IMP

IMP INTELLIGENCE SERIES

A market intelligence paper on the structural reset of the global specialty chemicals industry

# Specialty Chemicals

## The Tri-Polar Reckoning
## Capacity, Capex Bubbles & the Practical Skills Deficit

KEY FIGURES

**$914 Bn**
GLOBAL MARKET 2026

**$725 Bn**
BIG TECH AI CAPEX 2026

**75%**
EU CAPACITY UTILISATION

**46%**
CHINA SHARE OF OUTPUT

**1.2 Mn**
EU CHEMICAL JOBS

**3.2x**
EU VS. US ETHYLENE COST

MARKET INTELLIGENCE · STRATEGIC RESEARCH · COMMUNICATIONS

2026

# Executive Summary

The global specialty chemicals industry is no longer a single market. It is three regional markets that share molecules but not economics. Over the past decade China moved from low-cost workshop to dominant producer in segments Europe and the United States once treated as defensible — battery materials, high-performance polymers, fluorochemicals, advanced intermediates. The gap closed faster than incumbents allowed themselves to believe. It is now closed.

This paper takes a deliberately unfashionable view. The headline narrative of the day — that AI infrastructure spending creates a durable demand floor for advanced electronic chemicals — is structurally fragile. The four largest US hyperscalers will commit between $660 and $725 billion to AI infrastructure in 2026, against a directly attributable AI revenue base an order of magnitude smaller. That is not a market. That is a capex cycle priced as if it were one. Specialty chemicals exposure to that cycle is real, narrow, and concentrated in segments — high-purity electronics, advanced packaging, ancillary construction chemistries — that would absorb the first-order shock disproportionately.

Four structural shifts are reshaping the industry simultaneously:

**FOUR SHIFTS RUNNING IN PARALLEL**

**1. Tri-polar fragmentation.** The US, EU, and China/India blocs are decoupling on tariffs, carbon, feedstock access, and qualification standards. Global market share figures are now misleading at the regional operating level.

**2. China's anti-involution pivot.** Beijing is not simply cutting capacity. It is using overcapacity policy to force migration up the value chain — into the same high-performance segments European producers depend on for margin.

**3. Ghost capacity and demand fog.** European utilisation has stabilised around 75 percent. That is not a cycle. That is a permanent reset of the operating base. Producers running at 70 to 80 percent are technically open, structurally impaired.

**4. The practical skills deficit.** AI is rapidly absorbing rule-based chemical R&D. It cannot diagnose a leaking reactor, commission a new polymerisation line, or troubleshoot a corroded heat exchanger. The shortage is in the second category — and it is widening fast.

What follows is a structural analysis, not a forecast. We avoid predicting where the market goes. We describe the forces shaping it, the data behind them, and the strategic implications for European producers, communicators, and decision makers who need to act on something more durable than the news cycle. The conclusions are deliberately uncomfortable. That is the point.

# Contents

# 01 The Market by the Numbers

The global specialty chemicals market sits at approximately $914 billion in 2026, with consensus growth rates between 2.9 and 3.9 percent CAGR through the early 2030s. The figure varies meaningfully across reporting agencies depending on segmentation methodology — whether performance materials, consumer chemistries, and parts of life-science chemistry are included or excluded. Those headline numbers obscure more than they reveal. Behind them sit three structurally distinct regional markets running on different feedstocks, different cost bases, different regulatory loads, and increasingly different customer pools.

**$914 Bn**
GLOBAL MARKET 2026

**46%**
CHINA SHARE CHEMICAL OUTPUT

**$204 Bn**
US SPECIALTY MARKET

**€635 Bn**
EU CHEMICAL TURNOVER

### Top producers: a concentration story

The top five producers — BASF, Dow, Evonik, Shin-Etsu, and dsm-firmenich — together hold roughly 17.8 percent of global market share. The next tier (Arkema, Covestro, Clariant, Solvay, Lanxess, Huntsman, Croda, Albemarle, Nouryon, Ashland, PPG, Eastman, Wacker, Lubrizol) accounts for another 15 to 18 percent. Beyond that, the market is a long tail of regional specialists, contract manufacturers, and Indian and Chinese producers moving up the value chain. Consolidation pressure has not produced the concentration the consultancies forecast. The sector remains structurally fragmented, particularly in Asia.

### Regional distribution

| Region | Market Size 2026 | Share | Structural Position |
|---|---|---|---|
| Asia Pacific | ≈ $400 Bn | ≈ 44% | Production volume centre; China + India drive net additions |
| North America | ≈ $204 Bn (US alone) | ≈ 22% | Energy cost advantage; reshoring tailwind on critical chemistries |
| Europe (EU27 + UK) | ≈ €350 Bn (specialty share of €635 Bn total) | ≈ 22% | High-value specialty exporter; structural energy-cost disadvantage |
| Middle East | Growing, integrated | ≈ 7% | Petrochemical base feeding into specialty downstream investments |
| Rest of World | Mixed | ≈ 5% | Latin America, CIS, Africa — fragmented and feedstock-dependent |

**WHY THE HEADLINE NUMBER UNDERSTATES FRAGILITY**

European specialty chemicals run at roughly 75 percent capacity utilisation — 9.5 percentage points below the 2014–2019 average. European gas prices are still approximately three times US Henry Hub. European ethylene is about 3.2 times more expensive to produce than on the US Gulf Coast. The €47 billion European chemical trade surplus depends almost entirely on high-value specialty exports holding their margin. That is the pressure point this paper traces.

# 02 How the Map Was Redrawn: A Decade of Structural Shift

Between 2015 and 2025, the global specialty chemicals map rotated. China did not just expand. It moved up the value stack into segments European and US producers had assumed were defensible by virtue of technology, patents, qualification cycles, or customer inertia. The data on what actually happened is unambiguous. The interpretive disagreements are about why — and what comes next.

### China: from workshop to value-chain competitor

China accounts for roughly 46 percent of global chemical production by value as of 2024. That figure refers to the total industry — base, intermediate, and specialty combined. Within specialty chemicals specifically, China's share is meaningfully lower (typically estimated at 35–40 percent depending on segmentation), but rising fast. The volume story is striking: China accounted for approximately 27 million tonnes per year of global ethylene capacity additions during 2020–2025, against total global additions of roughly 45 million tonnes. By 2030 Chinese ethylene capacity will reach 90 million tonnes per year, up from 62 million tonnes in 2025. The structural story is what sits downstream: high-performance polymers, battery cathode and electrolyte chemistries, photovoltaic-grade polysilicon, fluorinated specialties, advanced agrochemical intermediates. Chinese specialty exports for new-energy applications grew over 8 percent in 2025 even as commodity chemical profits dropped 5.4 percent.

### India: the second-source bet

India's specialty chemicals segment is projected to reach roughly $40 billion by 2026, with year-on-year export growth of 15 to 18 percent. Specialty chemistry now represents an estimated 50–60 percent of Indian chemical exports — the figure varies by source and classification boundary, with some industry sources citing higher numbers. The structural position is qualitatively different from China's: Indian producers are positioning explicitly as the qualified second source for European and US customers seeking China-plus-one risk diversification. Pharmaceutical intermediates, agrochemicals, fluorochemicals, and dyes are the strongest segments. The structural weakness is feedstock — India is chronically short of methanol, ethylene, propylene, and toluene, forcing import dependence on the same upstream chains that introduce volatility.

### Europe: defending margin on declining volume

European chemical industry turnover stands at €635 billion with 1.2 million direct employees across roughly 31,000 companies (97 percent of which are SMEs). The trade surplus contribution to European manufacturing was €47 billion in 2024 — but the position is eroding. European capacity utilisation has been stuck around 75 percent since the post-pandemic energy shock; the historical pre-crisis range (2014–2019) was approximately 84.5 percent. Europe is no longer the price-setter in any commodity chemical segment, and is defending margin in specialty segments where Chinese qualification cycles are now closing.

### United States: feedstock advantage, regulatory flux

The US specialty chemicals market sits at roughly $204 billion in 2025 and is projected to reach $299 billion by 2033 at 4.91 percent CAGR. The structural advantage remains feedstock cost — US Henry Hub gas pricing underwrites the entire downstream chain at levels Europe cannot match. What has changed is the policy environment: tariff regime instability, reshoring incentives, and IRA-related subsidies have reshaped capital allocation calculus across the board. The capex commitments are real. The demand assumptions underwriting them are increasingly contested.

### WHAT CHANGED STRUCTURALLY

A decade ago, Western companies protected margin through technology gaps, patent fortresses, and qualification cycles measured in years. Three of those four moats have eroded. Patent expiries, parallel Chinese R&D investment, and customer willingness to qualify Asian sources for cost-of-goods reasons have closed gaps that were considered unassailable in 2015. The remaining moat — application know-how, formulation expertise, integrated service — is the only one left. It is also the hardest to scale.

# 03 China's Anti-Involution: Strategic Pivot, Not Capacity Discipline

The Western reading of China's anti-involution policy has been systematically wrong. The narrative that Beijing is finally addressing overcapacity through orderly capacity rationalisation — and that this will relieve pricing pressure on European and US producers — collapses on contact with the actual policy text and implementation pattern.

### What anti-involution actually does

The policy was first introduced at the July 2024 Politburo meeting and operationalised through 2025. It targets four objectives in sequence: (1) phasing out small, energy-intensive, low-efficiency capacity; (2) preventing 'low-end repetitive construction' — meaning new entrants in already-saturated commodity segments; (3) tightening environmental and energy-consumption standards; and (4) directing capital toward high-value chemistry — explicitly named as advanced materials for AI, robotics, semiconductors, biomedical devices, batteries, and renewable energy. The fourth objective is the one Western analysts consistently underweight.

### The implementation reality

Profits in Chinese chemical raw materials and chemical product manufacturing fell 5.4 percent year-on-year in the first ten months of 2025. The price index for the sector has dropped roughly 36 percent since the cycle peak. Anti-involution has produced isolated tactical successes — caprolactam prices rose approximately 5 percent in November after major producers agreed to a 20 percent output cut — but the structural overcapacity has not meaningfully reduced. Local governments have material incentives to protect employment and tax receipts, undermining national-level closure directives. Even where small-scale plants are shut, large integrated world-scale facilities replace the volume.

> **THE STRATEGIC POINT**
>
> Anti-involution is not a retreat. It is a managed transition that consolidates Chinese commodity capacity into fewer, larger, more efficient producers — while accelerating capital deployment into high-value specialty chemistry. The export pressure on European and US specialty producers will not relieve. It will rotate. Pressure moves from polypropylene and PTA into the segments European producers still consider their margin fortress: high-performance polymers, fluorochemicals, electronic chemistries, advanced intermediates.

### The trade-defence layer

The other side of the equation is hardening. The US, EU, Japan, and several Southeast Asian markets have launched a coordinated wave of anti-dumping investigations against Chinese chemical exports. Carbon border adjustment mechanisms (CBAM in Europe) and local-content requirements are creating regulatory friction that the previous decade of WTO-based trade architecture explicitly prevented. The result: global chemical statistics increasingly mislead at the operating level. Regional capacity, regional demand, regional qualification standards now matter more than global market share.

### The fragmentation paradox

China is not short of large chemical producers. Sinopec ranks second globally by chemical sales, PetroChina ranks fourth, and Wanhua Chemical (FY2025 revenue around $30 billion, with the recent acquisition of Vencorex's specialty isocyanate business) ranks among the world's top fifteen. Rongsheng, Hengli, Hengyi, and Jiangsu Eastern Shenghong have each climbed the C&EN Global Top 50 ranking on the back of massive integrated complexes. What China lacks is a producer that combines global specialty depth, formulation know-how, application engineering at the customer interface, and pricing power across a diversified high-margin portfolio in the way BASF, Dow, Evonik, Shin-Etsu, or dsm-firmenich do. Chinese strength is

concentrated in scale and integration; specialty depth is being built actively but is not yet at parity. This distinction is what makes anti-involution hard to execute: the commodity layer is fragmented across thousands of small and medium-sized enterprises competing on price, while the specialty layer is still in active capability accumulation. The Chinese export pressure on European and US specialty producers will not relieve. European producers facing this competition cannot wait for rationality to assert itself in an irrationally fragmented commodity market while the specialty layer consolidates upward.

# 04 Ghost Capacity and the Regional Survival Map

The most useful frame for understanding the current European operating environment is not 'underutilisation' or 'cyclical weakness'. It is ghost capacity — production assets that are technically operational, running at 70 to 80 percent of nameplate, generating revenue but not earning their cost of capital. Ghost capacity is structurally different from idle capacity. It does not show up cleanly in shutdown statistics. It distorts pricing, blocks new investment, and quietly drains capital from balance sheets that look healthy on quarterly disclosure.

| 75% | 82% | 9.5pp | 3.2x* |
|---|---|---|---|
| EU CAPACITY UTILISATION | GLOBAL PP UTILISATION 2030 | BELOW PRE-CRISIS EU AVG | EU VS. US ETHYLENE COST |

*Ratio is feedstock- and energy-environment dependent. Naphtha-fed European crackers face a sharper cost gap against US ethane crackers than direct comparison suggests; the multiple narrows or widens with TTF gas pricing, Henry Hub differentials, and crude-naphtha spreads.

### Cycle or structural reset?

European chemical capacity utilisation has stabilised around 75 percent since the 2022 energy shock, against a 2014–2019 average closer to 84.5 percent. Whether this represents a cyclical trough or a structural reset is the analytical question that splits the industry. The cyclical case rests on demand recovery in construction, automotive, and consumer durables. The structural case rests on permanent feedstock-cost dislocation, sustained Chinese export pressure, and demand displacement to lower-cost regions. The behaviour of S&P Global / CERA's forward polypropylene model — average utilisation below 82 percent into the 2030s — is consistent with the structural reading. We do not predict which interpretation prevails. We note that capital allocation decisions made under the cyclical assumption will be expensive if the structural interpretation is correct.

### The inventory hangover

The 2024–2025 inventory cycle produced a persistent overhang that the consensus failed to anticipate. Customers built buffer stocks in response to tariff uncertainty, geopolitical risk, and supply-chain anxiety. Those stocks have not fully cleared. End-customer destocking through 2026 has compressed real demand below apparent demand, masking the underlying structural weakness in several specialty segments.

### How to recognise ghost capacity in the numbers

Ghost capacity reveals itself in the gap between EBITDA margin and return on capital employed (ROCE). European specialty chemical incumbents have continued to report respectable EBITDA margins through the post-2022 trough — typically 12 to 18 percent at the segment level. ROCE tells a different story. Where pre-shock ROCE for European specialty businesses sat in the 10–14 percent range, current operating ROCE for many has compressed below the typical 7–9 percent weighted-average cost of capital. The asset base earns its operating margin but does not earn its capital cost. Sustained, that is value destruction. Quarterly disclosure protects this from immediate scrutiny because EBITDA looks healthy. The capital allocation question — whether to defend, reposition, or exit — sits in the ROCE-versus-WACC gap that ghost capacity creates.

### The regional survival framing

What this implies for strategic positioning: the right question is no longer 'what is our global market share' but 'what is our regional survival rate' — meaning, in each of the three blocs (US, EU, China/India), can our operating model produce returns above cost of capital under tri-polar trade conditions? For many European specialty producers, the honest answer differs by region. European operations may earn cost of capital on EU-bound business but lose money on Chinese exports. US operations may earn on local business but face qualification barriers re-entering re-shoring American customer specifications. The aggregate global P&L hides this; regional P&L exposes it.

### IMPLICATION FOR CAPITAL ALLOCATION

The capital allocation question is no longer 'where do we expand'. It is 'which regions earn cost of capital, and which do not'. Producers that continue to subsidise loss-making regional operations — for legacy reasons, for relationship reasons, for optics — will be outcompeted by producers that exit cleanly and concentrate. This is the conversation few European boards are having out loud.

# 05 The AI Capex Trap and Specialty Chemicals Exposure

This section will be the most contested in the paper. The claim is straightforward: the AI infrastructure capex cycle currently underwriting demand projections for several specialty chemical segments is structurally fragile. We do not predict when or whether it corrects. We describe the gap, the chemistries exposed, and how the industry would react under a meaningful contraction.

### The capex-to-revenue gap

The five largest US hyperscalers — Microsoft, Alphabet, Amazon, Meta, Oracle — have committed between $660 and $725 billion in 2026 to AI-driven and AI-attributed infrastructure spending. The figure includes data centre construction, networking, GPU and accelerator procurement, and grid power infrastructure. Not all of it is strictly AI compute — a meaningful share supports general cloud workloads. CreditSights estimates approximately 75 percent of aggregate hyperscaler capex in 2026 funds AI-specific infrastructure (around $450 billion at the margin); the remainder supports traditional cloud and other business lines. The 2026 commitment is nearly double 2025 levels (approximately $443 billion) and roughly four times 2023 levels. Goldman Sachs's baseline AI capex model projects $765 billion in 2026 rising to $1.6 trillion annually by 2031. Cumulative buildout over 2026–2031 is estimated at $7.6 trillion across compute, data centres, and power.

Against that, AI-attributable revenue — depending on how it is defined — remains a fraction of the infrastructure spend. The definitional question matters here. At the model layer alone (OpenAI, Anthropic, Google's external Gemini revenue, etc.), revenue is an order of magnitude smaller than infrastructure capex. Defined more generously to include AI-augmented cloud services (Azure AI, AWS Bedrock, Google Cloud's AI-enabled enterprise revenue) and AI-attributable productivity gains internalised in core advertising and search businesses, the gap narrows substantially but remains material. OpenAI's CFO is reported to have warned internally about the spend-to-revenue trajectory. Capital intensity at the major hyperscalers has reached 45 to 57 percent of revenue — ratios historically associated with utilities and heavy industry, not technology. Free cash flow projections at the hyperscaler level are forecast to drop sharply through 2026 as capex outpaces operating earnings. Morgan Stanley and JPMorgan estimate the technology sector may need to issue $1.5 trillion in new debt to finance the buildout.

### The counterweight: platform economics

There is a serious case against the bubble framing. Hyperscalers do not monetise AI primarily through direct AI revenue lines. Their business model is platform economics: cloud pricing power, enterprise lock-in, productivity gains internalised in core advertising and consumer products, and long-dated infrastructure depreciation against compute that becomes the substrate for the next decade of enterprise software. Google Cloud's contracted backlog approached $460 billion at end-Q1 2026. Azure grew 40 percent in the latest reported quarter. Microsoft, Alphabet, and Amazon balance sheets remain among the strongest in the global economy. The bullish reading is that capex intensity is justified by genuine demand constraint and that the revenue base — properly measured across cloud, enterprise software, consumer productivity, and direct model layer — is closer to the infrastructure spend than the bear case allows. We do not adjudicate between these readings. We note that the asymmetry sits in the tail: the bull case requires sustained backlog conversion at current trajectory; the bear case requires only a meaningful disappointment.

**WHAT THIS IMPLIES — AND WHAT IT DOES NOT**

It does not imply imminent collapse. The hyperscalers have strong balance sheets, the demand backlog is real (Google Cloud backlog approached $460 billion at end-Q1 2026), and supply remains genuinely constrained. What it implies is structural fragility: any meaningful demand-side disappointment, any model-layer revenue shortfall, any shift in chip economic life assumptions, any power-grid bottleneck that elongates payback can compound into a sharp capex contraction. AI capex now sits at roughly 0.8 percent of US GDP. Historical technology booms have crested at 1.5 percent of GDP and corrected sharply. The risk is asymmetric.

## Where the specialty chemicals exposure sits

First-order exposure is narrower than commonly assumed. The chemistries that go directly into data centre construction and operation — high-purity electronic chemicals, photoresists, CMP slurries, advanced packaging materials, dielectric fluids for liquid cooling, thermal interface materials — are large in absolute revenue but concentrated in a small number of producers. A direct hyperscaler capex contraction would hit Shin-Etsu, Tokyo Ohka Kogyo, JSR, Merck Performance Materials, Linde Electronics, Air Liquide Electronics, and a small group of others.

Second-order exposure is broader and harder to track. Construction chemistries — sealants, adhesives, structural composites, specialty coatings, insulation materials, fire-retardant polymers — that have been priced and capacity-planned against an 'infinite growth' assumption for data centre construction would absorb a real hit. Power-related chemistries — transformer fluids, cable insulation polymers, battery-storage chemistries underwriting grid upgrades — sit in the same exposure bracket. These are not segments commonly framed as 'AI exposed', but their order books materially are.

## How the industry would react

In the event of a meaningful AI capex contraction — defined as a 20 percent or greater pullback in hyperscaler 2027 spending — the specialty chemicals industry would likely respond with a flight to essentials: water treatment, food and feed additives, pharmaceutical intermediates and excipients, industrial cleaning chemistries, agrochemicals. These are the segments with structurally inelastic demand, regulated qualification cycles that protect incumbents, and thin substitution risk. High-tech chemical startups raised against AI-adjacent narratives would face valuation compression of an order of magnitude similar to the 2001 telecom-equipment correction. Established producers with diversified portfolios would be insulated. Single-segment specialists with concentrated AI exposure would not.

# 06 The Performance Ceiling: Why Substitution Is the Wrong Frame

The substitution narrative — bio-based chemistries replacing petrochemical specialties, green alternatives displacing legacy molecules — has dominated industry communication for a decade. It is now hitting physical limits that are not communications problems. They are chemistry problems.

### What the performance ceiling looks like

| Property | Synthetic Benchmark | Bio-based Performance | Substitution Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| Continuous service temperature | PEEK: 250°C / PA12: 170°C | Bio-based polyamides: 150–160°C max | Ceiling reached |
| UV / weathering resistance | Fluoropolymers: 30+ years | Bio-based coatings: 7–12 years | Gap not closed |
| Dielectric strength | Synthetic esters: 75 kV/2.5mm | Vegetable esters: 65 kV/2.5mm | Acceptable in some applications |
| Mechanical strength (composites) | Carbon fibre / epoxy | Natural fibre composites: 30–60% lower | Application-dependent |
| Chemical resistance | PVDF, PTFE, PFA | Bio-based fluoroalternatives: emerging | Limited commercial readiness |
| Barrier properties (packaging) | EVOH, PA, multilayer films | PHA, PLA: 10–100x higher permeability | Application-restricted |

Performance comparisons in the table above are segment-specific and not directly interchangeable across applications. PEEK competes against different bio-based candidate chemistries than fluoropolymers; barrier performance in food packaging is benchmarked against different criteria than dielectric performance in transformer fluids. The point of the table is the pattern, not the cross-segment comparison: bio-based alternatives consistently approach but do not cross specific physical performance ceilings in demanding applications.

### The hybridisation reframe

The future of chemistry sustainability is not pure substitution. It is hybridisation: synthetic backbones with bio-based modifications, petrochemical molecules with mass-balanced renewable feedstock allocation, drop-in alternatives that meet 80 percent of performance specifications for 80 percent of applications while leaving the demanding 20 percent of applications to optimised synthetic chemistries. This reframe matters for communications strategy as much as for R&D allocation. Producers marketing 'bio-based replacement' against an unachievable performance spec lose credibility with technical buyers. Producers marketing 'hybrid chemistry that meets your spec at lower carbon intensity' win the spec-in conversation.

**THE STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS IMPLICATION**

Sustainability narratives that promise full substitution invite technical rebuttal. Sustainability narratives that frame hybridisation, mass-balance, and segmented application strategy survive technical scrutiny. The communications architecture matters: claims must match what the chemistry can actually deliver in the customer's qualification protocol, not what the marketing department wishes were true.

# 07 The Practical Skills Deficit

AI is rapidly absorbing rule-based chemical R&D work. Property prediction, retrosynthesis, formulation optimisation, regulatory documentation, technical literature synthesis — these are all moving into the LLM and ML-augmented workflow stack. The structural workforce implication is rarely articulated honestly: the chemical industry is producing a surplus of data-literate graduates and a catastrophic shortage of hands-on technicians who can diagnose a leaking reactor, commission a polymerisation line, or interpret a corroded heat exchanger.

### The bifurcation

| Workforce Segment | AI Impact 2026–2030 | Supply | Demand |
|---|---|---|---|
| Rule-based R&D analysts | Augmented or displaced | Surplus | Shrinking |
| Regulatory documentation specialists | Heavily augmented | Stable | Stable |
| Process engineers (computational) | Augmented | Adequate | Growing |
| Process engineers (on-site) | Minimal direct impact | Critical shortage | Growing |
| Skilled chemical operators / technicians | No meaningful AI substitution | Severe shortage | Growing |
| Maintenance / instrumentation specialists | Diagnostic tools augment, not replace | Severe shortage | Growing |
| Plant commissioning / start-up engineers | Documentation augmented; physical work unaffected | Critical shortage | Growing |

### Why the European training pipeline is failing

The hard data tracks the structural risk. Germany's Federal Employment Agency identifies 163 of approximately 1,200 occupations as bottleneck occupations in 2024 — roughly one in eight. The German Economic Institute projects a skilled-worker shortfall on the order of three million by 2030 even under high-migration assumptions. Across manufacturing in Germany, 33 percent of skilled vacancies remained unfilled in 2023. Average vacancy duration for skilled bottleneck occupations now runs into months. The German chemical industry's specific apprenticeship enrolment numbers are not disclosed at EU-aggregate level with full precision; available figures put EU-wide chemical industry apprenticeships in the order of tens of thousands, with Germany's Chemiekant ausbildung as the strongest national programme — though applications have declined as university enrolment in data science and software engineering has accelerated. The result is a generation of mid-career chemical operators retiring without qualified replacements. The plant runs as long as the experienced operator runs. When she retires, there is nobody to take the panel.

### What this means strategically

The producers that win the next decade will be those that treat technician retention, training pipeline investment, and tacit knowledge transfer as a board-level capital allocation question — not an HR operational issue. AI tools augment expertise. They do not replace it. A reactor with a malfunctioning agitator does not produce a structured ticket the LLM can interpret. It produces vibration, foaming, off-spec product, and a pressure excursion that an experienced technician diagnoses by walking the plant. That capability cannot be recruited at short notice. It must be built, retained, and protected.

### THE PARADOX STATED PLAINLY

AI is making rule-based chemical work cheaper and more abundant. Physical chemistry expertise is becoming scarcer and more expensive. Producers that bet capital allocation on the first trend without investing in the second are building a research apparatus they cannot operationalise. The bottleneck moves from invention to execution.

# 08 Underdeveloped Grapevines: Where Real Edge Sits

The most overdiscussed industry trends — green chemistry, circular economy, digital twins, AI-driven discovery — are at this point priced into strategy decks across the industry. The competitive edge sits in the underdiscussed segments: capabilities that boards do not yet treat as strategic but customers will pay for as supply chain conditions harden.

### Feedstock flexibility

Bio-refining is broadly discussed. Feedstock flexibility within bio-refining is not. The producer that can run a plant on three or four different waste streams — agricultural residue, used cooking oil, lignocellulosic biomass, post-consumer plastic pyrolysis oil — without major reconfiguration is structurally insulated against single-source feedstock disruption. Most current bio-refining investment is single-feedstock optimised. That is a fragility, not a strength.

### Qualified second sources

China-plus-one is a strategy slogan. The operational reality requires qualified second-source chemistries — material that has passed customer qualification protocols, holds regulatory documentation, and ships at audit-ready quality. Indian, Vietnamese, Mexican, and selected Eastern European producers are positioning here. The window is open through approximately 2028. After that, qualifications harden and incumbent positions become defensive.

### Regional toll capacity

The reshoring wave creates demand for European and US toll manufacturing capacity that does not yet exist at the right scale. Specialty producers that can offer flexible, GMP-compliant, multi-tonne toll capacity inside regional tariff zones can charge premium pricing without owning the underlying brand. This is a margin opportunity hiding in plain sight.

### CBAM-ready carbon documentation

The European Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism creates a documentation burden that smaller producers will struggle with. Specialty chemical producers with audit-ready carbon accounting at the SKU level — not the plant level — will have a regulatory moat through 2030. This is unglamorous infrastructure investment that pays off slowly and durably.

### Hybridisation chemistry

As noted in Section 06, the future of sustainability is hybrid. Producers with both petrochemical and bio-based capability under the same engineering team can offer mass-balanced product families that single-source competitors cannot match. The capability lives in process integration, not raw chemistry.

### End-of-life chemistry

Recycling and depolymerisation chemistry is underdeveloped at specialty scale. Most discussion focuses on commodity polymer recycling — PET, polyolefins. The real opportunity sits in high-performance polymer recovery: PA12, PEEK, fluoropolymers, engineering thermoplastics. The chemistry is solvable. The economics currently are not. Whichever producer cracks the economic equation first will hold a defensible position.

> **THE SIGNAL AMONG THE NOISE**
>
> These are not predictions. They are observations about where capital allocation has not yet caught up with demonstrated demand. The discipline is to look at what customers are quietly asking for in qualification calls, technical service requests, and supply agreement amendments — not what is on the conference agenda.

# 09 Implications for European Specialty Chemicals

This paper has avoided forecasts. The implications, however, are concrete enough to state directly. They apply to producers, but also to the communications and intelligence architecture surrounding them.

### Regional P&L discipline

Move from global market share metrics to regional cost-of-capital metrics. Each of the three blocs (US, EU, China/India) is now a separate operating environment with separate pricing dynamics, separate regulatory loads, and separate qualification standards. Producers running unified global P&L are masking regional underperformance.

### AI exposure mapping

Audit specialty chemical revenue by AI capex sensitivity. First-order exposure (electronic chemicals, advanced packaging materials) and second-order exposure (data centre construction chemistries, power infrastructure chemistries) should be quantified at the SKU level. If 20 percent or more of forward demand assumes hyperscaler capex growth at current trajectories, scenario stress-testing is overdue.

### Hybridisation positioning

Sustainability communications should reframe from substitution to hybridisation. Claim what the chemistry can deliver. Mass-balanced product families, drop-in compatibility for 80 percent of applications, performance-tier strategies that match feedstock to specification — these win the technical buyer. Pure substitution claims do not.

### Workforce capital allocation

Treat technician retention, apprenticeship investment, and tacit knowledge transfer as board-level questions. The producers that lose plant-floor expertise without replacing it will not be able to operationalise the AI-augmented R&D investments they are currently making. The bottleneck is execution, not invention.

### Communications architecture

The communications environment for specialty chemicals has fragmented. Trade press has thinned. Customer technical buyers consume content through LinkedIn, technical webinars, and direct industry intelligence rather than through trade publications. The producers building owned-content intelligence capabilities — papers, briefings, structured market analysis — will dominate the qualified-buyer conversation. The producers relying on legacy PR will be invisible where the decisions are made.

### Trade defence preparation

CBAM implementation, US tariff regime instability, and Asian anti-dumping responses are creating a regulatory environment where documentation and lobbying capability are now strategic assets. European producers without European-level association engagement and without SKU-level carbon accounting will face headwinds that lobbied competitors avoid.

### WHAT WOULD FALSIFY THIS THESIS

Analytical honesty requires stating the conditions under which the argument in this paper would be wrong. The thesis weakens if: (1) hyperscaler AI revenue scales materially faster than infrastructure depreciation, validating current capex intensity; (2) the European energy-cost differential closes through gas pricing convergence, LNG capacity build-out, or sustained TTF decompression; (3) China fails to execute the value-chain pivot that anti-involution policy targets, leaving Western specialty incumbents with a longer defensive runway than this paper assumes; (4) demographic pressure on European technical labour eases through successful immigration and accelerated training pipelines, removing the practical-skills constraint; (5) reshoring and CBAM-style trade defence prove sufficient to insulate regional specialty markets from Chinese export pressure. The first of these is the most binary; the rest are matters of degree. None can be ruled out. All deserve monitoring against the indicators specified above.

### THE CLOSING POINT

The specialty chemicals industry is not in cyclical weakness. It is in structural reset. The producers, communicators, and decision makers who treat it as a cycle will allocate capital against a recovery that is not coming. The producers who treat it as a reset will allocate against the new operating reality — tri-polar, feedstock-fragmented, workforce-constrained, regulatory-loaded, and exposed to a capex cycle whose underlying revenue base remains structurally fragile. That second group will absorb the share.

# 10 Sources and Methodology

## Approach

This paper synthesises publicly available data sources. No proprietary client data has been used. Where ranges are presented (for example, hyperscaler capex commitments at $660–725 billion), the range reflects genuine variation across reporting agencies — Goldman Sachs, S&P Global, CreditSights, Futurum Group, Visual Capitalist — rather than authorial uncertainty. Where single figures are presented, multiple sources have converged on the same number within reasonable variance.

## Limitations

Three limitations matter. First, the AI capex-to-revenue gap analysis is sensitive to definitional choices about what counts as AI-attributable revenue at the model layer versus the cloud-services layer. Second, the European capacity utilisation figure aggregates across chemical sub-segments with very different underlying dynamics. Third, the 'ghost capacity' framing is analytically useful but does not have a single agreed definition or measurement methodology in the industry literature.

## Primary public sources consulted

Cefic Facts & Figures 2024 and 2025 reports; Cefic Chemical Trends Reports; Cefic-Advancy Competitiveness Study; China Petroleum and Chemical Industry Federation (CPCIF) statistics and presentations to the World Petrochemical Conference 2026; National Bureau of Statistics of China; CITIC Securities and Cinda Securities sector reports; S&P Global Energy CERA / WPC 2026 conference disclosures; Goldman Sachs research notes on AI capex (December 2025, May 2026); Futurum Group AI Capex 2026 analysis; CreditSights hyperscaler capex estimates; Roland Berger involution study; ICIS / Asian Chemical Connections; Chemical & Engineering News (CEN); CHEManager anti-involution analysis; trade.gov India Chemicals Country Commercial Guide; Indian Brand Equity Foundation (IBEF); KPMG India Specialty Chemicals analysis; Research Nester, Global Market Insights, Precedence Research, MarketsandMarkets, Roots Analysis specialty chemicals market reports.

## Editorial position

IMP InterMediaPartners GmbH is an independent B2B market intelligence and communications agency. This paper expresses the author's interpretation of public data. It is not investment advice, does not represent any client position, and should not be treated as a forecast. The framing is deliberately oriented toward strategic decision-making by chemical industry practitioners, communicators, and senior buyers of market intelligence.

### IMP INTERMEDIAPARTNERS GMBH

B2B market intelligence, strategic communications, and structured analysis for specialty chemicals, pharma/CDMO, packaging, coatings, petfood, and automotive sectors. Founded 1976. Based in Wuppertal, Germany.