

# The FTSE 250 and their pension disclosures

An Annual Report from JLT Pension Capital Strategies  
September 2011

Strategies to Solutions



JLT PENSION CAPITAL STRATEGIES

FTSE 250



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

## Executive Summary

- The total deficit in FTSE 250 pension schemes at 30 June 2011 is estimated to be £6 billion. This is an improvement of £8 billion from the position 12 months ago.
- Only 82 FTSE 250 companies are still providing more than a handful of current employees with DB benefits (i.e. ignoring companies who are incurring ongoing DB service costs of less than 1% of total payroll). Of these, only 17 companies (i.e. just 7% of the FTSE 250) are still providing DB benefits to a significant number of employees (defined as incurring ongoing DB service cost of more than 5% of total payroll).
- There continues to be significant funding of pension deficits – and this at a time when most companies have precious little spare cash. Last year saw total deficit funding of £1.5 billion, up from £1.1 billion the previous year. Taylor Wimpey led the way with a deficit contribution of £122 million, but 47 other FTSE 250 companies also reported significant deficit funding contributions in their most recent annual report and accounts.
- The significant decline in ongoing DB pensions continues. We estimate that after allowing for the impact of changes in assumptions and market conditions, the underlying reduction in ongoing DB pension provision is approximately 10% in the last 12 months alone.
- The average pension scheme asset allocation to bonds is 50%, a slight increase on last year's figure of 48%. This compares to 49% the previous year and 42% three years ago. But this disguises some significant changes. In eight companies, pension scheme asset allocation to bonds has increased by more than 20%.
- There are a significant number of FTSE 250 companies where the pension scheme represents a material risk to the business. Twenty-one FTSE 250 companies have total disclosed pension liabilities greater than their equity market value. For Premier Foods, total disclosed pension liabilities are more than six times their equity market value.
- Only 25 companies disclosed a pension surplus in their most recent annual report and accounts; 120 companies disclosed pension deficits. However, we estimate that around 35 companies would disclose a surplus if they had a year-end of 30 June 2011.
- In the last 12 months, the total disclosed pension liabilities of the FTSE 250 companies have risen from £68 billion to £73 billion. A total of 20 companies have disclosed pension liabilities of more than £1 billion, the largest of which is Invensys with disclosed pension liabilities of £5.5 billion. A total of 155 companies have disclosed pension liabilities of less than £100 million, of which 104 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 250 would increase from £73 billion to around £89 billion, and the total deficit at 30 June 2011 would be around £22 billion.

*The appendix at the end of this report contains a full list of all the FTSE 250 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](http://www.cazenove.com)



Charles Cowling  
JLT Pension Capital Strategies  
0161 242 5388  
[charles\\_cowling@jltpcs.com](mailto:charles_cowling@jltpcs.com)



David Bor  
JLT Pension Capital Strategies  
0161 242 5329  
[david\\_bor@jltpcs.com](mailto:david_bor@jltpcs.com)

## Funding Position

The overall funding position of pension schemes of FTSE 250 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 250 companies with the best-funded pension schemes overall were as follows:

Name	Rank	Assets £m	Liabilities £m	Surplus/(Deficit) £m	Funding Level
Henderson	1	449	337	113	133%
Tullett Prebon	2	170	146	24	116%
London Stock Exchange	3	282	245	38	115%
Ladbrokes	4	263	229	35	115%
WH Smith	5	855	761	94	112%
Dignity	6	85	76	9	111%
Ashtead	7	64	58	6	111%
St. Modwen Properties	8	27	25	3	110%
Derwent London	9	12	11	1	110%
Provident Financial	10	514	473	41	109%

The FTSE 250 companies with the worst funded pension schemes overall were as follows:

Name	Rank	Assets £m	Liabilities £m	Surplus/(Deficit) £m	Funding Level
Kofax	241	3	4	(1)	66%
Ultra Electronics Holdings	242	143	222	(79)	65%
Thomas Cook	243	703	1,118	(415)	63%
Chemring	244	39	62	(23)	63%
Keller	245	31	51	(20)	60%
Aegis	246	4	12	(7)	37%
Ferrexpo	247	1	13	(12)	8%
AZ Electronic Materials	248	0	6	(6)	0%
Lamprell	248	0	12	(12)	0%
New World Resources	248	0	82	(82)	0%

In 2007, IFRIC14\* provided new guidance on irrecoverable surpluses. Within the FTSE 250, 12 companies have reported an irrecoverable surplus. The total reported irrecoverable surplus for FTSE 250 companies is now £283 million. The largest reported irrecoverable surpluses in the FTSE 250 were as follows:

Name	Rank	Irrecoverable Surplus £m
FirstGroup	1	82
Mitchells & Butlers	2	56
Inchcape	3	37
Invensys	4	30
WH Smith	5	26
Electrocomponents	6	25
Stagecoach	7	17
Misys	8	4
Laird	9	3
Genus	10	3

**Commentary**  
Adjusting these figures up to the quarter-end, we estimate that the total pension deficit in the FTSE 250 as at 30 June 2011 was £6 billion. This is an improvement of £8 billion from the position 12 months ago.

\* For more information on IFRIC14, see PCS publication – IAS19: A Quarterly Guide for Finance Directors, at 30 June 2011.

## 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. This report refers to investment mismatching in terms of the IAS19 accounting position, where liabilities are being valued using AA corporate bonds; therefore assets other than these bonds will lead to a mismatch.

The FTSE 250 companies with the highest allocation to bonds were:

Name	Rank	Assets £m	% of Assets in Bonds
Hunting	1	224	100%
WH Smith	2	855	96%
Aegis	3	4	95%
Phoenix Group	4	3,051	85%
BTG	5	95	83%
Rentokil Initial	6	1,070	81%
Misys	7	49	80%
Cable & Wireless Communications	8	1,203	79%
Logica	9	471	78%
London Stock Exchange	10	282	78%

The FTSE 250 companies with the lowest allocation to bonds were:

Name	Rank	Assets £m	% of Assets in Bonds
Greene King	241	235	22%
Capital & Counties Properties	242	11	21%
Electrocomponents	243	326	21%
Mondi	244	300	19%
Derwent London	245	12	19%
Northumbrian Water	246	713	18%
Tullett Prebon	247	170	10%
Homeserve	248	18	8%
RIT Capital Partners	249	15	8%
Renishaw	250	83	2%

The FTSE 250 companies with the greatest change in bond allocation were:

Name	Rank	Current Bond Allocation	Previous Bond Allocation	Switch to Bonds
Aegis	1	95%	47%	+48%
RPC Group	2	58%	31%	+27%
Brewin Dolphin Holdings	3	60%	33%	+27%
Cookson	4	77%	52%	+25%
Foreign & Colonial	5	57%	32%	+25%
St. Modwen Properties	6	31%	6%	+25%
Scottish Investment Trust	7	34%	58%	-24%
F&C Asset Management	8	62%	39%	+23%
Synergy Health	9	65%	43%	+21%
Qinetiq	10	35%	16%	+18%

### Commentary

Several companies and trustees are continuing to switch pension assets out of equities into bonds. Aegis Group is the latest company to report a big switch, with bond allocations increasing by 48%. A total of 52 FTSE 250 companies 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 use 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 50%, a slight increase on last year's figure of 48%. This compares to 49% the previous year and 42% 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 volatility investments in pension schemes. In addition, a further cause of movement towards bond-based assets could be one of the recently announced changes to IAS19 due to be implemented from 1 January 2013, subject to EU endorsement. In the P&L the expected return on assets will effectively be replaced by the discount rate applied to the assets, so there will be no benefit in the P&L of holding outperforming assets.

## 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 250 companies with the largest pension scheme liabilities (all those over £1 billion) are as follows:

Name	Rank	Total Pension Liabilities £m	Equity Market Value* £m
Invensys	1	5,452	2,596
FirstGroup	2	3,450	1,642
Premier Foods	3	3,120	456
Phoenix Group	4	2,995	1,045
Babcock International	5	2,795	2,531
Balfour Beatty	6	2,785	2,100
Carillion	7	2,129	1,618
Stagecoach	8	2,050	1,838
Daily Mail & General Trust	9	1,878	1,803
Taylor Wimpey	10	1,853	1,208
TUI Travel	11	1,709	2,509
Mitchells & Butlers	12	1,548	1,282
Cable & Wireless Worldwide	13	1,470	1,234
Go-Ahead	14	1,375	673
Atkins (WS)	15	1,282	752
Cable & Wireless Communications	16	1,212	1,066
Thomas Cook	17	1,118	1,142
Qinetiq	18	1,106	789
Rentokil Initial	19	1,082	1,721
Melrose	20	1,039	1,801

\* as at 30 June 2011

### Commentary

*In the last 12 months, the total disclosed pension liabilities of the FTSE 250 companies have risen from £68 billion to £73 billion. A total of 20 companies have disclosed pension liabilities of more than £1 billion, whilst 155 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 a 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; however, last year the government changed the index linkage for many inflation-linked benefits which has had the effect of reducing the expected benefit outgo. If pension liabilities were to be measured on a "risk-free" basis, with no allowance for default or further reduction in benefits, we estimate that it would add over 20% to the total pension liabilities, increasing the total disclosed pension liabilities from £73 billion to around £89 billion. The total deficit at 30 June 2011 on a "risk-free" basis would be around £22 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 250 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	
Premier Foods	1	456	(70%)	684%	
Phoenix Group	2	1,045	5%	287%	<i>280%**</i>
FirstGroup	3	1,642	(10%)	210%	
Invensys	4	2,596	(16%)	210%	
Go-Ahead	5	673	(14%)	204%	
Atkins (WS)	6	752	(45%)	171%	
Kier	7	515	(17%)	162%	
Dairy Crest	8	490	(12%)	159%	<i>104%**</i>
Dixons Retail	9	610	(40%)	156%	
Taylor Wimpey	10	1,208	(21%)	153%	
Qinetiq	11	789	(16%)	140%	
Balfour Beatty	12	2,100	(21%)	133%	
Carillion	13	1,618	(15%)	132%	
Mitchells & Butlers	14	1,282	(11%)	121%	
Cable & Wireless Worldwide	15	1,234	(7%)	119%	<i>93%**</i>

\* as at 30 June 2011

\*\* 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 250 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 £m	Previous DB Service Cost £m
FirstGroup	1	88	57
Stagecoach	2	56	42
Balfour Beatty	3	53	32
Go-Ahead	4	50	54
Babcock International	5	46	23
TUI Travel	6	37	27
Daily Mail & General Trust	7	30	30
Thomas Cook	8	24	21
Qinetiq	9	23	20
Premier Foods	10	21	12

### Commentary

Twenty-one FTSE 250 companies have total disclosed pension liabilities greater than their equity market value. For Premier Foods, total disclosed pension liabilities are more than six times their equity market value. Premier Foods also has a pension deficit bigger than 50% of their equity market value, and a further 20 companies have 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 250 companies, with several companies closing their scheme to future accrual or freezing pensionable salaries. We estimate that after allowing for the impact of changes in assumptions and market conditions, the underlying reduction in ongoing DB pension provision is approximately 10% in the last 12 months alone. We believe that the majority of FTSE 250 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 250 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
WH Smith	1	708	160	23%
Dairy Crest	2	490	61	12%
Atkins (WS)	3	752	86	11%
Premier Foods	4	456	40	9%
Daily Mail & General Trust	5	1,803	156	9%
Stagecoach	6	1,838	149	8%
Punch Taverns	7	461	32	7%
Howden Joinery	8	683	41	6%
Phoenix Group	9	1,045	53	5%
Taylor Wimpey	10	1,208	60	5%

\* as at 30 June 2011

The FTSE 250 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
Travis Perkins	241	2,375	-44	-2%
Redrow	242	382	-7	-2%
Kier	243	515	-10	-2%
Go-Ahead	244	673	-14	-2%
De La Rue	245	753	-18	-2%
Barratt Developments	246	1,102	-26	-2%
Thomas Cook	247	1,142	-34	-3%
Debenhams	248	888	-37	-4%
Britvic	249	945	-47	-5%
Mitchells & Butlers	250	1,282	-99	-8%

\* as at 30 June 2011

### Commentary

Over the year covered by their latest report and accounts, 98 companies felt the benefit of an unexpected gain to their balance sheet as a result of their pension schemes, whilst 46 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 large increases in the contributions seen in the last couple of years have ended, with the amount contributed in the most recent accounting year being £0.4 billion lower than the amount contributed the previous year.

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

The FTSE 250 companies who have made the largest surplus contributions to their pension schemes were as follows:

Name	Rank	Pension Contributions	Cost of Benefits	Surplus Contributions
		£m	£m	£m
Taylor Wimpey	1	126	4	122
Cable & Wireless Communications	2	106	5	101
Phoenix Group	3	85	5	80
Balfour Beatty	4	121	53	68
TUI Travel	5	94	37	57
Premier Foods	6	66	9	57
Travis Perkins	7	58	6	53
Invensys	8	70	19	51
Croda International	9	28	-22	50
De La Rue	10	50	8	43
Kier	11	34	-5	39
Mitchells & Butlers	12	45	8	37
Babcock International	13	83	46	37
Carillion	14	43	7	36

### Commentary

*In total, the amount contributed to FTSE 250 company pension schemes was £2.2 billion, up from £1.8 billion in the previous accounting year. This is more than the £0.7 billion cost of benefits accrued during the year. It therefore represents £1.5 billion of funding towards reducing pension scheme deficits. This is a decrease on the previous year's deficit funding of £1.1 billion.*

*Taylor Wimpey injected an additional £122 million into its pension schemes in 2010, on top of its regular contributions, which totalled £4 million. The decision was in response to the deficit of £406 million at 31 December 2009 – the seventh highest deficit in the FTSE 250 at the time.*

*The huge cash contributions paid by Taylor Wimpey came 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, such as property partnership deals.*



# 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
Aberdeen Asset Management	30-Sep-2010	2,553	117	150	(33)	78%	51%	(1%)	6%	(4)	(1%)	6	8	5
Aegis	31-Dec-2010	2,054	4	12	(7)	37%	95%	(0%)	1%	2	0%	0	0	0
Alliance Trust	31-Jan-2011	2,459	29	28	1	103%	41%	0%	0%	3	0%	4	1	3
Amlin	31-Dec-2010	2,006	366	365	(9)	97%	64%	(0%)	18%	13	1%	5	7	3
Ashtead	30-Apr-2011	856	64	58	6	111%	31%	1%	7%	2	1%	2	1	1
Atkins (WS)	31-Mar-2011	752	944	1,282	(338)	74%	41%	(45%)	171%	86	11%	37	39	31
Aveva	31-Mar-2011	1,156	48	51	(3)	94%	29%	(0%)	4%	8	1%	4	2	2
Avis Europe	31-Dec-2010	606	137	195	(58)	70%	49%	(10%)	32%	9	1%	20	9	16
AZ Electronic Materials	31-Dec-2010	1,169	0	6	(6)	0%	-	(1%)	1%	0	0%	0	0	(0)
Babcock International	31-Mar-2011	2,531	2,580	2,795	(215)	92%	48%	(8%)	110%	56	2%	83	46	37
Balfour Beatty	31-Dec-2010	2,100	2,344	2,785	(441)	84%	58%	(21%)	133%	98	5%	121	69	68
Barr (A.G.)	31-Jan-2011	511	80	77	15	103%	31%	0%	23%	5	1%	4	4	3
Barratt Developments	30-Jun-2010	1,102	202	248	(46)	81%	49%	(4%)	23%	(26)	(2%)	13	16	13
BBA Aviation	31-Dec-2010	1,035	404	399	5	101%	77%	1%	39%	17	2%	3	3	1
Beazley	31-Dec-2010	650	16	17	(1)	93%	32%	(0%)	3%	0	0%	1	1	1
Bellway	31-Jul-2010	863	33	42	(9)	79%	35%	(1%)	5%	2	0%	2	1	2
Berendsen	31-Dec-2010	926	238	242	(4)	99%	52%	(0%)	26%	14	2%	10	10	14
Berkeley	30-Apr-2011	1,691	13	12	0	104%	59%	0%	1%	(0)	(0%)	1	1	1
Bodycote	31-Dec-2010	700	75	76	(1)	99%	51%	(0%)	11%	3	0%	1	1	0
Booker	25-Mar-2011	1,035	542	550	(8)	99%	41%	(1%)	53%	(1)	(0%)	11	12	11
Bovis Homes	31-Dec-2010	588	74	76	(3)	96%	45%	(0%)	13%	4	1%	2	3	1
Brewin Dolphin Holdings	26-Sep-2010	342	49	62	(12)	80%	60%	(4%)	18%	(2)	(1%)	6	2	6
Britvic	03-Oct-2010	945	524	641	(117)	82%	42%	(12%)	68%	(47)	(5%)	24	20	18
Brown (N.)	26-Feb-2011	732	72	69	3	105%	47%	0%	9%	1	0%	6	6	5
BTC	31-Mar-2011	915	95	97	(2)	98%	83%	(0%)	11%	4	0%	4	4	4
Bunzl	31-Dec-2010	2,559	258	311	(53)	83%	37%	(2%)	12%	(3)	(0%)	15	11	10
Cable & Wireless Communications	31-Mar-2011	1,066	1,203	1,212	(9)	99%	79%	(1%)	114%	9	1%	106	60	101
Cable & Wireless Worldwide	31-Mar-2011	1,234	1,379	1,470	(91)	94%	50%	(7%)	119%	56	5%	28	12	14
Caledonia Investments	31-Mar-2011	1,005	64	69	(5)	93%	37%	(0%)	7%	1	0%	3	2	2
Capital & Counties Properties	31-Dec-2010	1,347	11	13	(2)	85%	21%	(0%)	1%	2	0%	0	0	(0)
Carillion	31-Dec-2010	1,618	1,889	2,129	(240)	89%	49%	(15%)	132%	15	1%	43	43	36
Carpetright	30-Apr-2011	441	17	21	(4)	81%	43%	(1%)	5%	0	0%	0	1	0
Catlin	31-Dec-2010	1,442	17	16	1	108%	50%	0%	1%	1	0%	0	0	0
Charter International	31-Dec-2010	1,322	594	721	(127)	82%	55%	(10%)	55%	0	0%	20	19	18
Chemring	31-Oct-2010	1,244	39	62	(23)	63%	29%	(2%)	5%	4	0%	2	2	2
Close Brothers	31-Jul-2010	1,111	29	31	(2)	95%	33%	(0%)	3%	(2)	(0%)	3	3	3
Cobham	31-Dec-2010	2,404	511	593	(82)	86%	45%	(3%)	25%	16	1%	24	17	19
Colt Group SA	31-Dec-2010	1,275	20	24	(5)	81%	67%	(0%)	2%	(2)	(0%)	3	2	1
Cookson	31-Dec-2010	1,855	590	695	(104)	85%	77%	(6%)	37%	7	0%	20	21	14
Croston	31-Mar-2011	345	14	17	(3)	82%	40%	(1%)	5%	1	0%	2	1	2
Croda International	31-Dec-2010	2,559	642	790	(148)	81%	50%	(6%)	31%	4	0%	28	25	50
Daily Mail & General Trust	03-Oct-2010	1,803	1,607	1,878	(271)	86%	35%	(15%)	104%	156	9%	35	31	5
Dairy Crest	31-Mar-2011	490	719	779	(60)	92%	71%	(12%)	159%	61	12%	22	30	22
De La Rue	26-Mar-2011	753	639	742	(103)	86%	43%	(14%)	99%	(18)	(2%)	50	25	43
Debenhams	28-Aug-2010	888	524	605	(81)	87%	49%	(9%)	68%	(37)	(4%)	8	7	8
Derwent London	31-Dec-2010	1,839	12	11	1	110%	19%	0%	1%	(0)	(0%)	0	0	0
Dixons Retail	01-May-2011	610	706	950	(244)	74%	28%	(40%)	156%	13	2%	12	21	12
Drax	31-Dec-2010	1,837	130	167	(37)	78%	47%	(2%)	9%	(6)	(0%)	8	8	3
Devro	31-Dec-2010	439	199	212	(13)	94%	49%	(3%)	48%	16	4%	5	5	4
Dignity	31-Dec-2010	433	85	76	9	111%	42%	2%	18%	(2)	(0%)	2	1	1
Electrocomponents	31-Mar-2011	1,183	326	306	20	106%	21%	2%	26%	7	1%	6	6	1
Elementis	31-Dec-2010	770	498	534	(36)	93%	52%	(5%)	69%	17	2%	13	9	12

\* as at 30 June 2011

# Appendix *(continued)*

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
Enterprise Inns	30-Sep-2010	325	19	19	0	100%	42%	0%	6%	0	0%	1	0	1
Euromoney Institutional Investors	30-Sep-2010	773	24	26	(2)	94%	74%	(0%)	3%	(2)	(0%)	1	1	1
F&C Asset Management	31-Dec-2010	399	190	218	(28)	87%	62%	(7%)	55%	15	4%	9	7	6
Fenner	31-Aug-2010	771	122	168	(46)	73%	30%	(6%)	22%	(6)	(1%)	5	4	4
Ferrexpo	31-Dec-2010	2,764	1	13	(12)	8%	46%	(0%)	0%	0	0%	0	0	(1)
Filtrona	31-Dec-2010	766	187	205	(18)	91%	42%	(2%)	27%	(6)	(1%)	12	8	10
FirstGroup	31-Mar-2011	1,642	3,450	3,450	(161)	95%	26%	(10%)	210%	15	1%	85	85	(3)
Foreign & Colonial	31-Dec-2010	1,935	190	218	(28)	87%	57%	(1%)	11%	15	1%	9	7	6
Genus	30-Jun-2010	617	131	157	(26)	83%	41%	(4%)	25%	7	1%	2	2	(7)
Go-Ahead	03-Jul-2010	673	1,375	1,375	(97)	93%	32%	(14%)	204%	(14)	(2%)	43	39	(7)
Granger	30-Sep-2010	539	19	25	(6)	76%	65%	(1%)	5%	(1)	(0%)	1	1	1
Great Portland Estates	31-Mar-2011	1,363	18	19	(1)	98%	60%	(0%)	1%	(0)	(0%)	0	0	0
Greene King	01-May-2011	1,047	235	281	(46)	84%	22%	(4%)	27%	25	2%	13	7	8
Greggs	01-Jan-2011	538	84	93	(9)	91%	28%	(2%)	11%	3	0%	1	1	1
Halma	02-Apr-2011	1,560	141	177	(36)	80%	30%	(2%)	0%	1	0%	9	9	6
Hays	30-Jun-2010	1,431	378	445	(67)	85%	48%	(5%)	31%	47	3%	6	7	1
Henderson	31-Dec-2010	1,646	449	337	113	133%	47%	7%	20%	15	1%	5	5	2
Hiscox	31-Dec-2010	1,607	144	147	(3)	98%	55%	(0%)	9%	6	0%	14	2	13
Home Retail Group	27-Feb-2011	1,344	749	756	(8)	100%	41%	(1%)	1%	2	0%	28	31	11
Homeserve	31-Mar-2011	1,639	18	18	(0)	100%	8%	(0%)	1%	4	0%	1	1	0
Howden Joinery	25-Dec-2010	683	595	731	(36)	81%	42%	(20%)	107%	41	6%	33	28	25
Hunting	31-Dec-2010	1,009	224	218	6	103%	100%	1%	22%	(3)	(0%)	2	2	0
Inchcape	31-Dec-2010	1,920	880	865	14	102%	64%	1%	45%	29	2%	30	38	23
Informa	31-Dec-2010	2,597	73	84	(11)	87%	33%	(0%)	3%	(1)	(0%)	4	3	2
International Personal Finance	31-Dec-2010	946	35	38	(3)	91%	44%	(0%)	4%	1	0%	1	1	4
Invensys	31-Mar-2011	2,596	5,024	5,452	(428)	92%	62%	(16%)	210%	56	2%	70	68	51
Jardine Lloyd Thompson	31-Dec-2010	1,471	480	552	(72)	87%	59%	(5%)	38%	13	1%	4	13	4
Keller	31-Dec-2010	299	31	51	(20)	60%	32%	(7%)	17%	(0)	0%	2	2	1
Kesa Electricals	30-Apr-2011	729	272	339	(68)	80%	39%	(9%)	47%	(1)	(0%)	15	9	12
Kier	30-Jun-2010	515	746	834	(87)	90%	23%	(17%)	162%	(10)	(2%)	34	21	39
Kofax	30-Jun-2010	387	3	4	(1)	66%	53%	(0%)	1%	(0)	(0%)	0	0	(0)
Ladbroke	31-Dec-2010	1,375	263	229	35	115%	58%	3%	17%	16	1%	7	7	3
Laird	31-Dec-2010	534	98	95	3	103%	64%	(1%)	18%	2	0%	0	0	(0)
Lamprell	31-Dec-2010	981	0	12	(12)	0%	-	(1%)	1%	(0)	(0%)	0	0	(1)
Law Debenture Corp	31-Dec-2010	439	33	34	(1)	97%	35%	(0%)	8%	0	0%	1	1	1
Logica	31-Dec-2010	2,142	471	516	(45)	91%	78%	(2%)	24%	(5)	(0%)	16	18	7
London Stock Exchange	31-Mar-2011	2,890	282	245	38	115%	78%	1%	8%	32	1%	1	4	1
Marston	02-Oct-2010	580	358	383	(25)	93%	35%	(4%)	66%	(1)	(0%)	14	14	11
Meggitt	31-Dec-2010	2,929	568	778	(211)	73%	38%	(7%)	27%	(13)	(0%)	35	32	31
Melrose	31-Dec-2010	1,801	920	1,039	(120)	88%	55%	(7%)	58%	30	2%	28	30	23
Millennium & Copthorne Hotels	31-Dec-2010	1,587	35	52	(17)	68%	46%	(1%)	3%	1	0%	3	3	1
Misys	31-May-2011	1,409	49	52	(3)	95%	80%	(0%)	4%	2	0%	1	1	(1)
Mitchells & Butlers	25-Sep-2010	1,282	1,405	1,548	(143)	91%	67%	(11%)	121%	(99)	(9%)	45	39	37
MITIE Group	31-Mar-2011	850	124	127	(3)	98%	23%	(0%)	15%	6	1%	8	7	8
Mondi	31-Dec-2010	2,279	300	366	(66)	82%	19%	(3%)	16%	21	1%	5	4	(2)
Morgan Crucible Co	02-Jan-2011	840	418	522	(104)	80%	57%	(12%)	62%	(7)	(1%)	16	14	11
Mothercare	26-Mar-2011	351	208	246	(38)	85%	28%	(11%)	70%	17	5%	5	6	2
National Express	31-Dec-2010	1,286	807	818	(10)	99%	24%	(1%)	64%	24	2%	22	28	6
New World Resources	31-Dec-2010	2,405	0	82	(82)	0%	-	(3%)	3%	12	0%	0	0	(4)
Northgate	30-Apr-2011	435	5	5	(0)	97%	65%	(0%)	1%	(0)	(0%)	1	0	1
Northumbrian Water	31-Mar-2011	2,155	713	759	(46)	94%	18%	(2%)	35%	74	3%	25	4	11
Paragon	30-Sep-2010	592	57	74	(17)	78%	38%	(3%)	12%	(6)	(1%)	2	2	1
Pennon	31-Mar-2011	2,503	454	540	(86)	84%	38%	(3%)	22%	2	0%	36	16	18
Persimmon	31-Dec-2010	1,458	305	403	(98)	76%	38%	(7%)	28%	3	0%	19	19	16

\* as at 30 June 2011

# Appendix *(continued)*

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
Phoenix Group	31-Dec-2010	1,045	3,051	2,995	56	102%	85%	5%	287%	53	5%	85	69	80
Premier Farnell	31-Jan-2011	916	187	211	(24)	89%	75%	(3%)	23%	0	0%	4	4	4
Premier Foods	31-Dec-2010	456	2,799	3,120	(321)	90%	54%	(70%)	684%	40	9%	66	65	57
Premier Oil	31-Dec-2010	2,231	18	21	(3)	87%	50%	(0%)	1%	0	0%	1	0	0
Provident Financial	31-Dec-2010	1,294	514	473	41	109%	52%	3%	37%	15	1%	10	8	2
Punch Taverns	21-Aug-2010	461	396	419	(23)	95%	45%	(5%)	91%	32	7%	5	4	4
PZ Cussons	31-May-2011	1,526	262	259	3	101%	39%	0%	17%	(5)	(0%)	7	5	14
Qinetiq	31-Mar-2011	789	981	1,106	(125)	89%	35%	(16%)	140%	0	0%	37	38	13
Rathbone Brothers	31-Dec-2010	488	95	101	(7)	93%	25%	(1%)	21%	(3)	(1%)	7	7	5
Redrow	30-Jun-2010	382	77	81	(4)	95%	61%	(1%)	21%	(7)	(2%)	1	2	(0)
Remishaw	30-Jun-2010	1,276	83	120	(37)	69%	2%	(3%)	9%	(15)	(1%)	0	0	0
Rentokil Initial	31-Dec-2010	1,721	1,070	1,082	(12)	99%	81%	(0%)	63%	18	1%	1	2	35
RII Capital Partners	31-Dec-2010	2,008	15	15	1	103%	8%	(0%)	1%	(0)	(0%)	1	1	1
Robork	31-Dec-2010	1,455	100	118	(17)	85%	42%	(1%)	8%	2	0%	3	3	1
RPC Group	31-Mar-2011	585	96	141	(46)	68%	58%	(8%)	24%	(1)	(0%)	9	6	8
Sawills	31-Dec-2010	515	120	142	(22)	84%	27%	(4%)	28%	11	2%	6	4	5
Scottish Investment Trust	31-Oct-2010	606	8	10	(2)	80%	34%	(0%)	2%	(1)	(0%)	1	1	0
Segro	31-Dec-2010	2,293	169	184	(15)	92%	58%	(1%)	8%	0	0%	2	2	0
Senior	31-Dec-2010	724	196	234	(38)	84%	72%	(5%)	32%	1	0%	13	21	12
Shanks	31-Mar-2011	503	113	108	5	105%	40%	1%	22%	9	2%	3	2	2
SIG	31-Dec-2010	806	98	123	(25)	80%	44%	(3%)	15%	(2)	(0%)	3	2	1
Smith (DS)	30-Apr-2011	1,086	732	879	(148)	83%	40%	(14%)	81%	40	4%	32	17	23
Spectris	31-Dec-2010	1,836	109	123	(14)	89%	73%	(1%)	7%	2	0%	6	4	8
Spirax-Sarco Engineering	31-Dec-2010	1,538	240	303	(63)	79%	24%	(4%)	20%	0	0%	18	15	11
Spirit Communications	31-Dec-2010	1,007	149	143	6	104%	65%	1%	14%	6	1%	1	0	1
Sports Direct International	26-Apr-2011	1,354	37	53	(16)	69%	40%	(1%)	4%	2	0%	2	1	2
St. Modwen Properties	30-Nov-2010	371	27	25	3	110%	31%	1%	7%	2	1%	0	0	0
Stagecoach	30-Apr-2011	1,838	1,970	2,050	(80)	96%	25%	(4%)	112%	149	8%	0	0	(56)
Synergy Health	03-Apr-2011	500	44	56	(12)	78%	65%	(2%)	11%	2	0%	3	2	2
Taylor Wimpey	31-Dec-2010	1,208	1,604	1,853	(249)	87%	63%	(21%)	153%	60	5%	126	50	122
Thomas Cook	30-Sep-2010	1,142	703	1,118	(415)	63%	37%	(36%)	98%	(34)	(3%)	31	33	7
Travis Perkins	31-Dec-2010	2,375	813	841	(28)	97%	25%	(1%)	35%	(44)	(2%)	58	31	53
TUI Travel	30-Sep-2010	2,509	1,215	1,709	(494)	71%	44%	(20%)	68%	(32)	(1%)	94	92	57
Tulleit Prebon	31-Dec-2010	763	170	146	24	116%	10%	3%	19%	15	2%	9	8	9
Ultra Electronics Holdings	31-Dec-2010	1,168	143	222	(79)	65%	26%	(7%)	19%	5	0%	5	6	(3)
United Business Media	31-Dec-2010	1,357	467	475	(8)	98%	40%	(1%)	35%	38	3%	5	7	4
Vicrex	30-Sep-2010	1,243	31	41	(10)	77%	45%	(1%)	3%	(1)	(0%)	4	4	2
WH Smith	31-Aug-2010	708	855	761	94	112%	96%	13%	108%	160	23%	13	70	13
William Hill	28-Dec-2010	1,592	262	293	(31)	89%	43%	(2%)	18%	6	0%	14	15	8
Yule Catto & Co	31-Dec-2010	775	199	265	(66)	75%	39%	(9%)	34%	1	0%	14	12	13

\* as at 30 June 2011

## JLT Pension Capital Strategies

6 Crutched Friars  
London EC3N 2PH  
Tel 020 7528 4892  
Fax 020 7309 8330  
Email [solutions@pensionstrategies.co.uk](mailto:solutions@pensionstrategies.co.uk)  
Web [www.jltpcs.com](http://www.jltpcs.com)

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

## 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.