RE: Pension slides for MO office

From: "Hughes, Karen (TBS)" <karen.hughes@ontario.ca>
To: "Veinot, Cindy (TBS)" <cindy.veinot@ontario.ca>, "Laughton, Patrick (TBS)" <patrick.laughton@ontario.ca>
Cc: "Hosick, Sarah (TBS)" <sarah.hosick@ontario.ca>, "Petsche, Nadine (TBS)" <nadine.petsche@ontario.ca>
Date: Mon, 24 Oct 2016 09:19:05 -0400

Yes – probably just need to clarify how this slide fits with the others to assist.

This shows what is currently in plan since it doesn't reflect the change which is helpful plain language background.

Karen

From: Veinot, Cindy (TBS)
Sent: October 24, 2016 8:33 AM
To: Laughton, Patrick (TBS); Hughes, Karen (TBS)
Cc: Hosick, Sarah (TBS); Petsche, Nadine (TBS)
Subject: RE: Pension slides for MO office

The computation of pension expense/recovery is not in question – there is no disagreement on that aspect of the accounting (think of it as step 1 and the disagreement is on step 2 – the valuation allowance). This slide is to assist in understanding why the pension plan is resulting in an increasing asset.

From: Laughton, Patrick (TBS)
Sent: October-24-16 8:30 AM
To: Veinot, Cindy (TBS); Hughes, Karen (TBS)
Cc: Hosick, Sarah (TBS); Petsche, Nadine (TBS)
Subject: RE: Pension slides for MO office

Hi Cindy –

Thanks very much for this.

Does the content on slide four reflect the current treatment for the pension plans (i.e., not the AG's approach)?

P.

From: Veinot, Cindy (TBS)
Sent: October-23-16 11:36 PM
To: Hughes, Karen (TBS)
Cc: Laughton, Patrick (TBS); Hosick, Sarah (TBS); Petsche, Nadine (TBS)
Subject: Pension slides for MO office

Please see attached. Explanatory notes have been included for each slide.

Cindy