



The FTSE 100 and their pension disclosures
A Quarterly Report from Pension Capital Strategies
October 2009

In association with [CAZENOVE](#)



PENSION CAPITAL STRATEGIES
Innovative Alternatives

Executive Summary

- The total deficit in FTSE 100 pension schemes at 30 September 2009 is estimated to be £64 billion. This is a deterioration of £82 billion on the position 12 months ago.
- Pension schemes' flight out of equities into bonds continues and may be accelerating. The average pension scheme asset allocation to bonds has increased to 49% from 41%. This represents the largest 12-month shift in investment strategy for more than 20 years, and it comes on top of a very significant shift, from 35%, the previous year. Over just two years, therefore, bond holdings of FTSE 100 pension schemes have increased by more than a third.
- Within the overall general shift from equities into bonds, there are a large number of companies reporting very significant individual changes to investment strategies. 25 FTSE 100 companies increased their bond allocations by more than 10%.
- There has been a noticeable growth in the number of FTSE 100 companies where the pension scheme now represents a material risk to the business. 7 FTSE 100 companies have total disclosed pension liabilities greater than their equity market value. For British Airways, BT and Invensys, total disclosed pension liabilities are more than double their equity market value.
- 13 companies disclosed a pension surplus in their most recent annual report and accounts; 74 companies disclosed pension deficits. However, we estimate that only around 5 companies would disclose a surplus if they had a year-end of 30 September 2009.
- In the last 12 months, the total disclosed pension liabilities of the FTSE 100 companies have fallen slightly from £380 billion to £376 billion. 12 companies have disclosed pension liabilities of more than £10 billion, the largest of which is Royal Dutch Shell with disclosed pension liabilities of £36 billion. 23 companies have disclosed pension liabilities of less than £100 million, of which 12 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 £376 billion to over £450 billion, and the total deficit at 30 September 2009 would be more than £150 billion.
- In total, the amount contributed to FTSE 100 company pension schemes in their last financial year was £11.6 billion, down from £12.3 billion in the previous year. This is still more than the £7.4 billion cost of benefits accrued during the year. It therefore represents £4.2 billion of funding towards reducing pension scheme deficits. Royal Dutch Shell has announced that it plans to inject an additional \$5 billion (£3.3 billion) into its pension schemes this year, on top of its regular contributions, which totalled £891 million in 2008. The announcement was in response to the deficit of £5.8 billion disclosed in its latest accounts – the highest deficit in the FTSE 100. This compares to a surplus of £6.8 billion just 12 months before. We believe that this will be the largest ever pension deficit contribution in the UK.

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

CAZENOVE

Cazenove is part of the UK's leading investment bank, J.P. Morgan Cazenove. The bank provides corporate and institutional clients with a wide range of services from sales and research to corporate broking and financial advice. It is corporate broker to more companies in the FTSE 100 and FTSE 250 than any other bank with 37 FTSE 100 clients, 83 FTSE 250 clients and 148 other clients.

Cazenove combines outstanding research with highly competitive sales and execution services for institutional investors worldwide. It has been consistently voted number one for UK sales and UK country analysis in the Thomson Extel Survey. It has also been voted first for UK research for the fourth year running in the Institutional Investor 2008 All Europe Research Team Survey.

www.cazenove.com



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

Funding Position

The overall funding position of pension schemes of FTSE 100 companies has deteriorated significantly 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
Rentokil Initial	1	1,049	914	135	115%
AMEC	2	1,221	1,065	156	115%
Prudential	3	5,317	4,673	644	114%
Rolls-Royce	4	7,446	6,546	900	114%
RSA	5	5,042	4,512	530	112%
Friends Provident	6	1,171	1,080	91	108%
Standard Life	7	1,629	1,513	116	108%
Old Mutual	8	828	778	50	106%
Schroders	9	548	525	22	104%
Associated British Foods	10	2,424	2,328	96	104%

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
International Power	91	219	301	(82)	73%
SABMiller	92	209	293	(84)	71%
Tesco	93	3,420	4,914	(1,494)	70%
AstraZeneca	94	3,914	5,674	(1,760)	69%
BG	95	506	734	(228)	69%
Smith & Nephew	96	467	690	(224)	68%
WPP	97	550	819	(269)	67%
Wolseley	98	640	981	(341)	65%
Vedanta Resources	99	17	37	(21)	45%
Eurasian Natural Resources	100	0	26	(26)	0%

In 2007, IFRIC14* provided new guidance on irrecoverable surpluses. 22 FTSE 100 companies have reported an irrecoverable surplus. The total reported irrecoverable surplus for FTSE 100 companies is now £2.5 billion. For Rolls-Royce, the irrecoverable pension surplus is equivalent to 12% of the market value of the company. The largest reported irrecoverable surpluses in the FTSE 100 were as follows:

Name	Rank	Irrecoverable surplus £m
Rolls-Royce	1	1,042
Prudential	2	793
Standard Life	3	153
Scottish & Southern Energy	4	131
Friends Provident	5	113
British American Tobacco	6	61
BHP Billiton	7	47
Anglo American	8	42
Associated British Foods	9	35
Invensys	10	20

Commentary

Adjusting these figures up to the quarter-end, we estimate that the total pension deficit in the FTSE 100 as at 30 September 2009 was £64 billion. This is an estimated deterioration of £82 billion on the position 12 months ago.

* For more information on IFRIC14, see PCS publication – IAS19: A Quarterly Guide for Finance Directors, at 30 September 2009.

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	91%
Invensys	2	4,627	91%
ICAP	3	8	88%
London Stock Exchange	4	235	86%
Sage Group	5	16	84%
Rolls-Royce	6	7,446	83%
Friends Provident	7	1,171	77%
Prudential	8	5,317	75%
BHP Billiton	9	873	74%
HSBC	10	14,330	74%

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

Name	Rank	Assets £m	% of Assets in Bonds
Capita	91	427	30%
BAE Systems	92	12,978	30%
Thomas Cook	93	582	30%
Unilever	94	11,447	28%
BG	95	506	27%
Centrica	96	2,642	27%
BP	97	18,063	25%
International Power	98	219	16%
Inmarsat	99	24	12%
Hammerson	100	42	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
SABMiller	1	65%	41%	+24%
Kingfisher	2	63%	42%	+21%
Morrison Supermarkets	3	62%	41%	+21%
Friends Provident	4	77%	59%	+19%
InterContinental Hotels	5	72%	56%	+17%
Standard Life	6	49%	33%	+16%
Royal Bank of Scotland	7	54%	39%	+15%
Cobham	8	53%	39%	+15%
Aviva	9	56%	42%	+14%
Next	10	50%	36%	+14%

Commentary

The pace at which companies and trustees are switching pension assets out of equities into bonds is accelerating. SABMiller and Morrisons are the latest companies to report a big switch, increasing their bond allocations by 24% and 21% respectively. Over the past two years, Morrisons has increased its bond allocation from 17% to 62%. 41 FTSE 100 companies now have more than 50% of 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, the average pension scheme asset allocation to bonds has increased to 49%, from 41% in the previous year's accounts. This represents the largest 12-month shift in investment strategy for more than 20 years, and it comes on top of a very significant shift, from 35%, the previous year.

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. More recently, persistent problems in the credit markets have maintained a high spread on corporate bonds. This has countered the effects of rising inflation and increasing life expectancy, stifling the growth in pension liabilities over the last year.

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
Royal Dutch Shell	1	36,374	110,432
BT	2	33,326	10,053
Royal Bank of Scotland	3	27,752	30,017
Lloyds Banking Group	4	22,326	28,167
BP	5	22,004	104,200
BAE Systems	6	17,133	12,313
HSBC	7	16,494	123,186
National Grid	8	16,000	14,784
Barclays	9	15,615	40,747
Unilever	10	14,038	53,774
British Airways	11	12,806	2,536
GlaxoSmithKline	12	10,980	64,431

* as at 30 September 2009

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
Intertek	78	77	1,994
British Land	79	69	4,051
Liberty International	80	56	2,715
Hammerson	81	51	2,748
Vedanta Resources	82	37	5,258
Inmarsat	83	32	2,519
Eurasian Natural Resources	84	26	11,287
Alliance Trust	85	21	2,076
Sage Group	86	20	3,054
Fresnillo	87	20	5,536
ICAP	88	10	2,721

* as at 30 September 2009

In addition, Admiral, Antofagasta, Autonomy Corporation, BSKyB, Burberry, Cairn Energy, Kazakhmys, Lonmin, Petrofac, Randgold Resources, Shire and Tullow Oil all reported no defined benefit pension liabilities.

Commentary

In the last 12 months, the total disclosed pension liabilities of the FTSE 100 companies have fallen slightly from £380 billion to £376 billion. 12 companies have disclosed pension liabilities of more than £10 billion, whilst 23 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 detailed discussion paper from the Accounting Standards Board last year.

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% of the total pension liabilities, i.e. increasing the total disclosed pension liabilities from £378 billion to over £450 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 MV	Liabilities as a % of Equity Market Value
British Airways	1	2,536	(24%)	505%
BT	2	10,053	(40%)	332%
Invensys	3	2,317	(8%)	208%
BAE Systems	4	12,313	(34%)	139%
Rexam	5	2,285	(4%)	113%
National Grid	6	14,784	(8%)	108%
RSA	7	4,429	12%	102%
Royal Bank of Scotland	8	30,017	(7%)	92%
Smiths Group	9	3,445	(9%)	90%
Aviva	10	12,273	(5%)	81%
Lloyds Banking Group	11	28,167	(5%)	79%
Rolls-Royce	12	8,719	10%	75%
Marks & Spencer	13	5,745	(2%)	72%
Sainsbury	14	5,724	(5%)	63%
Whitbread	15	2,137	(11%)	63%

* as at 30 September 2009

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 Bank of Scotland	1	705	684
Royal Dutch Shell	2	655	594
Lloyds Banking Group	3	469	524
BT	4	459	576
BP	5	442	425
Tesco	6	428	461
HSBC	7	405	401
Barclays	8	299	332
GlaxoSmithKline	9	246	255
Rio Tinto	10	227	131

Commentary

Seven FTSE 100 companies have disclosed pension liabilities greater than the total equity value of the company, and three FTSE 100 companies now have disclosed pension liabilities valued at over double the company equity value. In addition, BAE Systems, British Airways, BT, G4S, Severn Trent and Whitbread have disclosed pension deficits bigger than 10% of the equity value of the company. For BT, their disclosed pension deficit is almost half the company's 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. Although there is not yet a significant decline in total DB pension provision shown in the accounts of FTSE 100 companies (total service cost in the latest accounts of £7.1 billion compares to £7.4 billion in the previous year), PCS believes that the majority of FTSE 100 companies will cease DB pension provision to all employees within 2 to 3 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	Unexpected Balance Sheet Gain (£m)	Impact as a % of Equity Value
RSA	1	4,429	275	6%
Standard Life	2	4,846	156	3%
Rentokil Initial	3	2,062	44	2%
Invensys	4	2,317	41	2%
Legal & General	5	5,146	33	1%
SABMiller	6	23,683	111	0%
TUI Travel	7	2,846	4	0%
Sage Group	8	3,054	2	0%
Eurasian Natural Resources	9	11,287	5	0%
Vedanta Resources	10	5,258	0	0%

* as at 30 September 2009

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
Reed Elsevier	91	5,674	-462	-8%
Smiths Group	92	3,445	-409	-12%
Whitbread	93	2,137	-256	-12%
Marks & Spencer	94	5,745	-694	-12%
Royal Dutch Shell	95	110,432	-13,741	-12%
National Grid	96	14,784	-2,068	-14%
Sainsbury	97	5,724	-903	-16%
BAE Systems	98	12,313	-2,554	-21%
British Airways	99	2,536	-1,447	-57%
BT	100	10,053	-7,047	-70%

* as at 30 September 2009

Commentary

Over the year covered by their latest report and accounts, 10 companies felt the benefit of an unexpected gain to their balance sheet as a result of their pension schemes, whilst 78 companies suffered an unexpected loss to their balance sheet as a result of their pension schemes. This is in stark contrast to 12 months ago when 63 companies reported an unexpected gain and 27 reported an unexpected loss.

BT and British Airways were ranked 2nd and 3rd in this analysis as at 30 September 2008, with impacts of +21% and +17% respectively. These two companies are now at the bottom of this table, with impacts of a staggering -57% and -70% of equity market value. This emphasises the volatility that can be caused by 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. But where the contributions paid are less than the cost of benefits, this will increase pension scheme deficits (or reduce pension scheme surpluses).

The increases in pension scheme contributions seen in recent years seem to be slowing, with the amount contributed in the most recent accounting year being £0.7 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 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
National Grid	1	799	136	663
Aviva	2	620	163	457
Unilever	3	594	195	399
BAE Systems	4	486	139	347
Lloyds Banking Group	5	762	504	258
Royal Dutch Shell	6	891	655	237
GlaxoSmithKline	7	443	258	185
British Airways	8	331	154	177
Centrica	9	243	103	140
Rolls-Royce	10	279	162	117

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
Hammerson	91	1	2	-1
SABMiller	92	5	6	-1
Eurasian Natural Resources	93	0	2	-2
International Power	94	7	10	-3
BG	95	45	51	-6
Home Retail Group	96	14	20	-7
BT	97	441	459	-18
HSBC	98	381	410	-29
Tesco	99	376	428	-52
BP	100	271	487	-215

Commentary

In total, the amount contributed to FTSE 100 company pension schemes was £11.6 billion, down from £12.3 billion in the previous accounting year. This is still more than the £7.4 billion cost of benefits accrued during the year. It therefore represents £4.2 billion of funding towards reducing pension scheme deficits.

Royal Dutch Shell has announced that it plans to inject an additional \$5 billion (£3.3 billion) into its pension schemes this year, on top of its regular contributions, which totalled £891 million in 2008. The announcement was in response to the deficit of £5.8 billion disclosed in its latest accounts – the highest deficit in the FTSE 100. This compares to a surplus of £6.8 billion just 12 months before. We believe that this will be the largest ever pension deficit contribution in the UK.

The huge cash contributions announced 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, Tesco and Whitbread have utilised prime properties to create £500 million and £150 million worth of contingent assets respectively.

Appendix

Name	Year End	Equity Market Value		Pension Assets		Pension Liabilities		Surplus / (Deficit)		Funding Level	% Bonds		Surplus / (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	£m	£m	£m		£m	£m	£m	£m		£m	£m		£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
3i	31-Mar-2009	2,781	419	437	(18)	96%	48%	(1%)	16%	(8)	(0%)	37	9	29										
Admiral	31-Dec-2008	3,061																						
Alliance Trust	31-Jan-2009	2,076	19	21	(2)	93%	53%	(0%)	1%	(3)	(0%)	1	1	0										
AMEC	31-Dec-2008	2,497	1,221	1,065	156	115%	61%	6%	43%	(113)	(5%)	26	36	14										
Anglo American	31-Dec-2008	26,426	1,430	1,488	(58)	96%	57%	(0%)	6%	(80)	(0%)	27	35	3										
Antofagasta	31-Dec-2008	7,488																						
Associated British Foods	13-Sep-2008	6,708	2,424	2,328	96	104%	60%	1%	35%	(255)	(4%)	54	61	17										
AstraZeneca	31-Dec-2008	40,921	3,914	5,674	(1,760)	69%	48%	(4%)	14%	(799)	(2%)	207	158	22										
Autonomy Corporation	31-Dec-2008	3,869																						
Aviva	31-Dec-2008	12,273	9,338	9,951	(613)	94%	56%	(5%)	81%	(949)	(8%)	620	297	457										
BAE Systems	31-Dec-2008	12,313	12,978	17,133	(4,155)	76%	30%	(34%)	139%	(2,554)	(21%)	486	487	347										
Barclays	31-Dec-2008	40,747	14,496	15,615	(1,119)	93%	47%	(3%)	38%	(1,949)	(5%)	407	389	95										
BG	31-Dec-2008	36,623	506	734	(228)	69%	27%	(1%)	2%	(19)	(0%)	45	62	(6)										
BHP Billiton	30-Jun-2009	37,696	873	1,042	(169)	84%	74%	(0%)	3%	(139)	(0%)	70	47	33										
BP	31-Dec-2008	104,200	18,063	22,004	(3,941)	82%	25%	(4%)	21%	(5,584)	(5%)	271	374	(215)										
British Airways	31-Mar-2009	2,536	12,205	12,806	(601)	95%	53%	(24%)	505%	(1,447)	(57%)	331	944	177										
British American Tobacco	31-Dec-2008	39,192	4,169	4,752	(583)	88%	46%	(1%)	12%	(551)	(1%)	145	138	66										
British Land	31-Mar-2009	4,051	69	69	0	100%	42%	0%	2%	(2)	(0%)	4	3	2										
BSkyB	30-Jun-2009	10,017																						
BT	31-Mar-2009	10,053	29,353	33,326	(3,973)	88%	40%	(40%)	332%	(7,047)	(70%)	441	708	(18)										
Bunzl	31-Dec-2008	2,082	202	253	(51)	80%	43%	(2%)	12%	(43)	(2%)	9	17	3										
Burberry	31-Mar-2009	2,178																						
Cable & Wireless	31-Mar-2009	3,642	1,939	1,988	(49)	98%	62%	(1%)	55%	(86)	(2%)	28	35	15										
Cadbury	31-Dec-2008	10,919	2,269	2,494	(225)	91%	50%	(2%)	23%	(390)	(4%)	84	120	22										
Cairn Energy	31-Dec-2008	3,837																						
Capita	31-Dec-2008	4,497	427	452	(25)	95%	30%	(1%)	10%	(48)	(1%)	39	21	13										
Carnival	30-Nov-2008	4,531	123	119	4	104%	64%	0%	3%	(8)	(0%)	4	19	1										
Centrica	31-Dec-2008	12,827	2,642	2,755	(113)	96%	27%	(1%)	21%	(409)	(3%)	243	218	140										
Cobham	31-Dec-2008	2,482	407	458	(51)	89%	53%	(2%)	18%	(22)	(1%)	11	11	6										
Compass	30-Sep-2008	7,114	1,419	1,552	(133)	91%	66%	(2%)	22%	(8)	(0%)	56	110	35										
Diego	30-Jun-2009	24,179	4,592	5,789	(1,197)	79%	44%	(5%)	24%	(996)	(4%)	128	84	27										
Eurasian Natural Resources	31-Dec-2008	11,287	0	26	(26)	0%	-	(0%)	0%	5	0%	0	0	(2)										
Experian	31-Mar-2009	5,372	416	448	(32)	93%	36%	(1%)	8%	(116)	(2%)	8	10	1										
Fresnillo	31-Dec-2008	5,536	18	20	(2)	88%	91%	(0%)	0%	(1)	(0%)	0	1	(0)										
Friends Provident	31-Dec-2008	1,933	1,171	1,080	91	108%	77%	5%	56%	(29)	(2%)	49	33	25										
G4S	31-Dec-2008	3,106	1,121	1,448	(328)	77%	43%	(11%)	47%	(201)	(6%)	53	38	37										
GlaxoSmithKline	31-Dec-2008	64,431	9,288	10,980	(1,692)	85%	46%	(3%)	17%	(1,809)	(3%)	443	504	185										
Hamerson	31-Dec-2008	2,748	42	51	(8)	84%	0%	(0%)	2%	(1)	(0%)	1	1	(1)										
Home Retail Group	28-Feb-2009	2,381	504	551	(46)	92%	40%	(2%)	23%	(135)	(6%)	14	14	(7)										
HSBC	31-Dec-2008	123,186	14,330	16,494	(2,164)	87%	74%	(2%)	13%	(1,278)	(1%)	381	634	(29)										
ICAP	31-Mar-2009	2,721	8	10	(2)	80%	88%	(0%)	0%	(2)	(0%)	1	1	1										
Imperial Tobacco	30-Sep-2008	18,382	2,769	2,874	(105)	96%	41%	(1%)	16%	(357)	(2%)	42	46	2										
Inmarsat	31-Dec-2008	2,519	24	32	(8)	75%	12%	(0%)	1%	(3)	(0%)	3	3	2										
InterContinental Hotels	31-Dec-2008	2,325	379	411	(32)	92%	72%	(0%)	18%	(41)	(2%)	18	37	13										
International Power	31-Dec-2008	4,389	219	301	(82)	73%	16%	(2%)	7%	(78)	(2%)	7	11	(3)										
Intertek	31-Dec-2008	1,994	59	77	(19)	76%	34%	(1%)	4%	(14)	(1%)	5	4	3										
Invensys	31-Mar-2009	2,317	4,627	4,814	(187)	96%	91%	(8%)	208%	41	2%	64	116	41										
Johnson Matthey	31-Mar-2009	2,980	778	889	(112)	87%	43%	(4%)	30%	(166)	(6%)	28	26	1										

Appendix (continued)

Name	Year End	Equity Market Value £m	Pension Assets £m	Pension Liabilities £m	Surplus / (Deficit) £m	Funding Level £m	% Bonds	Surplus / (Deficit) as % of Market Value	Liabilities as % of Market Value	Unexpected Balance Sheet Impact £m	Balance Sheet Impact as % of Market Value	Current Funding £m	Previous Funding £m	Surplus Funding £m
Kazakhmys	31-Dec-2008	5,748	-	-	(74)	-	63%	(1%)	-	(189)	-	48	103	-
Kingfisher	31-Jan-2009	4,987	1,363	1,437	(74)	95%	63%	(1%)	29%	(189)	(4%)	-	-	25
Land Securities	31-Mar-2009	4,725	107	104	3	103%	59%	0%	2%	(12)	(0%)	4	2	3
Legal & General	31-Dec-2008	5,146	1,047	1,187	(140)	88%	68%	(3%)	23%	33	1%	58	39	35
Liberty International	31-Dec-2008	2,715	50	56	(6)	89%	42%	(0%)	2%	(8)	(0%)	3	2	1
Lloyds Banking Group	31-Dec-2008	28,167	20,934	22,326	(1,392)	94%	43%	(5%)	79%	(863)	(3%)	762	738	258
London Stock Exchange	31-Mar-2009	2,332	235	230	5	102%	86%	0%	10%	(11)	(0%)	7	6	6
Lonmin	30-Sep-2008	3,205	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Man Group	31-Mar-2009	5,605	173	206	(33)	84%	40%	(1%)	4%	(31)	(1%)	8	3	3
Marks & Spencer	28-Mar-2009	5,745	3,977	4,113	(136)	97%	58%	(2%)	72%	(694)	(12%)	92	111	20
Morrison Supermarkets	01-Feb-2009	7,292	1,758	1,807	(49)	97%	62%	(1%)	25%	(101)	(1%)	141	193	103
National Grid	31-Mar-2009	14,784	14,797	16,000	(1,203)	92%	59%	(8%)	108%	(2,068)	(14%)	799	465	663
Next	24-Jan-2009	3,540	326	395	(69)	83%	50%	(2%)	11%	(36)	(1%)	22	9	12
Old Mutual	31-Dec-2008	5,318	828	778	50	106%	55%	1%	15%	(154)	(3%)	13	14	4
Pearson	31-Dec-2008	6,203	1,578	1,594	(16)	99%	43%	(0%)	26%	(89)	(1%)	57	157	20
Petrofac	31-Dec-2008	3,408	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Prudential	31-Dec-2008	15,228	5,317	4,673	644	114%	75%	4%	31%	(63)	(0%)	95	101	50
Randgold Resources	31-Dec-2008	4,616	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Reckitt Benckiser	31-Dec-2008	21,662	710	881	(171)	81%	48%	(1%)	4%	(122)	(1%)	20	10	3
Reed Elsevier	31-Dec-2008	5,674	2,682	3,051	(369)	88%	48%	(7%)	54%	(462)	(8%)	79	83	4
Rentokil Initial	31-Dec-2008	2,062	1,049	914	135	115%	62%	7%	44%	44	2%	35	82	33
Rexam	31-Dec-2008	2,285	2,505	2,586	(81)	97%	71%	(4%)	113%	(53)	(2%)	50	44	35
Rio Tinto	31-Dec-2008	40,755	7,295	9,121	(1,826)	80%	40%	(4%)	22%	(1,189)	(3%)	315	117	84
Rolls-Royce	31-Dec-2008	8,719	7,446	6,546	900	114%	83%	10%	75%	(114)	(1%)	279	707	117
Royal Bank of Scotland	31-Dec-2008	30,017	25,756	27,752	(1,996)	93%	54%	(7%)	92%	(2,431)	(8%)	810	599	77
Royal Dutch Shell	31-Dec-2008	110,432	30,611	36,374	(5,763)	84%	49%	(5%)	33%	(13,741)	(12%)	891	630	237
RSA	31-Dec-2008	4,429	5,042	4,512	530	112%	70%	12%	102%	275	6%	123	168	52
SABMiller	31-Mar-2009	23,683	209	293	(84)	71%	65%	(0%)	1%	111	0%	5	12	(1)
Sage Group	30-Sep-2008	3,054	16	20	(4)	81%	84%	(0%)	1%	2	0%	1	1	(0)
Sainsbury	21-Mar-2009	5,724	3,310	3,619	(309)	91%	58%	(5%)	63%	(903)	(16%)	128	82	75
Schroders	31-Dec-2008	3,018	548	525	22	104%	46%	1%	17%	(30)	(1%)	12	19	4
Scottish & Southern Energy	31-Mar-2009	10,796	1,787	1,930	(143)	93%	63%	(1%)	18%	(279)	(3%)	71	74	49
Segro	31-Dec-2008	2,698	110	116	(5)	95%	58%	(0%)	4%	(16)	(1%)	16	4	13
Serco	31-Dec-2008	2,443	1,194	1,343	(149)	89%	58%	(6%)	55%	(4)	(0%)	61	105	13
Severn Trent	31-Mar-2009	2,286	1,075	1,308	(233)	82%	45%	(10%)	57%	(123)	(5%)	42	56	18
Shire	31-Dec-2008	6,063	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Smith & Nephew	31-Dec-2008	4,975	467	690	(224)	68%	41%	(4%)	14%	(155)	(3%)	23	20	8
Smiths Group	31-Jul-2009	3,445	2,775	3,087	(312)	90%	47%	(9%)	90%	(409)	(12%)	53	56	35
Standard Chartered	31-Dec-2008	30,775	1,188	1,478	(291)	80%	55%	(1%)	5%	(166)	(1%)	81	54	31
Standard Life	31-Dec-2008	4,846	1,629	1,513	116	108%	49%	2%	31%	156	3%	60	64	13
Tesco	28-Feb-2009	31,452	3,420	4,914	(1,494)	70%	35%	(5%)	16%	(629)	(2%)	376	340	(52)
Thomas Cook	30-Sep-2008	1,994	582	771	(190)	75%	30%	(10%)	39%	(27)	(1%)	33	37	12
TUI Travel	30-Sep-2008	2,846	924	1,167	(243)	79%	48%	(9%)	41%	4	0%	70	33	39
Tullow Oil	31-Dec-2008	9,025	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Unilever	31-Dec-2008	53,774	11,447	14,038	(2,591)	82%	28%	(5%)	26%	(2,878)	(5%)	594	790	399
United Utilities	31-Mar-2009	3,082	1,484	1,697	(213)	87%	44%	(7%)	55%	(124)	(4%)	45	16	6
Vedanta Resources	31-Mar-2009	5,258	17	37	(21)	45%	40%	(0%)	1%	0	0%	7	4	4
Vodafone	31-Mar-2009	73,786	1,100	1,332	(232)	83%	44%	(0%)	2%	(254)	(0%)	98	86	52
Whitbread	26-Feb-2009	2,137	1,107	1,340	(233)	83%	45%	(11%)	63%	(256)	(12%)	55	56	50
Wolseley	31-Jul-2009	4,254	640	981	(341)	65%	35%	(8%)	23%	(103)	(2%)	47	34	13
WPP	31-Dec-2008	6,758	550	819	(269)	67%	68%	(4%)	12%	(154)	(2%)	44	47	25
Xstrata	31-Dec-2008	26,891	1,146	1,363	(217)	84%	62%	(1%)	5%	(122)	(0%)	41	58	12

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.

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 J.P. Morgan Cazenove Limited 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, J.P. Morgan Cazenove Limited 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.



PENSION CAPITAL STRATEGIES

Innovative Alternatives

Pension Capital Strategies Ltd

6 Crutched Friars

London

EC3N 2PH

Telephone: 020 7528 4892

Fax: 020 7309 8330

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