

Jet Kero FOB Spore Cargo Benchmark Statement for Jet Kero FOB Spore Cargo (PJABF00)

Latest update: 4/17/2026

Details of assessment	2
Market reflected in assessment	2
Methodology for assessment	3
Data used for assessment	3
Possible disruptions to assessment	4
Discretion in assessment	5
Changes to assessment	5

This benchmark statement was first published 10/14/2019, and was last updated 4/17/2026.¹ The following assessment is not in scope of EU Benchmarks regulation but is in scope of Article 19 for the UK Benchmarks Regulation (2019 No. 657) and is not excluded by Article 2(g). In the UK, PBBV is making use of the transitional period available for third country benchmarks which are in scope of the UK BMR. This transitional period ends on 31 December 2030 and grants continued access to the UK for third country providers in scope of the UK BMR until that date. Per HM Treasury's Benchmark Equivalence (No.2) Directions 2020, PBBV will apply for endorsement or recognition for this benchmark before the end of the transitional period available under the UK BMR.

Under the Commission delegated regulation (EU) 2020/1816 dated July 2020 and supplementing Regulation (EU) 2016/2011, this benchmark does not pursue ESG objectives and is not aligned with Paris Agreement objectives.³ The full explanation is available at the end of this statement.

Details of assessment

Jet Kero FOB Spore Cargo reflects the tradeable value at 16:30 Singapore on the assessment date of material conforming to the following parameters⁴ ⁵.

ISIN: None available⁶

Commodity: jet fuel

Grade: Def Stan 91-91 A1

Shipping Terms: FOB

Location region: Singapore⁷

Basis location: Straits

Delivery method: Cargo

Delivery dates: 15-30 days

Unit of measure: barrels

¹ ESMA TECHNICAL STANDARDS UNDER THE BENCHMARKS REGULATION Article 1, Paragraph 1a

³ COMMISSION DELEGATED REGULATION (EU) 2020/1816 OF 07.2020 Section 4, Paragraphs 5-7

⁴ ESMA TECHNICAL STANDARDS UNDER THE BENCHMARKS REGULATION Article 1, Paragraph 2a

⁵ Regulation (EU) 2016/1011, Article 27, Paragraph 1a; ESMA TECHNICAL STANDARDS UNDER THE BENCHMARKS REGULATION Article 4, Paragraph c

Currency: USD

Volume: 100,000-250,000 b

Platts Specifications Guide: [Platts Methodology and Specifications](#)

Platts Methodology Guide: [Platts Assessments Methodology Guide](#)

Key terms for this benchmark are listed in the Platts publicly-available methodology document: [Platts Methodology and Specifications](#)

The incoterms used to describe the nature of the market being assessed are defined by the International Chamber of Commerce.

Quality – or grade – definitions are provided by industry-specific associations, by national or international trade bodies, including the International Standards Organization, by equity holders (whole or part) in the brand or grade being assessed, or have been specified by Platts in the methodology and specification guides⁸.

This assessment is based on **input data** regarding the above material provided by market participants through the Market on Close process and by individual sources⁹.

The explanation of market information used for this assessment is published in Platts Global Alert on page 2495. The explanation for the application of judgment for this assessment is published in Platts Global Alert on page 2494¹⁰.

Market reflected in assessment

This assessment reflects trade between **participants in the market** from a variety of positions, including traders, producers, consumers and financial institutions. Platts, part of S&P Global Energy, publishes information from a range of

⁶ ESMA TECHNICAL STANDARDS UNDER THE BENCHMARKS REGULATION Article 1, Paragraph 1b

⁷ ESMA TECHNICAL STANDARDS UNDER THE BENCHMARKS REGULATION Article 1, Paragraph 2b

⁸ Regulation (EU) 2016/1011, Article 27 Paragraph 2a

⁹ ESMA TECHNICAL STANDARDS UNDER THE BENCHMARKS REGULATION Article 1, Paragraph 1c

entities active in this market as detailed below, and historical participation data is available for all entities¹¹.

Market access requires at a minimum sufficient financial standing and creditworthiness, which is typically assessed bilaterally by potential counterparts in that market ahead of concluding any bilateral trades. Beyond financial standing, new entrants to the market would typically establish trading relationships with a range of active market participants on terms that are typical to the market.

Entities also need to be able to perform as a buyer and/or seller in the market through trade performance, and have the logistical capability to perform in accordance with its expected business model (for example, evidence of owned/rented storage facilities and trading operations)¹².

The **size of this market** is measurable in two distinct ways. Firstly, the availability of and demand for physical material meeting the criteria defining the market reality outlined above. In physical commodity markets the actual size varies over time dependent on factors such as field production, maintenance, international trade flows, processing throughput and storage, among others. Data on these volumes are available through a range of sources. Platts tracks the changing volumes through ship tracking, official customs data, official production data and tender information, and publishes this information through its information services. While the overall size of the physical supply and demand is useful, it is not directly relevant to assessing spot value, which is instead reflective of trade in that commodity.

The second measure of a market is volume of trade. A significant majority of physical volumes is typically traded on a long-term contract basis between companies or governments, and these volumes are typically much bigger than those that

¹⁰ ESMA TECHNICAL STANDARDS UNDER THE BENCHMARKS REGULATION Article 4, Paragraph d

¹¹ ESMA TECHNICAL STANDARDS UNDER THE BENCHMARKS REGULATION Article 1, Paragraph 2ci

¹² ESMA TECHNICAL STANDARDS UNDER THE BENCHMARKS REGULATION Article 1, Paragraph 2cii

trade on a spot basis. However, the incremental spot parcel sets the price, at the margin. Platts monitors spot trade constantly, and receives a wide range of information about the market. The volume of spot trade varies considerably depending on factors including demand and supply, international trade arbitrage, inventories and others. Moreover, the flow of a commodity among entities active in that market essentially means that potential trade volumes may be multiples of the physical volumes referenced above. Trade lots may pass through a chain of counterparts several times over. Assessing spot market value is not limited to trades but is also based on bids and offers in the open market, which may not result in a trade but nevertheless demonstrate information about the appetite to trade at a given price level among the wider spot market. Platts retains a record of all bids, offers & trades reported for consideration in this assessment and historical data is available¹³.

Methodology for assessment

Platts employs an end-day **methodology** for this market in order to fully reflect intra-day price movement by using clear timestamping to fully define data in the assessment process. Platts assesses the value of jet fuel using its Market on Close (MOC) assessment process. The MOC assessment process establishes core standards for how data is collected and published, how data is prioritized by value, and ultimately how data is analyzed in the course of completing Platts assessments.

This information is published in real-time, as it is received, on Platts information services. Platts publishes information received so that it can be fully tested by the market at large. Information collected and published may include the identities of buyers and sellers, confirmed prices, volumes, location, and stated trading terms.

Because price is a function of time, Platts Market on Close assessment process is utilized to observe changes to market

values up until the timestamp. The MOC is a structured process within which Platts can evaluate changes to prices by reporting live trades, bids and offers from active market participants¹⁴.

Methodology is reviewed regularly to ensure it reflects prevailing market conditions. Such reviews are carried out by Platts reporters and their managers, supplemented and supported by price methodology specialists who operate separately from the reporting teams. Platts follows a clearly defined process for **public consultation on material changes to its methodologies**. This process is based on full transparency and communication with industry stakeholders aimed at gaining market acceptance for any proposed introduction or changes to methodology. For more information on the **review and approval procedures**, please visit: [Methodology Review and Change](#)¹⁵.

Data used for assessment

Input data for this benchmark is published by Platts and underpinned by transparency. Under Platts Market on Close guidelines for collecting and publishing data, Platts publishes market information including but not limited to firm bids and offers from named companies, expressions of interest to trade and confirmed trades that are received from market participants throughout the day.

The companies providing such information are reviewed in advance of publication through the Market on Close review process, as detailed in the MOC Participation Guidelines available here: [MOC Participation Guidelines](#)

In cases of illiquidity, Platts may additionally consider verifiable data reported and published through the day as provided for publication by individual sources, through established editorial methods.

Platts has developed guidelines for Management of Sources that address source identification, source evaluation, source development, using source information and source

dependency. Individual sources are verified as per Platts Source Management Guidelines.

Input data may include fully and partially confirmed bids, offers and trades, notional trading values and other market information. Market reporters endeavor to verify all market information they receive, including by testing it within the market: trades reported as executed are verified as being executed and Platts ensures that any bids/offers reported are available to the market as a whole.

Platts assessments represent the value of a commodity traded in an open market space at 'arm's-length'.

Transactions that are viewed as not being at arm's-length are excluded from consideration in assessments.

Platts publishes the most relevant information collected that meets its methodological standards, typically through real-time information services and with as much transparency as possible in order to test information within the market. Platts may observe direct market activity as well as the effect of movements in related markets through spread differentials or blending and shipping economics, for example.

Platts assessments are designed to reflect repeatable market value at the close of the assessment process. Platts tracks market price evolution during the entire day, and publishes a wide range of data relating to market value as it does so. All data that has been published through the day is analyzed during the assessment process. Towards the close of the day, Platts focuses its assessment process to publish named firm bids and offers, expressions of interest to trade and confirmed trades, with all relevant details. This transparent data is prioritized in the assessment process, because it is available to the entire market for testing.

Platts does not typically use price and fundamentals **models** to determine market value for this benchmark, but instead seeks to establish the actual tradeable value of a commodity in the open market. Models may be useful as a guide of the impact of price movements in related markets, but these are not directly used in this benchmark assessment.

¹³ ESMA TECHNICAL STANDARDS UNDER THE BENCHMARKS REGULATION Article 1, Paragraph 2ciii

¹⁴ Regulation (EU) 2016/1011, Article 27 Paragraph 2b

¹⁵ Regulation (EU) 2016/1011, Article 27 Paragraph 2b; ESMA TECHNICAL STANDARDS UNDER THE BENCHMARKS REGULATION Article 1, Paragraph 5

Platts may **extrapolate** from input data that conforms to Platts guidelines and is relevant to this market but does not represent the specified criteria of the published benchmark. Physical commodity markets are generally heterogeneous in nature. Key attributes often vary from the base standard reflected in Platts assessments as jet fuel is supplied to market. Platts seeks to align the standard specifications for the jet fuel markets it assesses and the timestamps reflected in its assessments with standard industry practice.

The quality of jet fuel supplied, delivery location, and other specific terms of trade may vary in the physical commodity markets assessed by Platts. This is one reason among many why data collected from the physical jet fuel markets may not be simply averaged to produce a representative assessment value.

Because of the complex nature of the physical jet fuel markets, jet fuel market data typically must be aligned with standard definitions to allow for a fully representative final published assessment. Platts aligns data collected through an analysis of the physical jet fuel markets with its standard assessment specifications through a process called normalization.

Normalization is an essential price adjustment technique used to align reported market information to the base standard reflected in Platts price assessments.

Platts establishes the level of normalization by surveying markets and observing the economic impact of variance from the base standard. This is done by analyzing freight rates (for locational differences), quality premiums (for quality differences), the movements of all markets through time (for time differences) and other premiums associated with the size of trades and delivery terms.

Normalization for time may be done by analyzing movement in a related market observed through time, and that movement may provide a basis by which to align market value of an earlier reported bid, offer or transaction to market value at the MOC close. The alignment for time is essential to

ensure that Platts price assessments reflect the prevailing value of a market at the close or end of the MOC process.

Data prioritization in the final assessment also reflects transparency and repeatability. When determining a final market assessment, Platts gives the greatest priority to fully verifiable and transparent market information. A firm bid or offer that has been published by Platts in accord with its data publishing standards, and which still stands open to the marketplace at the close of the assessment process, establishes clear parameters for Platts final published assessments. Platts typically assesses market value between the most competitive bid, and most competitive offer, open to the market at the close or end of the MOC process. This ensures that Platts assessments reflect the transactable value at the close.

Completed, transparent transactions that are fully published by Platts are important in helping establish where trading interest prevails in the market, and may help determine where, in a bid/offer spread, Platts may assess value for publication. Firm bids and offers that are available to the entire market take precedence over trades that have been concluded earlier in the assessment process when establishing the value of the market, particularly if bids are available at the close above previously traded levels, or offers are available to the market below previously traded levels. Value is a function of time, and value may move on after a transaction is completed in the market place. Similarly, firm bids and offers that are available to the entire market take precedence over transactional activity reported to Platts after the fact¹⁶.

Possible disruptions to assessment

Should supply of, or demand for, material conforming to the assessment parameters cease or reach levels that prevent regular trade at standard terms, or the availability of data concerning market trade of this material clearly and

unambiguously cease, the **measurement of the market** may become unreliable. Under such circumstances, Platts may review whether to end publication of this assessment, or to amend the parameters to reflect a similar, but tradeable, material¹⁷.

Platts does not specify a **minimum amount of transaction data**, or a transaction data threshold, for the publication of its price assessments. Physical commodity markets vary in liquidity. Any particular market analyzed on its own typically demonstrates rising and falling levels of transactional activity through time. Platts is committed to providing an independent and transparent assessment of value for every market that it covers, regardless of the level of market liquidity.¹⁸

During periods of **illiquid or fragmented market activity**, as during all times, Platts seeks to receive market information from as broad a cross section of the market as possible. If a very limited number of participants are active in the market, or if a limited number submit data that constitutes a significant proportion of the total data upon which the assessment is based, Platts will continue to seek fully transparent and verifiable data from the market at large and to apply Platts methodology principles of transparency and time sensitivity. Platts considers data for assessment of any market where a single company provides more than half of all available information to be one where such a company provides a significant proportion of data. However, for consideration in the MOC process such a company's bids or offers must be clearly available for execution by any other potential MOC trading counter party. Therefore, untraded bids or offers constitute data concerning the broader market, not just the company bidding or offering, if no other counterparty chooses to trade at that level¹⁹.

For **periods of stress**, Platts has a Business Continuity Policy which aims to minimize the impact of serious disruptive events on business and benchmark operations. Platts tracks

¹⁶ Regulation (EU) 2016/1011, Article 27 , Paragraph 2c

¹⁷ Regulation (EU) 2016/1011, Article 27 , Paragraph 1a

¹⁸ Regulation (EU) 2016/1011, Article 27 , Paragraph 2c, ESMA TECHNICAL STANDARDS UNDER THE BENCHMARKS REGULATION Article 1, Paragraph 3a, 3b

¹⁹ Regulation (EU) 2016/1011, Article 27 , Paragraph 2g

global events through its market news coverage and in doing so is alerted to periods during which liquidity in a market being assessed may be compromised. Any market disruptive event is reviewed to determine its potential impact on a market price assessment.

Platts assessment principles apply equally during periods of high or low liquidity.

Some circumstances may mean that **insufficient input data** is available for a benchmark to be determined; specifically, when a market disruption event occurs that means no market data are available and there is a strong likelihood of disconnect in value from any related markets. Examples would include extreme financial, natural or political events. Platts may conclude following a market disruptive event that there is insufficient or unreliable market information and may therefore decide to suspend or discontinue publishing the benchmark and related information for a period, and would notify subscribers of any such halt in publication. A publication schedule is available on our website²⁰: [Pricing Holiday Schedule](#)

Discretion in assessment

Platts methodologies clearly delineate how reporters should **exercise discretion** during the benchmark assessment process. As explained in the methodologies, Platts editors apply judgment when determining (1) whether information is suitable for publication, (2) when and how to normalize data and (3) where to assess final value. All such exercise of discretion may be **subsequently evaluated** by Platts editorial management for adherence to the standards published in Platts methodologies. Editorial management may exercise discretion when evaluating an assessment and the use of discretion prior to publication, as well as when evaluating a potential correction and the use of discretion for that.

Judgment may be applied when analyzing transactional data to determine if it meets Platts standards for publication; judgment may also be applied when normalizing values to reflect differences in time, location, and other trading terms when comparing transactional data to the base standard reflected in Platts assessments²¹.

An **ex-post evaluation process** is conducted before publication on every benchmark assessment by a competent peer or manager. The price assessments are reviewed and the exercise of judgment is further discussed and verified during this process. Finally, assessments that are used as benchmarks are supported by assessment rationales. These rationales explain the application of judgment and are published together with the relevant price assessment, offering full transparency to the market²².

To ensure the **consistent exercise of discretion**, Platts ensures that reporters are trained and regularly reviewed in their own and each other's markets. Every assessment of this benchmark, including the use of discretion, is reviewed and approved by a competent peer or manager²³.

Changes to assessment

Please be advised that factors, including external factors beyond the control of Platts, may **necessitate changes to**, or the cessation of, the benchmark. For more information, please visit: [Methodology Review and Change](#). Such factors may include changes in physical market conditions that could materially impact the parameters described at the start of this benchmark statement²⁴.

Platts does not sponsor, endorse or market any specific financial product or provide investment advice. Users of Platts benchmarks should nevertheless be advised that changes to, or the cessation of, the benchmark may have an **impact upon**

financial instruments that reference the benchmark and users should contact the relevant product provider or fund manager for more information²⁵.

Platts is committed to promptly correcting any material **errors in published input data or in the determination of the benchmark**. When a re-determination of the benchmark is made, it is only based on data that was available when the assessment was made. Corrections are made as soon as possible after a potential error is identified. All potential corrections are evaluated and approved by senior editorial management. Subscribers are notified of a correction through publication of a subscriber note as well as through data feeds²⁶.

²⁰ Regulation (EU) 2016/1011, Article 27 Paragraph 2e; ESMA TECHNICAL STANDARDS UNDER THE BENCHMARKS REGULATION Article 1, Paragraph 3abc

²¹ Regulation (EU) 2016/1011, Article 27 Para 1b; ESMA TECHNICAL STANDARDS UNDER THE BENCHMARKS REGULATION Article 1, Paragraph 4

²² ESMA TECHNICAL STANDARDS UNDER THE BENCHMARKS REGULATION Article 1, Paragraph 4

²³ Regulation (EU) 2016/1011, Article 27 Paragraph 2d; ESMA TECHNICAL STANDARDS UNDER THE BENCHMARKS REGULATION Article 1, Paragraph 4

²⁴ Regulation (EU) 2016/1011, Article 27, Paragraph 1c

²⁵ Regulation (EU) 2016/1011, Article 27 Paragraph 1d; ESMA TECHNICAL STANDARDS UNDER THE BENCHMARKS REGULATION Article 1, Paragraph 5b

²⁶ Regulation (EU) 2016/1011, Article 27 Paragraph 2f

EXPLANATION OF HOW ESG FACTORS ARE REFLECTED IN THE BENCHMARK STATEMENT	
SECTION 1 – CONSIDERATION OF ESG FACTORS	
Item 1. Name of the benchmark administrator.	Platts, a Division of S&P Global
Item 2. Type of benchmark or family of benchmarks.	Commodity
Item 3. Name of the benchmark or family of benchmarks.	Jet Kero FOB Spore Cargo
Item 4. Are there in the portfolio of the benchmark administrator any EU Climate Transition Benchmarks, EU Paris-aligned Benchmarks, benchmarks that pursue ESG objectives or benchmarks that take into account ESG factors?	No
Item 5. Does the benchmark or family of benchmarks pursue ESG objectives?	No
<p>Item 6. Where the response to Item 5 is positive, provide below the details (score) in relation to the ESG factors listed in Annex II for each family of benchmarks at aggregated level.</p> <p>The ESG factors shall be disclosed at an aggregated weighted average value at the level of the family of benchmarks.</p>	
a) List of combined ESG factors:	Not Applicable
b) List of environmental factors:	Not Applicable
c) List of social factors:	Not Applicable
d) List of governance factors:	Not Applicable

<p>Item 7. Where the response to Item 5 is positive, provide below the details (score) for each benchmark, in relation to the ESG factors listed in Annex II, depending on the relevant underlying asset concerned.</p> <p>Alternatively, all of this information may be provided in the form of a hyperlink to a website of the benchmark administrator included in the benchmark statement. The information on the website shall be easily available and accessible. Benchmark administrators shall ensure that information published on their website remains available</p>	
a) List of combined ESG factors:	Not Applicable
b) List of environmental factors:	Not Applicable
c) List of social factors:	Not Applicable
d) List of governance factors:	Not Applicable
Hyperlink to the information on ESG factors for each benchmark:	Not Applicable
Item 8. Data and standards used	
a) Description of data sources used to provide information on the ESG factors in the benchmark statement.	Not Applicable
<i>Describe how the data used to provide information on the ESG factors in the benchmark statement are sourced and whether, and to what extent, data are estimated or reported.</i>	
b) Reference standards.	Not Applicable
<i>List the supporting standards used for the reporting under item 6 and/or item 7</i>	
SECTION 2 – ADDITIONAL DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS FOR EU CLIMATE	

TRANSITION AND EU PARIS-ALIGNED BENCHMARKS	
<p>Item 9. Where a benchmark is labelled as ‘EU Climate Transition Benchmark’ or ‘EU Paris-aligned Benchmark’, benchmark administrators shall also disclose the following information:</p>	
a) forward-looking year-on-year decarbonisation trajectory;	Not Applicable
b) degree to which the IPCC decarbonisation trajectory (1,5°C with no or limited overshoot) has been achieved on average per year since creation;	Not Applicable
c) overlap between those benchmarks and their investable universe, as defined in Article 1, point (e), of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) .../... [PO please insert a reference to Commission Delegated Regulation supplementing Regulation (EU) 2016/1011 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards the minimum standards for EU Climate Transition Benchmarks and EU Paris-aligned Benchmarks]1, using the active share at asset level.	Not Applicable
SECTION 3 – DISCLOSURE OF THE ALIGNMENT WITH THE OBJECTIVES OF THE PARIS AGREEMENT	
<p>Item 10. By the date of application of this Regulation, for significant equity and bond benchmarks, EU Climate Transition Benchmarks and EU Paris-aligned Benchmarks, benchmark</p>	

<p>administrators shall also disclose the following information.</p> <p>By 31 December 2021, benchmark administrators shall, for each benchmark or, where applicable, each family of benchmarks, disclose the following information:</p>	
a) Does the benchmark align with the target of reducing carbon emissions or the attainment of the objectives of the Paris Agreement;	No
b) the temperature scenario, in accordance with international standards, used for the alignment with the target of reducing GHG emissions or attaining of the objectives of the Paris Agreement;	Not Applicable
c) the name of the provider of the temperature scenario used for the alignment with the target of reducing GHG emissions or the attainment of the objectives of the Paris Agreement;	Not Applicable
d) the methodology used for the measurement of the alignment with the temperature scenario;	Not Applicable
e) the hyperlink to the website of the temperature scenario used.	Not Applicable
Date on which information has last been updated and reason for the update:	June 2025: Annual Review