


HYDRAULIC FRACTURING

PRODUCT LINE REPORT



Kimberlite, LLC
5 Grogans Park Dr, Suite 210
The Woodlands, TX 77380



HYDRAULIC FRACTURING SERVICES SUPPLIER PERFORMANCE REPORT

Overview

The 2016 Hydraulic Fracturing Services Supplier Performance Report presents the results of in-depth, personal interviews with decision makers with oil & gas operators worldwide who purchase and use hydraulic fracturing services. The report assesses market share, supplier performance, supplier competitive positioning and buying preferences among the oil & gas operators worldwide.

The report is based on person-to-person phone interviews with 137 respondents worldwide conducted from March to June, 2016.

Each respondent interviewed was pre-qualified for the product category evaluated and the interviews lasted approximately 30 to 45 minutes on average. Completion, production and drilling managers and engineers and other subject matter experts were interviewed for their respective area of responsibility.


Performance ratings for over 35 oilfield service companies were evaluated in the report including both the major suppliers (Schlumberger, Halliburton and Baker Hughes) and smaller, independent and regionally based suppliers.

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary & Analysis
2. Supplier Market Share & Penetration
3. Net Promoter Score Ratings
4. Supplier Competitive Positioning Value Maps
5. Supplier Head-to-Head Performance Analysis


Example Exhibits

A. Supplier Market Share Data – Estimated share of business awarded



ESTIMATED MARKET SHARES BY SELECTED REGIONS								
Suppliers	Worldwide		NAM Land		International Land		Total Offshore	
	% Using	Est Market %	% Using	Est Market %	% Using	Est Market %	% Using	Est Market %
Supplier A	57.70%	42.48%	37.00%	17.47%	62.50%	49.87%	65.40%	43.56%
Supplier B	33.30%	25.43%	29.60%	20.97%	28.10%	17.52%	38.50%	27.11%
Supplier C	38.70%	24.92%	33.30%	12.74%	37.50%	18.37%	42.30%	27.08%
Supplier D	11.70%	3.71%	29.60%	20.97%	9.40%	9.39%	3.80%	1.23%
Supplier E	4.50%	1.30%	14.80%	6.61%	-	-	1.90%	1.02%
Supplier F	0.90%	0.16%	3.70%	5.38%	-	-	-	-
Supplier G	0.90%	0.39%	3.70%	5.38%	-	-	-	-
Supplier H	0.90%	0.16%	3.70%	2.15%	-	-	-	-
Supplier I	0.90%	0.16%	3.70%	2.15%	-	-	-	-
Supplier J	0.90%	0.16%	3.70%	2.15%	-	-	-	-
Supplier K	0.90%	0.12%	3.70%	1.61%	-	-	-	-

B. Supplier Market Penetration – Suppliers used over past year worldwide and by selected regions



C. Supplier Net Promoter Scores

The Net Promoter Score (NPS) is a widely used industry benchmark and is based on the question “How likely would you be to recommend this company (or product) to a friend or colleague” using a scale of 0 to 10 with 10 being highly likely. NPS is a good benchmark to track and monitor customer loyalty.

The report presents supplier Net Promoter Scores versus Industry Average by:

- Region and Company Type



NET PROMOTER SCORES - HYDRAULIC FRACTURING SERVICES					
	Category Average	Supplier A	Supplier B	Supplier C	Supplier D
Worldwide	17.8%				
US Land	14.9%				
Canada	20.1%				
BY COMPANY TYPE					
Majors	20.3%				
Large Independents	12.1%				
Med/ Small Independents	22.7%				
National Oil Companies	22.1%				
ABOVE INDUSTRY AVERAGE PERFORMANCE		INDUSTRY AVERAGE PERFORMANCE		BELOW INDUSTRY AVERAGE PERFORMANCE	


D. Supplier Value Map – Competitive Positioning of Major Suppliers

Evaluating each supplier's overall performance relative to the respective cost for the supplier services is important to track and measure. This analysis is reflected in the Value Map which is a visual picture of the relative competitive positioning of each supplier. Supplier performance is plotted on the X-axis and supplier pricing is plotted on the Y-axis. The "fair value line" is shown diagonally across the Value Map and its slope reflects the relative weights customers place on costs and benefits.

Supplier Value Map – Individual Suppliers Competitive Positioning by:

- Worldwide – Region – Company Type





E. Supplier Head-to-Head Analysis – Strengths & Weaknesses on Key Performance Criteria

