

The FTSE 100 and their pension disclosures

A Quarterly Report from JLT Pension Capital Strategies

February 2011

Strategies to Solutions



JLT PENSION CAPITAL STRATEGIES

FTSE 100



In association with **J.P.Morgan** CAZENOVE

Executive Summary

- The total deficit in FTSE 100 pension schemes at 31 December 2010 is estimated to be £28 billion. This is an improvement of £29 billion from the position 12 months ago.
- There has been a very significant increase in the funding of pension deficits – and this at a time when most companies have precious little spare cash. Last year saw total deficit funding of £12.1 billion, up from £4.2 billion the previous year (an increase of almost 200%). Royal Dutch Shell led the way with a massive deficit contribution of over £2.7 billion, but 58 other FTSE 100 companies also reported significant deficit funding contributions in their most recent annual report and accounts.
- Pension schemes' flight out of equities into bonds seems to have halted. The average pension scheme asset allocation to bonds is 49%, the same as last year. This follows a very significant shift, from 41% the previous year and 35% just three years ago.
- There are a number of companies reporting very significant individual changes to investment strategies. Six FTSE 100 companies increased their bond allocations by more than 10%.
- Whilst there has been a significant increase in deficit funding contributions, there has been a marked decline in the provision of ongoing DB pension provision. The reduction in total service cost from £7.0 billion in the previous year to £6.0 billion in the current year represents a 15% decline in employee pension provision.
- There are a significant number of FTSE 100 companies where the pension scheme now represents a material risk to the business. Eight FTSE 100 companies have total disclosed pension liabilities greater than their equity market value. For British Airways and BT, total disclosed pension liabilities are more than treble their equity market value.
- Only six companies disclosed a pension surplus in their most recent annual report and accounts; 79 companies disclosed pension deficits. However, taking account of asset appreciation during the second half of the year, we estimate that 20 companies would disclose a surplus if they had a year-end of 31 December 2010.
- In the last 12 months, the total disclosed pension liabilities of the FTSE 100 companies have risen from £377 billion to £439 billion. A total of 14 companies have disclosed pension liabilities of more than £10 billion, the largest of which is BT with disclosed pension liabilities of £43 billion. A total of 27 companies have disclosed pension liabilities of less than £100 million, of which 15 companies have no defined benefit pension liabilities.
- If pension liabilities were measured on a "risk-free" basis rather than using a AA bond discount rate, the total disclosed pension liabilities of the FTSE 100 would increase from £439 billion to around £530 billion, and the total deficit at 31 December 2010 would be around £125 billion.

The appendix at the end of this report contains a full list of all the FTSE 100 companies analysed and their relevant pension disclosures.

Published in association with

J.P.Morgan CAZENOVE

J.P. Morgan Cazenove is a marketing name for the UK investment banking businesses [and EMEA cash equities and equity research businesses] of JPMorgan Chase & Co. and its subsidiaries. J.P. Morgan provides corporate and institutional clients with a wide range of services from sales and research to corporate broking and financial advice.

In the UK, J.P. Morgan Cazenove is corporate broker to more companies in the FTSE 100 and FTSE 250 than any other bank.

J.P. Morgan's global research is #1 overall in combined major Institutional Investor (II) surveys and #1 in combined major equity surveys. In the most recent II poll, J.P. Morgan Cazenove ranked #1 for UK research.

J.P. Morgan Cazenove equity research covers approximately 950 stocks across 40 sectors in Europe. Our stock coverage is complemented by a diverse set of strategy teams, including equity, derivatives, small and mid-caps, quant, accounting and valuation, investment companies, and pensions.

www.cazenove.com



Charles Cowling
JLT Pension Capital Strategies
0161 242 5388
charles_cowling@pensionstrategies.co.uk



David Bor
JLT Pension Capital Strategies
0161 242 5329
david_bor@pensionstrategies.co.uk

Funding Position

The overall funding position of pension schemes of FTSE 100 companies has improved over the year covered by their latest annual report and accounts.

Including all pension arrangements, both UK and overseas, whether funded or unfunded, the FTSE 100 companies with the best-funded pension schemes overall were as follows:

Name Funding	Rank	Assets £m	Liabilities £m	Surplus/(Deficit) £m	Funding Level
Old Mutual	1	953	815	138	117%
Prudential	2	5,512	5,174	338	107%
Resolution	3	1,012	953	59	106%
British Land	4	98	95	3	103%
Man Group	5	258	253	5	102%
Investec	6	116	115	1	101%
AMEC	7	1,324	1,328	(4)	100%
Morrison Supermarkets	8	2,111	2,128	(17)	99%
Rolls-Royce	9	7,402	7,537	(135)	98%
Associated British Foods	10	2,690	2,776	(86)	97%

The FTSE 100 companies with the worst funded pension schemes overall were as follows:

Name Funding	Rank	Assets £m	Liabilities £m	Surplus/(Deficit) £m	Funding Level
WPP	91	588	836	(248)	70%
Hammerson	92	47	69	(21)	69%
GKN	93	2,190	3,186	(996)	69%
AstraZeneca	94	4,337	6,364	(2,027)	68%
SABMiller	95	227	336	(109)	68%
BG	96	665	1,031	(366)	65%
Wolseley	97	724	1,156	(432)	63%
Sage Group	98	15	26	(11)	57%
Vedanta Resources	99	22	46	(24)	47%
Eurasian Natural Resources	100	0	29	(29)	0%

In 2007, IFRIC14* provided new guidance on irrecoverable surpluses. Within the FTSE 100, 16 companies have reported an irrecoverable surplus. The total reported irrecoverable surplus for FTSE 100 companies is now £1.4 billion. The largest reported irrecoverable surpluses in the FTSE 100 were as follows:

Name Funding	Rank	Irrecoverable Surplus £m
Prudential	1	588
Rolls-Royce	2	335
Scottish & Southern Energy	3	256
Anglo American	4	66
British American Tobacco	5	52
BHP Billiton	6	46
Invensys	7	30
HSBC	8	29
Associated British Foods	9	13
IMI	10	7

Commentary

Adjusting these figures up to the quarter-end, we estimate that the total pension deficit in the FTSE 100 as at 31 December 2010 was £28 billion. This is an improvement of £29 billion from the position 12 months ago.

* For more information on IFRIC14, see PCS publication – IAS19: A Quarterly Guide for Finance Directors, at 31st December 2010.

Investment Mismatching

Legislation over a number of years has clarified that pension liabilities are a form of corporate debt. Despite the fact that there is an increasing weight of opinion from academics and analysts that mismatched investment strategies in pension schemes reduce shareholder value, many companies are still running very large mismatched equity positions in their pension schemes. This has the impact of creating balance sheet volatility which some academic evidence might suggest flows through to share price volatility. Inevitably, analysis of mismatching is limited to the information disclosed in the annual report and accounts. Given the bond-like nature of pension liabilities, the allocation of pension assets to bonds gives an indication of the level of investment mismatching that exists.

The FTSE 100 companies with the highest allocation to bonds were:

Name	Rank	Assets £m	% of Assets in Bonds
Fresnillo	1	18	88%
Capital Shopping Centres	2	60	87%
Resolution	3	1,012	83%
Rolls-Royce	4	7,402	82%
Sage Group	5	15	76%
ICAP	6	8	75%
Prudential	7	5,512	75%
Weir Group	8	552	74%
HSBC	9	15,106	73%
BHP Billiton	10	1,021	72%

The FTSE 100 companies with the lowest allocation to bonds were:

Name	Rank	Assets £m	% of Assets in Bonds
Capita	91	579	30%
BAE Systems	92	15,142	30%
Intertek	93	73	30%
Tesco	94	4,696	29%
Unilever	95	12,793	28%
BP	96	19,742	25%
BG	97	665	16%
International Power	98	277	13%
Inmarsat	99	33	10%
Hammerson	100	47	0%

The FTSE 100 companies with the greatest change in equity-to-bonds allocation were:

Name	Rank	Current Bond Allocation	Previous Bond Allocation	Switch to Bonds
Capital Shopping Centres	1	87%	42%	+45%
Barclays	2	63%	47%	+16%
Serco	3	66%	52%	+14%
ICAP	4	75%	88%	-13%
Aviva	5	69%	56%	+12%
BG	6	16%	27%	-11%
Vedanta Resources	7	50%	40%	+10%
Rexam	8	61%	71%	-10%
Centrica	9	36%	27%	+9%
Scottish & Souther Energy	10	54%	63%	-9%

Commentary

Some companies and trustees are continuing to switch pension assets out of equities into bonds, which could indicate some “profit taking” as a result of the recent massive rally in equity markets. Capital Shopping Centres is the latest company to report a big switch, increasing their bond allocations by 45%. A total of 41 FTSE 100 companies now have more than 50% of pension scheme assets in bonds. Moreover, company disclosures reveal little of the extensive activity there has been by a number of companies to reduce mismatching risk by LDI (liability-driven investment) strategies, which frequently make use of derivatives and other financial instruments. Overall though, the average pension scheme asset allocation to bonds is now 49%, unchanged from the previous year’s accounts. This follows a very significant shift, from 41% the previous year and from 35% just three years ago.

We can also expect IFRIC14 to impact on pension scheme investment strategies. If shareholders see none of the upside of pension scheme investment in equities and all of the downside, there will inevitably be further pressure on company management to encourage moves towards lower risk investments in pension schemes.

Size of Pension Scheme

In recent years, pension schemes have grown significantly. Attempts by many companies to stem the growth of their pension liabilities by closing defined benefit pension schemes to new entrants have had little impact. Changes in economic conditions and increasing life expectancy have contributed to the spiralling growth in pension liabilities. Following the credit crunch, high spreads on corporate bonds prevailed over 2009, which countered the effects of rising inflation and increasing life expectancy, stifling the growth of pension liabilities. Over 2010, spreads on corporate bonds returned closer to historically normal levels and this significantly inflated pension liabilities reported in 2010 year-end accounts.

The FTSE 100 companies with the largest pension scheme liabilities (all those over £10 billion) are as follows:

Name	Rank	Total Pension Liabilities £m	Equity Market Value* £m
BT	1	43,293	13,981
Royal Dutch Shell	2	39,381	133,713
Royal Bank of Scotland	3	30,830	22,838
Lloyds Banking Group	4	27,073	44,725
BP	5	23,281	87,722
BAE Systems	6	20,488	11,245
Barclays	7	20,486	31,502
National Grid	8	19,598	19,146
HSBC	9	18,869	114,648
British Airways	10	16,826	3,134
Unilever	11	14,515	59,460
GlaxoSmithKline	12	12,438	64,981
Aviva	13	11,812	11,025
Rio Tinto	14	10,006	68,521

* as at 31 December 2010

The FTSE 100 companies with the smallest pension liabilities (all those under £100 million) are as follows:

Name	Rank	Total Pension Liabilities £m	Equity Market Value* £m
British Land	74	95	4,582
Intertek	75	93	2,817
Hammerson	76	69	2,952
Capital Shopping Centres	77	63	2,884
Aggreko	78	49	4,057
Vedanta Resources	79	46	6,670
Inmarsat	80	45	3,076
Eurasian Natural Resources	81	29	13,496
Alliance Trust	82	28	2,462
Sage Group	83	26	3,578
Fresnillo	84	21	11,962
ICAP	85	9	3,552

* as at 31 December 2010

In addition, Admiral, Antofagasta, ARM Holdings, Autonomy Corporation, BSkyB, Burberry, Cairn Energy, Kazakhmys, Lonmin, Petrofac, Randgold Resources, Shire and Tullow Oil all reported no defined benefit pension liabilities. We have also assumed that African Barrick Gold and Essar Energy have no DB pension liabilities since no accounts have yet been produced for these companies.

Commentary

In the last 12 months, the total disclosed pension liabilities of the FTSE 100 companies have risen from £377 billion to £439 billion. A total of 14 companies have disclosed pension liabilities of more than £10 billion, whilst 27 companies have disclosed pension liabilities of less than £100 million.

The possibility of measuring pension liabilities on a "risk-free" basis (i.e. using gilt-based discount rates rather than AA bond discount rates) has been debated at length, including in the recent detailed discussion paper from the Accounting Standards Board. In the UK, a company can no longer default on its promises to pension scheme members unless it goes into liquidation (in which case it is likely there is no value left for shareholders). It is therefore difficult to see that shareholders get any value out of their (very limited) ability to default on pension promises, and so applying a discount rate which allows for a probability of default is illogical. If pension liabilities were to be measured on a "risk-free" basis, we estimate that it would add around 20% to the total pension liabilities, i.e. increasing the total disclosed pension liabilities from £439 billion to around £530 billion. The total deficit at 31 December 2010 on a "risk-free" basis would be around £125 billion.

Significance of the Pension Scheme in the Boardroom

The impact of the pension liabilities on corporate decision-making and its importance in the boardroom depends on the relative size of the pension scheme. In the analysis below, the pension scheme deficit and liabilities are expressed as a percentage of the equity market value of the company.

The FTSE 100 companies with the most significant pension scheme liabilities are as follows:

Name	Rank	Equity Market Value* £m	Surplus / (Deficit) as a % of Equity Market Value	Liabilities as a % of Equity Market Value
British Airways	1	3,134	(66%)	537%
BT	2	13,981	(56%)	310%
Invensys	3	2,857	(18%)	190%
BAE Systems	4	11,245	(48%)	182%
Royal Bank of Scotland	5	22,838	(13%)	135%
RSA	6	4,318	(8%)	119% <i>86%**</i>
Aviva	7	11,025	(15%)	107%
National Grid	8	19,146	(7%)	102%
Rexam	9	2,912	(9%)	94%
GKN	10	3,444	(29%)	93%
Marks & Spencer	11	5,854	(6%)	91%
Smiths Group	12	4,828	(6%)	69% <i>59%**</i>
Sainsbury	13	6,951	(6%)	67%
Rolls-Royce	14	11,537	(1%)	65%
Barclays	15	31,502	(12%)	65%

* as at 31 December 2010

** These companies' pension schemes have purchased contracts which insure part of their liabilities; the figures in italics represent the impact of the liabilities without these insured sections.

A further sign of the significance of pensions in the boardroom is the extent of continuing DB provision to employees. This can be measured by looking at the ongoing spend on DB pensions (the service cost) before any allowance for deficit spending. The FTSE 100 companies with the highest ongoing spending is shown in the table below, together with the previous year's spend for comparison.

Name	Rank	Current DB Service Cost	Previous DB Service Cost
Royal Dutch Shell	1	619	655
Royal Bank of Scotland	2	583	705
BP	3	430	442
Lloyds Banking Group	4	395	469
Tesco	5	391	428
HSBC	6	381	405
Barclays	7	281	299
GlaxoSmithKline	8	251	246
BT	9	206	459
Unilever	10	203	214

Commentary

Eight FTSE 100 companies have total disclosed pension liabilities greater than their equity market value. For British Airways and BT, total disclosed pension liabilities are more than treble their equity market value. In addition, British Airways and BT have disclosed pension deficits bigger than 50% of the equity value of the company, with a further 11 companies with disclosed pension deficits bigger than 10% of their equity market value.

Increasingly companies are reacting to the combination of difficult economic conditions, rising pension costs and increasingly aggressive pension regulations by closing pension schemes to future and even current employees. This decline in total DB pension provision is now apparent in the accounts of FTSE 100 companies, which show a 15% decline in ongoing DB pension provision in just one year (total service cost in the latest accounts of £6.0 billion compares to £7.0 billion in the previous year). PCS believes that the majority of FTSE 100 companies will cease DB pension provision to all employees within two years.

Impact of the Pension Scheme on the Company's Share Price

As already mentioned, there is some evidence that balance sheet volatility caused by pension schemes flows through to share price volatility. Changes in the balance sheet position resulting from pensions can be separated into expected changes and unexpected changes. Expected balance sheet changes arise largely from the contributions paid by the company and the costs shown in the company's income statement. Unexpected balance sheet changes arise largely from actuarial gains and losses (due to stock market volatility) and changes to actuarial assumptions.

In the analysis below, the unexpected change in balance sheet position (net of change in irrecoverable surplus) is expressed as a percentage of the equity market value of the company. We are not suggesting that the balance sheet impact will translate into a £ for £ impact on a company's share price (not least because of the impact of deferred tax), but this analysis gives a good indication of those companies most positively (and negatively) affected by their pension schemes in their last financial year.

The FTSE 100 companies most positively affected by their pension schemes were:

Name	Rank	Equity Market Value* £m	Unanticipated Balance Sheet Gain (£m)	Impact as a % of Equity Value
Resolution	1	3,389	73	2%
Reed Elsevier	2	6,565	94	1%
Old Mutual	3	6,680	71	1%
Royal Dutch Shell	4	133,713	962	1%
Smith & Nephew	5	6,005	40	1%
Diageo	6	29,847	138	0%
Morrison Supermarkets	7	7,109	20	0%
BP	8	87,722	193	0%
Unilever	9	59,460	101	0%
WPP	10	9,936	12	0%

* as at 31 December 2010

The FTSE 100 companies most negatively affected by their pension schemes were:

Name	Rank	Equity Market Value* £m	Unanticipated Balance Sheet Gain (£m)	Impact as a % of Equity Value
Royal Bank of Scotland	91	22,838	-1,403	-6%
Lloyds Banking Group	92	44,725	-3,497	-8%
Barclays	93	31,502	-2,929	-9%
Serco	94	2,716	-255	-9%
Aviva	95	11,025	-1,107	-10%
Invensys	96	2,857	-294	-10%
BAE Systems	97	11,245	-1,727	-15%
RSA	98	4,318	-932	-22%
BT	99	13,981	-4,322	-31%
British Airways	100	3,134	-1,546	-49%

* as at 31 December 2010

Commentary

Over the year covered by their latest report and accounts, 12 companies felt the benefit of an unexpected gain to their balance sheet as a result of their pension schemes, whilst 73 companies suffered an unexpected loss to their balance sheet as a result of their pension schemes.

Contributions Paid Into Pension Schemes

This analysis compares the pension scheme contributions actually paid by companies with the cost of pension benefits accrued during the year. Surplus pension contributions paid in excess of the cost of benefits will reduce pension scheme deficits. However, where the contributions paid are less than the cost of benefits, this will increase pension scheme deficits (or reduce pension scheme surpluses).

The levelling out of pension scheme contributions seen in recent years seems to have ended, with the amount contributed in the most recent accounting year being £6.8 billion higher than the amount contributed the previous year.

Only contributions actually paid in the relevant accounting year are included in the analysis below.

The FTSE 100 companies who have made the largest surplus contributions to their pension schemes were as follows:

Name	Rank	Pension Contributions £m	Cost of Benefits £m	Surplus Contributions £m
Royal Dutch Shell	1	3,345	619	2,726
Lloyds Banking Group	2	1,859	462	1,397
Unilever	3	1,071	159	912
BT	4	916	206	710
BAE Systems	5	864	183	681
GlaxoSmithKline	6	894	245	649
Royal Bank of Scotland	7	1,153	598	555
National Grid	8	572	112	460
Centrica	9	403	70	333
Barclays	10	601	282	319
British Airways	11	364	123	241
Rio Tinto	12	370	130	240
HSBC	13	617	394	224
BP	14	646	431	216
AstraZeneca	15	365	181	185

Commentary

In total, the amount contributed to FTSE 100 company pension schemes was £18.2 billion, up from £11.4 billion in the previous accounting year. This is more than the £6.1 billion cost of benefits accrued during the year. It therefore represents £12.1 billion of funding towards reducing pension scheme deficits. This is nearly a 200% increase on the previous year's deficit funding of £4.2 billion.

Royal Dutch Shell injected an additional £2.7 billion into its pension schemes in 2009, on top of its regular contributions, which totalled £0.6 billion. The decision was in response to the deficit of £5.8 billion at 31 December 2008 – the highest deficit in the FTSE 100 at the time. We believe that this will be the largest ever pension deficit contribution in the UK.

The huge cash contributions paid by Royal Dutch Shell come at a time when most companies have precious little spare cash. Widening deficits, and perhaps weaker perceived sponsor covenants, will inevitably lead to trustees requesting larger deficit-correcting contributions from sponsoring employers. This year we expect to see a trend towards companies looking at alternative sources to fund their pension schemes. Most recently, Sainsbury and Marks & Spencer have announced plans to use property partnership deals – worth £750 million and £300 million respectively – to help tackle their pension deficits.

Appendix

Name	Year End	Equity Market Value £m	Pension Assets £m	Pension Liabilities £m	Surplus/ (Deficit) £m	Funding Level	% Bonds	Surplus / (Deficit) as % of Market Value	Liabilities as % of Market value	Unanticipated Balance Sheet Impact £m	Balance Sheet Impact as % of Market Value	Current Funding £m	Previous Funding £m	Surplus / (Deficit) funding £m
3i	31-Mar-2010	3,165	587	615	(28)	95%	44%	(1%)	19%	(71)	(2%)	67	37	62
Admiral	31-Dec-2009	4,065	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
African Barrick Gold	31-Dec-2009	2,506	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Aggreko	31-Dec-2009	4,057	43	49	(6)	88%	50%	(0%)	1%	(2)	(0%)	6	6	5
Alliance Trust	31-Jan-2010	2,462	23	28	(5)	82%	51%	(0%)	1%	(3)	(0%)	1	1	0
AMEC	31-Dec-2009	3,813	1,324	1,328	(4)	100%	57%	(0%)	35%	(172)	(4%)	18	26	6
Anglo American	31-Dec-2009	44,227	1,693	1,845	(151)	92%	55%	(0%)	4%	(136)	(0%)	40	27	19
Antofagasta	31-Dec-2009	15,892	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ARM Holdings	31-Dec-2009	5,544	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Associated British Foods	18-Sep-2010	9,354	2,690	2,776	(86)	97%	61%	(1%)	30%	(19)	(0%)	66	76	31
AstraZeneca	31-Dec-2009	42,006	4,337	6,364	(2,027)	68%	46%	(5%)	15%	(384)	(1%)	365	207	185
Autonomy Corporation	31-Dec-2009	3,612	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Aviva	31-Dec-2009	11,025	10,105	11,812	(1,707)	86%	69%	(15%)	107%	(1,107)	(10%)	294	620	138
BAE Systems	31-Dec-2009	11,245	15,142	20,488	(5,346)	74%	30%	(48%)	182%	(1,727)	(15%)	864	486	681
Barclays	31-Dec-2009	31,502	16,700	20,486	(3,786)	82%	63%	(12%)	65%	(2,929)	(9%)	601	407	319
BG	31-Dec-2009	43,665	665	1,031	(366)	65%	16%	(1%)	2%	(153)	(0%)	68	45	27
BHP Billiton	30-Jun-2010	56,261	1,021	1,163	(142)	88%	72%	(0%)	2%	(34)	(0%)	102	70	68
BP	31-Dec-2009	87,722	19,742	23,281	(3,539)	85%	25%	(4%)	27%	193	0%	646	271	216
British Airways	31-Mar-2010	3,134	14,756	16,826	(2,070)	88%	45%	(66%)	537%	(1,546)	(49%)	364	331	241
British American Tobacco	31-Dec-2009	49,185	4,618	5,370	(752)	86%	43%	(2%)	11%	(280)	(1%)	214	145	132
British Land	31-Mar-2010	4,582	98	95	3	103%	38%	0%	2%	(2)	(0%)	3	4	1
BSkyB	30-Jun-2010	12,901	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BT	31-Mar-2010	13,981	35,429	43,293	(7,864)	82%	41%	(56%)	310%	(4,322)	(31%)	916	441	710
Bunzl	31-Dec-2009	2,359	223	283	(60)	79%	38%	(3%)	12%	(15)	(1%)	11	9	6
Burberry	31-Mar-2010	4,862	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Carroll Energy	31-Dec-2009	5,869	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Capita	31-Dec-2009	4,271	579	611	(32)	95%	30%	(1%)	14%	(58)	(1%)	72	39	48
Capital Shopping Centres	31-Dec-2009	2,884	60	63	(3)	95%	87%	(0%)	2%	(13)	(0%)	17	3	16
Carnival	30-Nov-2009	6,338	162	186	(24)	87%	65%	(0%)	3%	(30)	(0%)	4	4	1
Centrica	31-Dec-2009	17,084	3,533	4,098	(565)	86%	36%	(3%)	24%	(809)	(5%)	403	240	333
Compass	30-Sep-2010	10,920	1,639	2,029	(390)	81%	59%	(4%)	19%	(59)	(1%)	43	57	21
Diageo	30-Jun-2010	29,847	5,367	6,359	(992)	84%	46%	(3%)	21%	138	0%	195	128	109
Essar Energy	31-Dec-2009	7,558	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Eurasian Natural Resources	31-Dec-2009	13,496	0	29	(29)	0%	-	(0%)	0%	(0)	(0%)	0	0	(1)
Experian	31-Mar-2010	8,124	541	590	(49)	92%	39%	(1%)	7%	(18)	(0%)	8	8	1
Fresnillo	31-Dec-2009	11,962	18	21	(4)	83%	88%	(0%)	0%	(1)	(0%)	0	0	(0)
G4S	31-Dec-2009	3,585	1,335	1,703	(368)	78%	42%	(10%)	47%	(59)	(2%)	51	53	38
GKN	31-Dec-2009	3,444	2,190	3,186	(996)	69%	55%	(29%)	93%	(134)	(4%)	51	37	21
GlaxoSmithKline	31-Dec-2009	64,981	10,694	12,438	(1,744)	86%	46%	(3%)	19%	(621)	(1%)	894	443	649
Hammerston	31-Dec-2009	2,952	47	69	(21)	69%	0%	(1%)	2%	(13)	(0%)	1	1	(0)
HSBC	31-Dec-2009	114,648	15,106	18,869	(3,763)	80%	73%	(3%)	16%	(1,797)	(2%)	617	381	224
ICAP	31-Mar-2010	3,552	8	9	(1)	89%	75%	(0%)	0%	1	0%	0	1	0
IMI	31-Dec-2009	3,025	1,045	1,288	(243)	81%	43%	(8%)	43%	(143)	(5%)	27	27	18
Imperial Tobacco	30-Sep-2010	20,008	2,960	3,802	(842)	78%	38%	(4%)	19%	(75)	(0%)	70	53	32
Inmarsat	31-Dec-2009	3,076	33	45	(12)	74%	10%	(0%)	1%	(7)	(0%)	4	3	3
InterContinental Hotels	31-Dec-2009	3,557	342	408	(66)	84%	65%	(2%)	11%	(25)	(1%)	13	18	8
International Power	31-Dec-2009	6,646	277	374	(97)	74%	13%	(1%)	6%	(16)	(0%)	13	7	0
Intertek	31-Dec-2009	2,817	73	93	(20)	79%	30%	(1%)	3%	(3)	(0%)	4	5	2

Appendix (continued)

Name	Year End	Equity Market Value £m	Pension Assets £m	Pension Liabilities £m	Surplus/ (Deficit) £m	Funding Level %	Bonds % of Market Value	Surplus/ (Deficit) as % of Market Value	Liabilities as % of Market value	Unanticipated Balance Sheet Impact £m	Balance Sheet Impact as % of Market Value	Current Funding £m	Previous Funding £m	Surplus/ (Deficit) funding £m
Invenys	31-Mar-2010	2,857	4,919	5,441	(522)	90%	60%	(18%)	190%	(294)	(10%)	68	64	50
Investec	31-Mar-2010	2,831	116	115	1	101%	60%	0%	4%	(11)	(0%)	4	4	4
Johnson Matthey	31-Mar-2010	4,375	1,045	1,247	(202)	84%	46%	(5%)	29%	(117)	(3%)	51	28	27
Kazakhmys	31-Dec-2009	8,639	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kingfisher	30-Jan-2010	6,170	1,518	1,716	(198)	88%	62%	(3%)	28%	(164)	(3%)	66	48	44
Land Securities	31-Mar-2010	5,149	142	148	(7)	96%	56%	(0%)	3%	(11)	(0%)	7	4	6
Legal & General	31-Dec-2009	5,671	1,193	1,474	(281)	81%	67%	(5%)	26%	(159)	(3%)	62	58	51
Lloyds Banking Group	31-Dec-2009	44,725	23,518	27,073	(3,555)	87%	47%	(8%)	61%	(3,497)	(8%)	1,859	762	1,397
Lommin	30-Sep-2010	3,975	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Man Group	31-Mar-2010	5,066	258	253	5	102%	38%	0%	5%	(17)	(0%)	59	8	56
Marks & Spencer	03-Apr-2010	5,854	4,949	5,300	(351)	93%	53%	(6%)	91%	(252)	(4%)	83	92	26
Morrison Supermarkets	31-Jan-2010	7,109	2,111	2,128	(17)	99%	60%	(0%)	30%	20	0%	42	40	16
National Grid	31-Mar-2010	19,146	18,186	19,598	(1,412)	93%	57%	(7%)	102%	(550)	(3%)	572	799	460
Next	30-Jan-2010	3,645	433	482	(50)	90%	47%	(1%)	13%	(13)	(0%)	43	22	34
Old Mutual	31-Dec-2009	6,680	953	815	138	117%	56%	2%	12%	71	1%	14	13	6
Pearson	31-Dec-2009	8,109	1,727	1,967	(240)	88%	49%	(3%)	24%	(287)	(4%)	90	57	72
Petrofac	31-Dec-2009	5,478	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Prudential	31-Dec-2009	16,858	5,512	5,174	338	107%	75%	2%	31%	(115)	(1%)	85	95	51
Randgold Resources	31-Dec-2009	5,802	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Reckitt Benckiser	31-Dec-2009	25,551	801	1,064	(263)	75%	38%	(1%)	4%	(99)	(0%)	27	20	11
Reed Elsevier	31-Dec-2009	6,565	3,067	3,302	(235)	93%	40%	(4%)	50%	94	1%	101	79	34
Resolution	31-Dec-2009	3,389	1,012	953	59	106%	83%	2%	28%	73	2%	10	49	7
Rexam	31-Dec-2009	2,912	2,480	2,746	(266)	90%	61%	(9%)	94%	(168)	(6%)	17	50	6
Rio Tinto	31-Dec-2009	68,521	7,658	10,006	(2,348)	77%	40%	(3%)	15%	(641)	(1%)	370	231	240
Roils-Royce	31-Dec-2009	11,537	7,402	7,537	(135)	98%	82%	(1%)	65%	(390)	(3%)	288	279	159
Royal Bank of Scotland	31-Dec-2009	22,838	27,925	30,830	(2,905)	91%	55%	(13%)	135%	(1,403)	(6%)	1,153	810	555
Royal Dutch Shell	31-Dec-2009	133,713	37,313	39,381	(2,068)	95%	45%	(2%)	29%	962	1%	3,345	891	2,726
RSA	31-Dec-2009	4,318	4,810	5,140	(330)	94%	66%	(8%)	119%	(932)	(22%)	130	123	77
SAB Miller	31-Mar-2010	35,415	227	336	(109)	68%	68%	(0%)	1%	(1)	(0%)	1	5	(4)
Sage Group	30-Sep-2010	3,578	15	26	(11)	57%	76%	(0%)	1%	1	0%	1	1	(1)
Sainsbury	20-Mar-2010	6,951	4,237	4,658	(421)	91%	55%	(6%)	67%	(173)	(2%)	134	128	85
Schroders	31-Dec-2009	5,072	573	614	(41)	93%	47%	(1%)	12%	(70)	(1%)	9	12	1
Scottish & Southern Energy	31-Mar-2010	11,275	2,298	2,782	(484)	83%	54%	(4%)	24%	(509)	(5%)	110	71	89
Serco	31-Dec-2009	2,716	1,357	1,744	(388)	78%	66%	(14%)	64%	(255)	(9%)	62	61	28
Severn Trent	31-Mar-2010	3,481	1,393	1,748	(355)	80%	42%	(10%)	50%	(132)	(4%)	40	42	25
Shire	31-Dec-2009	8,631	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Smith & Nephew	31-Dec-2009	6,005	531	713	(182)	74%	39%	(3%)	12%	40	1%	26	23	10
Smiths Group	31-Jul-2010	4,828	3,043	3,325	(281)	92%	42%	(6%)	69%	(21)	(0%)	51	53	46
Standard Chartered	31-Dec-2009	40,245	1,245	1,541	(296)	81%	53%	(1%)	4%	(66)	(0%)	85	81	65
Standard Life	31-Dec-2009	4,881	1,836	1,924	(88)	95%	51%	(2%)	39%	(69)	(1%)	62	60	20
Tesco	27-Feb-2010	33,797	4,696	6,536	(1,840)	72%	29%	(5%)	19%	(322)	(1%)	415	376	24
TUI Travel	30-Sep-2010	2,753	1,215	1,709	(494)	71%	44%	(18%)	62%	(32)	(1%)	94	92	57
Tullow Oil	31-Dec-2009	11,157	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Unilever	31-Dec-2009	59,460	12,793	14,515	(1,723)	88%	28%	(3%)	24%	101	0%	1,071	584	912
United Utilities	31-Mar-2010	3,996	1,911	2,182	(271)	88%	51%	(7%)	55%	(50)	(1%)	44	45	15
Vedanta Resources	31-Mar-2010	6,670	22	46	(24)	47%	50%	(0%)	1%	(8)	(0%)	10	7	7
Vodafone	31-Mar-2010	87,027	1,487	1,690	(203)	88%	40%	(0%)	2%	(74)	(0%)	133	98	104
Weir Group	01-Jan-2010	3,738	552	623	(71)	89%	74%	(2%)	17%	(53)	(1%)	15	10	13
Whitbread	04-Mar-2010	3,145	1,281	1,715	(434)	75%	45%	(14%)	14%	(186)	(6%)	5	55	0
Wiseley	31-Jul-2010	5,778	724	1,156	(432)	63%	34%	(7%)	20%	(93)	(2%)	42	47	15
WPP	31-Dec-2009	9,936	588	836	(248)	70%	70%	(2%)	8%	12	0%	48	44	26
Xstrata	31-Dec-2009	43,885	1,326	1,580	(254)	84%	59%	(1%)	4%	(64)	(0%)	70	41	47

* There are currently no accounts available for African Barrick Gold and Essar Energy. Therefore, for the purposes of this report, we have assumed that these companies have no defined benefit pension liabilities.

Notes

All of the analysis contained in this report is based on the IAS19 numbers disclosed in a company's most recently published annual report and accounts.

No adjustment is made for the fact that companies have applied different interpretations of IAS19 and have used different actuarial assumptions (for example, different mortality assumptions can make a significant difference to a company's pension liabilities).

No adjustment is made in the individual analysis for the fact that companies have different year-ends. Inevitably, different market conditions applying at different year-ends will affect the comparisons.

The assets and liabilities shown are the total global pension assets and liabilities, not just the UK figures.

The figures shown in this report are before adjustment for IFRIC14 (and before adjustment for any other unrecognised pension surpluses), except for Unanticipated Balance Sheet Impact, which is shown net of the change in irrecoverable surplus.

Whilst all reasonable care has been taken in the preparation of this publication, no liability is accepted under any circumstances by Jardine Lloyd Thompson for any loss or damage occurring as a result of reliance on any statement, opinion, or any error or omission contained herein. Any statement or opinion reflects our understanding of current or proposed legislation and regulation, which may change without notice. The content of this document should not be regarded as specific advice in relation to the matters addressed.

J.P. Morgan Cazenove is a marketing name for the UK investment banking businesses [and EMEA cash equities and equity research businesses] of JPMorgan Chase & Co. and its subsidiaries (collectively JPMorgan). This publication has been prepared for information purposes only and is not a solicitation, or an offer, to buy or sell any security or to participate in any trading strategy, and should not be regarded as specific or investment advice in relation to the matters addressed. It has been prepared without regard to the individual financial objectives and circumstances of the recipients. It does not purport to be a complete description of the securities, markets or developments referred to in it. The information on which this publication is based has been obtained from sources which we believe to be reliable, but we have not independently verified such information and we do not warrant that it is accurate or complete. All expressions of opinion are subject to change without notice. Third party data providers make no warranty relating to the accuracy, completeness or timeliness of their data and shall have no liability whatsoever for losses that may arise from reliance upon such data. Jardine Lloyd Thompson and JPMorgan shall have no responsibility or liability whatsoever for loss or damage that may arise from reliance upon any statement or opinion in, or any error or omission from, this publication (including, without limitation, such third party data). Each of Jardine Lloyd Thompson, JPMorgan, and their respective connected companies, and the directors, officers and employees of each of them, may from time to time have a long or short position, or other interest, in the securities of the companies referred to and may sell or buy such securities and interests and may trade them in ways that may be inconsistent with any discussion in this publication.

JLT Pension Capital Strategies

6 Crutched Friars

London EC3N 2PH

Tel 020 7528 4892

Fax 020 7309 8330

Email solutions@pensionstrategies.co.uk

Web www.pensionstrategies.co.uk

JLT Pension Capital Strategies. A trading Name of Pension Capital Strategies Limited. Authorised and regulated by the Financial Services Authority. A member of the Jardine Lloyd Thompson Group. Registered Office: 6 Crutched Friars, London EC3N 2PH. Registered in England No 5651461. VAT No. 244 2321 96