September 7, 2010

Technical Director
Financial Accounting Standards Board
401 Merritt 7
P.O. Box 5116
Norwalk, CT 06856-5116
(e-mail: director@fasb.org)

Re: File Reference No. 100-C

Dear Technical Director, Board Members and Staff:

PPL Corporation (“PPL”) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Proposed Accounting Standards Update “Plan Accounting – Defined Contribution Pension Plans (Topic 962) – Reporting Loans to Participants by Defined Contribution Pension Plans (“Proposed ASU”) referenced above. PPL is an energy and utility holding company that, through its subsidiaries, controls or owns nearly 12,000 megawatts of generating capacity in the United States, sells energy in key U.S. markets, and delivers electricity to about four million customers in Pennsylvania and the United Kingdom.

Question 1 – Do you agree that participant loans should be classified by defined contribution pension plans as notes receivable from participants, separately from plan investments? If not, why not? What alternative classification would you prefer and why?

Yes, PPL agrees that the proper classification for participant loans is as a note receivable, rather than inclusion with plan investments.

Question 2 – Do you agree that participant loans should be measured at their unpaid principal balance plus any accrued but unpaid interest? If not, why not? What alternative measurement would you prefer and why?

Yes, PPL agrees that the unpaid principal balance plus any accrued but unpaid interest is the appropriate measure, and is a widely recognized industry practice.

Question 3 – The Task Force concluded that no additional disclosures specific to participant loans would be required as part of the amendments in this proposed Update. Do you agree? If not, what additional disclosures do you believe would be necessary?

Yes, PPL agrees that no additional disclosures specific to participant loans would be needed. The plan reporting audience and plan participants are fully aware of how plan loans are
structured and valued based on existing plan documents, communications and reporting requirements.

**Question 4** – Do you agree that the amendments in this proposed Update should be applied retrospectively, with early adoption allowed? If not, why not?

Yes, PPL agrees with applying these amendments retrospectively.

**Question 5** – How much time do you believe would be necessary for you to efficiently implement the amendments in this proposed Update?

The time needed to implement the amendments in the proposed Update is minimal.

We would like to thank the Board for the opportunity to share our views on the Proposed ASU.

Best regards,

Vincent Sorgi
Vice President & Controller

cc: Mr. P. A. Farr
Mr. M. A. Cunningham
Mr. M. D. Woods