



The FTSE 100 and their pension disclosures
A Quarterly Report from Pension Capital Strategies
October 2007

In association with  Numis
Securities



PENSION CAPITAL STRATEGIES
Innovative Alternatives

Executive Summary

- The total deficit in FTSE 100 pension schemes at 30 September 2007 is estimated to be £2 billion. This is an improvement of £44 billion on the position 12 months ago.
- We believe that FTSE 100 companies are underestimating future life expectancy possibly by between one and three years. We therefore estimate that the total pension deficit could be understated by as much as £40 billion.
- There is increasing evidence of FTSE 100 pension schemes reducing the mismatching of pension assets to liabilities by reducing equity holdings and increasing bond allocations. Ten FTSE 100 companies reveal that they have increased bond allocation by more than 10% over the period since their previous accounts.
- Despite improvements in pension scheme funding levels, companies are facing huge increases in Pension Protection Fund (PPF) levies. The total levy projected to be collected in 2007-8 is £675 million, which compares with the latest estimate of the 2006-7 levy of between £300 million and £320 million.
- In its "purple book", published last year, the Pension Regulator estimated that full buy-out solvency liabilities are nearly 50% higher than the IAS19 liabilities recorded in company accounts. Applying a similar adjustment to the FTSE 100 pension liabilities would suggest that the total buy-out solvency deficit in FTSE 100 pension schemes currently amounts to approximately £200 billion.
- 18 companies disclosed a pension surplus in their most recent annual report and accounts; 75 companies had deficits. However we estimate that about 40 companies would disclose a surplus if they had a year end of 30 September 2007.
- In the last 12 months the total disclosed pension liabilities of the current FTSE 100 companies have fallen slightly from £392 billion to £390 billion. 13 companies have pension liabilities of more than £10 billion, the largest of which is BT with pension liabilities of £39 billion. 14 companies have pension liabilities of less than £100 million, of which 6 companies have no defined benefit pension liabilities.
- To date there has been little sign of FTSE 100 companies backing away entirely from DB pension provision, although many FTSE 100 companies have closed their DB schemes to new entrants and a few FTSE250 companies have stopped future accrual of DB benefit for all employees.
- As pension funding positions have improved so the financial significance of pension scheme deficits has reduced. But British Airways has reported a pension deficit of almost 30% of their equity market value. British Airways, BT, ICI and BAE Systems all have total pension liabilities greater than their equity market value.
- In total, the amount contributed to FTSE 100 company pension schemes in their last financial year was £14.4 billion - up from £11.8 billion in the previous year. This is more than the £7.7 billion cost of benefits provided to employees during the year. It therefore represents £6.7 billion of funding towards reducing pension scheme deficits.

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



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



Rob Dales
Pension Capital Strategies
0113 203 5883
rob_dales@pensionstrategies.co.uk

Published in association with



Published in association with Numis Securities Limited is a leading investment banking and institutional stockbroking business. It provides a full service of research, execution, corporate broking and corporate finance advice to high quality companies quoted in the UK and their institutional investors.

Numis was voted the leading brokerage for UK quoted companies with a market capitalisation of up to £1bn in the definitive Thomson Extel Survey 2007. It was also ranked first for Equity Research, Trading & Execution and Corporate Access as well as second for Equity Sales. Underlining the quality of its Research team, Numis was ranked in the top 3 for ten sectors in the UK Equity market, including No.1 in five of those sectors, more than any other UK stockbroker.

It has taken an active interest in the future of defined benefit pension schemes including raising £500m for Paternoster Limited, the bulk buy-out insurer.

www.numiscorp.com

Funding Position

The overall funding position of pension schemes of FTSE 100 companies has improved slightly 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	Rank	Assets £m	Liabilities £m	Surplus/(Deficit) £m	Funding Level
British Land	1	79	70	9	113%
Royal Dutch Shell	2	34,444	30,758	3,686	112%
Experian	3	545	492	53	111%
Old Mutual	4	836	758	78	110%
Lonmin	5	79	73	6	108%
Smiths Group	6	3,319	3,071	248	108%
Resolution	7	1,117	1,037	80	108%
Associated British Foods	8	2,393	2,230	163	107%
Schroders	9	518	501	17	103%
Johnson Matthey	10	952	922	30	103%

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

Name	Rank	Assets £m	Liabilities £m	Surplus/(Deficit) £m	Funding Level
Taylor Wimpey	91	1,420	1,793	-373	79%
Hammerson	92	43	55	-12	78%
SABMiller	93	564	726	-162	78%
Wolseley	94	613	801	-188	77%
Barratt Developments	95	168	233	-65	72%
WPP	96	470	657	-187	72%
Persimmon	97	257	361	-104	71%
BG	98	482	727	-245	66%
Vedanta Resources	99	9	27	-18	32%
Shire	100	0	2	-2	0%

Commentary

Adjusting these figures up to the quarter end, we estimate that the total pension deficit in the FTSE 100 as at 30 September 2007 was £2 billion. This is an estimated improvement of £44 billion on the position 12 months ago. However, the pension disclosures on mortality assumptions would suggest that FTSE 100 companies are still underestimating the impact of future improvements in longevity. We believe that FTSE 100 companies are underestimating future life expectancy possibly by between one and three years. We therefore estimate that the total pension deficit could be understated by as much as £40 billion.

Despite this improvement in pension scheme funding levels, companies are facing huge increases in Pension Protection Fund (PPF) levy premiums. The total levy which the PPF Board estimates it needs to collect for 2007-8 is £675 million. This compares with the latest estimate of the 2006-7 levy of between £300 million and £320 million. Part of the reason for this significant increase in PPF levies is down to the £343 million deficit the PPF revealed in its first Annual Report and Accounts as at 31 March 2006. The PPF Board is also proposing changes in the method of calculating the levy which will mean that the burden of the levy increases will fall more heavily on the least well funded pension schemes - giving greater incentives to companies to improve pension funding levels further.

In its "purple book", published last year, the Pension Regulator has estimated that full buy-out solvency liabilities are nearly 50% higher than the IAS19 liabilities recorded in company accounts. Applying a similar adjustment to the FTSE 100 pension liabilities would suggest that the total buy-out solvency deficit in FTSE 100 pension schemes currently amounts to approximately £200 billion.

Investment Mismatching

Recent legislation 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, 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 £m
Resolution	1	1,117	82%
ICI	2	8,039	80%
Rentokil Initial	3	921	80%
Lonmin	4	79	75%
ICAP	5	6	73%
Standard Chartered	6	1,195	67%
Northern Rock	7	329	63%
HSBC	8	14,101	62%
Taylor Wimpey	9	1,420	61%
WPP	10	470	59%

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

Name	Rank	Assets £m	% of Assets in Bonds £m
Unilever	91	11,585	23%
Royal Dutch Shell	92	34,444	22%
Tesco	93	4,007	21%
BAE Systems	94	14,289	21%
Smith & Nephew	95	455	20%
Centrica	96	2,988	19%
BP	97	20,369	18%
Morrison Supermarkets	98	1,774	17%
BG	99	482	16%
International Power	100	226	14%

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
Rentokil Initial	1	80%	38%	42%
Prudential	2	57%	36%	21%
Northern Rock	3	63%	43%	20%
Diageo	4	32%	14%	18%
HSBC	5	62%	47%	15%
Standard Life	6	27%	12%	15%
Wolseley	7	33%	18%	15%
HBOS	8	25%	14%	11%
Cadbury Schweppes	9	40%	29%	11%
Sainsbury	10	44%	34%	10%

Commentary

There is evidence emerging of moves in the last year to reduce the mismatching of pension assets to liabilities. Diageo are the latest company to report a big switch into bonds, increasing from 14% to 32%. 19 FTSE 100 companies now have more than 50% of pension assets in bonds. However, 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, the average pension scheme asset allocation to bonds has increased slightly to 36%.

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. Noticeable too is the growing difference between those companies with very large pension liabilities, and those with little or no pension liabilities.

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	38,779	24,828
Royal Dutch Shell	2	30,758	128,559
Royal Bank of Scotland	3	20,951	49,647
BP	4	19,985	107,941
Barclays	5	18,150	40,274
BAE Systems	6	17,456	17,310
Lloyds TSB	7	17,378	30,620
HSBC	8	16,414	106,477
National Grid	9	16,127	20,357
British Airways	10	14,610	4,416
Unilever	11	13,040	50,953
GlaxoSmithKline	12	10,345	72,810
Aviva	13	10,196	19,107

* as at 30 September 2007

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
Lonmin	87	73	5,690
British Land	88	70	6,004
Hammerson	89	55	3,389
Liberty International	90	47	4,131
Vedanta Resources	91	27	5,842
Enterprise Inns	92	19	3,030
ICAP	93	7	3,400
Shire	94	2	6,702
Antofagasta	95	0	7,517
BSkyB	95	0	12,182
Carphone Warehouse	95	0	3,141
Kazakhmys	95	0	6,604
Sage Group	95	0	3,248
Tullow Oil	95	0	4,285

* as at 30 September 2007

Commentary

In the last 12 months the total disclosed pension liabilities of the current FTSE 100 companies have fallen from £392 billion to £390 billion. 13 companies have pension liabilities of more than £10 billion, whilst 14 companies have pension liabilities of less than £100 million.

Significance of the Pension Scheme in the Board Room

The impact of the pension liabilities on corporate decision making and its importance in the board room 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	Deficit as a % of Equity Market Value	Liabilities as a % of Equity Market Value
British Airways	1	4,416	29%	331%
BT	2	24,828	2%	156%
ICI	3	7,796	15%	118%
BAE Systems	4	17,310	18%	101%
Royal & Sun Alliance	5	4,963	-1%	97%
National Grid	6	20,357	3%	79%
Daily Mail	7	2,325	7%	79%
Rexam	8	3,541	9%	75%
Smiths Group	9	4,130	-6%	74%
Rolls-Royce	10	9,508	10%	73%

* as at 30 September 2007

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

Name	Rank	Equity Market Value* £m	Deficit as a % of Equity Market Value	Liabilities as a % of Equity Market Value
Enterprise Inns	91	3,030	0%	1%
Vedanta Resources	92	5,842	0%	0%
ICAP	93	3,400	0%	0%
Shire	94	6,702	0%	0%
Antofagasta	95	7,517	0%	0%
BSkyB	95	12,182	0%	0%
Carphone Warehouse	95	3,141	0%	0%
Kazakhmys	95	6,604	0%	0%
Sage Group	95	3,248	0%	0%
Tullow Oil	95	4,285	0%	0%

* as at 30 September 2007

Commentary

Whilst there are six FTSE 100 companies with no defined benefit pension liabilities, four FTSE 100 companies have pension scheme liabilities that are bigger than the total equity value of the company. One FTSE 100 company, British Airways, has a pension deficit bigger than 20% its equity value. A further four companies have deficits greater than 10% of their equity value.

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 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	Unexpected Balance Sheet Gain (£m)	Impact as a % of Equity Value
BAE Systems	1	17,310	1,285	7%
Rolls-Royce	2	9,508	640	7%
Royal & Sun Alliance	3	4,963	320	6%
BT	4	24,828	1,412	6%
Rexam	5	3,541	180	5%
Barclays	6	40,274	1,978	5%
Royal Bank of Scotland	7	49,647	1,943	4%
Centrica	8	13,993	477	3%
Lloyds TSB	9	30,620	877	3%
Royal Dutch Shell	10	128,559	3,541	3%

* as at 30 September 2007

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

Name	Rank	Equity Market Value* £m	Unexpected Balance Sheet Gain (£m)	Impact as a % of Equity Value
Tate & Lyle	91	1,937	-4	0%
Xstrata	92	31,521	-81	0%
Friends Provident	93	3,698	-10	0%
Scottish & Newcastle	94	5,778	-17	0%
Home Retail Group	95	3,271	-18	-1%
Johnson Matthey	96	3,579	-31	-1%
Persimmon	97	2,917	-36	-1%
Northern Rock	98	755	-12	-2%
Punch Taverns	99	2,622	-51	-2%
British Airways	100	4,416	-445	-10%

* as at 30 September 2007

Commentary

Over the year covered by their latest report & accounts, 75 companies felt the benefit of an unexpected gain to their balance sheet as a result of their pension schemes, whilst 16 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 provided by companies to their employees during the year. Surplus pension contributions paid in excess of the cost of benefits will reduce pension scheme deficits. But where the contributions paid are less than the cost of benefits, this will increase pension scheme deficits (or reduce pension scheme surpluses).

Pension scheme contributions continue to increase with the amount contributed in the most recent accounting year being almost £3 billion greater than the amount contributed the previous year. Of those companies with defined benefit pension schemes, only two FTSE 100 companies (Enterprise Inns and Resolution) made no pension scheme contributions in their last financial 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
BAE Systems	1	1,097	196	901
HBOS	2	857	227	630
British Airways	3	543	-63	606
Marks & Spencer	4	611	114	497
Unilever	5	744	252	492
Aviva	6	554	199	355
Sainsbury	7	362	15	347
BT	8	926	600	326
GlaxoSmithKline	9	606	288	318
Compass	10	329	38	291

The FTSE 100 companies who made the lowest surplus contributions were as follows:

Name	Rank	Pension Contributions £m	Cost of Benefits £m	Surplus Contributions £m
BG	90	39	48	-9
Friends Provident	90	18	27	-9
Home Retail Group	92	13	23	-10
Rio Tinto	93	92	110	-18
Vodafone	94	55	74	-19
Barclays	95	383	407	-24
Daily Mail	96	22	53	-31
United Utilities	97	8	50	-42
Reed Elsevier	98	61	105	-44
HSBC	99	235	413	-178
Royal Bank of Scotland	100	380	668	-288

Commentary

In total, the amount contributed to FTSE 100 company pension schemes was £14.4 billion, up from £11.8 billion in the previous accounting year. This is more than the £7.7 billion cost of benefits provided to employees during the year. It therefore represents £6.7 billion of funding towards reducing pension scheme deficits.

Whilst this is a significant level of additional funding, it is surprising that FTSE 100 companies have not contributed more to their pension schemes. With the tax advantages of gross roll up of interest in a UK pension scheme (as well as the opportunity to reduce PPF levy premiums, which look set for a significant increase in 2007) it should make financial sense for FTSE 100 companies to borrow money in the capital markets rather than run a deficit in the pension scheme - given that their net borrowing costs, after corporation tax relief, are likely to be less than the gross interest they could earn in the pension scheme. However it is clear that companies are investigating ways to make large contributions of non-cash assets. For instance, Marks & Spencer contributed £500 million in the form of an interest in the company's property portfolio.

Appendix

Name	Year End	Equity Market Value	Pension Assets	Pension Liabilities	Surplus / (Deficit)	Funding Level	% Bonds	Deficit as % of Market Value	Liabilities as % of Market Value	Unexpected Balance Sheet Impact	Balance Sheet Impact as % of Market Value	Current Funding	Previous Funding	Surplus Funding
		£m	£m	£m	£m			Value	Value	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
3i	31-Mar-2007	3,867	479	480	(1)	100%	44%	0%	12%	14	0%	10	31	(2)
Alliance & Leicester	31-Dec-2006	3,357	1,311	1,337	(26)	98%	48%	1%	40%	47	1%	26	17	3
Anglo American	31-Dec-2006	43,556	2,122	2,171	(49)	98%	49%	0%	5%	67	0%	167	48	130
Antofagasta	31-Dec-2006	7,517	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Associated British Foods	16-Sep-2006	6,337	2,393	2,230	163	107%	57%	(3)%	35%	73	1%	48	50	1
Astrazeneca	31-Dec-2006	36,140	4,235	5,159	(924)	82%	35%	3%	14%	14	0%	180	97	12
Aviva	31-Dec-2006	19,107	9,223	10,196	(973)	90%	53%	5%	53%	106	1%	554	383	355
BAE Systems	31-Dec-2006	17,310	14,289	17,456	(3,167)	82%	21%	18%	101%	1,285	7%	1,097	323	901
Barclays	31-Dec-2006	40,274	17,506	18,150	(644)	96%	43%	2%	45%	1,978	5%	383	369	(24)
Barratt Developments	30-Jun-2007	2,592	168	233	(65)	72%	41%	3%	9%	16	1%	18	13	1
BAT	31-Dec-2006	35,500	3,938	4,296	(358)	92%	39%	1%	12%	237	1%	144	146	45
BG	31-Dec-2006	28,471	482	727	(245)	66%	16%	1%	3%	13	0%	39	18	(9)
BHP Billiton	30-Jun-2007	39,518	878	894	(16)	98%	58%	0%	2%	75	0%	36	81	3
BP	31-Dec-2006	107,941	20,369	19,985	384	102%	18%	(0)%	19%	1,337	1%	605	607	135
British Airways	31-Mar-2007	4,416	13,316	14,610	(1,294)	91%	43%	29%	331%	(445)	(10)%	543	286	606
British Energy	31-Mar-2007	5,504	2,671	2,736	(65)	98%	36%	1%	50%	69	1%	125	124	48
British Land	31-Mar-2007	6,004	79	70	9	113%	38%	(0)%	1%	10	0%	10	6	10
BSkyB	30-Jun-2007	12,182	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BT	31-Mar-2007	24,828	38,390	38,779	(389)	99%	33%	2%	156%	1,412	6%	926	452	326
Cable & Wireless	31-Mar-2007	4,553	2,289	2,238	51	102%	39%	(1)%	49%	113	2%	18	115	4
Cadbury Schweppes	31-Dec-2006	11,930	2,537	2,708	(171)	94%	40%	1%	23%	72	1%	133	89	63
Capita	31-Dec-2006	4,336	444	471	(27)	94%	25%	1%	11%	13	0%	19	17	(1)
Carnival	30-Nov-2006	3,930	113	132	(19)	86%	57%	0%	3%	17	0%	6	6	2
Carphone Warehouse	31-Mar-2007	3,141	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Centrica	31-Dec-2006	13,993	2,988	3,284	(296)	91%	19%	2%	23%	477	3%	164	155	21
Compass	30-Sep-2006	5,831	1,408	1,690	(282)	83%	35%	5%	29%	(7)	(0)%	329	67	291
Daily Mail	30-Sep-2006	2,325	1,679	1,830	(151)	92%	33%	7%	79%	38	2%	22	39	(31)
Diageo	30-Jun-2007	28,101	5,019	5,269	(250)	95%	32%	1%	19%	337	1%	95	108	(7)
DSG International	28-Apr-2007	2,448	688	727	(38)	95%	29%	2%	30%	46	2%	65	17	53
Enterprise Inns	30-Sep-2006	3,030	19	19	0	100%	32%	0%	1%	0	0%	0	0	0
Experian	31-Mar-2007	5,286	545	492	53	111%	31%	(1)%	9%	37	1%	20	12	(5)
Friends Provident	31-Dec-2006	3,698	1,045	1,122	(77)	93%	40%	2%	30%	(10)	(0)%	18	16	(9)
GlaxoSmithKline	31-Dec-2006	72,810	9,248	10,345	(1,097)	89%	33%	2%	14%	291	0%	606	673	318
Hammerson	31-Dec-2006	3,389	43	55	(12)	78%	45%	0%	2%	0	0%	7	5	5
HBOS	31-Dec-2006	34,140	6,644	7,501	(857)	89%	25%	3%	22%	239	1%	857	366	630
Home Retail Group	31-Dec-2006	3,271	637	628	9	101%	29%	(0)%	19%	(18)	(1)%	13	115	(10)
HSBC	31-Dec-2006	106,477	14,101	16,414	(2,313)	86%	62%	2%	15%	60	0%	235	1,339	(178)
ICAP	31-Mar-2007	3,400	6	7	(1)	81%	73%	0%	0%	0	0%	1	1	1
ICI	31-Dec-2006	7,796	8,039	9,198	(1,159)	87%	80%	15%	118%	170	2%	235	152	174
Imperial Tobacco	30-Sep-2006	15,182	3,035	3,072	(37)	99%	26%	0%	20%	97	1%	42	41	(1)
Intercontinental Hotels	31-Dec-2006	2,886	325	387	(62)	84%	45%	2%	13%	4	0%	5	47	0
International Power	31-Dec-2006	6,770	226	241	(15)	14%	14%	0%	4%	13	0%	12	9	1
Invesco	31-Dec-2006	5,563	168	193	(25)	87%	23%	0%	3%	10	0%	15	3	11
ITV	31-Dec-2006	3,990	2,372	2,657	(285)	89%	39%	7%	67%	27	1%	225	142	202
Johnson Matthey	31-Mar-2007	3,579	952	922	30	103%	41%	(1)%	26%	(31)	(1)%	28	24	(5)
Kazakhmys	31-Dec-2006	6,604	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kingfisher	03-Feb-2007	4,188	1,377	1,432	(55)	96%	40%	1%	34%	96	2%	122	172	83
Land Securities	31-Mar-2007	7,823	144	150	(6)	96%	51%	0%	2%	4	(0)%	4	5	1
Legal & General	31-Dec-2006	8,605	1,170	1,346	(176)	87%	55%	2%	16%	31	0%	41	33	22
Liberty International	31-Dec-2006	4,131	47	47	0	101%	40%	(0)%	1%	1	0%	2	2	1
Lloyds TSB	31-Dec-2006	30,620	15,279	17,378	(2,099)	88%	28%	7%	57%	877	3%	550	419	193
Lonmin	30-Sep-2006	5,690	79	73	6	108%	75%	(0)%	1%	(2)	(0)%	1	1	0

Appendix (continued)

Name	Year End	Equity Market Value	Pension Assets	Pension Liabilities	Surplus / (Deficit)	Funding Level	% Bonds	Deficit as % of Market Value	Liabilities as % of Market Value	Unexpected Balance Sheet Impact	Balance Sheet Impact as % of Market Value	Current Funding	Previous Funding	Surplus Funding
		£m	£m	£m	£m	£m		Value	Value	£m		£m	£m	£m
Man Group	31-Mar-2007	10,852	182	208	(26)	88%	42%	0%	2%	14	0%	17	16	3
Marks & Spencer	31-Mar-2007	10,472	5,228	5,487	(260)	95%	48%	2%	52%	(3)	(0%)	611	130	497
Mitchell & Butlers	30-Sep-2006	2,460	1,182	1,281	(99)	92%	41%	3%	52%	27	2%	31	42	17
Morrisons Supermarkets	04-Feb-2007	7,576	1,774	1,972	(198)	90%	17%	4%	26%	170	2%	95	92	42
National Grid	31-Mar-2007	20,357	15,468	16,127	(659)	96%	53%	3%	79%	376	2%	276	191	161
Next	27-Jan-2007	4,109	380	427	(47)	89%	34%	1%	10%	37	1%	48	28	31
Northern Rock	31-Dec-2006	755	329	351	(22)	94%	63%	3%	46%	(12)	(2%)	51	26	40
Old Mutual	31-Dec-2006	8,828	836	758	78	110%	57%	(1%)	9%	52	1%	14	7	6
Pearson	31-Dec-2006	6,119	1,633	1,810	(177)	90%	26%	3%	30%	103	2%	45	45	16
Persimmon	31-Dec-2006	2,917	257	361	(104)	71%	27%	4%	12%	(36)	(1%)	14	8	7
Prudential	31-Dec-2006	18,557	5,275	5,210	65	101%	57%	(0%)	28%	485	3%	152	29	83
Punch Taverns	19-Aug-2006	2,622	369	394	(25)	94%	32%	1%	15%	(51)	1%	34	11	34
Reckitt Benckiser	31-Dec-2006	20,491	850	959	(109)	89%	32%	1%	5%	34	0%	13	11	(4)
Reed Elsevier	31-Dec-2006	7,847	2,772	3,008	(236)	92%	28%	3%	38%	179	2%	61	47	(44)
Rentokil Initial	31-Dec-2006	3,029	921	1,040	(119)	89%	80%	4%	34%	45	1%	9	211	19
Resolution	31-Dec-2006	4,684	1,117	1,037	80	108%	82%	(2%)	22%	(4)	(0%)	0	0	(6)
Reuters	31-Dec-2006	8,129	1,298	1,408	(110)	92%	47%	1%	17%	12	0%	207	19	168
Rio Tinto	31-Dec-2006	3,541	2,313	2,639	(326)	88%	52%	9%	75%	180	5%	41	22	19
Roxam	31-Dec-2006	42,155	3,077	3,054	23	101%	29%	(0%)	7%	207	0%	92	99	(18)
Rolls-Royce	31-Dec-2006	9,508	5,906	6,899	(993)	86%	32%	10%	73%	640	7%	153	177	21
Royal & Sun Alliance	31-Dec-2006	4,963	4,870	4,814	56	101%	50%	(1%)	97%	320	6%	203	215	128
Royal Bank of Scotland	31-Dec-2006	49,647	18,959	20,951	(1,992)	90%	35%	4%	42%	1,943	4%	380	452	(288)
Royal Dutch Shell	31-Dec-2006	128,559	34,444	30,758	3,686	112%	22%	(3%)	24%	3,541	3%	704	702	12
SABMiller	31-Mar-2007	20,938	564	726	(162)	78%	32%	1%	3%	(8)	(0%)	14	8	(8)
Sage Group	30-Sep-2006	3,248	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sainsbury	24-Mar-2007	10,060	4,298	4,401	(103)	98%	44%	1%	44%	167	2%	362	188	347
Schroders	31-Dec-2006	3,944	518	501	17	103%	44%	(0%)	13%	6	0%	8	41	(5)
Scottish & Newcastle	31-Dec-2006	5,778	2,057	2,337	(280)	88%	43%	5%	40%	(17)	(0%)	64	58	40
Scottish & Southern Energy	31-Mar-2007	13,031	2,110	2,202	(92)	96%	28%	1%	17%	47	0%	62	56	32
Severn Trent	31-Mar-2007	3,305	1,365	1,500	(135)	91%	34%	4%	45%	17	1%	97	105	56
Shire	31-Dec-2006	6,702	0	2	(2)	0%	-	0%	0%	0	0%	0	0	0
Smith & Nephew	31-Dec-2006	5,426	455	518	(63)	88%	20%	1%	10%	25	0%	30	75	14
Smiths Group	31-Jul-2007	4,130	3,319	3,071	248	108%	39%	(6%)	74%	113	3%	103	110	62
Standard Chartered	31-Dec-2006	22,449	1,195	1,425	(230)	84%	67%	1%	6%	41	0%	44	39	(4)
Standard Life	31-Dec-2006	6,272	1,271	1,491	(220)	85%	27%	4%	24%	2	0%	107	46	53
Tate & Lyle	31-Mar-2007	1,937	1,188	1,240	(52)	96%	46%	3%	64%	(4)	(0%)	40	39	22
Taylor Wimpey	31-Dec-2006	3,144	1,420	1,793	(373)	79%	61%	12%	57%	1	0%	48	30	40
Tesco	24-Feb-2007	34,503	4,007	4,957	(950)	81%	21%	3%	14%	114	0%	321	270	113
Tullow Oil	31-Dec-2006	4,285	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Unilever	31-Dec-2006	50,953	11,585	13,040	(1,455)	89%	23%	3%	26%	929	2%	744	572	492
United Utilities	31-Mar-2007	6,162	2,706	2,644	62	102%	35%	(1%)	43%	54	1%	8	4	(42)
Vedanta Resources	31-Mar-2007	5,842	9	27	(18)	32%	34%	0%	0%	5	0%	2	2	1
Vodafone	31-Mar-2007	93,616	1,251	1,292	(41)	87%	27%	0%	1%	67	0%	55	85	(19)
Whitbread	01-Mar-2007	3,076	1,366	1,562	(196)	87%	40%	6%	51%	39	1%	110	113	104
Wolseley	31-Jul-2006	5,465	613	801	(188)	77%	33%	3%	15%	1	0%	30	27	10
WPP	31-Dec-2006	7,967	470	657	(187)	72%	59%	2%	8%	22	0%	49	36	30
Xstrata	31-Dec-2006	31,521	1,222	1,291	(69)	95%	48%	0%	4%	(81)	(0%)	33	3	21
Yell	31-Mar-2007	3,343	302	330	(27)	92%	40%	1%	10%	16	0%	18	86	(4)

Notes

- All of the analysis contained in this report is based on the IAS19 (FRS17) 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.

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.



PENSION CAPITAL STRATEGIES

Innovative Alternatives

Pension Capital Strategies Ltd

6 Crutched Friars

London

EC3N 2PH

Telephone: 020 7528 4892

Fax: 020 7528 4983

solutions@pensionstrategies.co.uk

www.pensionstrategies.co.uk

Pension Capital Strategies Ltd.

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