

LETTER OF COMMENT NO. 42

Hewitt Associates LLC 100 Half Day Road Lincolnshire, IL 60069 Tel 847-295-5000 Fax 847-771-7905 www.hewitt.com

Argentina Australia Austria Belgium Brazil Canada Channel Islands Chile

China Czech Republic Dominican Republic

France
Germany
Greece
Hong Kong SAR
Hungary
India
Ireland
Italy
Japan
Malaysia
Mauritius
xico

herlands
Philippines
Poland
Portugal
Puerto Rico
Singapore
Slovenia
South Korea
Spain
Sweden
Switzerland
Thailand
United Kingdom
United States
Venezuela

May 23, 2006

Technical Director—File Reference No. 1025-300 Financial Accounting Standards Board 401 Merritt 7 P. O. Box 5116 Norwalk, CT 06856-5116

Dear Sir:

Subject: File Reference 1025-300

This letter contains Hewitt Associates' comments on the proposed amendment of FASB Statement Nos. 87, 88, 106 and 132(R) as issued in the March 31, 2006 Exposure Draft titled "Employers' Disclosures about Pensions and Other Postretirement Benefits." Hewitt Associates is a global management consulting firm assisting large and small employers in all aspects of employee benefit and compensation programs. Our actuaries and consultants have a great deal of experience in the subject area of the Exposure Draft and have helped hundreds of employers with the application of FASB Statements No. 87, 88, 106 and 132.

We are supportive of the Board's efforts to develop useful financial information. We also recognize the challenges inherent in developing a standard that provides for valuable, but not overly lengthy, information about pension and other postretirement benefits. While we welcome the Board's attempt to balance these competing goals, we have concerns about some of the proposed changes.

Our specific comments follow.

Balance Sheet Recognition of Funded Status

The proposed standard includes a requirement to recognize the overfunded or underfunded status of defined benefit postretirement plans as an asset or a liability in the statement of financial position. For purposes of this measurement, the Projected Benefit Obligation (PBO) would be used for pensions, while the Accumulated Postretirement Benefit Obligation (APBO) would be used for other postretirement plans.

We believe that the use of the PBO for this measurement is inconsistent with the common understanding of balance sheet liabilities. We believe that the ABO is a better measure for pensions. In addition, the use of the APBO for all employees and retirees is also somewhat inconsistent with the common understanding of balance sheet liabilities.

Technical Director—File Reference No. 1025-300 Page 2 May 23, 2006

Use of PBO vs. ABO

Under FAS 87, the PBO is measured using assumptions about future compensation levels if the pension benefit formula is based on future compensation levels. While the use of the PBO may be appropriate for use as the determinate of net periodic pension cost, its use is inappropriate to measure a balance sheet liability.

- FASB Concept Statement 6 states that the essential characteristics of a liability include that "the duty or responsibility obligates a particular entity, leaving it little or no discretion to avoid the future sacrifice" and "the transaction or other event obligating the entity has already happened." The PBO does not satisfy either of these criteria. In particular, the plan sponsor has a great deal of discretion over both the level of future compensation levels and whether plan benefits will continue to be based on future compensation levels. For example, over the past year, several high profile companies have announced that pension benefits will be frozen and no longer be based on future compensation levels. In addition, even if the pension plan is not frozen, future compensation levels are dependent on the participant continuing to render service in the future.
- The value of future compensation to employees is not recorded as a liability on the balance sheet. Thus, it is inconsistent to require that an incremental value of future compensation increases be recorded on the balance sheet as part of the PBO.
- The PBO would be unlike other balance sheet liabilities in that it cannot be settled.
 That is, a plan sponsor cannot exchange the PBO obligation with a third party due
 to the future compensation element which remains in the control of the plan
 sponsor.

The ABO is a more appropriate measure if a liability is going to be recorded on the balance sheet.

- The ABO is based on compensation and service as of the measurement date, and has the characteristics of a liability as stated in Concept 6.
- The ABO can be settled with a third party (e.g., annuity contracts can be, and have been, purchased from an insurer for benefits accrued to date) and, thus, is a better measure of the actual economic liability.

Technical Director—File Reference No. 1025-300 Page 3 May 23, 2006

- Under the current standards, the ABO is in some ways similar to the APBO as
 defined in FAS 106 for retiree medical benefits. While the APBO includes an
 allowance for health care cost trend rates, this is different than the inclusion of
 future compensation levels in the PBO. Health care inflation is outside the plan
 sponsor's control. In addition, health care inflation is similar to automatic cost-ofliving increases provided by some pension plans and which would be reflected in
 the ABO,
- Use of the ABO is consistent with the existing FAS 87 requirement to record an additional minimum liability on the balance sheet based on unfunded ABO.

Thus, we strongly believe that the ABO is the proper measure to be used if pension liabilities are to be recorded on the balance sheet.

Use of APBO

As noted above, under the current standards, the APBO for retiree medical plans is somewhat similar in concept to the ABO. However, the Board should note that the liability for a retiree medical plan is also fundamentally different than other liabilities recorded on the balance sheet. Retiree medical benefits generally do not vest and can usually be eliminated by a plan sponsor at any time. In contrast, pension benefits based on the ABO generally are vested benefits and cannot be eliminated by the plan sponsor.

We acknowledge that other contingent benefits are recognized on the balance sheet, thus, the fact that retiree medical benefits do not vest does not support a conclusion that no liability exists. However, we believe that it would be more consistent with the ABO measure used for pension plans if balance sheet recognition of other postretirement plans be limited to the APBO for those plan participants who are eligible as of the measurement date to retire and receive benefits, along with the APBO for current retirees.

Consistent with our comments above on ABO, for pay related benefits accounted for under FAS 106 (such as life insurance), we recommend that the salary increase component not be included in the APBO amount reported on the balance sheet.

Technical Director—File Reference No. 1025-300 Page 4 May 23, 2006

Use of Early Measurement Date

The proposed standard includes a requirement to use a measurement date as of the date of the financial statements (i.e., fiscal year end). Under the current requirements, a measurement of plan assets and liabilities can be made at a date not more than three months prior to the fiscal year end. In addition, both FAS 87 and FAS 106 indicate that the measurement date concept is not intended to require that all procedures be performed after that date, but "as with other financial statement items requiring estimates, much of the information can be prepared as of an earlier date and projected forward to account for subsequent events."

While we acknowledge that conceptually it is desirable to use the fiscal year end as the measurement date, as detailed below, we believe that practical considerations outweigh the perceived benefits for many companies. As a result, we believe that the ability to use a measurement date up to 90 days before fiscal year end should be retained.

Implied Accuracy of Measurements

As the current standards acknowledge, the liability amounts are simply estimates. Due to the nature of these benefit plans, the true liability is not known until the last participant receives their final benefit payment many, many years from the measurement date. Numerous economic and demographic actuarial assumptions are used to estimate the liabilities, including assumptions for health care trend rates, retirement, mortality, and turnover. In addition, it is usually not practical to collect actual participant data as of the measurement date (e.g., data collection can take many months for large plans), thus data is usually collected as of an earlier date and, in essence, projected to the measurement date using actuarial assumptions and techniques. Since the overall process involves many estimates and a projection of liabilities based on data that is a number of months old, the concern about the exact measurement date seems to imply a false level of precision and does not produce a more accurate estimate of the actual plan liabilities.

Asset Values

A requirement to use a measurement date as of fiscal year end could provide timing difficulties for some companies regarding the collection of asset information. While advances in the electronic reporting of asset information have made most asset information available in a timelier manner, not all asset information is readily available soon after the measurement date.

 For companies with plans in other countries, it can be difficult to collect timely asset information.

Technical Director—File Reference No. 1025-300 Page 5 May 23, 2006

- The gathering of asset information can be difficult for any plan where the plan year does not coincide with the fiscal year end of the company.
- For many companies, the collection of asset information needs to be coordinated and collected from various sources (e.g., from different asset managers).
- Some investments are not traded in public markets and time is needed to properly
 value the investment (e.g., it typically takes four months to get asset values for a
 private equity investment, and even the value of investments in real estate are
 reported with about a two month lag).
- While it is relatively uncommon for the reported asset values to be later revised, such revisions do occur. Shortening the time frame between measurement date and required reporting, reduces the likelihood that the corrected information will be reported to the plan sponsor before the Form 10-K filing due date.

Thus, in some cases, the use of an early measurement date results in more, not less, accurate reporting information as an early measurement date provides an entity with extra time to collect accurate asset information.

Discount Rate Selection

We also believe that the Board should allow for more timing flexibility in the selection of the discount rate.

• The current standards require that the discount rate (and other assumptions) must be chosen as of the measurement date. Practically, this means that final benefit liability amounts cannot be prepared until after the measurement date. In the past, this requirement has not presented much of a problem because good estimates of the liabilities could be prepared in advance. However, the increasing use of more sophisticated methods to value plan liabilities (e.g., use of a yield curve as the discount rate) make it very difficult to produce accurate estimates in advance of the measurement date and require additional time to produce the liabilities after the measurement date (e.g., time is needed to construct yield curve, and time is then needed for the actuary to produce the liabilities). Thus, the requirement to use a measurement date at fiscal year end will likely create timing difficulties for many companies.

Technical Director—File Reference No. 1025-300 Page 6 May 23, 2006

• For companies with numerous plans, a reasonable amount of time needs to be provided to allow for the collection and preparation of the required disclosure information, including the preparation of liability amounts. This would be particularly true for companies with plans in multiple countries. Under the current requirements, many companies are benefiting from the use of an early measurement date as it provides these companies with the time needed to accurately prepare and collect the required information.

As an alternative, if the Board does decide to require that assets and liabilities be reported as of the fiscal year end (i.e., the measurement date), we believe that the Board should allow that the selection of the discount rate can be made up to 30 days (or some other reasonable period) prior to the fiscal year end (with a requirement that such procedure be used consistently from year to year). A discount rate selected within 30 days of fiscal year end would still be representative of the level of interest rates at fiscal year end. This allowance would recognize practical considerations in the selection of the discount rate and preparation of reported benefit liabilities, along with the fact that the liability amounts are estimates.

Transition Rules for Change in Measurement Date

For a company that is required to change to an end of year measurement date, the proposed standard includes a requirement that net periodic benefit cost for the period between the measurement date that would have been used for the immediately preceding fiscal year and the fiscal year beginning after December 15, 2006, shall be recognized, net of tax, as an adjustment of the opening balance of retained earnings. We believe that this adjustment to retained earnings is intended to represent a cumulative type adjustment for the change in measurement date (for example, by capturing the amount of expense "missed" for the period between the measurement dates).

We believe that making such an adjustment to retained earnings is not appropriate for the transition. A company that is required to change measurement dates will not have missed any expense, as each fiscal year both before and after the change will have reflected 12 months of net periodic benefit cost. Thus, a requirement to reflect in retained earnings net periodic benefit cost for the period between the two measurement dates will have the result that a company that uses an early measurement date will be required to reflect more than 12 months (i.e., 13 to 15 months) of net periodic benefit cost for a 12 month period.

Technical Director—File Reference No. 1025-300 Page 7 May 23, 2006

In addition, assets and liabilities measured at an early measurement date are intended to be a proxy for assets and liabilities measured as of fiscal year end. Thus, by requiring a measurement date as of the fiscal year end, the proposed change is simply improving the "accuracy" of the estimate by requiring the use of a more current measurement date. Under the current requirements of FAS 87 and FAS 106, a change in estimate is treated as an actuarial gain/loss (for example, collecting new census data, updating assumptions). Thus, we believe that treating the effect of the change in measurement date as a gain/loss is more consistent with the existing requirements.

We suggest instead, that for purposes of calculating net periodic benefit cost, that expense for the period between the measurement date that would have been used and the first end of year measurement date can be ignored. For example, a company would move directly from a September 30, 2005 measurement date to a December 31, 2006 measurement date for expense purposes. For these calculations, the amount of unrecognized prior service cost that would have existed at the September 30, 2006 measurement date will be brought forward to December 31, 2006. Any other differences will simply be included as a component of unrecognized gain/loss.

Our approach is also preferable as it provides a company with the option to avoid the cost of having two measurement dates in the year of change. That is, a company could choose to adopt the change in measurement date provisions early and have fiscal 2006 disclosures be based on the required December 31, 2006 measurement date. In such a case, the company would not need to perform calculations for a September 30, 2006 measurement date as these amounts would not be needed for any purpose.

Interim Period Financial Reports

We agree with the Board's decision not to add any new disclosure requirements for interim financial reports.

Effective Date for Change in Measurement Date Requirements

For the change in measurement date, we believe that some companies—particularly those with foreign plans—will need more than just a couple of months to get new procedures put into place. Thus, while we believe that the Board should not eliminate the option to use an early measurement date, if the Board does make this change, then we believe that the Board should consider a year delay in the effective date for this change. That is, instead of having the effective date apply to plan years beginning after December 15, 2006, the effective date should be as follows:

Technical Director—File Reference No. 1025-300 Page 8 May 23, 2006

- The effective date for net periodic benefit cost purposes should be applied to fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2007.
- The effective date for disclosure purposes should be applied to fiscal years ending after December 15, 2007.

Effective Date for Non-Calendar Fiscal Years

Under the proposal, the requirement to recognize the funded status of a plan on the balance sheet is effective for fiscal years ending after December 15, 2006. Based on conversations with the FASB staff, it is our understanding that the defined effective date means that the requirements are to be first applied at the end of the fiscal year that ends after December 15, 2006 (unless early application is adopted). For example, for a company with a fiscal year that begins on November 1, 2006, the requirements would first be applied to the annual financial statement issued as of October 31, 2007. Interim period financial statements issued for periods prior to October 31, 2007 (i.e., for third financial quarter ending July 31, 2007) would **not** need to reflect the new requirements.

We believe that it would be helpful to clarify the effective date definition to help prevent misinterpretation. For example, for a fiscal year that begins on November 1, 2006, it is possible to interpret the requirements as applying to financial statements, both interim and annual, for the entire fiscal year—since the interim period financial statements in this example **would be** for the fiscal year that ends after December 15, 2006.

Disclosures Considered But Not Proposed

We agree with the Board's conclusions to reject a number of other disclosure items that were requested by users of financial statements. Not only would some of these disclosure items be costly to develop (e.g., estimate of plan liability on a termination basis), they truly are of limited value—and worse, potentially misleading—to users of financial statements unless the disclosure requirements were significantly expanded to adequately explain these concepts. These issues should be addressed in the second phase of FASB's project.

Technical Director—File Reference No. 1025-300 Page 9 May 23, 2006

Conclusion

As noted, we are supportive of the Board's efforts and we agree that the current disclosure requirements could be improved. However, as indicated by our comments, there are several areas that we think should be revisited. We hope the Board will give careful consideration to our comments. If any of our comments need further explanation, please contact me at 847-295-5000.

Sincerely,

Hewitt Associates LLC

Curtis M. Cartolano

Cutio M. Cartelano

Principal

TA:wp