

Securing the supply of graphite for batteries

K. Bhuwalka^{1,2*}, H. Ramachandran³, S. Narasimhan^{2,3}, A. Yao^{2,3}, J. Frohmann⁴, L. Peiseler^{5,6,7}, W. Chueh^{2,3,4}, A. Boies⁸, S.J. Davis^{9,4}, S. Benson⁴

*corresponding author; email: bhuwalka@stanford.edu

¹ Precourt Institute for Energy, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305, USA

² Applied Energy Division, SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory, Menlo Park, CA 94305, USA

³ Department of Materials Science and Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305, USA

⁴ Department of Energy Science and Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305, USA

⁵ Energy and Technology Policy Group, ETH Zurich; Clausiusstrasse 37, CH-8092, Zurich, Switzerland

⁶ Materials and Device Engineering Group, ETH Zurich; Gloriastrasse 35, CH-8092, Zurich, Switzerland

⁷ Institute of Science, Technology and Policy, ETH Zurich; Universitätsstrasse 41, CH-8092, Zurich, Switzerland

⁸ Department of Mechanical Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305, USA

⁹ Department of Earth System Science, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305, USA

Abstract

The increasing demand for graphite in batteries, particularly for electric vehicles, has led to concerns around supply chain security. Currently, over 92% of global anode material is produced in China, posing a geopolitical risk for other countries reliant on graphite supply for domestic industries. This paper assesses the costs of producing battery-grade graphite (natural and synthetic) in the US and China using process-based cost models. We find that production costs in the US significantly exceed those in China due to higher capital intensity and input costs. Our analysis reveals that a majority of modeled projects in the US are not competitive at current market prices. We identify key cost drivers, including capital costs, economies of scale, and input material prices, and explore pathways to improve the competitiveness of US graphite production, such as supportive financing and process innovation directions. The analysis of conventional graphite production costs at scale also informs ceiling costs for alternative, promising pathways such as methane pyrolysis and catalytic graphitization. This study highlights the challenges and trade-offs in building a diversified graphite supply chain and informs policy and investment decisions.

Introduction

As the consumption of batteries increases for use in electric vehicles (EVs), energy storage systems (ESS), and consumer electronics, the global demand for graphite is surging. From 2018 to 2023, graphite demand grew by over 50% to 3,600 kilotons (kt), with most of the growth (89%) related to batteries.¹ Furthermore, demand is expected to increase by another 70% over the next 5 years, with projected demand reaching 2,920 kt in 2028 (**Fig 1a**) primarily driven by EV batteries—an 1,800% increase over a decade.

Globally, over 92% of anode material is currently produced in China, posing a significant supply risk to automakers and countries across the world.¹ Graphite trade has already become a point of geopolitical leverage: in late 2024, China restricted graphite exports in response to US limits on semiconductor exports, following stricter permitting rules enacted from just one year prior.² Therefore, some are advocating for a more decentralized supply chain for battery-grade graphite. However, the low costs of production in China presents a major challenge to scaling up economically competitive production elsewhere. Prices of high-grade synthetic graphite (defined below) from China fell by 53% to \$7,500/t from 2022 to 2025, reaching a level at which most Western producers are unable to compete today.³ In response, governments across the world have responded with low-cost loans and incentives to support local production of graphite.⁴ Despite the announcement of many planned projects thus far, challenges remain in achieving price-competitiveness. In late 2024, North American graphite producers lobbied for the imposition of a 920% tariff on graphite imports.⁵ While such aggressive trade policies would allow domestic producers to compete, the increased costs of graphite will lead to higher prices for domestically produced EVs and ESS. This may substantially impact sales and reduce the competitiveness of American-made products.⁶ Near-term decisions will need to balance the trade-offs between low-cost materials and a secure, diversified supply chain.

Although there are numerous technical studies of graphite production technologies as well as some life-cycle analyses,⁷⁻¹⁴ there has not been a systematic assessment of graphite costs across the multitude of production pathways. Holistically assessing production pathways and technology roadmaps is needed to identify strategies to increase competitiveness and quantify policy trade-offs towards securing supply chains. Here, we develop detailed process-based cost models for various production pathways for battery-grade graphite and obtain industry-vetted data on key input parameters, including the cost of raw materials, energy, labor, equipment, and construction. We then use these models to compare costs of graphite production (1) along different process pathways and (2) across different regions between the US and China. The key contribution of this work is a model that allows for a direct comparison between various process routes and production regions. By building a bottom-up model, we can investigate how changing parameters such as input costs, process efficiencies and economies-of-scale impact the costs of graphite production. In this work, we perform Monte-Carlo simulations to test the sensitivities of estimated costs to a wide range of inputs. Details of data sources and cost modeling approach are provided in the *Methods* section.





Figure 1: Overview of the graphite anode market. a. Graphite anode production and demand in 2023 and projections for 2028. Demand and production are segmented by region, and material type (natural, synthetic) b. Commercial processes to make graphite for batteries. Processes modeled in this paper are in white text, with yellow boxes representing the natural graphite (NG) pathway and green boxes representing the synthetic graphite (SG) pathway. NG processing begins with mining flake graphite ore, which is concentrated into graphite concentrate. The concentrated flakes are segregated based on size, shaped into spheres (spheronization), and purified using a combination of heating and acid or alkali treatment (typically, HF purification). SG is produced from petrochemical feedstocks like needle coke. This feedstock is spheronized and then graphitized (typically in an Acheson furnace) at temperatures of around 3000 C. Both NG and SG are pitch coated as a final step. Grey boxes and arrows represent innovative processes that are not operating at-scale, and these are highlighted in the discussion section.

Main

Whereas graphite is used in a multitude of applications today—from electric arc furnace electrodes to lubricants, nuclear moderators, crucibles, and pencil lead—battery-grade graphite specifically for Li-ion batteries has comparatively stringent and particular requirements. Given the necessity for high gravimetric and volumetric energy densities, long cycle life, and reasonable charge/discharge rates, battery-grade graphite necessarily requires (1) high material crystallinity which corresponds to lithium storage capacity measured in mAh/g, which increases energy density of the cell (2) high material purity for improved cycle life (3) tightly controlled particle sizes for rate performance (4) engineered morphology towards sphericity to minimize electrode tortuosities and maximize achievable electrode calender densities, and (5) optimized surface areas to minimize first cycle inefficiency loss due to the formation of the solid electrolyte interphase (SEI) layer. Naturally, material requirements are application-specific due to the need for cost-performance tradeoffs, therefore resulting in a range of specifications for graphite for battery anodes. Given the rapid growth of the battery industry spurring continued process innovations and cell design advances, these requirements continue to evolve with new producers needing to meet high standards for material quality. In Table 1, we compile information from 100+ anode materials specification sheets, to summarize the most current understanding of material requirements at the time of this writing (1Q2025).

	Units	High (SG / NG)		Median (SG / NG)		Low (SG / NG)	
Specific Capacity	<i>mAh/g</i>	355	360	350	360	345	358
Material Purity	%	99.97		99.95		99.9	
Achievable Calender Density	<i>g/cc</i>	1.7		1.65		1.55	1.65
First Cycle Efficiency	%	93%	93.5%	92%	93%	92%	
Particle Size	<i>μm, D₅₀</i>	13-15	14-16	12-16	11-17	10-20	8-22
Surface Area	<i>m²/g</i>	2	4.85	1.85	2.5	1.5	2.1

Table 1: Percentile values of key materials requirements for natural and synthetic graphite products used in battery applications. Data is taken from 100+ product specification sheets across 13 suppliers. “High” refers to the 75th percentile of values in the collected data, while “low” refers to the 25th percentile of data. Purity threshold is based on industry interviews, not collected data. Sources of data for the materials specifications, and value distribution plots, are presented in SI.

In order to achieve such stringent and particular engineered material properties, the production process for battery-grade graphite can be highly involved and complex. Irrespective of the exact processing technologies, the transformation of carbonaceous feedstocks into battery-grade graphite combines four “processing functions”: Purification, Graphitization, Particle Shaping, and Surface Modification (Coating). Processes are chosen and optimized to various degrees by producers to serve these functions, with some common pathways highlighted in **Figure 1b**.

There are generally two primary material feedstocks from which battery-grade graphite is made from today: mined flake graphite concentrate and petroleum coke. In light of the supply chain risks highlighted above, there is also recent interest in alternative feedstocks, which include methane, biochar, and in some cases, even carbon dioxide. Purification naturally refers to the processing steps to minimize impurities and maximize the carbon content of the material. Broadly, there are either chemical or thermal approaches to purification, and a combination of the two may often be used. Graphitization refers to the formation of the highly-ordered, laminar structure of graphene layers characteristic of graphite between which lithium ions sit when the anode is lithiated (charged). Depending on the production pathway, graphitization may result in nanometer-scale domains of graphite crystallites between turbostratic/disordered regions or long-range micron-sized graphite crystals. Graphitization generally requires

substantial thermal energy and represents the most energy-intensive step for synthetic graphite production routes. New emerging approaches may leverage catalytic levers to circumvent energy-intensive thermal processing. In cases where ultra-high temperature processing is used such as for conventional synthetic graphite production, the Purification and Graphitization functions are performed concurrently. Particle Shaping is critical to produce engineered spherical morphologies that pack tightly resulting in greater energy density while also allowing for the efficient transport of lithium ions needed for fast charging. Shaping includes down-sizing larger primary particles via “**spheronization**” or “rounding” to obtain desired particle sizes, as well as agglomerating finer primary particles to produce spherical secondary particle morphologies. Finally, as the interface between the graphite active material and electrolyte are critical within a Li-ion cell, Surface Modification includes the particle exterior coating steps performed to tailor power performance, first cycle efficiency, and cycle life. Since Surface Modification directly correlates with key performance parameters associated with differentiated anode active material (AAM) products, this functional vertical represents a substantial portion of the intellectual property (IP) behind AAM producers.

Today, approximately 75% of battery-grade graphite is synthetic graphite (SG) and the remainder is natural graphite (NG); **Figure 1a**. In this paper, we model SG production as the transformation of calcined needle coke (a type of petroleum coke) via shaping, graphitization, and coating. NG production involves shaping of mined graphite concentrate, followed by purification and coating.

Of the SG production routes today, Acheson and Box furnace processes dominate the Graphitization step in China. Acheson furnaces, originally developed by Edward Goodwin Acheson in 1891 to synthesize silicon carbide (SiC) is the predominant furnace technology used for synthetic graphite. Here, petroleum coke is contained in graphite crucibles, which are arranged in a double- or triple-stacked linear array within a pit furnace with refractory lining. In between the cylindrical crucibles, a large amount of coke “pack material” is used as filler which buries the crucibles to isolate from air. At either end of the furnace are ultra high-power direct current (DC) electrodes. During operation of the Acheson furnace, high currents are passed between the DC electrodes, using the crucible-pack material as a resistive core to create large amounts of Joule heating upwards of 2,800°C. After several hours of sustained passage of current, the furnace is allowed to cool over the next 18-20 days before the pack material can be removed without risk of carbon oxidation. The temperature, current profile, and time passed are process parameters to tune for optimal product crystallinity (degree of graphitization), uniformity, and production throughput. As repeated use of the pack material will cause it to similarly graphitize and experience an decrease in electrical resistivity, used pack materials must be replaced or blended with new pack material to maintain optimal resistive properties. Box furnaces are recently growing in popularity as an alternative design, and legacy Acheson furnaces can be repurposed into Box furnaces. They work by dividing the furnace into equal volume chambers to eliminate the need for packing material, doubling the effective volume of the furnace. Additionally, they reduce the labor required as material can be fed into and extracted easily with automated powder feed and vacuum suction. However, heating and cooling of graphite takes longer in a box furnace (30-35 days) due to the inherently poorer thermal uniformity of the furnace construction, which thereby need additional time for temperature soaking.

For natural flake graphite, the Graphitization step can be omitted as the mined ores inherit high degrees of crystallinity. Instead, the key functional vertical required is Purification. Of the NG production routes today, acid leaching dominates in China. Using such a highly caustic acid, such as hydrofluoric acid (HF), is necessary to leach out the detrimental silicate impurities often found in flake graphite. In regions where there is resistance to handle HF due to human health hazards and environmental concerns, other alternative pathways are considered, such as carbochlorination, acid-alkali roasting, and high-temperature processes; Carbochlorination, which involves injecting graphite with chlorine gas at high temperatures (>1,200°C) so that impurities react and are volatilized, is the process of choice for multiple North American projects.

In our subsequent modeling below within this paper, we model the costs of graphite production via three primary routes across the two regions of US and China: (1) SG production via the Acheson process in both US and China, (2) NG production via carbochlorination in the US, and (3) NG production via HF acid leaching in China.

Comparing Graphite Production in the US vs. China

We find that the costs of producing battery-grade graphite in the US significantly exceed the costs of production in China for both SG and NG routes. **Figure 2** shows the distribution of the capital and operating costs from our Monte-Carlo simulations. While there are some differences in the operating expenditures between US and China (y-axis), most of the difference in costs result from the larger capital intensity of plants in the US (x-axis). For SG, capital intensity in the US ranges from \$12,000 – \$28,000/tpa (tpa = metric tonnes per annum), with a baseline value of \$17,000/tpa. By comparison, capital intensity in China ranges from \$6,000 – \$12,000/tpa, with a baseline value of \$8,250/tpa. Similarly, for NG, capital intensity ranges from \$12,000 – \$30,000/tpa in the US and \$4,000 – \$6,000/tpa in China, with baseline values of \$17,500/tpa and \$4,300/tpa respectively.

The grey diagonal contour lines in **Figure 2** represent the materials price at which a project would make a 15% internal rate of return (IRR) on investment over 10 years. We choose 15% as the IRR value as a high return might be expected by investors given the many risks. In 2024, prices for high-grade NG were between \$6,500/t to \$7,500/t while prices for SG were between \$7,000/t to \$8,000/t. From the cost distributions in **Figure 2**, we can see that a majority of modeled projects in the US have a cost structure such that they would not be competitive at those prices (the grey diagonal contours crossing the cost distributions exceed historic prices). Only 7% of simulations for SG production would be able to generate a 15% IRR at a price of \$7,500/t, while only 10% of NG simulations could at a price of \$7,000/t. In contrast, over 95% of the modeled projects in China can generate a 15% IRR at those prices. A major contributor to the US's uncompetitiveness is driven by the speed at which prices are falling in China—either due to continued process innovations, fierce competition within China, or favorable industrial policies. Whereas average prices for NG and SG in China were \$7,000/t and \$7,500/t respectively in 2024, they were \$9,000/t and \$11,000/t respectively just two years prior in 2022—around when many US graphite players conducted their feasibility studies and established their business cases. Based on the 2022 prices, 47% of modeled NG projects in the US and 86% of modeled SG projects could survive with a 15% IRR. Therefore, the rapidly falling prices of Chinese graphite in the last several years has critically challenged the assumptions of competitiveness amongst the Western producers, severely jeopardizing their scale-up trajectory. In the face of this challenge, scaling up projects in Western countries will require more supportive prices.

Diving further into the specific costs of SG production in the US and China, the initial capital expenditure (CapEx) is a key reason for the reduced competitiveness in the West. For a 45 ktpa (ktpa = kilotonnes per annum) plant in the US, the required CapEx is approximately \$1.02B whereas it would be \$370M in China—64% lower. Specifically, the CapEx associated with the Graphitization functional vertical dominates costs, with the furnace itself representing over 50% of the total plant CapEx (**Figure 3**). In contrast to CapEx, OpEx for SG production in the US and China are more comparable. The baseline OpEx for SG production is \$5,461/t in the US and \$4,230/t in China.

NG production is also significantly more expensive in the US than in China. This is in part driven by our assumption that NG production in China continues to use the HF acid-leaching process whereas US-based production would use a carbochlorination process instead. This assumption is supported by multiple North American projects stating their intentions to use carbochlorination for purifying graphite (e.g. GraphiteOne).^{15,17} A plant producing 45 ktpa of NG in the US via carbochlorination requires approximately \$790M in CapEx, while a similarly-sized facility in China would cost just \$195M—75% lower. This disparity is greater than that seen for SG because the CapEx associated with HF acid-leaching is substantially lower compared to carbochlorination—which requires large furnaces with long heating and cooling periods, increasing capital requirements per tonne of output. Highlighting two tangible examples, according to the feasibility study for the Nouveau Monde Graphite (NMG) NG project in Canada, the carbochlorination capital intensity is \$3,745/tpa,¹⁵ while the capital intensity for an HF purification facility based on Hensen Graphite's Weihai plant in China is only \$520/tpa.¹⁶ Beyond the differences in processing pathways for making NG, the lower CapEx in China also results from significantly cheaper equipment in general and lower labor costs for construction workers. For example, NMG's spheronization facility in Canada has a capital intensity of \$2,600/tpa (\$107M CapEx for 40 ktpa capacity) while Falcon's Morocco plant (based on Hensen Graphite's Weihai Plant in China) has a spheronization capital intensity of only \$760/ktpa (\$19M CapEx for 25 ktpa

capacity). Additionally, OpEx for NG production is also greater in the US (\$4,788/t) compared to China (\$3,488/t). In the following section, we will discuss the major drivers of the cost advantage that positions Chinese manufacturers favorably within the global graphite market.




Figure 2: Results of cost modeling for graphite production. Orange regions represent the distribution of cost for NG projects modeled (Capital Intensity on x-axis, Operating Cost on y-axis), while green regions represent the cost of SG projects. Capital Intensity refers to the Capital Expenditure (CAPEX) needed per tpa (metric tonnes per annum) of capacity, while OPEX represents the cost of producing a tonne of graphite. Region to the left are results from our China model and region to the right are results from the US model. The grey diagonal lines represent the graphite price at which a project with a particular cost structure would generate a 15% rate of return on investment (IRR) in 10 years. Stars display the costs in our baseline scenario for NG and SG in US and China, while circles represent costs from public **company reports** (we adjust some reported costs for consistency; see Table 2 for information).

Table 2: Reported costs of anode materials facilities from public feasibility studies and reports

Owner Company	Report Year	Plant Location	Process Type	Capacity (ktpa)	CapEx (\$M)	OpEx (\$/t)	Total Cost (\$/t)	Notes
Falcon ¹⁶	2025	Morocco	Acid	26	106	3193	4005	[1]
Renascor ¹⁸	2023	Australia	Acid-Alkali	25	346	2334	5092	[2]
Syrah ¹⁹	2023	Louisiana, US	Acid	11.25	209	4310	8011	[3]
NMG ¹⁵	2022	Canada	Carbo-Chlor	42	673	2631	7224	[4]
Next Source ²⁰	2024	Saudi Arabia	Acid	20	280	4571	7361	
Talga ²¹	2021	Sweden	Acid-Alkali	19.5	528	2363	7758	
Graphite One ²²	2024	Ohio, US	Carbo-Chlor	25	436	4960	8435	
Anovion ²³	2023	Georgia, US	Synthetic	40	800	6000	9985	[5]
NOVONIX ²⁴	2024	Tennessee, US	Synthetic	31	760	5500	10385	[6]

Adjustments: The Total Cost reported on the right assumes that the Capex is annualized such that the internal rate of return (IRR) on the Capex over 10 years is 15%. Since not all projects are equivalent in the product output, adjustments are made to make the costs comparable. Assumed product output is anode active material (AAM)

[1] Falcon Energy uses Chinese equipment and partnership with Chinese entity, Hensen graphite

[2] Renascor produces 50ktpa of spherical purified graphite (uncoated). 50% of this is not primary material of particle sizes large enough for battery applications, so we adjust capacity to represent the capacity of battery-grade material. We add a cost for coating based on our own analysis (\$90M CAPEX and \$550/t OPEX). Note that since it is a vertically integrated plant, Renascor assumes a feedstock cost of \$405/t, while we assume ~\$800/t for other projects.

[3] Assume concentrate costs \$425/t from Balma mine (vertically integrate)

[4] OPEX does not include concentrate, We add a cost of \$700/t concentrate, or \$1400/t-AAM

[5] Anovion does not report OPEX. We assume it to be \$6000/t-AAM based on our analysis

[6] We assume that capital costs are annualized at the same rate for all facilities. NOVONIX may have a lower cost of capital due to support from U.S. Department of Energy's Loan Programs Office

Key Cost Drivers of Synthetic Graphite Production

Our total cost analysis of SG production using the Acheson process reveals a striking disparity between costs in the US and China. In our baseline case, the total cost of production in the US is ~ 60% higher (\$8,625/t; **Figure 3a**) than costs in China (\$5,617/t; **Figure 3b**).

In **Figure 3a**, we show the processes and inputs that contribute significantly to the costs of SG production. The needle coke feedstock represents a similar expense for both countries, provided that the same input material is purchased from the global commodity market (\$929/t; **Figures 3a and 3b**). China produces over 1,000 ktpa of needle coke; producers in the US and UK (such as Phillips 66) are capable of producing 400 ktpa.²⁵ While producers in China have begun to use lower-cost sponge coke as a feedstock for SG, the resulting material is often of lower quality more suitable for low-grade graphite. For our analysis, we assume that needle coke prices do not differ by region, but strategic supply agreements can drive down costs further. For spheronization, costs are driven by equipment CapEx and related maintenance costs, both of which are lower in China. The cost of the spheronization process itself is low (<\$1,000/t) but spheronization impacts the total cost significantly because low yields drives up feedstock costs. The impact of changing yields is investigated later below.

As shown in **Figures 3a and 3b**, the majority of the production costs are driven by the graphitization process. Graphitization involves the construction of large Acheson-like furnaces, which drives CapEx. Here, needle coke undergoes thermal processing close to 3,000°C and cooled over weeks in a batch process, thereby requiring multiple furnaces to be constructed and operated in parallel in order to achieve a large-capacity plant. The significant difference in the annualized CapEx for graphitization (\$1,700/t in the US and \$720/t in China) is a key culprit for the cost differential between the two regions. Electricity prices, a crucial factor in the energy-intensive, electricity-driven Acheson process, are also lower in China relative to the US, though closer in comparison. Chinese graphitization plants are concentrated in Inner Mongolia, which has low power costs (5.5c/kWh or ~0.4 RMB/kWh),²⁶ while we assume most American producers will face the industrial rates in the Southeast US (6.5c/kWh).²⁷ The moderately lower electricity prices help reduce electricity-related costs by \$150/t. In both the US and China, it is possible for producers to enter into power purchase agreements and lock-in lower rates, especially in regions with negative pricing due to excess renewable capacity.

Finally, consumables such as the packing material are a large cost driver due to the sheer amount of packing material consumed per tonne of SG produced (>2:1 ratio of pack material vs graphite feedstock). In the US, purchasing and disposing of packing material contributes \$700/t in cost of SG. In contrast, the packing material in China is resold to other industries such as steelmaking, and are therefore able to recover part of or (in some cases) all of the cost. The crucibles are also a significant cost driver (\$500/t in the US), as they can only be reused 5-6 times before deteriorating. Process improvements that can extend the lifetime of crucibles can help bring these costs down, as well as secondary markets for used crucibles. Lower maintenance costs, which result directly from the lower CapEx, further drives down the economics of SG production in China.

While we model the most commonly-used Acheson furnaces, other furnace technologies such as continuous or box furnaces are increasingly being used by producers. By eliminating the need for packing material and crucibles, box furnaces can save ~\$700/t in costs. Additionally, the 10% higher effective furnace throughput translates to \$170/t in CapEx savings, and the higher effective volume leads to 40% lower power consumption per output (\$400/t in OpEx savings). Despite their promised cost savings, Box furnaces still have key technical challenges to overcome, including aforementioned challenges with temperature distribution and product uniformity.

Instead of using resistive Joule heating as in the case of Acheson and Box furnaces, Continuous furnaces use inductive Eddy-current heating via external coils around annular or tubular channels through which material flows continuously downward via gravity within an inert gas environment. Continuous graphitization has the promise of lower energy consumption (6-8 kWh/kg) compared to Acheson furnaces (15 kWh/kg) due to a more surgical, local application of heat, translating to a ~\$500/t savings in electricity costs. However, due to the architecture of the system and the necessity to operate at ~3,000°C, continuous graphitization furnaces may have greater equipment

downtime due to more frequent refractory maintenance and repair, thereby increasing costs. Moreover, the CapEx of continuous furnaces is anticipated to be higher than Acheson furnaces. Therefore, even if annual maintenance costs are assumed to be the same across both processes (5% of initial CapEx), a 25% higher CapEx for Continuous graphitization equipment would erode the cost benefits from reduced electricity use. A key technical materials-related challenge in continuous graphitization is whether furnace temperatures can fully meet the temperatures obtained in Acheson furnaces without severely deteriorating equipment up-time. Lower temperatures will result in lower degrees of graphitization, resulting in materials with lower specific capacities. This challenge has significant revenue impacts, since prices can be 50% lower for mid- to low-grade graphite compared to high-grade.

Key Cost Drivers of Natural Graphite Production

For NG production, we see a similar disparity in costs between regions (baseline cost is \$7,989/t in the US and \$4,339/t in China; **Figures 3c and 3d**). The feedstock material (graphite concentrate) represents a large proportion of costs for NG production. The higher concentrate costs are driven by both the costs of mining and the significantly lower yields of spheronization of graphite concentrate compared to needle coke (assumed 50% yield for NG and 70% for SG). Graphite concentrate prices are assumed to be \$750/t in China and \$800/t in the US since the production is concentrated in China and the US would be an importer. Vertically integrating NG production with graphite mining and concentration can benefit from lower concentrate costs and process optimization that can maximize spheronization yields. For example, Syrah assumes a graphite concentrate cost of \$425/t for its Vidalia facility as it owns and operates the Balama mine in Mozambique.¹⁹ Similarly, Renascor assumes prices of \$405/t in its proposed integrated mining and processing project in Australia.¹⁸ We assume different purification processes in the US and China. Carbochlorination (in the US) is more expensive than HF acid-leaching (in China). As shown in **Figures 3c and 3d**, total purification costs are double in the US (~\$2,000/t) compared to China (\$1,000/t). This is due to the construction of furnaces required for carbochlorination which do not exist for HF acid-leaching. The need to heat up the furnaces further adds operating costs to the US base case as well.




Figure 3: a) Baseline costs of producing synthetic graphite for batteries (SG) in the US; b) Baseline costs of producing SG in China. Baseline cost assumptions are in SI Tables, and represent the scenario highlighted by the green star in Figure 2. c) Baseline costs of producing natural graphite for batteries (NG) in the US on an annualized per tonne basis; d) Baseline costs of producing NG in China. Baseline cost assumptions are in SI Tables, and represent the scenario highlighted by the orange stars in Figure 2. We convert the initial capital investment (CAPEX) into an annual number by assuming that producers need to pay back the investment in 10 years at a 15% IRR. The total costs here represent the minimum price needed for a plant to make a 15% IRR. For SG, producers in both the US and China are assumed to use Acheson furnaces for graphitization. Costs are ordered by the process flow, with dark colors representing CAPEX and light colors representing OPEX. Sph: Spheronization, Carbo-chlor: Carbochlorination, Coat: Coating. Plants in China use HF Purification while US plants are assumed to use carbochlorination due to issues of safety and permitting in using HF. In this baseline, all plants produce 45ktpa of battery-grade graphite.

Pathways to increasing competitiveness of graphite production

Figure 4 quantifies the most important factors that impact production costs. Going from left to right within each panel (SG on left, NG on right) we vary model parameters from their baseline value to the value which minimizes cost, creating a pathway that minimizes overall costs. As the parameters are varied, the height of the bars represent the minimum price needed for the projects to be competitive. For example, as we change the required rate of return on capital (IRR) from 15% (baseline) to 5%, the price needed for SG plants to be competitive reduces from \$8,865/t to \$7,635/t. The green and orange dashed line represent prices in 2024 for high-grade SG and NG respectively.




Figure 4: Sensitivity Analysis of production costs to the most important parameters, for US synthetic graphite production (green; left) and US natural graphite production (orange; right). The minimum and maximum values of the parameters are written along the bar. The y-axis is the cost of production, each bar represents how the cost changes when the parameter varies from the value on the bottom to the top. We change parameters one-by-one moving left to right, highlighting a pathway to cost reduction. For a particular parameter, the parameters to its left are fixed at the value that minimizes cost i.e. IRR is fixed at 5% when varying capacity. Black dotted line is the baseline cost (Fig 3) and the colored dotted line represents 2024 prices for high-grade material.

We observe that the cost of capital is the most important factor in determining economic viability. If the required IRR is 25%, prices required for NG and SG production would exceed \$9,000/t and \$9,500/t, compared to respective costs of \$7,056/t and \$7,635/t when IRR is 5%. The required IRR is assumed to be identical between US and China in our analysis, but cheaper financing costs in China can further drive down project costs towards competitiveness. For both SG and NG production, economies-of-scale play a strong role, with larger capacity plants naturally having lower costs. For synthetic graphite, even when the required IRR is 5%, a smaller plant size (20 ktpa) results in a cost exceeding \$9,500/t, while the larger plant (80 ktpa) brings costs down to \$7,230/t. While larger plants have lower costs over their lifetime, they also necessitate greater investments, which can be unfeasible. Plants in China benefit from both larger capacity and cheaper government financing. Government support in terms of low-cost financing for large-scale US graphite projects could play a critical role in driving down costs towards competitiveness. A combination of a 5% IRR and 80 ktpa capacity can drive the required prices for competitive NG production down to \$6,590/t, which is lower than historic prices for high-grade NG material. The required prices for an 80 ktpa SG plant to make a 5% IRR (\$7,230/t) is also lower than SG prices in 2024.

Lower input costs, both in terms of feedstock materials and electricity prices, are vital in driving down costs further. For SG, which requires a large amount of electricity to operate Acheson furnaces, power-purchase agreements with prices close to 3c/kWh can further decrease the required price from \$7,260/t to \$6,700/t. Raw material costs also constitute a major driver: needle coke prices significantly impact synthetic graphite costs, and graphite concentrate prices strongly influence natural graphite costs. A reduction in graphite concentrate prices to \$500/t can reduce the required price for NG plants to make a 5% IRR down from \$6,590/t to \$5,950/t. However, it is projected that the graphite concentrate market will enter into a supply deficit over the next few years, likely raising the prices of concentrate.²⁸ Vertically integrated projects and companies can likely ensure they secure feedstock at cheaper costs. However, vertical integration requires even larger capital investments which may not be feasible for many players.

Given the large losses experienced in spheronization, improvements to yields can play a significant role in driving down costs for production, especially for NG production which tends to have greater losses. With low concentrate prices, increasing shaping yields for NG production from 50% to 80% can drive down the required price from \$5,950/t to \$5,200/t. For improving the competitiveness of graphite production, emphasis should be placed on improving the yields of spheronization via R&D.

Since CapEx dominates production costs for both SG and NG, we need process innovations to lower capital intensity (CapEx per tonne of throughput). In particular, the Graphitization and Purification functional verticals of SG and NG production are primary CapEx cost drivers. One of the most viable ways to reduce capital intensities is to increase the throughput of production processes, either via greater operating efficiencies, improved equipment designs, or process innovations that reduce required temperatures. Doubling the throughput of the Graphitization and Purification functions (increase to 0.8 TPH and 0.3 TPH, respectively) can further drive down prices to \$4,798/t for NG and \$5,957/t for SG. This effect of doubling production throughput is the same as halving CapEx, so process innovations are critical.

It is critical to note that reaching competitiveness requires a combination of supportive financing and process improvements—as shown above, each parameter individually is insufficient. This presents a chicken-and-egg problem that hinders scaling. Producers need to operate at large scales to improve processes and optimize parameters, yet it is unlikely investors will opt to fund large-scale projects without higher profit margins.

Discussion

Graphite is a material that critically underpins many aspects of the global economy, finding application within energy technologies, defense technologies, and steel production. Given the significant reliance of these vital industries on graphite, China's dominance over the supply chain raises significant economic security concerns. Amidst growing political tensions, disruptions in the graphite supply chain could lead to significant price increases if production remains concentrated in China. Parallels can be drawn to China's rare earth elements (REE) export restrictions in 2010 when, similar to graphite today, China dominated 97% of the production of REEs. Upon China restricting REE export quotas by 40%, export prices for neodymium oxide increased from \$25/kg to \$340/kg within a year.²⁹ Export restrictions are beginning to be placed on graphite, making it vulnerable to a similar disruption. Assuming a disruption would increase graphite prices from \$7/kg to \$35/kg (a smaller increase than the REE case), US-manufactured EV costs would increase by \$2,800 (assuming ~100 kg graphite per EV). Applying such a shock to the US automotive market in 2023 would lead to a 14% decrease in EV sales for US automakers, causing a \$1.4 billion reduction in their revenue, and a \$2.3 billion cost increase for consumers due to higher vehicle prices (see Methods for more details).

While scaling up production globally is key to building a resilient and diversified supply chain, our analysis in this paper shows significant challenges to the economic competitiveness of graphite production outside China. Given this, decision-makers need to develop strategies that support the industry in the short term and drive it towards economic competitiveness in the long run. We recommend two parallel paths for building a secure graphite supply chain: (1) industrial policy support for mature graphite projects and (2) increased R&D investments for new processing pathways that leverage localized carbonaceous feedstocks.

Given graphite projects in the West will find it hard to compete with projects in China, governments should use supportive policy tools to help scale production. There is a wide range of policy options to choose from, and different solutions can have multiplicative effects. Our modeling found that supportive financing is the most important driver in reducing the costs of graphite production. When supportive financing (via lower costs of capital) is combined with price support and premiums, a large portion of previously uncompetitive projects become competitive. Since graphite production is capital-intensive, once the capital costs are paid off, they can likely compete without additional policy support in the long run. Policy tools can also incentivise consumers of graphite to preferentially purchase from domestic producers, and support local projects via price premiums.

In the long run, we will need focused innovation to drive down costs towards competitiveness. Three promising pathways for future R&D to focus on are (1) methane pyrolysis, (2) catalytic graphitization of biomass, and (3) graphite recycling. Methane pyrolysis leverages the abundant natural gas reserves in countries like the US to produce hydrogen and carbon. Previous work has focused primarily on hydrogen yields, and assumes that methane pyrolysis produces lower-value amorphous carbon products (such as carbon black).³⁰ As methane pyrolysis produces 3x more carbon by weight than hydrogen, replacing the US's hydrogen production from steam methane reforming with pyrolysis would produce enough carbon (~10 million tonnes) to meet 200x of US anode demand (~150 kt).³¹ Techno-economic assessments of methane pyrolysis show that it can produce amorphous carbon at less than \$1-2/kg.³² If the amorphous carbon needs to undergo graphitization post pyrolysis, costs can exceed conventional processes. However, pyrolysis methods such as the Hazer process which directly produce crystalline graphite particles could be viable in the future.³³ Assuming purification and coating costs are similar to our modeled results for US NG (~\$3/kg), directly producing graphitic carbon particles of 10-20 micron (350+ mAh/g; 95% graphite) via methane pyrolysis at \$3/kg would make the process competitive with China.

However, research has shown that the economics of methane pyrolysis are very sensitive to catalyst recovery, with catalyst losses hurting the economics significantly. While methane pyrolysis can take many forms, research on molten-media pyrolysis shows that if the resulting carbon has a contamination of 0.0005 wt% of the Ni-Bi catalyst, the production cost could increase to \$8/kg³⁴. Therefore, minimizing catalyst loss and contamination are key areas for future research, as well as identifying lower cost catalysts that can produce graphite directly. If catalyst loss can

be minimized, and methane pyrolysis results in graphite with 99.95% purity, we may also avoid the need for purification (saving \$2/kg). The primary challenge lies in controlling the morphology and crystallinity of the resulting carbon, particularly in achieving the particle size and surface area required for EV battery anodes. While methane pyrolysis is an interesting pathway, the value hinges on key uncertainties regarding its products—specifically the degree to which they require purification and graphitization to meet battery-grade specifications.

Catalytic graphitization of biomass presents another alternative that utilizes agricultural waste as feedstock. The process involves pyrolysis to create biochar, followed by catalytic graphitization. The catalyst, often iron-based, facilitates the rearrangement of carbon atoms into the layered structure of graphite.^{35–37} This method is adaptable to local resources and there are biographite plants using local agricultural feedstocks at a pilot-stage in multiple countries. Although research has focused on using biomass, catalytic graphitization can be applied to various kinds of carbon products. While the technology is promising, achieving the appropriate purity for EV battery anodes remains a challenge. Costs are driven by the need for many rounds of purification to remove the catalyst particles from the resulting graphite particles to reach 99.95% purity.

Assuming the particle size and crystal growth of graphite can be controlled via the temperature and time of the catalytic graphitization reaction, the new process can avoid the micronization step which increases costs for current pathways. Assuming biochar feedstock costs \$200/t, and identical downstream processing (purification and coating) costs of \$3/kg, catalytic graphitization can produce battery-grade material competitively if it costs less than \$3/kg. While the process benefits from lower CAPEX and electricity consumption than Acheson graphitization, the iron catalyst could add \$2/kg in cost if it is not regenerated (assuming \$1/kg and 2x loading). Since the catalyst forms a significant portion of the cost, future research should focus on increasing efficiencies in regenerating the catalyst. Further research is also needed to understand the relationship between feedstock properties, processing decisions, and the resulting graphite's suitability for battery applications.

Many products that currently use graphite in batteries will be reaching end-of-life in the next few years, so recycling of graphite could provide a secure source of supply. Graphite recycling has potential because the end-of-life material does not need to undergo the costly graphitization step which represents over 50% SG production costs. However, we need to overcome challenges in economically removing impurities and restoring the graphite's original structure. Recycling needs to remove metal oxides and internal impurities, which can be challenging due to interfacial reactions between the electrolyte and anode.³⁸ Scaling of recycling processes is another hurdle, but could be supported by defining quality targets for different applications. While silicon also has the potential to substitute some graphite in anodes and increase energy density,³⁹ issues with volume expansion mean this substitution is likely to remain limited in the near-medium term.

Scaling production fast, for both mature and new technologies, is imperative. However, in reality, there can be many delays in production. As new plants scale, they risk falling into the 'valley of death'. Before they are operating at scale and consistently producing high-quality material, plants may only be able to sell lower quality material at lower prices to markets such as ESS. For example, medium capacity graphite used in portable electronics can have 40% lower prices and lower capacity graphite for ESS applications can have 65% lower prices than high-capacity graphite used in EVs.²⁸ Since graphite producing projects have high CAPEX, receiving lower revenue in early years can be damaging to their economics and extend payback periods. Moreover, testing and qualification of new material can take ~5 years, including lab-bench, pilot, and full operation testing to assess the performance of the material in a battery under different conditions.⁴⁰ If material takes years to qualify after a project reaches full production, the delayed revenue can make the economics unsustainable. Industry coordination is needed to reduce qualification times and help producers get to market faster: one method could be to identify test metrics that increase consumer confidence earlier.

In this paper, we have developed a generalized process-based cost model that is applied to estimate the techno-economics of the common graphite production pathways of today. The model allows for a like-like comparison between regions and processing routes, and helps identify key parameters that drive costs. The results

presented here highlight key policy and innovation priorities for building a resilient graphite supply chain. Future work will apply the approach developed here to study the competitiveness of new processing pathways, such as methane pyrolysis and catalytic graphitization. Moreover, while we focus on the costs of production, future work will model the impacts of supply disruptions so decision makers can quantify the value of building a resilient supply chain. By quantitatively comparing the value of supply chain resilience with the costs of scaling domestic production, we can illuminate vital policy trade-offs.

Methods

In this paper, we build process-based cost models to estimate the cost of producing graphite anode active material (AAM). To build the models, we identify the main inputs and outputs of the production process and assign costs to each process step. Key input parameters include the cost of raw materials, energy, labor, equipment, and construction. Data on input parameters is sourced from feasibility studies, and verified via extensive feedback from industry. For a desired plant capacity, we scale the capital investment and estimate the number of production lines needed for each process. We annualize the capital costs based on an expected rate of return on capital and derive a total cost per tonne of AAM produced (Details in SI). The model is applied to compare costs of AAM produced in the US and China.

We assume three major process steps for the production of natural graphite. The -100-mesh portion (< 150 μm) of graphite concentrate is micronized and spheronized in order to reduce the particle size and to turn the graphite flakes into spherical particles with a 50th percentile size of 20 micron and tapped density between 0.85 and 0.95 g/cc (NMG; Table 13-13). Second, graphite is purified to a concentration of >99.95% purity. Finally, the purified spherical graphite is coated with a thin layer of coal-tar pitch to reduce the surface area of graphite and improve both the first cycle efficiency and rate performance of the material. The main inputs for each process step are presented in the Supporting Information (SI).

There are multiple alternative pathways to purify graphite, including acid leaching, acid-alkali roasting, carbochlorination, and high-temperature processes. Despite leaching via hydrofluoric acid (HF) being the most common purification method in China, we chose to model carbo-chlorination as the purification process in the US due to the hazards of handling HF. Carbochlorination involves injecting the graphite with chlorine gas at high temperatures (>1200 celsius), so that the impurities react and are volatilized. Multiple North American projects are planning to use carbochlorination for purifying graphite.^{15,17} For Chinese production of AAM via natural graphite, we assume HF purification is used.

For battery anode-grade synthetic graphite production, calcined needle coke is first spheronized to meet similar specifications as above. Spheronized coke is then packed into crucibles and graphitized in an Acheson furnace. Over 5 days, a furnace of ~100t capacity reaches the top temperature of around 3000 °C and the electrical power is shut off. The furnace takes 18 days to cool down to temperatures at which the graphitized product can be handled. Finally, the graphitized particles are pitch coated to reduce surface area and improve performance, in a process similar to the natural graphite route. We assume that synthetic graphite production in both the US and China undergo graphitization via the Acheson furnace, and the resulting graphite has a specific capacity greater than 350mAh/g.

For all the processing pathways, we run the cost model over a range of input parameters by conducting a Monte-Carlo simulation over uniformly distributed input parameters. We discuss the distribution of the simulated costs, and use the results to identify which parameters have the most significant impact in increasing the competitiveness of graphite production. We classify a simulation as being “competitive” if the resulting costs are lower than the price of anode material in 2024 (\$7500/t for synthetic graphite, and \$7000/t for natural graphite).

For modeling the impact of supply disruptions, we use results from Allcott et al.⁶ Allcott et al. modeled the US automotive market via consumer choice model to study the impact of the IRA subsidies. They found that removing the \$7500 subsidy for US-made electric vehicles would decrease US EV sales by 37%, while foreign EV sales would be unaffected. US producer surplus would be reduced by \$3 billion/year and US consumer surplus would be reduced by \$5 billion/year. For our disruption analysis in the discussion section, we assume iso-elastic demand i.e. that a \$3750 increase in manufacturing costs would have half the impact of removing the \$7500 subsidy.

Supporting Information: Assumption Tables

1. Synthetic Graphite (Acheson)

a. Spheronization Line

	Unit	Baseline	Range	Notes
Throughput	tonnes/hr	2.5	± 25%	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study (2022): 3 micronization + spheronization lines have 60 ktpa throughput. Each line has 3 micronizers and 11 spheronizers for a target primary particle size of 20 micron. Corroborated via data from 2 equipment manufacturers.
Electricity	kWh/t	2200	± 25%	Data from 2 spheronization equipment manufacturers
Labour	FTE	8	± 25%	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study (2022): 24 FTEs for 3 lines
Equipment Cost (US)	Million \$	17.5	± 25%	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study (2022): Equipment Cost of 93 million CAD for 3 lines (Table 21-14) Corroborated via data from 2 equipment manufacturers, which report a cost of ~\$1million/ktpa feed Graphite One Feasibility Study (2022) (Section 21)
Construction Labour (US)	hrs	79000	± 25%	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study (2022) (Table 21-14), Graphite One Feasibility Study (2022) (Section 21)
Other CAPEX (US)	Million \$	6.5	± 25%	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study (2022) (Table 21-14)
Total CAPEX (China)	Million \$	8	± 25%	Falcon’s Technical Report, prepared by Anzaplan, models costs based on Hensen Graphite’s recently completed plant in Weihai, China. Spheroidization has \$19M CAPEX for 45ktpa feed (~6tph). Cost is scaled for 2.5tph
Yield	%	70	(40,80)	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study Table 13-12 (2022), Graphite One Feasibility Study (2022) (Section 19)

b. Acheson Furnace

	Unit	Baseline	Range	Notes
Throughput	tonnes/hr	0.22	(0.1, 0.3)	GraphiteOne uses Acheson-type furnaces with a capacity of 110t per batch. Based on conversation with industry, we assume that each batch takes 500 hours (~3 weeks).
Electricity	kWh/t	15000	± 25%	Shang et al, Carrere et al. ^{43,44}
Labour	FTE	3	± 25%	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study
Equipment Cost (US)	Million \$	6.8	± 25%	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study (Table 21-14): Equipment cost of 84 million CAD for 9 Acheson-type furnaces.
Other CAPEX (US)	Million \$	5.7	± 25%	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study (Table 21-14)
Construction Labour (US)	hrs	47000	± 25%	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study (Table 21-14)
Total CAPEX (China)	Million \$	4.7	± 25%	Falcon Feasibility Study
Yield	%	100	0	Carrere et al. ⁴⁴
Crucible	#/t-SG	10	0	Assumed that each crucible holds ~100 kg of graphite. Based on conversations with industry
Crucible Lifetime	#	5	1	Based on conversations with industry
Packing material	t/t-powder	2	0	Epsilon LCA ¹⁰

c. Coating

	Unit	Baseline	Range	Notes
Throughput	tonnes/hr	0.83	± 25%	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study (2022), Graphite One Feasibility Study (2022). 6 coating lines for annual capacity of 40ktpa
Electricity	kWh/t	391	± 25%	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study (2022) , Graphite One Feasibility Study (2022)
Nitrogen	t/t-feed	0.725	0	Graphite One Feasibility Study (2022). Falcon's feasibility study reports Nitrogen use of 560 m3/t which is ~0.7/t
Labour	FTE	5	± 25%	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study : 32 FTE for 6 coating lines
Equipment Cost	Million \$	10.5	± 25%	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study (2022) Graphite One Feasibility Study

				(2022) (Table 21-14),
Construction Labour	hrs	53000	± 25%	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study (2022) (Table 21-14)
Other CAPEX	Million \$	4.8	± 25%	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study (2022),
CAPEX (China)	Million \$	10.5	± 25%	Falcon Feasibility Study has 42 million CAPEX for 27ktpa capacity. Scaled based on throughput here
Yield	%	100		Graphite One Feasibility Study (2022) Section 19; Engels et al.

d. Other Plant Parameters

	Unit	Baseline	Range	Notes
Capacity	ktpa	45	(20,80)	
Labour	FTE	90	± 10%	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study (2022)
Equipment Cost	Million \$	22	± 25%	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study (2022)
Equipment Cost (China)	Million \$	7	± 25%	Assume that unassigned capital costs are 1/3rd in China compared to the US. Validated by discussions with companies in China, and the difference in capital intensity of Falcon's plant vs North American plants.
Construction Labour	hrs	180000	± 25%	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study (2022)
Other CAPEX	Million \$	129	± 25%	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study (2022)
Other CAPEX (China)	Million \$	47	± 25%	Assume that unassigned capital costs are 1/3rd in China compared to the US. Validated by discussions with companies in China, and the difference in capital intensity of Falcon's plant vs North American plants.
Consumable Cost	Million \$	13	± 25%	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study (2022)
G&A Cost	Million \$	11	± 25%	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility (2022)
Uptime	%	90	± 5%	
Electricity	kWh/t	2166	± 10%	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study (2022)

2. Natural Graphite

a. Spheronization

	Unit	Baseline	Range	Notes
Throughput	tonnes/hr	2.5	± 25%	Same as SG (see Table above)
Electricity	kWh/t	2200	± 25%	Assumed the same as SG (see Table above). From conversations with equipment manufacturers, energy consumption can be higher for NG spheronization lines than SG
Labour	FTE	8	± 25%	Same as SG (see Table above)
Equipment Cost (US)	Million \$	17.5	± 25%	Assumed the same as SG (see Table above). From conversations with equipment manufacturers, equipment costs can be higher for NG spheronization lines than SG
Construction Labour (US)	hrs	79000	± 25%	Same as SG (see Table above)
Other CAPEX (US)	Million \$	6.5	± 25%	Same as SG (see Table above)
Total CAPEX (China)	Million \$	8	± 25%	Same as SG (see Table above)
Yield	%	50	(40,80)	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study Table 13-12 (2022), Graphite One Feasibility Study (2022) (Section 19). Falcon Morocco Feasibility Study. Corroborated with data from equipment manufacturers

b. Carbo-chlorination

	Unit	Baseline	Range	Notes
Throughput	tonnes/hr	0.55	(0.3, 0.8)	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study (2022) has 9 furnaces for 40ktpa feed;
Electricity	kWh/t	3427	± 10%	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study (2022),
Labour	FTE	3	± 10%	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study (2022): 28 FTE for 9 purification furnaces
Equipment cost (CAPEX)	Million \$	6.8	± 25%	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study (2022)
Construction Labour (CAPEX)	hrs	47000	± 25%	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study (2022)

Other CAPEX	Million \$	17	± 25%	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study (2022)
Yield	%	95	0	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study (2022), Graphite One Feasibility Study (2022)

c. Acid Leaching

	Unit	Baseline	Range	Notes
Throughput	tonnes/hr	3.6		Falcon's Feasibility Study produces 27kt of material per year which translates to 3.6tph with a 85% uptime
Electricity	kWh/t	180		Falcon's Feasibility Study; Engels et al reports 305 kWh/t
Water	m3/t	16.4		Falcon's Feasibility Study; Engels et al reports 25 m3/t
Natural Gas	m3/t	150		Falcon's Feasibility Study; Engels et al reports 1050MJ/t
Lime	t/t-feed	0.5		Falcon's Feasibility Study; Engels et al reports 0.4 m3/t
HCl	t/t-feed	0.65		Falcon's Feasibility Study, Engels et al ⁹
HNO3	t/t-feed	0.15		Falcon's Feasibility Study. Engels et al reports 0.1kg/t
HF	t/t-feed	0.35		Falcon's Feasibility Study; Engels et al reports 0.2kg/t
Labour	FTE	20		Falcon's Feasibility Study
CAPEX	Million \$	13		Falcon's Feasibility Study
Yield	%	95		Falcon's Feasibility Study

d. Coating

Assumed identical to SG production. See Table above

e. Other Plant Parameters







	Unit	Baseline	Range	Notes
Capacity	ktpa	45	(20,80)	
Labour	FTE	90	± 10%	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility

				Study (2022)
Equipment Cost	Million \$	22	± 25%	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study (2022)
Construction Labour	hrs	180000	± 25%	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study (2022)
Other CAPEX	Million \$	129	± 25%	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study (2022)
CAPEX (China)	Million \$	45	± 25%	Falcon Feasibility Study had \$30 million other CAPEX for a 25ktpa plant. Scaled to 45ktpa based on a scaling factor of 0.7
Consumable Cost	Million \$	13	± 25%	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study (2022)
G&A Cost	Million \$	11	± 25%	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study (2022)
Uptime	%	90		
Electricity	kWh/t	2166	± 10%	Nouveau-Monde Graphite Feasibility Study (2022)

Cost Factors

Variables	Unit	US Value	US Range	China Value	China Range	Notes
Electricity	\$/kWh	0.065	± 0.02	0.0553	± 0.02	Based on electricity price data ^{26 27}
Payback Period	years	10	0	10	0	
Required IRR	%	15	± 10	15	± 10	
Sales Rate	%	3	0	3	0	Percentage of OPEX spent on Sales
Maintenance Rate	%	5	0	5	0	Percentage of initial capex that is spent on maintenance per year
Labour	USD/yr	100,000	± 20000	25,000	± 5000	
Scaling Factor		0.7	0.1	0.7	0.1	Percentage change in CAPEX for each percentage change in capacity
Crucible	USD	250	± 50	200	± 50	Value based on interview with industry. Epsilon's LCA used a value of \$950/t of used crucibles
Packing Material	USD/t	350	± 100	200	± 50	Assumes that Chinese companies can recover \$150/t by selling packing material.
Chlorine	USD/t	690	± 100	690	± 100	
Lime	USD/t	420	± 100	420	± 100	
Nitrogen	USD/t	250	± 50	250	± 50	
Pitch	USD/t	700	± 300	700	± 300	
Needle Coke	USD/t	650	± 300	650	± 300	Masterson et al.
Graphite Concentrate	USD/t	800	± 300	750	± 250	
Other Labour Rate	USD/hr	50	± 10	5	0	

Supporting Information: Product Specifications



Distribution of values for key product specifications. Horizontal dotted line represents the 25th, 50th and 75th percentile values (corresponding to low/median/high in Table 1). Data from specification sheets of: Anovion, BTR New Material Group, Guangdong Kaijin New Energy, Hunan Zhongke Shinzoom Technology Co., Ltd., JFE Chemical Corporation, LongTime (LT) Technologies, Nacional de Grafite, Shanghai Putailai (Jiangxi Zichen), Shanshan Technology, Kuntian New Energy Technology, Shenzhen XFH Technology Co., Ltd (“Xiangfenghua”), and Shangtai Technology.

References

1. Martin, D. Enabling North American Graphite Growth.
2. Benson, E. & Denamiel, T. China's New Graphite Restrictions. (2023).
3. Tsuji, K. Global Value Chains: Graphite in Lithium-ion Batteries for Electric Vehicles.
4. Battery-makers, graphite producers clash over tariffs on Chinese supply.
<https://www.spglobal.com/marketintelligence/en/news-insights/latest-news-headlines/battery-makers-graphite-producers-clash-over-tariffs-on-chinese-supply-81016370>.
5. US graphite miners ask Washington to impose 920% tariff on Chinese rivals | Reuters.
<https://www.reuters.com/markets/commodities/us-graphite-miners-ask-washington-impose-920-tariff-chinese-rivals-2024-12-18/>.
6. Allcott, H., Kane, R., Maydanchik, M. S., Shapiro, J. S. & Tintelnot, F. The Effects of "Buy American": Electric Vehicles and the Inflation Reduction Act.
7. Surovtseva, D., Crossin, E., Pell, R. & Stamford, L. Toward a life cycle inventory for graphite production. *Journal of Industrial Ecology* 26, 964–979 (2022).
8. Engels, P. et al. Life cycle assessment of natural graphite production for lithium-ion battery anodes based on industrial primary data. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 336, 130474 (2022).
9. Dai, Q., Kelly, J. C., Gaines, L. & Wang, M. Life Cycle Analysis of Lithium-Ion Batteries for Automotive Applications. *Batteries* 5, 48 (2019).
10. Epsilon LCA Synthetic Graphite.
11. Salas, S. D. & Dunn, J. B. Methane-to-graphite: A pathway to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the U.S. energy transition. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling* 210, 107832 (2024).
12. Trotta, F. et al. A Comparative Techno-Economic and Lifecycle Analysis of Biomass-Derived Anode Materials for Lithium- and Sodium-Ion Batteries. *Advanced Sustainable Systems* 6, 2200047 (2022).
13. Gao, S. W., Gong, X. Z., Liu, Y. & Zhang, Q. Q. Energy Consumption and Carbon Emission Analysis of Natural Graphite Anode Material for Lithium Batteries. *Materials Science Forum* 913, 985–990 (2018).
14. Lee, S.-M., Kang, D.-S. & Roh, J.-S. Bulk graphite: materials and manufacturing process. *Carbon letters* 16, 135–146 (2015).
15. Allaire, A. & Eng, P. NMG Feasibility Study. Technical Report (2020).
16. de Wit, D. R., Siegert, J., Audet, M.-A., Moryoussef, P. & GmbH, D. A. TECHNICAL REPORT ON THE NATURAL GRAPHITE ACTIVE ANODE INTEGRATED GLOBAL STRATEGY PRELIMINARY ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT.
17. Preliminary Feasibility Study Technical Report - Graphite One Project Alaska, USA (2022)
<https://www.graphiteoneinc.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/JDS-Graphite-One-NI-43-101-PFS-20221013-compressed.pdf>.
18. Vidalia Active Anode Material Facility.
<https://www.syrahresources.com.au/our-business/vidalia-active-anode-material-facility>.
19. Nykoliation, B. NextSource Materials Announces Global Anode Expansion Strategy Update, Economic Results of Proposed Battery Anode Facility in Saudi Arabia, and Strategic Partner Process. Next Source
<https://www.nextsourcematerials.com/nextsource-materials-announces-global-anode-expansion-strategy-update-economic-results-of-proposed-battery-anode-facility-in-saudi-arabia-and-strategic-partner-process/> (2024).
20. Robust Vittangi Anode Project DFS Press Release (2021)
[https://minedocs.com/21/Talga_Group\(Vittangi\)-FS-07012021.pdf](https://minedocs.com/21/Talga_Group(Vittangi)-FS-07012021.pdf).
21. Graphite One Investor Presentation "An All-American Battery Materials Supply Chain Solution"
<https://www.graphiteoneinc.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/2024-08-07-G1-Investor-Deck.pdf>.
22. anovion_admin. Anovion Technologies Announces Plans for New Manufacturing Facility in Georgia. Anovion Technologies
<https://www.anoviontech.com/news/anovion-technologies-announces-plans-for-800-million-initial-investment-in-new-manufacturing-facility-in-southwest-georgia/> (2023).
23. NOVONIX Completes Independent Engineering Assessment of Riverside Facility | NOVONIX Group.
<https://ir.novonixgroup.com/news-releases/news-release-details/novonix-completes-independent-engineering-assessment-riverside/>.
24. Masterson, L. Needle coke demand growth to tighten anode coke | Latest Market News.
<https://www.argusmedia.com/en/news-and-insights/latest-market-news/2290678-needle-coke-demand-growth-to-tighten-anode-coke> (2022).
25. China's Industrial Power Rates: A Guide for Investors. China Briefing News
<https://www.china-briefing.com/news/chinas-industrial-power-rates-category-electricity-usage-region-classification/> (2024).

26. Electric Power Monthly - U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA).
https://www.eia.gov/electricity/monthly/epm_table_grapher.php.
27. Siviour Definitive Feasibility Study, Renascor Resources
<https://renascor.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/20191111-Siviour-Definitive-Feasibility-Study-1996951.pdf>.
28. ESG of graphite: how do synthetic graphite and natural graphite compare? Benchmark Source
<https://source.benchmarkminerals.com/article/esg-of-graphite-how-do-synthetic-graphite-and-natural-graphite-compare> (2022).
29. Eldesoky, A. et al. Impact of Graphite Materials on the Lifetime of NMC811/Graphite Pouch Cells: Part II. Long-Term Cycling, Stack Pressure Growth, Isothermal Microcalorimetry, and Lifetime Projection. *J. Electrochem. Soc.* 169, 010501 (2022).
30. Zaghbi, K., Song, X., Guerfi, A., Rioux, R. & Kinoshita, K. Purification process of natural graphite as anode for Li-ion batteries: chemical versus thermal. *Journal of Power Sources* 119–121, 8–15 (2003).
31. Associates, B. Lithium-ion Battery Recycling: Scale up and Battery Qualification. Battery Associates
<https://www.battery.associates/post/lithium-ion-battery-recycling-scale-up-and-battery-qualification> (2022).
32. Shen, Y., Moomy, R. & Eggert, R. G. China's public policies toward rare earths, 1975–2018. *Miner Econ* 33, 127–151 (2020).
33. Dermühl, S. & Riedel, U. A comparison of the most promising low-carbon hydrogen production technologies. *Fuel* 340, 127478 (2023).
34. Patlolla, S. R. et al. A review of methane pyrolysis technologies for hydrogen production. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 181, 113323 (2023).
35. Shokrollahi, M., Teymouri, N., Ashrafi, O., Navarri, P. & Khojasteh-Salkuyeh, Y. Methane pyrolysis as a potential game changer for hydrogen economy: Techno-economic assessment and GHG emissions. *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy* 66, 337–353 (2024).
36. Cornejo, A. & Chua, T. AND GRAPHITIC CARBON FROM HYDROCARBONS.
37. You, H. et al. Sustainable Production of Biomass-Derived Graphite and Graphene Conductive Inks from Biochar. *Small* 20, 2406669 (2024).
38. Shi, Z. et al. Bio-based anode material production for lithium-ion batteries through catalytic graphitization of biochar: the deployment of hybrid catalysts. *Sci Rep* 14, 3966 (2024).
39. Lower, L. et al. Catalytic Graphitization of Biocarbon for Lithium-Ion Anodes: A Minireview. *ChemSusChem* 16, e202300729 (2023).
40. Liu, Y. et al. Highly porous graphitic materials prepared by catalytic graphitization. *Carbon* 64, 132–140 (2013).
41. Bonkile, M. P. et al. Is silicon worth it? Modelling degradation in composite silicon-graphite lithium-ion battery electrodes. *Journal of Power Sources* 606, 234256 (2024).
42. Shang, T. et al. Insights into the thermal and electric field distribution and the structural optimization in the graphitization furnace. *Energy* 297, 131269 (2024).
43. Carrère, T., Khalid, U., Baumann, M., Bouzidi, M. & Allard, B. Carbon footprint assessment of manufacturing of synthetic graphite battery anode material for electric mobility applications. *Journal of Energy Storage* 94, 112356 (2024).