consumption. The article also shows that the main changes in the balance of supply and demand for petroleum products are local in nature, and the transformation of consumption will not lead to a decrease in oil refining, but also create incentives for additional investment in the industry.

**Keywords:** energy consumption transformation, energy transition, imbalances of oil products markets, configuration of model plants, optimization of capacity utilization, economic benefits.

<sup>\*</sup> Email: vulanov@hse.ru

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup> Corresponding Author's Email: oleg.skorobogatko@mail.ru

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

The balance at the global oil market is achieved through meeting global demands by means of producing a wide range of oil products with the facilities of oil refineries. Oil refining is characterized by producing a number of oil products that have different properties and areas of application. Oil market has to be balanced to work effectively. The main regulation tool is to change capacities of oil refining units, their loading and mode of working. As a result, the prices that perform a signaling function and help prevent disbalancing of the system in the long term are formed in the oil products market.

Nowadays the demand for oil products is changing. In recent decades, there have been changes in the dependence of energy consumption on economic growth. As a result of energy efficiency growth, in the developed countries energy consumption does not increase together with the economic growth but in some cases it even decreases (Wang, R., Zhang, H., Shi, F., Zhang, Y., Zhang, L., 2018). In regards to oil products consumption, this trend is more pronounced because of the availability of alternative types of energy and inter-fuel competition. According to a number of studies by scientific and industry associations (ERIRAS, 2019, The Oxford Institute for Energy Studies, 2019), these changes are expected to accelerate in prospect. This tendency is a challenge for the sphere of oil refining. As it is mentioned above, in order to maintain the balance, the industry must make changes in the capacity, loading and operation of oil refining plants.

On the other hand, today the world witnesses events that reverse the competitiveness of alternative energy sources – further hydrocarbon fuel utilization is becoming more profitable because of the significant decline in oil prices related to the collapse of the OPEC+ agreement and possible global recession caused by the epidemiological situation. Nevertheless, the current situation is short-term and cannot have a significant impact on long-term development trends of the global energy. Therefore, this effect will not be considered in the further analysis.

The efficiency of oil production, just like production of other energy sources, determines the efficiency of the economy on the whole, as transportation and energy costs are parts of the prime cost of most goods and services. The operation of the industry, in which the minimum use of material, labour and financial resources is achieved, is possible only with a high degree of utilization of existing equipment and without excessive investments. Oil refining industry is characterized by high capital requirements of production and a long payback period. EIA estimates that the average amount of investment in oil refining necessary to increase the volume of oil refining by 5 million tons (it includes construction of primary processing facilities and secondary processes for processing naphtha fractions into components of motor gasoline) is \$720 mln paid off in 25 years with an internal rate of return of 12%. Thus, the efficient use of existing refining facilities can help avoid unjustified investments and multi-billion dollar financial losses.

Therefore, it is advisable to consider options for optimizing the use of existing facilities to meet the potential demand for oil products.

To achieve the stated objective, it is necessary to achieve the following goals:

• to study the global balance of the forecast demand and supply taking into account trans-regional oil products trade flows;

- to form the algorithm to optimize the loading of existing oil refineries;
- to use the suggested algorithm on the basis of the IEA 2018 forecast and to give recommendations for optimizing the loading of oil refineries.

There exists a great number of practical tasks of optimizing the loading of oil refining plants. The most widespread tasks are tactical and short-term. In modeling oil refineries as an object of management, the objective is to reduce operating expenses, improve the quality of fraction extraction; there are other objectives aiming at the use of available production reserves and optimal loading of production facilities. At the same time, an important characteristic of such models is that they are presented in great detail.

A set of detailed information and a regular factual comparison base open wide possibilities for applying various methods of mathematical modeling. The most popular method is the linear programming and its variations (multi-period and continuous production models, sequential linear programming, nonlinear optimization planning models). At the same time, the scientific community pays much attention to improving the convergence of such models and minimization of estimation error. This gives an opportunity to model each aspect of the plant operation in detail, including in-depth production and economic performances. Such models are used for corporate purposes (Honeywell, 2018) and for academic research (Ghaithan et al., 2017; Zhao et al., 2017). However, being very complex, narrow-oriented and dependent on a large number of variables, this approach is not suitable for long-term forecasting and achieving the stated objective.

There exists a conceptually different approach to oil refining modeling. It is used in large-scale analytical models like world energy model (IEA, 2016) and the national energy modeling system oil market model (EIA, 2012). In such models, the oil refining modeling unit is regarded as a means of meeting demand. At the same time, it does not allow to carry out the analysis of management decisions at the oil refinery level. To sum up, to achieve the stated objective we will use the combined approach that takes into account long-term planning capabilities of the latest model type and gives the opportunity to analyze the effectiveness of plant load changes at the supply and demand balance level.

# **2. INFORMATION BASE AND METHODS**

In order to achieve the objectives, the following methodology is proposed, consisting of three successive stages:

- 1. Based on the demand change forecast value for macro-regions, potential trade flows of petroleum products are calculated using a transport task that minimizes logistics costs;
- 2. On the basis of actual data, a technological model of the oil refining industry of each macro-region is formed to identify a number of technologically achievable variants of oil products output.
- 3. Based on the results of the first stage, the expected imbalances in the oil products markets in each macro-region are analyzed. For each case, an algorithm is consistently implemented to optimize the loading of existing refineries in order to reduce potential imbalances. The algorithm will be described below.

As an example, the IEA forecast for 2018 is used to demonstrate the application of the methodology, as the data of this organization are presented in a high level of detail and enjoy authority in the industry and scientific community. At the same time, data of this organization reflect energy consumption transformation trends that it will be agreed with the concepts described above.

The whole approach is based on voluminous indicators, with the target situation being the achievement of a balance of supply and demand in each region of the world under consideration. At some stages, current price parameters are used to rank the economic efficiency of processes or to determine the direction of export-import deliveries. The analysis was based on the following data (Table 1) obtained by the authors on the basis of the comparison of IEA data on world consumption of petroleum products in terms of regions and petroleum products.

The regional aspect is taken into account by using estimated regional prices of petroleum products in modeling interregional trade flows. Prices of oil products are determined by the following algorithm:

- 1. The European region is defined as the baseline region, and it is assigned a price equal to the average actual oil value for 2018 in North-Western Europe (NWE quotation);
- 2. Pricing in the region is defined on the basis of evidence on regional demand and supply;
- 3. If the region is a net exporter of oil, the price was determined by the following formula:

$$Pr = \max\{Pr_i - Fr_i\}$$
<sup>[1]</sup>

Pr – region price;

 $Pr_i$  – i-import region price;

- $Fr_i$  freight rate on transportation to i-import region;
- 4. If the region is a net importer of oil, the price was determined by the following formula:

$$Pr = \min\{Pr_i + Fr_i\}$$
[2]

5. Flow modeling is carried out according to the principle of ranking deliveries according to the margin level for the exporter, i.e., according to the level of export price difference and domestic prices (the premise about the priority of the domestic market is applied). It can be shown that this approach is equivalent to minimizing logistical costs.

In order to identify many technologically achievable options for output of products, taking into account the previous detail, seven model plants of different configuration were built, each of which conditionally corresponds to the set of refining plants of each macroregion: North America, Central and South America, Europe, Former countries of the USSR, Africa, Middle East, South-East Asia.

Total	Southeast Asia	Eurasia	Middle East	Africa	Europe	C. and S. America	North America	Consumption	Region of
576,5	185,5	34	82,5	19,5	59	34,3	161,7	2017	Liquefi
771,5	272,7	39,8	153,8	35,4	52,6	41,6	175,5	2040	ed Petro
34%	47%	17%	86%	81%	-11%	21%	9%	Growth rate	leum Gases
1277,5	335,5	56	78,5	59,5	99	101,8	547,2	2017	Gasolin
1262,5	384,6	51,1	114,1	84,2	68,9	96,3	463,2	2040	e
-1%	15%	-9%	45%	42%	-30%	-5%	-15%	Growth rate	
342,5	219,5	31	5,5	1	59,5	9,2	16,8	2017	Naphth
517,5	368,2	41,4	11,7	2,1	60,6	12,8	20,8	2040	nta
%15	%89	34%	//3%	107%	2%	38%	24%	Growth rate	
369,5	129,5	12,5	25,5	13,5	74,5	16,4	97,6	2017	Jet Fue
519,5	210,7	16,2	52,6	27,1	73,6	22	117,3	2040	-
41%	63%	30%	106%	101%	-1%	34%	20%	Growth rate	
1397	456,5	60	94,5	83,5	339,5	109,6	253,4	2017	Diesel
1537	579,5	60,6	152,1	130,9	261,5	114,8	237,5	2040	
10%	27%	1%	61%	57%	-23%	5%	-6%	Growth rate	
354	133	10,5	75	20	50	31	34,5	2017	Fuel O
319	123,9	7,8	88,6	23	28,3	23,8	23,7	2040	ii
-10%	-7%	-26%	18%	15%	-43%	-23%	-31%	Growth rate	
528	192,5	44,5	55,5	12,5	67,5	36,2	119,3	2017	Other (
493	200,8	37	73,4	16,1	42,7	31,2	91,9	2040	Dil Proc
-7%	4%	-17%	32%	29%	-37%	-14%	-23%	Growth rate	lucts

# Table 1. Forecast of world petroleum products consumption, 2017-2040, mln t

Source: Authors' calculations based on International Energy Agency data.

Unit Capacity	Southeast Asia	North America	Europe	Middle East	Eurasia	C. and S. America	Africa
Atmospheric distillation	1747,0	1202,5	923,7	467,0	438,7	317,1	174,5
Vacuum distillation	610,0	587,2	411,2	146,0	175,3	140,4	32,7
Isomerization	20,5	35,2	31,2	10,7	11,6	3,3	1,9
Catalytic reforming	243,6	218,7	134,3	47,6	53,6	18,9	19,7
Hydrotreatment	547,2	305,0	345,2	104,6	98,8	62,6	24,5
Hydrocracking	273,7	133,2	156,6	58,4	31,3	20,1	5,5
Catalytic cracking	400,5	398,3	173,1	38,1	43,2	78,5	15,3
Delayed coking	192,2	172,6	31,3	12,1	16,2	31,1	4,5
Alkylation	15,4	59,6	13,2	3,3	2,9	5,4	1,2
Bitumen unit	43,7	64,1	36,2	14,0	14,1	10,5	4,3
Hydroconversion	109,4	19,2	7,0	12,4	-	-	0,8
Total	4203,2	3195,6	2263,0	914,3	885,8	688,0	285,0

Table 2. Configuration of model plants, million ton per annum

Source: Authors' calculations based on Woodmac database.

Data about refineries and their capacity were collected to calibrate model plant material balances from the Woodmac database containing current data for 2014. The base was supplemented by the authors with a list of installations put into operation over the last five years. Data on new installations of Paradip and Mumbai plants in India, Star oil refinery in Turkey, modernized installations of Turkmenbashi plants, Chimkent and Atyrau refinery in Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan, and other installations were added to the database.

According to the collected refinery capacity database, the model plants have the configuration shown above (Table 2).

IEA information was used as a source of data on world demand for petroleum products. However, the organization does not provide open data on the production of petroleum products in the relevant nomenclature by region of the world. Therefore, the missing production data were filled with information from the UN databases.

Each of the model plants uses installations with universal material balances. In order to match the model result to the actual output of oil products, the material balance of each process is taken at the level corresponding to the generally accepted values, after which it is calibrated according to the production data of 2016, so that the sum of deviation of squares of oil products output is minimal (Table 3).

Many technologically achievable production options can be evaluated after refinery models that match the actual balance of demand and supply across regions of the world were build. In addition, with an understanding of material balances, it became possible to detail the supply side of petroleum products to the level of individual production processes.

In the third stage, the options for optimization of the load of existing oil refining plants are determined according to the following scheme:

- After taking into account the effects of international trade, the imbalances of a particular macro-region are analysed;
- On the basis of the model plant characterizing the oil refining industry of this region, details of products output to the level of individual technological processes are formed;

Atmospheric distillationCrude oilIPG2.1%Atmospheric distillationCrude oilId fuel8.1%Gas oil26.9%Fuel oil44.8%Vacuum distillationFuel oil44.8%1.0sesFuel oilGas oil3.8%0.0%Vacuum distillationFuel oil44.8%1.0sesNaphthafuel oin1.0%1.0%Naphtha of hydrotrackingGas4.4%Naphtha of hydrotrackingIsomerizate95.0%Naphtha of hydrotrackingIsomerizate95.0%Naphtha of hydrotrackingLosses0.6%Naphtha of hydrotrackingLosses0.6%Naphtha of hydrocrackingLosses0.6%Naphtha of hydrocrackingLosses0.6%Naphtha of hydrocrackingLosses0.6%Naphthafuel oin1.1%Naphtha1.1%NaphthaGas oilCases0.6%Gas oilLosses0.6%Gas oilJat fuel5.5%HydrocrackingVacuum gas oil of delayed cokingNaphthaVacuum gas oil of hydrocrackingGas1.1%Vacuum gas oil of hydrocrackingGas1.1%Vacuum gas oil of hydrocrackingGas oil1.1%Vacuum gas oil of hydrocrackingGas oil1.1%Catalytic cracking </th <th>Unit</th> <th>Feedstock</th> <th>Product</th> <th>Products Output, %</th>	Unit	Feedstock	Product	Products Output, %	
Atmospheric distillationFuel oilNaphha16.2% Her luciAtmospheric distillationFuel oil8.1% Cas oil26.9% Fuel oil44.8% (as oil)Vacuum distillationFuel oil44.8% (as oil)3.8% (Vacuum gas oil)47.2% (TarMaphthaFuel oil6as oil)3.8% (Vacuum gas oil)47.2% (Vacuum gas oil)47.2% (Vacuum gas oil)IsomerizationNaphtha of reforming (Naphtha of hydrocracking)Isomerizate95.0% (Vacuum gas oil)4.4% (Vacuum gas oil)Catalytic reformingIsomerizate95.0% (Vacuum gas oil)0.6% (Vacuum gas oil)0.6% (Vacuum gas oil)HydrotreatmentGas1.1% (Vacuum gas oil)Naphtha1.1% (Vacuum gas oil)HydrotreakingGas oil1.3% (Vacuum gas oil)1.3% (Vacuum gas oil)1.3% (Vacuum gas oil)HydrocrackingVacuum gas oil of delayed coking (Cas a)1.3% (Vacuum gas oil)1.1% (Vacuum gas oil)MaphthaYacuum gas oil of delayed coking (Cas a)1.3% (Vacuum gas oil)1.1% (Vacuum gas oil)MaphthaYacuum gas oil of hydrocracking (Cas a)1.1% (Cas a)1.1% (Cas a)Delayed cokingVacuum gas oil of hydrocracking (Cas a)1.1% (Cas a)1.1% (Cas a)MaphthaYacuum gas oil of hydrocracking (Cas a)1.1% (Cas a)1.1% (Cas a)Delayed cokingYacuum gas oil of hydrocracking (Cas a)1.1% (Cas a)1.1% (Cas a)MaphthaYacuum gas oil of hydrocracking (			LPG	2.1%	
Atmospheric distillation         Crude oil         Ief fael         8.1%           Qae oil			Naphtha	16.2%	
Admosphere distination         Clade on         Gas oil         26.9%, Fuel oil           Vacuum distillation         Fuel oil         44.8%           Vacuum distillation         Fuel oil         3.8%           Vacuum distillation         Fuel oil         3.8%           Vacuum gas oil of thydroreating         Vacuum gas oil of thydroreating         1.9%           Naphtha of reforming         Gas         4.4%           Naphtha of hydroreating         Isomerizate         95.0%           Naphtha of hydroreating         Isomerizate         95.0%           Naphtha of hydroreating         Isomerizate         0.6%           Maphtha of hydroreating         Isoses         0.6%           Maphtha of hydroreating         Isoses         0.6%           Reformat         8.34%         Isoses         0.6%           Hydrotreatiment         Gas oil         1.3%         Isoses         0.6%           Maphtha         Cas si         1.3%         Isoses         0.6%           Vacuum gas oil of delayed coking         Vac	Atmographania digtillation	Cruda ail	Jet fuel	8.1%	
Fuel oil         Fuel oil         44.8%           Vacuum distillation         Fuel oil         Iosses         1.9%           Vacuum distillation         Fuel oil         Gas oil         3.8%           Vacuum gas oil         47.2%         Tau         0.1%           Iosses         1.9%         1.0%         1.0%           Vacuum gas oil         47.2%         1.0%         1.0%           Naphtha         Maphtha of hydrotreating         Gas         1.9%           Naphtha of hydrotreating         Iosmerizate         95.0%         0.6%           Naphtha of hydrocenversion         Gas         1.1%         Naphtha           Catalytic reforming         Naphtha         Iosses         0.6%           Maphtha of hydrocenversion         Gas         1.1%         Naphtha           Maphtha         Naphtha         1.2%         Naphtha         1.2%           Aromatics         2.7%         Reformat         83.4%         1.0%           Losses         0.6%         Gas         1.3%         1.1%           Mydrotreatment         Gas oil         1.3%         Samphina         1.1%           Mydrotreating         Vacuum gas oil         Maphtha         1.1%         Samphina <td>Atmospheric distination</td> <td>Crude on</td> <td>Gas oil</td> <td>26.9%</td>	Atmospheric distination	Crude on	Gas oil	26.9%	
Vacuum distillationFuel oilLosses1.9% (Gas oil3.8% (Vacuum gas oil4.7.2% (Tar4.7.1% 			Fuel oil	44.8%	
Vacuum distillationFuel oilGas oil3.8% Vacuum gas oil47.2% 47.2% Tar47.1% 47.1% Losses47.2% 1.9%IsomerizationNaphthaGas1.9%1.9%Naphtha of reforming Naphtha of hydrocrasting Naphtha of hydrocrastingGas4.4%Naphtha of hydrocrasting Naphtha of hydroconversionIsomerizate95.0%Catalytic reformingNaphtha of hydroconversionCases0.6%Maphtha of hydroconversionGas1.1%Maphtha of alydroconversionCases0.6%Maphtha of hydroconversionGas1.1%Maphtha of nydroconversionGas1.3%Maphtha of hydroconversionGas1.3%Maphtha of hydroconversionGas1.3%Maphtha of hydroconversionGas1.3%Maphtha of hydroconversionGas1.3%Maphtha1.1%1.1%Maphtha1.1%1.1%Maphtha1.1%1.1%Maphtha1.1%1.1%Gas oil1.3%1.3%Maphtha21.8%1.1%Maphtha21.8%1.1%Maphtha21.8%1.1%Maphtha1.1%1.1%Gas oil oil oil flydroconversionGas3.1%Maphtha1.2%Gas3.1%Maphtha1.1%Gas3.1%Maphtha1.1%Gas3.1%Maphtha1.1%Gas3.1%Maphtha1.2%Gas3.1%Maphtha1.2			Losses	1.9%	
Vacuum distillation         Fuel oil         Vacuum gas oil         47.2%           Tar         47.1%           Tar         47.1%           Tar         47.1%           Losses         1.9%           Naphta of reforming         Gas           Naphta of hydrocracking         Isomerizate         95.0%           Naphta of hydrocracking         Isomerizate         0.6%           Naphta of hydrocracking         Losses         0.6%           Naphta of hydrocracking         Losses         0.6%           Naphtha of hydrocracking         Losses         0.6%           Naphtha of hydrocracking         Cases         0.6%           Naphtha         12.2%         Aromatics         2.7%           Aromatics         2.7%         Reformat         83.34%           Losses         0.6%         0.6%         0.6%           Hydrotreatment         Gas oil         1.1%         1.1%           Hydrotreatment         Gas oil         1.1%         1.1%           Hydrotreatment         Gas oil         2.1%         1.1%           Hydrotreatment         Gas oil         1.1%         1.1%           Gas oil of delayed coking         Diesel         45.8%			Gas oil	3.8%	
Tar         47.1%           Iose         1.9%           Isomerization         Naphtha         1.9%           Naphtha of reforming         Isomerizate         95.0%           Naphtha of hydrotreating         Isomerizate         95.0%           Naphtha of hydrocencking         Isomerizate         95.0%           Naphtha of hydrocenversion         Isomerizate         95.0%           Aphtha of hydrocenversion         Isomerizate         95.0%           Reformat         83.4%         Isomerizate           Aphtha of hydrocenversion         Gas         1.1%           Naphtha of hydrocenversion         Gas         1.9%           Maphtha of hydrocenversion         Gas         1.1%           Maphtha of hydrocenversion         Gas         1.9%           Maphtha of hydrocenversion         Gas         1.9%           Maphtha of hydrocenversion         Gas         1.9%           Maphtha of hydrocenversion         Gas         1.3%           Hydrotreatment         Gas oil         1.9%           Maphtha of hydrocenversion         Gas         1.3%           Hydrotreatment         Yacuum gas oil of delayed coking         Vacuum gas oil of delayed coking           Vacuum gas oil of hydrocenversion	Vacuum distillation	Fuel oil	Vacuum gas oil	47.2%	
Image in the image interval is a set in the interval is a set in the i	v acuum distination	ruer on	Tar	47.1%	
Naphtha Naphtha of reformingGas4.4%Naphtha of hydrocrackingIsomerizate95.0%Naphtha of hydrocrackingIsomerizate95.0%Naphtha of hydrocrackingLosses0.6%Naphtha of hydroconversionGas1.1%Catalytic reformingNaphtha12.2%Naphtha of hydroconversionGas1.1%Naphtha of hydroconversionGas1.1%Maphtha12.2%1.0%Maphtha1.2%1.1%Maphtha1.2%1.1%Maphtha1.1%1			Losses	1.9%	
Naphtha of reformingSec.1.17Naphtha of hydrotreatingIsomerizate95.0%Naphtha of delayed cokingLosses0.6%Naphtha of hydroconversionGas1.1%Catalytic reformingNaphtha of hydroconversionGas1.1%Naphtha of hydroconversionGas1.1%Maphtha1.2.2%7%Aromatics2.7%1.0%HydrotreatmentGas oil1.1%Gas oil0.6%1.1%HydrotreatmentGas oil1.1%HydrotreatmentGas oil0.6%HydrotreatmentGas oil1.1%HydrotreatmentGas oil1.1%HydrotreatmentGas oil2.8%HydrotreatmentYacuum gas oil of delayed coking0.9%HydrotreatmentGas oil2.1%HydrotreatingGas oil2.1%HydrotreatingGas oil3.1%HydrotreatingGas oil3.1%Faculty crackingVacuum gas oil of hydrocenversion11.8%Catalytic crackingYacuum gas oil of hydrocenversion1.8%Delayed cokingVacuum gas oil of hydrocenversion1.8%HydroconversionTarGas oil3.1%HydroconversionTarGas oil3.1%HydroconversionTarGas oil3.1%HydroconversionTarGas oil3.1%HydroconversionTarGas oil3.1%HydroconversionTarGas oil3.1%Hydroconversion		Naphtha	Gas	4 4%	
IsomerizationNaphtha of hydrocracking Naphta of hydrocenking Naphta of hydrocenversionIsomerizate P5.0%Naphta of hydrocenversionLosses0.6%Catalytic reformingNaphtha of hydrocenversionGas1.1%Naphtha of hydrocenversionNaphtha12.2%Aromatics2.7%Reformat83.4%Losses0.6%0.6%Maphtha1.1%10.0%Maphtha1.1%10.0%Maphtha1.1%10.0%Maphtha1.1%11.0%Maphtha1.1%11.0%Maphtha1.1%11.0%Maphtha1.1%11.0%Maphtha1.1%11.0%Maphtha1.1%11.0%Maphtha1.1%11.0%Maphtha21.8%0.9%Macuum gas oil1.28%0.9%Vacuum gas oil of delayed cokingMaphtha21.8%Maphtha1.1%10.0%10.0%Macuum gas oil of hydrocenkeinGas3.1%Macuum gas oil of hydrocenkeinGas3.1%Maphtha1.1%11.1%Maphtha11.1%11.1%Maphtha11.1%11.1%Maphtha11.1%11.1%Macuum gas oil of hydrocenversion1.86%Maphtha1.1%1.86%Maphtha1.1%1.1%Macuum gas oil of hydrocenversion1.86%Maphtha1.1%1.1%Maphtha1.1%1.1%Maphtha1.1%1.1%		Naphtha of reforming	Gub	1.170	
NonicrizationNaphtha of hydrocrackingNonicrization25.0%Naphtha of hydroconversionLosses0.6%Catalytic reformingNaphtha of hydroconversionGas1.1%Naphtha of hydroconversionGas1.1%Naphtha12.2%Aromatics2.7%Reformat83.4%10.05%0.6%Losses0.6%0.6%Gas1.3%1.1%HydrotreatmentGas oil1.05%0.6%Yacuum gas oilJiesel9.67%HydrocrackingVacuum gas oil of delayed coking100%0.6%Vacuum gas oil of delayed cokingGas3.1%Vacuum gas oil of hydrocrackingGas3.1%Vacuum gas oil of hydrocrackingGas oil11.8%Vacuum gas oil of hydrocrackingGas oil11.8%Delayed cokingVacuum gas oil of hydrocrackingVacuum gas oil9.3%Delayed cokingTarGas0.6%HydroconversionIteg0.6%11.8%Maphtha11.7%Gas oil18.6%Vacuum gas oil of hydroconversionVacuum gas oil9.3%Delayed cokingTarGas0.6%HydroconversionTarGas0.6%HydroconversionTarGas0.6%Bitumen unitTarTar100%Bitumen unitTarDises0.9%Catalytic racking0.9%0.9%0.9%Catalytic rackingTar100%0.9%Catalytic racking<	Isomerization	Naphtha of hydrotreating	Isomerizate	95.0%	
Naphtha of hydroconversionLosses0.6%Naphtha of hydroconversionGas1.1%Aphtha of hydroconversionNaphtha12.2%Aromatics2.7%ReformatReformat83.4%10Losses0.6%0.6%Gas oilGas1.3%HydrotreatmentGas oil10%HydrotreatmentGas oil1.1%HydrotreatmentMaphtha1.1%HydrotreatmentGas oil0.6%Vacuum gas oil of delayed cokingGas2.8%HydrotreatmentVacuum gas oil of delayed cokingDiesel45.8%Vacuum gas oil of delayed cokingVacuum gas oil of hydroconversionDiesel45.8%Vacuum gas oil of hydroconversionGas3.1%11.8%Catalytic crackingVacuum gas oil of hydroconversionGas oil18.6%Vacuum gas oil of hydroconversionVacuum gas oil9.3%11.8%Delayed cokingTarGas0.6%11.8%HydroconversionTarGas0.6%11.8%Gas oil3.1%11.7%11.7%11.7%Gas oil0.6%0.6%1.9%11.7%Maphtha11.7%Gas0.6%11.8%Maphtha11.7%Gas0.6%11.8%Maphtha11.7%Gas0.6%11.8%Maphtha11.7%Gas0.6%11.8%Maphtha11.7%Gas0.6%11.8%Maphtha11.7%Gas0.6% <t< td=""><td>Isomenzation</td><td>Naphtha of hydrocracking</td><td>Isomenzate</td><td>95.070</td></t<>	Isomenzation	Naphtha of hydrocracking	Isomenzate	95.070	
Naphtha of hydroconversionLosses0.6%Catalytic reformingGas1.1%Naphtha12.2%Aromatics2.7%Reformat83.4%Losses0.6%Gas oilGasHydrotreatmentGas oilMaphtha1.1%Gas oilDieselGas0.9%Gas0.9%Gas0.9%Maphtha1.1%Diesel96.7%Losses0.9%Gas2.8%Naphtha1.1%Diesel96.7%Losses0.9%Maphtha2.18%Vacuum gas oil of delayed cokingNaphthaVacuum gas oil of delayed cokingVacuum gas oilVacuum gas oil of hydrocrackingGasVacuum gas oil of hydrocrackingGasVacuum gas oil of hydrocrackingGasVacuum gas oil of hydrocrackingGasVacuum gas oil of hydrocrackingGasPaper-propylene fraction11.8%Gas0.6%Losses4.1%Catalytic crackingGasTarGasGas0.6%Losses3.1%Petroleum coke31.9%HydroconversionTarTarGasGas5.8%Naphtha11.2%Gas5.8%Naphtha12.2%Diesel41.9%Catalytic crackingGasTarGasGas0.6%Catalytic cracking30.		Naphtha of delayed coking	Lassas	0.6%	
Gas         1.1%           Naphtha         12.2%           Aromatics         2.7%           Reformat         83.4%           Losses         0.6%           Gas oil         Gas         1.3%           Hydrotreatment         Gas oil         Gas         1.3%           Hydrotreatment         Gas oil         Gas         1.3%           Hydrotreatment         Gas oil         Gas         1.3%           Vacuum gas oil         Jet fuel         96.7%         0.6%           Losses         0.9%         Gas         2.8%           Vacuum gas oil of delayed coking         Vacuum gas oil of delayed coking         Diesel         45.8%           Vacuum gas oil of hydrocarcking         Vacuum gas oil of hydrocarcking         Gas         3.1%           Vacuum gas oil of hydrocarcking         Vacuum gas oil of hydrocarcking         Gas oil         18.6%           Vacuum gas oil of hydrocarcking         Vacuum gas oil of hydrocarcking         Gas oil         9.3%           Delayed coking         Tar         Gas         0.6%         1.9%           Hydroconversion         Tar         Gas         0.6%         1.1%           Bitumen unit         Tar         Tar         Gas		Naphtha of hydroconversion	LOSSES	0.0%	
Catalytic reforming         Naphtha         I2.2%           Aromatics         2.7%           Reformat         83.4%           Losses         0.6%           Gas oil         Gas           Hydrotreatment         Gas oil           Gas oil         Naphtha           Hydrotreatment         Gas oil           Vacuum gas oil         Gas           Vacuum gas oil of delayed coking         Gas           Vacuum gas oil of delayed coking         Vacuum gas oil of hydrocracking           Vacuum gas oil of hydrocracking         Gas           Vacuum gas oil of hydrocracking         Gas oil           Delayed coking         Tar           Gas oii         0.6%			Gas	1.1%	
Catalytic reforming         Naphtha         Aromatics         2.7%           Reformat         83.4%         0.6%			Naphtha	12.2%	
Reformat83.4%InstantInstantInstantHydrotreatmentGas oilInstantHydrotreatmentGas oilInstantInstantInstantInstantHydrotreatmentGas oilInstantHydrotreatmentVacuum gas oilGas0.9%InstantInstantInstantHydrocrackingVacuum gas oil of delayed cokingInstant21.8%Vacuum gas oil of delayed cokingVacuum gas oil of delayed cokingInstant2.1%Vacuum gas oil of hydrocrackingGas3.1%11.8%Vacuum gas oil of hydrocrackingGas3.1%11.8%Vacuum gas oil of hydrocrackingGas oil18.6%18.6%Vacuum gas oil of hydrocrackingGas oil9.3%11.7%InstantInstant11.7%11.7%11.7%InstantGas oil30.7%11.8%11.7%HydroconversionTarGas oil30.7%12.2%HydroconversionTarGas5.8%11.7%Bitumen unitTarBitumen9.1%12.2%HydroconversionTarBitumen9.1%10.5%Bitumen unitTarBitumen9.1%10.5%HydroconversionTarBitumen9.1%10.5%HydroconversionTarBitumen9.1%10.5%HydroconversionTarBitumen9.1%10.5%HydroconversionTarBitumen9.1%10.5%Hydroconversion	Catalytic reforming	Naphtha	Aromatics	2.7%	
Index and the series of the			Reformat	83.4%	
HydrotreatmentGas oilGas1.3%HydrotreatmentGas oilNaphtha1.1%Discel96.7%Losses0.9%Losses0.9%Cas2.8%MydrotrackingVacuum gas oil21.8%Jet fuel5.5%MydrotrackingJet fuel5.5%Discel45.8%MydrotrackingVacuum gas oil of delayed cokingVacuum gas oil22.1%MydrotrackingVacuum gas oil of delayed cokingCases2.0%Vacuum gas oil of hydrocrackingGas3.1%Vacuum gas oil of hydrocrackingGasoline53.1%Vacuum gas oil of hydrocroversionVacuum gas oil9.3%Vacuum gas oil of hydrocroversionVacuum gas oil9.3%TarGas0.6%11.7%HydroconversionGas30.7%HydroconversionTarGas5.8%Bitumen unitTarDiesel49.1%HydroconversionTarDiesel49.1%Bitumen unitTarHumen99.1%			Losses	0.6%	
HydrotreatmentGas oilNaphtha1.1%HydrotreatmentGas oil96.7%Losses0.9%0.9%Losses0.9%0.9%Losses0.9%0.9%Maphtha21.8%0.9%Vacuum gas oil of delayed cokingJet fuel5.5%Vacuum gas oil of delayed cokingDiesel45.8%Vacuum gas oil of delayed cokingVacuum gas oil of hydrocracking22.1%Vacuum gas oil of hydrocrackingGas3.1%Vacuum gas oil of hydrocrackingGasoline53.1%Vacuum gas oil of hydrocrackingGasoline53.1%Vacuum gas oil of hydrocrackingGasoline53.1%Vacuum gas oil of hydrocrackingGasoline9.3%Delayed cokingTarGas0.6%HydroconversionTarGas oil30.7%HydroconversionTarGas5.8%Bitumen unitTarDiesel49.1%Bitumen unitTarBitumen99.1%			Gas	1.3%	
HydroreachingGas ofDiesel96.7%HydrocrackingIosses0.9%HydrocrackingVacuum gas oilCas2.8%Vacuum gas oil21.8%21.8%Jet fuel5.5%Diesel45.8%Vacuum gas oil of delayed cokingDiesel45.8%Vacuum gas oil of delayed cokingCas2.1%Vacuum gas oil of delayed cokingCas3.1%Propae-propylene fraction11.8%Vacuum gas oil of hydrocrackingGas oil18.6%Vacuum gas oil of hydrocroversionCasoline53.1%Vacuum gas oil of hydrocroversionCasoline9.3%Vacuum gas oil of hydrocroversionLosses4.1%Delayed cokingTarGas0.6%LPG0.7%Naphtha11.7%Gas oil30.7%Vacuum gas oil23.8%Petroleum coke31.9%Losses0.6%Losses0.6%Case5.8%HydroconversionTarGas5.8%Bitumen unitTarGas0.6%Bitumen unitTarBitumen99.1%	Hydrotreatment	Gas oil	Naphtha	1.1%	
Index and the series of the	riydiotreatment	Gason	Diesel	96.7%	
HydrocrackingGas2.8%HydrocrackingNaphtha21.8%Jet fuel5.5%Vacuum gas oil of delayed cokingDiesel45.8%Vacuum gas oil of delayed cokingVacuum gas oil22.1%Losses2.0%Gas3.1%Vacuum gas oil of hydrocrackingGas3.1%Vacuum gas oil of hydrocrackingGasoline53.1%Vacuum gas oil of hydrocrackingGasoline53.1%Vacuum gas oil of hydrocrackingGasoline9.3%Vacuum gas oil of hydroconversionLosses4.1%Gas0.6%Losses4.1%Gas0.6%11.7%Delayed cokingTarGas oil30.7%HydroconversionTarGas5.8%Naphtha11.7%Gas31.9%Losses0.6%Gas5.8%Maphtha12.2%1012.2%HydroconversionTarDiesel49.1%Bitumen unitTarBitumen99.1%			Losses	0.9%	
Hydrocracking         Vacuum gas oil         Naphtha         21.8%           Hydrocracking         Jet fuel         5.5%           Vacuum gas oil of delayed coking         Diesel         45.8%           Vacuum gas oil of delayed coking         Cas         2.1%           Vacuum gas oil         Q2.1%         Losses         2.0%           Catalytic cracking         Vacuum gas oil of hydrocracking         Gas         3.1%           Vacuum gas oil of hydrocrowersion         Vacuum gas oil of hydroconversion         Vacuum gas oil         9.3%           Vacuum gas oil of hydroconversion         Vacuum gas oil         9.3%         Vacuum gas oil         9.3%           Delayed coking         Tar         Gas         0.6%         IPG         0.7%           Hydroconversion         Tar         Gas         0.6%         IPG         0.7%           Hydroconversion         Tar         Gas         0.6%         IPG         0.7%           Hydroconversion         Tar         Gas         5.8%         Naphtha         11.7%           Gas         0.6%         Gas         5.8%         Naphtha         12.2%           Hydroconversion         Tar         Gas         5.8%         Naphtha         12.2%			Gas	2.8%	
HydrocrackingJet fuel5.5%Vacuum gas oil of delayed cokingDiesel45.8%Vacuum gas oil of delayed cokingQacuum gas oil22.1%Losses2.0%Gas3.1%Propane-propylene fraction11.8%Gasoline53.1%Vacuum gas oil of hydrocrackingGas oil18.6%18.6%Vacuum gas oil of hydroconversionVacuum gas oil9.3%10.5%Vacuum gas oil of hydroconversionCases4.1%10.5%Delayed cokingTarGas0.6%11.7%HydroconversionTarGas30.7%30.7%HydroconversionTarGas5.8%31.9%Bitumen unitTarTarDiesel49.1%Bitumen unitTarBitumen99.1%31.9%		Vacuum gas oil	Naphtha	21.8%	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c } \mbox{Hybrid conversion} & Diesel & 45.8\% \\ \hline \mbox{Vacuum gas oil of delayed coking} & Diesel & 45.8\% \\ \hline \mbox{Vacuum gas oil of delayed coking} & Uacuum gas oil & 22.1\% \\ \hline \mbox{Losses} & 2.0\% \\ \hline \mbox{Gas} & 3.1\% \\ \hline \mbox{Propane-propylene fraction} & 11.8\% \\ \hline \mbox{Gas oil of hydrocencking} & Gas oil & 18.6\% \\ \hline \mbox{Vacuum gas oil of hydrocenversion} & Vacuum gas oil & 9.3\% \\ \hline \mbox{Vacuum gas oil of hydrocenversion} & Vacuum gas oil & 9.3\% \\ \hline \mbox{Vacuum gas oil of hydrocenversion} & Vacuum gas oil & 9.3\% \\ \hline \mbox{Vacuum gas oil of hydrocenversion} & Gas & 0.6\% \\ \hline \mbox{LPG} & 0.7\% \\ \hline \mbox{Naphtha} & 11.7\% \\ \hline \mbox{Gas oil & 30.7\% \\ \hline \mbox{Vacuum gas oil & 23.8\% \\ \hline \mbox{Petroleum coke} & 31.9\% \\ \hline \mbox{Losses} & 0.6\% \\ \hline \mbox{LPG} & 0.7\% \\ \hline \mbox{Vacuum gas oil & 23.8\% \\ \hline \mbox{Petroleum coke} & 31.9\% \\ \hline \mbox{Losses} & 0.6\% \\ \hline \mbox{Losses} & 0.6\% \\ \hline \mbox{Lpc} & 12.2\% \\ \hline \mbox{Losses} & 0.6\% \\ \hline \mbox{Lpc} & 12.2\% \\ \hline Lp$	Hydrocracking		Jet fuel	5.5%	
Vacuum gas oil of delayed cokingVacuum gas oil $22.1\%$ LossesCatalytic crackingVacuum gas oil $2.0\%$ Catalytic crackingVacuum gas oil of hydrocrackingGas $3.1\%$ Vacuum gas oil of hydrocrackingGasoline $53.1\%$ Vacuum gas oil of hydroconversionGasoline $53.1\%$ Vacuum gas oil of hydroconversionVacuum gas oil $9.3\%$ Vacuum gas oil of hydroconversionGas $0.6\%$ Vacuum gas oil of hydroconversionGas $0.6\%$ Vacuum gas oil of hydroconversionGas $0.6\%$ TarGas $0.6\%$ HydroconversionTarGas $0.6\%$ TarGas $0.6\%$ HydroconversionTarGas $5.8\%$ Naphtha $11.2\%$ OutputTarGas $0.6\%$ Wacuum gas oil $23.8\%$ Petroleum coke $31.9\%$ Losses $0.6\%$ Uses $5.8\%$ Naphtha $12.2\%$ Diesel $49.1\%$ Vacuum gas oil $27.2\%$ Losses $5.7\%$ Bitumen unitTarIossesIosses $0.9\%$	Tryatoetaeking		Diesel	45.8%	
Image: Catalytic cracking         Vacuum gas oil         Losses         2.0%           Vacuum gas oil         Gas         3.1%           Vacuum gas oil of hydrocracking         Gasoline         53.1%           Vacuum gas oil of hydrocroversion         Gas oil         18.6%           Vacuum gas oil of hydrocroversion         Vacuum gas oil         9.3%           Vacuum gas oil of hydrocroversion         Vacuum gas oil         9.3%           Iosses         4.1%         11.7%           Gas         0.6%         14.1%           Delayed coking         Tar         Gas         0.6%           IPG         0.7%         0.7%           Naphtha         11.7%         11.7%           Gas oil         30.7%         23.8%           Petroleum coke         31.9%         12.2%           Indexes         0.6%         12.2%           Maphtha         12.2%         12.2%           Iossel         0.6%         27.2%           Hydroconversion         Tar         Gas         5.8%           Bitumen unit         Tar         Bitumen         99.1%		Vacuum gas oil of delayed coking	Vacuum gas oil	22.1%	
Gas $3.1\%$ Propane-propylene fraction         11.8%           Qacuum gas oil of hydrocracking         Gas oil         53.1%           Vacuum gas oil of hydrocracking         Gas oil         18.6%           Vacuum gas oil of hydroconversion         Vacuum gas oil         9.3%           Vacuum gas oil of hydroconversion         Vacuum gas oil         9.3%           Delayed coking         Far         Gas         0.6%           ILPG         0.7%         0.7%           Naphtha         11.7%         Gas oil         30.7%           Vacuum gas oil         23.8%         9.1%         0.6%           ILPG         0.6%         31.9%         0.6%           Vacuum gas oil         23.8%         0.6%         31.9%           Petroleum coke         31.9%         0.6%         31.9%           ILosses         0.6%         6as         5.8%           Naphtha         12.2%         12.2%           Disesel         49.1%         27.2%           ILosses         5.7%         5.7%           Bitumen unit         Tar         Insees         0.9%			Losses	2.0%	
$\begin{array}{c} \mbox{Propane-propylene fraction} & 11.8\% \\ \hline \mbox{Propane-propylene fraction} & 11.8\% \\ \hline \mbox{Gasoline} & 53.1\% \\ \hline \mbox{Gas oil} & 18.6\% \\ \hline \mbox{Vacuum gas oil of hydroconversion} & Vacuum gas oil & 9.3\% \\ \hline \mbox{Losses} & 4.1\% \\ \hline \mbox{Losses} & 4.1\% \\ \hline \mbox{Gas} & 0.6\% \\ \hline \mbox{LPG} & 0.7\% \\ \hline \mbox{Naphtha} & 11.7\% \\ \hline \mbox{Gas oil} & 30.7\% \\ \hline \mbox{Vacuum gas oil} & 23.8\% \\ \hline \mbox{Vacuum gas oil} & 27.2\% \\ \hline \mbox{Losses} & 0.6\% \\ \hline \mbox{Vacuum gas oil} & 27.2\% \\ \hline \mbox{Losses} & 5.7\% \\ \hline \mbox{Bitumen unit} & Tar \\ \hline \mbox{Tar} & \hline \mbox{Intermediation} & 99.1\% \\ \hline \mbox{Losses} & 0.9\% \\ \hline \mbox{Vacuum gas oil} & 99.1\% \\ \hline \mbox{Losses} & 0.9\% \\ \hline \mbox{Vacuum gas oil} & 27.2\% \\ \hline \mbox{Losses} & 5.7\% \\ \hline \mbox{Bitumen unit} & Tar \\ \hline \mbox{Losses} & 0.9\% \\ \hline \mbo$		Vacuum gas oil	Gas	3.1%	
Catalytic crackingVacuum gas oil of hydrocrackingGasoline $53.1\%$ Gas oilDelayed cokingVacuum gas oil of hydroconversionVacuum gas oil $9.3\%$ LossesDelayed cokingGas $0.6\%$ LPGTarGas oil $0.7\%$ NaphthaHydroconversionTarGas $0.6\%$ CasoliHydroconversionTarGas $0.6\%$ CasoliBitumen unitTarGasS.8\% NaphthaBitumen unitTarGasS.8\% S.8\%Bitumen unitTarGasS.7\%Bitumen unitTarBitumen99.1%			Propane-propylene fraction	11.8%	
Product         Case of         18.6%           Vacuum gas oil of hydroconversion         Vacuum gas oil         9.3%           Losses         4.1%           Gas         0.6%           LPG         0.7%           Naphtha         11.7%           Gas oil         30.7%           Vacuum gas oil         23.8%           Petroleum coke         31.9%           Losses         0.6%           Icoses         0.6%           Vacuum gas oil         23.8%           Petroleum coke         31.9%           Losses         0.6%           Icoses         5.8%           Naphtha         12.2%           Diesel         49.1%           Vacuum gas oil         27.2%           Icoses         5.7%           Bitumen unit         Tar         Icoses         0.9%	Catalytic cracking	Vacuum gas oil of hydrocracking	Gasoline	53.1%	
Vacuum gas oil of hydroconversionVacuum gas oil of hydroconversionVacuum gas oil 0,3% LossesDelayed coking $A.1\%$ Delayed coking $A.1\%$ TarGas0.6% LPGVacuum gas oil30.7%Vacuum gas oil23.8%Petroleum coke31.9%Losses0.6%Losses0.6%Maphtha11.2%Diesel49.1%Vacuum gas oil27.2%Losses5.7%Bitumen unitTarBitumen99.1%	, ,		Gas oil	18.6%	
Instrument         Losses         4.1%           Losses         4.1%           Gas         0.6%           LPG         0.7%           Naphtha         11.7%           Gas oil         30.7%           Vacuum gas oil         23.8%           Petroleum coke         31.9%           Losses         0.6%           Image: Series         0.6%           Vacuum gas oil         23.8%           Petroleum coke         31.9%           Losses         0.6%           Gas         5.8%           Naphtha         12.2%           Diesel         49.1%           Vacuum gas oil         27.2%           Losses         5.7%           Bitumen unit         Tar         Bitumen         99.1%		Vacuum gas oil of hydroconversion	Vacuum gas oil	9.3%	
Delayed coking         Tar         Cas $0.6\%$ LPG $0.7\%$ Naphtha $11.7\%$ Gas oil $30.7\%$ Vacuum gas oil $23.8\%$ Petroleum coke $31.9\%$ Losses $0.6\%$ Hydroconversion         Tar         Gas $5.8\%$ Bitumen unit         Tar         Diesel $49.1\%$ Losses $5.7\%$ Diesel $27.2\%$ Losses $5.7\%$ Diesel $99.1\%$			Losses	4.1%	
Delayed coking         Tar         LPG $0.7\%$ Naphtha         11.7%           Gas oil $30.7\%$ Vacuum gas oil $23.8\%$ Petroleum coke $31.9\%$ Losses $0.6\%$ Gas $5.8\%$ Naphtha $12.2\%$ Diesel $49.1\%$ Vacuum gas oil $27.2\%$ Losses $5.7\%$ Bitumen unit         Tar           Bitumen $99.1\%$			Gas	0.6%	
Delayed cokingTarNaphtha11.7%Gas oil $30.7\%$ Vacuum gas oil $23.8\%$ Petroleum coke $31.9\%$ Losses $0.6\%$ Losses $0.6\%$ Maphtha $12.2\%$ Diesel $49.1\%$ Vacuum gas oil $27.2\%$ Losses $5.7\%$ Bitumen unitTarTarDiesesDieses $0.9\%$			LPG Newbelle	0./%	
$\begin{array}{c c} \mbox{Delayed coking} & \mbox{Tar} & \begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline Cas on & $50.7\%$ \\ \hline Vacuum gas oil & $23.8\%$ \\ \hline Petroleum coke & $31.9\%$ \\ \hline Losses & $0.6\%$ \\ \hline Losses & $0.6\%$ \\ \hline Losses & $0.6\%$ \\ \hline Naphtha & $12.2\%$ \\ \hline Naphtha & $12.2\%$ \\ \hline Naphtha & $12.2\%$ \\ \hline Vacuum gas oil & $27.2\%$ \\ \hline Losses & $5.7\%$ \\ \hline Bitumen unit & $Tar$ & \hline Horses & $0.9\%$ \\ \hline \end{array}$	Deleved estains	Ter	Naphtha	11./%	
Vacuum gas oli         23.8%           Petroleum coke         31.9%           Losses         0.6%           Gas         5.8%           Naphtha         12.2%           Diesel         49.1%           Vacuum gas oil         27.2%           Losses         5.7%           Bitumen unit         Tar           Bitumen         99.1%	Delayed coking	1 81		30.7%	
Hydroconversion         Tar         Gas         5.8%           Bitumen unit         Tar         Bitumen         Bitumen         99.1%			Potroloum colvo	23.8%	
Hydroconversion         Tar         Gas         5.8%           Bitumen unit         Tar         Diesel         49.1%           Bitumen unit         Tar         Bitumen         5.7%				51.9%	
Hydroconversion         Tar         Cas         5.8%           Naphtha         12.2%           Diesel         49.1%           Vacuum gas oil         27.2%           Losses         5.7%           Bitumen unit         Tar           Bitumen         99.1%			Cae	5 80/	
HydroconversionTarHapitula12.2%Diesel49.1%Vacuum gas oil27.2%Losses5.7%Esses5.7%Bitumen unitTarLosses0.9%			Vas Naphtha	12.0%	
Dieser     49.1%       Vacuum gas oil     27.2%       Losses     5.7%       Bitumen unit     Tar       Bitumen     99.1%	Hydroconversion	Tar	Diesel	12.270	
Bitumen unit     Tar     Bitumen     99.1%	riyuroconversion	1 ai	Vacuum gas oil	77.2%	
1000000000000000000000000000000000000				5 7%	
Bitumen unit Tar Losses 0.9%			Bitumen	99.1%	
	Bitumen unit	Tar	Losses	0.9%	

# Table 3. Material balances of model plants technological installations

Source: Authors' calculations.

- In case of output surplus, the possibility of changing the operation of the processes is analyzed, replacing the output of surplus oil product with an alternative one, without reducing the load of processing plants;
- In case of impossibility of substitution or its insufficiency, for each of the key groups of oil products, supply curve is built based on economic benefit from production of additional ton of the target oil product (ΔEB<sub>top</sub>).

The economic benefit from the production of an additional ton of target oil ( $\Delta EB_{top}$ ) is calculated as follows:

$$\Delta EBtop = \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{i} production of oil product_i * price of oil product_i - feedstock_i * price of feedstock_i}{output of target oil product,\%} [3].$$

Based on the price data of 2018, the supply curve of the main oil products is formed, showing the efficiency ratio of different processes in the production of the target oil product (Figure 1). Argus Media data is used as price parameters to construct indicative supply curves. Since the data set is not complete, the base was supplemented by estimates of oil products quotations, based on average annual spreads.

- Process load giving the least economic benefit is reduced;
- The effects of load reduction on the output of other petroleum products are analyzed.



Figure 1. Supply curves of petroleum products by technological processes, US doll./t.

292

Optimization of the use of operating capacities to meet the prospective demand for petroleum products is achieved by carrying out the described sequence of actions.

The difference in the proposed approach to optimizing the loading of refining plants is as follows:

- 1. Long-term period (planning horizon more than 20 years) is considered;
- Global scale the global refining industry is modeled by macro-region rather than individual facilities;
- 3. Due to the long planning horizon, volume key figures are used in optimization (it is advisable to avoid price parameters due to their high volatility).

The most common application of optimization models in refining is optimization of individual refinery activities using techniques primarily based on variations in linear programming task. In this case, it is possible to take into account all the many nuances inherent in a particular refinery and to build a model that gives the result as close to reality as possible, but this approach has limitations that do not allow it to be applied to the task under study.

This approach in solving optimization problems has a fairly long history of application and has been detailed in the works of authors J. M. Pinto, M. Joly, L. F. L. Moro (Planning and scheduling models for refinery operations, 2000) and M. Göthe-Lundgren, J. Lundgren, J. Persson (An optimization model for refinery production scheduling, 2002). Subsequently, many authors continued to explore specific aspects of this approach, in particular Fragkogios, A., Saharidis, G. K. D. (Modeling and solution approaches for crude oil scheduling in a refinery, 2018) provide an overview of the approaches used in refining modelling, Silveira, E. A., Caldeira-Pires, A., Luz, S. M., Silveira, C. M. (Mass and energy allocation method analysis for an oil refinery characterization using multi-scale modeling, 2017) suggest a way to bridge the gap associated with the application of the life cycle method, and Oliveira, F., Nunes, P. M., Blajberg, R., Hamacher, S. (A framework for crude oil scheduling in an integrated terminal-refinery system under supply uncertainty, 2016) consider optimization features of integrated complex of refinery with an infrastructure in conditions of uncertainty.

Far fewer works in which the task of optimizing refineries is applied to a set of plants at the national or regional level. An A. P. Caetani, L. Ferreira, D. Borenstein article (Development of an integrated decision-making method for an oil refinery designing in Brazil, 2015) examines the application of an optimization task to Brazil's refining industry. A combined approach to refining optimization is used in N. O. Kapustin, D. A. Grushevenko (Exploring the implementations of Russian Energy Strategy project for oil refining sector, 2018), an integral part of which is the modelling of refinery groups in bottom-up valuation.

Directly, the issue of the impact of energy transition on the economic efficiency of the oil industry was considered in the works of Goldthau, Westphal (Why the Global Energy Transition Does Not Mean the End of the Petrostate) and Bukar Zanna Waziri, Aminu Hassan, Reza Kouhy (The effect of transitioning to renewable energy consumption on the Nigerian oil and gas exports: An ARDL approach), however, the work focused in general on the oil industry as a combination of oil production, processing and distribution, and there was no separate detailed analysis of oil refining.

In contrast, the impact of energy transition or regulatory initiatives associated with it on individual refineries is considered in the articles Pagliaro, Meneguzzo (Oil refining in Sicily: A critical perspective looking to the future) and Haarstad, Rusten (The challenges of greening energy: policy/industry disillusioned). And while the examples and conclusions are very illustrative, this does not make it possible to draw conclusions on the global implications for the industry.

# **3.** CALCULATIONS

According to IEA forecasts, total consumption of oil products will increase by 575 million toe by 2040 (by 380 million toe excluding liquefied petroleum gases - LPG, the vast majority of which are produced by gas processing plants), at the same time, demand growth is expected to be uneven both for consumption regions and for petroleum products (Figure 2).



Source: Authors' calculations based on International Energy Agency data.



The largest increase in consumption of oil products is expected in South-East Asia - 401.2 million tons, in the Middle East - 158.1 million tons and in Africa - 93.3 million tons. In the CIS and Central and South America, according to forecasts, stagnation of consumption of oil products is expected at the level of close values of 2017 - a decrease of 0.4 and 3.3 million tons, respectively. In North America and Europe, on the contrary, demand for petroleum products is expected to decline significantly - by 114.5 million tons and 154.5 million tons.

Naphtha has the greatest prospects, the growth of which, depending on the region, will be from 2 to 113% during the analyzed period. Of the petroleum products used as fuel, kerosene will maintain a steady demand for aviation transport, in the absence of an affordable alternative. The expected change in kerosene consumption would be between -1% and 106%. Other petroleum products used as fuel - gasoline, diesel and fuel oil will have different dynamics depending on the region of consumption (Table 1).

Significant growth is expected in other segments of petroleum products consumption by vehicles especially in the absence of an economically affordable alternative - by 193 million tons by trucks and by 170 million tons in aviation. The largest increase in consumption will

be in the petrochemical sector - more than 240 million tons. The spread of the synthetic and composite materials usage, substitution of natural materials in various spheres of human life creates a significant non-fuel niche for petroleum products. Increasing the use of petroleum products as raw materials for processing is consistent with the global goal of reducing carbon emissions.





Figure 3. Structure of world petroleum products consumption, 2017-2040, mln t.

Source: Authors' calculations based on International Energy Agency data.



The values of potential imbalances in the oil products markets were obtained without taking into account the factor of international trade, comparing the forecast changes in demand with the current demand to supply ratio (Figure 4). The modelling of export-import flows is carried out in accordance with the methodology described above. Product markets and sales volumes are determined by comparing sales prices with transportation costs and then ranking them in descending order, which ensures the highest level of revenue from the

sale of a certain oil product. The calculations are also made taking into account the premise of equidistance of production of a ton of oil product as a result of a similar process in different regions of the world (in fact, there are differences in operating costs of similar processes in different regions of the world, primarily due to different costs of labor and energy, but the impact of this factor is not significant and it is not the subject of research).

With the elimination of the international trade factor, the imbalances in the oil products markets have significantly decreased and their structure has changed considerably (Figure 5). It is important to note:

- At the global level, the market is not expected to overburden by motor fuels;
- Local surpluses related to demand reduction in the production region are absorbed by developing regions as a result of international trade;
- The main surplus oil products in the future will remain fuel oil and other heavy residues;
- South-East Asia and Africa are the most promising regions for refining because of their proximity to growing markets;
- Potentially at the lowest cost, the transformation of oil products markets will be carried over by the oil refining industry of CIS countries, the largest in terms of capacity of which are Russia, Belarus and Kazakhstan with oil resources, substantial production capacity and a successful geographical location (proximity to Africa and South-East Asia), countries will only need to develop appropriate infrastructure and reorient export flows of petroleum products;;
- The most problematic is likely to be the surplus of heavy products, such as petroleum coke and the residue of catalytic cracking in North America, primarily the United States. Most of them are exported to developing countries in South-East Asia now, such as India, where they are used as fuels for industry and for electricity generation. But as environmental regulation is tightened and other cleaner energy sources become more accessible, the need for them will decrease significantly.



Source: Authors' calculations based on International Energy Agency data.

Figure 5. Projected imbalances of petroleum products markets by regions of the world after accounting for international trade, 2040, mln t.



Figure 6. Structure of world oil products supply by technological processes, 2017, mln t.

It is possible to evaluate the effectiveness of options to optimize the loading of processing plants in the context of future demand, using model plants corresponding to the actual supply by regions of the world. For this purpose, oil products are considered, global or regional demand for which may decrease in the future. After that, a set of management solutions is determined, the implementation of which reduces the production of a potentially redundant product in the market, and the optimal one in terms of achieving a balance of demand and supply is chosen.

Once the supply side has been detailed to the level of individual petroleum products, the region of production and the production process (Figure 6), the next step is to project a forecast change in demand for the current supply in order to identify imbalances, that potential management decisions will be aimed at preventing in the future.

## **4.** ANALYSIS RESULTS

Global demand for petroleum products will not decrease in the future, but its structure will change significantly both in terms of petroleum products and in terms of consumption regions. South-East Asia, the Middle East and Africa, as a result of higher economic development, will be key drivers of increased consumption of petroleum products. However, in North America and Europe, demand for petroleum products is expected to decline significantly.

The role of traditional drivers of oil products consumption growth will change significantly - economic growth and growth of motorization will be compensated by influence of technological and environmental factors. Population consumption is no longer a source of growth, but industry and commercial transport will account for the bulk of the increase. Among petroleum products, naphtha has the greatest prospects, the growth of demand for which is due to the increase in consumption of petroleum products by the petrochemical

sector. Gasoline is the only light oil product used as fuel, the demand for which will decrease in the future.

At the global level, the market is not expected to become overfilled by motor fuels, as local demand-side surpluses in the production region are absorbed by developing regions as a result of international trade. The main surplus products in the future will remain fuel oil and other heavy residues of oil refining. South-East Asia and Africa are the most promising regions for refining because of their proximity to growing markets.

Considering the arguments described above and the "supply curves" formed earlier, it is noted that at the global level there is a tendency to increase the demand for jet fuel. The current oil refining volume meets increasing needs by increasing the extraction of the kerosene fraction in atmospheric distillation and separating a kerosene fraction in vacuum gas oil hydrocracking units. At the same time, an excess of fuel oil supply is formed in almost all regions (except South-East Asia). According to the obtained "supply curves," the most painless method is to reduce processing, but in this case, it will be impossible to meet the demand for other petroleum products, especially diesel and naphtha. Thus, the investment attractiveness of capital investments in the construction of deep oil refining processes aimed at increasing the production of diesel fuel is confirmed.

Investments in vacuum gas oil hydrocracking and tar hydroconversion are most appropriate. Delayed coking is less suitable despite lower capital costs relative to hydroconversion (based on current project estimates, the capital cost of the tar hydroconversion construction is almost 2 times the cost of a delayed coking unit construction of similar capacity - 325 and \$633 million for 1 million tons per year, respectively), since processing produces a large number of other products (coke), global demand for which will decline. In the case of investments in a delayed coking unit, it is advisable to reduce the risks of product sales by integrating with electric generation, which involves additional costs for the conversion of power plant equipment to coke consumption as fuel and the installation of carbon air filters.

The decline in demand for gasoline creates a risk of excess capacity for the production of gasoline components. However, demand for naphtha is growing every region, at a faster pace. Thus, the total demand for the gasoline fraction is increasing, but its consumption pattern is changing significantly. According to the corresponding "supply curve" from the point of view of economic efficiency, it is optimal to reduce the load of isomerization units. However, reducing the isomerization and catalytic reforming load will not solve the problem. The most rational approach is to convert part of the catalytic reformers to the production of aromatic hydrocarbons and to change the operating conditions of the catalytic cracking plants in order to maximize the production of the propane-propylene and butane-butylene fractions. In this case, the utilization of the active capacities is optimized, and part of the demand for naphtha in petrochemicals is replaced by another feedstock used in the polymerization. The main petrochemical process is the polymerization, whereby long carbon chains are formed from monomers (chemical elements consisting of one molecule). The main products of this process are basic polymers - primarily polyethylene and polypropylene, the further processing of which allows to produce most of commercially used plastics. The pyrolysis feedstock is typically petroleum products such as liquefied petroleum gases and naphtha. Ethane is also used in the dehydration process. An alternative may be to use propane-propylene, butanebutylene fractions and aromatic hydrocarbons immediately in the polymerization process (skipping the pyrolysis process).

When considering oil refining problems at the regional level, according to the authors, the most relevant solutions are proposed for Europe, North America and South-East Asia. For the countries of CIS and the Middle East, a more important task will be to take advantage of its geographical location and resource potential to integrate into the new emerging configuration of international trade of petroleum products. For example, the main export market of Russian petroleum products is North-Western Europe and the main product stream is served by Baltic Sea ports. According to the analysis, it is advisable to develop infrastructure to reorient flows towards the Black Sea and the Pacific coast to meet the increasing demand of African and South-East Asian countries. For Africa, South and Central America, there are currently no preconditions for the formation of excess refining capacity.

The development of this study and the expansion of its results is promising. The logical continuation will be to consider not only volume indicators, but also price parameters, which, although derived from the ratio of volume indicators, are important for the economic assessment of the activities of refineries and the efficiency of investment projects.

On the basis of regression analysis, it is planned to identify the relationship between cross spreads (the difference in the cost of petroleum products and the raw materials from which they were produced), the capacity of various refining processes and the volume of demand for petroleum products, which were replaced by alternative fuels as a result of environmental and technological factors.

Based on the obtained results, it will be possible to switch from analysis of forecast volume indicators changes to economic analysis of oil products output efficiency by various technological processes and their investment attractiveness in the forecast period.

# CONCLUSION

The research showed that "energy transition" is changing the structure of demand, but global demand for oil products will continue to grow. The main changes in the balance of demand and supply for oil products in the future will be local. The transformation of consumption will not reduce the volume of oil refining, it will create incentives for additional investments in the industry. Expected changes in demand can bring opportunities for oil refining development, increasing processing depth, expansion into foreign markets or integration with related business areas such as petrochemistry and electric power industry.

The combined approach to oil refining modeling and the proposed algorithm justified the management measures that could optimize the loading of oil refineries. The proposed method allowed to offset restrictions related to inability to review management decisions at the oil refinery plant level, which is specific to macro-level modeling, and to using a large number of variables that are not available in long-term forecasting used to optimize the load at the certain factory level. This approach can be used in the development of oil refinery development strategies.

In the long term, optimization of the loading of oil refining plants will be achieved by changing the level of fraction extraction and altering the operation mode of the refineries. Reduction of the primary crude load is not expected due to the increased demand for straight-run fractions such as kerosene and naphtha. In order to solve the problem of excess fuel oil, deepening processes will be loaded at the maximum level and in the future, it will be

necessary to build additional deep oil refining processes. Conversion of a part of catalytic reformers and catalytic crackers to release of products used as a raw material for petrochemistry optimizes facility loading and will replace part of the prospective demand for naphtha used in the polymerization.

# REFERENCES

- Bodington C. E., Baker T. E., A history of mathematical programming in the petroleum industry, *Interfaces* 20 (4) (1990) 117-127.
- [2] Cherepovitsyn A. E., Tcvetkov P. S., Overview of the prospects for developing a renewable energy in Russia. Proceedings of 2017 International Conference on Green Energy and Applications, *ICGEA* 2017, № 7925466, 2017. pp. 113 117.
- [3] Gao X., Huang D., Jiang Y., Chen T. A decision tree based decomposition method for oil refinery scheduling. *Chinese Journal of Chemical Engineering* 26 (2018) 1605– 1612.
- [4] Goldthau, A., Westphal, K. Why the global energy transition does not mean the end of the petrostate. *Global Policy*; London Vol. 10, Iss. 2, (May 2019).
- [5] EIA, 2012. Petroleum Market Model of the National Energy Modeling System: Model Documentation 2012, Part 1 Report and Appendix A. U.S. Energy Information Administration, Washington.
- [6] EIA, *Technical options for processing additional light tight oil volumes within the United States*. (2015) U.S. Energy Information Administration, Washington.
- [7] EIA, *World Energy Outlook 2018- Report and Appendix A*. U.S. Energy Information Administration, Washington.
- [8] ERIRAS, 2019. Global and Russian Energy Outlook 2019. P. 211.
- [9] Ferreira Coelho J. M., Szklo A. Dealing with petroleum surpluses in Brazil through optimization refining model. *Energy Strategy Reviews* 6 (2015) 80-91.
- [10] Göthe-Lundgren M., Lundgren J., Persson J., An optimization model for refinery production scheduling, *Int. J. Prod. Econ.* 78 (3) (2002) 255-270.
- [11] Ghaithan, Ahmed M., Attia, Ahmed, Duffuaa, Salih O., 2017. Multi-objective optimization model for a downstream oil and gas supply chain. *Appl. Math. Model.* 52, 689– 708.
- [12] Honeywell, 2018. Symphonite Refining and Petrochemical Modeling System (RPMS). Honeywell international Inc., Available at: (https://www.honeywellprocess.com/en-US/ explore/products/advanced-applications/software-production-management/Pages/rpms. aspx) (Accessed 1 March 2018).
- [13] Kalyuzhnova Y., Nygaard, C. A., Omarov, Y., Saparbayev, A. (2016), Different Models of Local Content Implementation in the Oil and Gas Industry. *Local Content Policies in Resource-Rich Countries*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- [14] Kapustin N. O., Grushevenko D. A. Exploring the implications of Russian Energy Strategy project for oil refining sector. *Energy Policy* 117 (2018) 198–207.
- [15] Makarov A. A., Mitrova T. A., Kulagin V. A. World and Russian energy development Forecast 2019. Moscow: Institute for Energy Studies RAS - Moscow School of Management SKOLKOVO. Rus. (2019) P. 210.

- [16] Mikhaylov, V. E., Khomenok, L. A., Sherapov, V. V. (2016), Problems in creation of modern air inlet filters of power gas turbine plants in Russia and methods of their solving. *Thermal Engineering*, 63(8), 529-535.
- [17] Morozov I. V., Potanina Y. M., Voronin S. A., Kuchkovskaya N. V., Siliush M. D. Prospects for the Development of the Oil and Gas Industry in the Regional and Global Economy. *International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy*, 2018, 8(4), 55-62.
- [18] Oliveira, F., Nunes, P. M., Blajberg, R., Hamacher, S. A framework for crude oil scheduling in an integrated terminal-refinery system under supply uncertainty. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 252(2), 2016. p. 635-645.
- [19] Pagliaro, M., Meneguzzo, F. Oil refining in Sicily: A critical perspective looking to the future. *Energy Science & Engineering; London* Vol. 8, Iss. 3, (Mar 2020).
- [20] Pervozvanskiy A. A. Mathematical modeling in production management. Moscow: *Nauka. Rus.* (1975) P. 615.
- [21] Pinto J. M., Joly M., Moro L. F. L., Planning and scheduling models for refinery operations, *Comput. Chem. Eng.* 24 (2000) 2259–2276.
- [22] Ponomarenko T. V., Cherepovitsyn A. E., Fedoseev S. V., Sidorov D. E. Organizational-economic mechanism of financing strategic investment projects at the regional level in regions with poor infrastructure. *International Journal of Applied Engineering Research*, 2016, 11 (16), pp. 9007-9013.
- [23] Rusten, G. The challenges of greening energy: policy/industry dissonance at the Mongstad refinery, Norway. Haarstad, Havard; *Environment and Planning C: Government & Policy* Vol. 34, Iss. 2, (March 2016).
- [24] The Oxford Institute for Energy Studies, 2019. The Energy Transition and Oil Companies' Hard Choices. *Energy Insight*. 50 P. 1-15.
- [25] Ulanov V. L. Landmarks of effective management decisions in the Russian raw material sector, Economic and Social Development 30th International Scientific Conference on Economic and Social Development. *Varazdin development and Entrepreneurship Agency*, 2018. P. 374-382.
- [26] Ulanov V. L., Sazonov D. U. Renewable energy sources as a factor of Russian energy company development risk. Moscow: Izvestiya RAN. *Energetika. Rus.* (2018) № 4. P. 3-13.
- [27] Zhao, Hao, Ierapetritou, Marianthi G., Shah, Nikisha K., Rong, Gang, 2017. Integrated model of refining and petrochemical plant for enterprise-wide optimization. *Comput. Chem. Eng.* 97, 194–207.
- [28] Wang, R., Zhang, H., Shi, F., Zhang, Y., Zhang, L. Empirical study of the relationship between global energy consumption and economic growth. CIEEC 2017 - *Proceedings* of 2017 China International Electrical and Energy Conference. P. 394-399.
- [29] Waziri, B., Hassan, A. and Kouhy, R. (2018), "The effect of transitioning to renewable energy consumption on the Nigerian oil and gas exports: An ARDL approach," *International Journal of Energy Sector Management*, Vol. 12 No. 4, pp. 507-524.