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## Original Internal Pay Equity Research Felt Fair Pay - "FFP" = 2 X

- 13 research studies over 15 years with 1000+ managers from CEO to front line in USA, Canada, UK (see MVC Associates International published articles)
- Differential Work justifies Differential Pay \& data shows a consistent Felt Fair Pay multiplier / differential
- Each TRUE differential Level of Work (see Appendix) was identified as worth 2X more in Total Direct Compensation than the level directly below it
- MVC Associates has effectively applied 2X to 2.5X differential to its 5 Levels of CEO Work analysis for clients worldwide


# Jeff Immelt, CEO of GE <br> Validates 2X to 3X CEO Pay Differential as Felt Fair Pay - FFP 

- Winter Issue of Compensation Standards: "CEO role should be paid within a small range of the top 20+ executive team members"
- Immelt points out that his pay is within 2 to 3 times his top executive team members


## Moody's Multi-Dimensional Credit \& Governance Risk Analysis including Red Flag > 3X CEO Pay Differential

## June 2006 Comment on CEO Pay Structures

- Board Picks \& Pays the CEO
- RED FLAG > 3X CEO to any NEO pay differential
$->3 X$ CEO pay differential is a possible indicator of weak board \& poor corporate governance
- > 3X CEO pay differential is a possible indicator of key person risk \& CEO succession problem
- Outsized CEO pay to peers also a key warning flag for other potential governance \& credit risks


## High CEO to NEO PEM May Indicate

- CEO pay not justified by CEO Level of Work (5 CEO LEVELS) nor validated by Truly Comparable Peer Group \& Pay-for-Performance links
- NEO Group may lack appropriate delegated decision authority relative to CEO Role
$>$ Management structure risk / overly dominant CEO
- Poorly structured performance metrics \& poor delegation of truly Differential Work cascading throughout the Organization
$>$ Failure of executive team to be accountable for Future Value, growth \& innovation already built into enterprise valuation
>May foster drive for acquisition vs. organic growth, high balance sheet leverage at the risk of LONG TERM sustainable value creation
- Weakness in Internal Succession Planning in the natural talent pool the NEO's \& $3^{\text {rd }}$ tier of Management
- Weakness in Board processes, Director Independence \& Execution of Fiduciary Duty
- Broader systemic \& governance risks


## NEW MVC Assoc RESEARCH SAYS CEO Internal Pay Equity Multiplier (PEM) is in $2 X$ to $3 X$ Range

- MVC Associates Board clients ask: What is a standard for CEO Pay Fairness / Equitable CEO Pay Differential?
- MVC Associates conducted research across the Russell 3000 (2000 companies for 2003 to 2005)
- Setting aside the extreme outliers, our analysis shows the median value of the CEO to Median NEO Pay Differential for 1600 companies for 2003 to 2005 is 2.45 X - within the 2 X to 3 X range
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## MVC Associates International <br> Model Internal Pay Equity Table

| Internal Pay Equity Multiplier for each Work Level |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Starting "X" Total Compensation <br> \$ for Senior Manager / Entry Level <br> Director <br> $\$ 118,000$ <br> 4000 compensation data points - TOTAL COMPENSATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Work Level |  | Work Level 7 | Work Level 6 | Work Level 5 | Workl Level 4 | Work Level 3 |
| Management Layer Down From Board |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|  |  | Global CEO Pay Band \$ | COO/Sector CEO or Sector President Pay Band \$ | Business Unit President Pay Band \$ | Business Unit SVP or VP Pay Band \$ | Snr Mgr/ Director Pay Band \$ |
| Cumulative Pay Multiplier from "X" from Senior Manager or Entry Level Director | 101.63 | 40.33 | 16.00 | 6.35 | 2.52 | 1.00 |
| Top of Total Equitable Compensation Band by Work Level | HIGH | \$11,391,599 | \$ 4,520,476 | \$ 1,793,840 | \$ 711,841 | \$ 282,477 |
| Middle of Total Equitable Compensation Band by Work Level | MEDIUM | \$ 7,176,033 | \$ 2,847,632 | \$ 1,130,013 | \$ 448,418 | \$ 177,944 |
| Bottom of Total Equitable Compensation Band by Work Level | LOW | \$ 4,758,654 | \$ 1,888,355 | \$ 749,347 | \$ 297,360 | \$ 118,000 |

# MVC Associates International Internal Pay Equity Benchmark Analysis 


Total Compensation \$ $=\quad$ Base +
Bonus + Non-Equity Incentive +
GrantDFVSO

Internal Pay Equity Multipliers cOO/Sector CEO TO Mid Pres TO Mid Mgmt Pay ceo To Mgmt Pay Multiplier-
Global COO or COO /
Sector CEO $/$

| Global CEO | Sector <br> Sector <br> Total Comp $\$$ <br> President $\$$ |
| :--- | :--- | Pay Multiplier Mitiplier Layer 5 - Snr Layer 5-Snr Mgr/Director $\mathrm{Mgr} /$ Director $=$

Net

## Work Level

 ExxonGE
ConocoPhillips
J\&. $J$
Corp
Merck
UPS
3M
McDonalds
Caterpillar
Dupont
Aloca
Honeywell
Kimberly Clark
Xerox
General Mills
Whiripool

Goodyear $\quad \$$| 13,878 |
| :--- |

Median $\quad \$ 31,359 \quad 8.1 \quad \$$

Internal Pay Equity Multiplier Model
GrantDFVSO

|  | COO/Sector | CEO TO Mid |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Pres TO Mid Mgmt Pay  <br> CEO TO Mgmt Pay Multiplier |  |
| COO/ | Multiplier- | Layer $5-$ Snr |
| President | Layer 5-Snr | Mgr / Director |
| Pay | Mgr Director | $=$ |
| Multiplier | $=\$ 118,000$ | 118,000 |

Work Level 7 Work Level 6 \$ 17,891,025 \$ 8,015,898 S 14,605,125 $\quad \mathbf{S} \quad 8,684,189$ \$ 14,586,778 $\$ \quad 6,072,118$ $\begin{array}{llllll}53,324 & \$ & 14,649,560 & \$ & 4,713,801\end{array}$

| 65,449 | $\$$ | $8,237,430$ | $\$$ | $3,707,453$ | 2.22 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

$\begin{array}{lllll}22.630 & \mathrm{~S} & 7,828,634 & \mathrm{~S} & 5,991,836\end{array}$
\$ $4,097,520$ \$ $1,357,820$ $\begin{array}{lll} & \$ & 4,235,721 \\ & \$ & 3,585,555\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{\$} & 12,775,092 & \mathbf{S} & 3,585,55 \\ \mathrm{~S} & 12,403,552 & \mathrm{~S} & 4,716,22\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{rrrr}\mathbf{S} & 10.139 .960 & \mathbf{S} & 4,795,305 \\ \$ & 9,433,601 & \$ & 3,940,986\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{S} & 9,576,192 & \$ & 5,156,577\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lrll}\mathbf{\$} & 9.486,469 & \mathbf{S} & 2,294,33 \\ \mathbf{S} & 10.235,700 & \mathbf{S} & 3,915,01\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lrlr}\mathbf{S} & 10,235,700 & \mathbf{S} & 3,915,015 \\ \mathbf{S} & 11,606,405 & \mathbf{S} & 4,613,194 \\ \mathbf{S} & 9,411,446 & \mathbf{\$} & 3,258,221\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llrll}10,000 & S & 9,411,446 & \text { S } & 3,258,221\end{array}$
20.258 S
$681 \$ 10,921,053$ \$ 4,424,458
$3,541 \quad \$ \quad 29,681 \quad \$ 10,921,053 \quad \$ \quad 4,424,458$

5

| Minimum | \$ | 13,878 | -4.6 | \$ | (330) | \$ | 12,442 | \$ | 4,097,520 | \$ | 1,357,820 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maxmimum | 8 | 697,239 | 24 | \$ | 39,500 | \$ | 377.635 | \$ | 17,891,025 | \$ | 8,684,189 |


|  | $\$$ | $6,87,239$ | 24 | $\$$ | 39,500 | $\$$ | 377,635 | $\$$ | $17,891,025$ | $\$$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## CPS Energy Board Ensures Management Structure \& Pay Alignment

- Fiduciary Duty of Directors to ensure social well being, corporate health \& sustainability of the Enterprise
- Want to ensure commitment of the workforce to carrying out the enterprise mission
- Concern about rising pay differentials between CEO \& other senior officers vs. the rest of the workforce (4000 employees)
- Concern that executive compensation surveys driving wider CEO pay differential \& looking for alternative process to help benchmark equitable pay
- Work Levels \& Internal Pay Equity (pay multipliers) as an alternative


## CPS Energy Board Asks Key Questions of Management about Organization Structure \& Pay

- How many layers of management do you have ?
- How many layers of management do you really need ?
( what the are the performance metrics for each mgmt layer that are differential \& validate the value-add of each management layer ?)
- What is the internal pay differential between each management layer that justifies the differential pay / work relationship ?
- What is the headcount and total cost of management at each management layer?


## CPS Energy

Average
Total Compensation \$\$ by Management Layer


## CPS Energy 2005

## Enterprise Structure \& Internal Pay Analysis

| Layer <br> Down From <br> Board | \# of <br> FTE's | Average <br> Annual Total <br> Compensation <br> \& Benefits by <br> Layer | Layer <br> To <br> Layer <br> Pay <br> Multiplier | Cumulative <br> Pay <br> Multiplier <br> To Front <br> Line | Total Annual <br> Comp \& Benefits <br> Cost \$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ <br> CEO | 1 | $\$ 548,803$ | $\mathbf{2 . 5 3}$ | 10.31 | $\$ 548,803$ |
| $\mathbf{2}$ <br> SVP | 13 | $\$ 216,596$ | 1.92 | 4.07 | $\$ 2,815,743$ |
| $\mathbf{3}$ <br> VP | 71 | $\$ 113,075$ | 1.48 | 2.12 | $\$ 8,028,321$ |
| $\mathbf{4}$ <br> Dir | 237 | $\$ 76,459$ | 1.22 | 1.44 | $\$ 18,120,834$ |
| $\mathbf{5}$ <br> Manager | 638 | $\$ 62,742$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 2}$ | 1.18 | $\$ 40,029,526$ |
| $\mathbf{6}$ <br> Superintendent <br> Engineer | 1693 | $\$ 61,712$ | 1.15 | 1.16 | $\$ 104,478,807$ |
| $\mathbf{7}$ <br> Supervisor | 946 | $\$ 53,855$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 1}$ | 1.01 | $\$ 50,947,025$ |
| $\mathbf{8}$ <br> Analyst | 181 | $\$ 53,246$ |  |  | $\$ 9,637,591$ |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{3 7 8 0}$ |  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 2 3 4 , 6 0 6 , 6 5 1}$ |

## CPS Energy 2005 Mgmt Structure / Internal Pay Analysis

- CEO to NEO Pay differential at 2.5 X is reasonable as long as CEO role is doing differential work - pay multiplier needs to be monitored challenge executive compensation survey bias to ratchet up CEO pay
- CEO (Work Level 5) to Director (Work Level 3 entry role) pay differential should be in the 4 to 5 times pay multiplier range \& should be monitored regarding setting CEO pay levels
- Consider implementing a Work Level based organization design and pay structure including internal pay equity and equitable pay differentials for each value added mgmt layer (Work Level)
- Ask CEO about the \# of Management Layers knowing the organization probably needs 5 Work Levels ( CEO to Front Line ) not 8 organizational layers
- Analyze \& Re-design Management Structure including removing non-value added management layers and excess enterprise compensation costs highlighted by small internal pay differentials


## Work Levels / Internal Pay Equity Multipliers Aligning differential work \& differential pay

- Works Levels for Management Structure Design \& Internal Pay Equity Multipliers for Differential Compensation
- Can keep CEO / NEO pay levels and pay differentials in check \& balance to the rest of the organization
- Minimize the risk of being of challenged on CEO pay by Institutional Investors, Moody's, media
- Provide a framework for the design of optimal management structure \& removal of excess enterprise compensation costs due to over-layering \& over-titling
- Ensure organization alignment between differential work justifying differential pay at all levels in the enterprise


## Guiding Principles For The Board \& Executive Management Executive Job Design \& Executive Pay

## Only Differential Executive Work Justifies Differential Executive Pay

If the Top 3 layers of senior management are doing the same work including:

- Accountabilities
- Performance metrics
- Performance periods

Then what is the unique value-add that justifies current CEO / NEO compensation levels?

Differential Executive Work is the necessary justification for Internal Pay Equity Multipliers between Levels of Management

## MVC Board \& CEO Clients Check For Wasted \& Excessive Enterprise Compensation



How many management layers are truly needed?

- What is the Internal Pay Equity Multiplier between each management layer?
- Pay Multiplier Red Flags !
- Organization Re-Design undertaken to remove \$ 30+ million in wasted compensation - from over-layering \& over-titling


## Sample Summary

Management Structure, Enterprise Cost of Management
\& Internal Pay Equity Multiplier Analysis
Company \$ 4 Billion Revenues and 4000 Employees

| Mgmt <br> Layer <br> Down <br> From <br> Board | \# of Mgmt FTE's | Median <br> Annual Total Management Compensation \& Benefits by Mgmt Layer | Mgmt <br> Layer to Mgmt Layer Pay Multiplier | Cumulative Pay Multiplier To Front Line Mgmt | 3 year <br> Fully Loaded Mgmt Costs Total Comp \& Benefits by Layer | Mgmt Layer $\%$ of 3 yr Total Cost of Mgmt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ \text { CEO } \end{gathered}$ | 1 | \$ 6,873,908 | 4.17 | 94.17 | \$ 20,621,724 | 10 \% |
| $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{2} \\ \text { EVP } \end{gathered}$ | 7 | \$ 1,647,489 | 5.47 | 22.57 | \$ 37,597,269 | 18 \% |
| $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ V P \text { \& } S V P \end{gathered}$ | 6 | \$ 301,192 | 1.88 | 4.13 | \$ 5,960,435 | 3 \% |
| $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{4} \\ \text { Snr Dir } \end{gathered}$ | 48 | \$ 159,841 | 1.04 | 2.19 | \$ 29,547,779 | 14 \% |
| $5$ <br> Directors | 35 | \$ 153,228 | 1.54 | $\underline{2.10}$ | \$ 15,790,520 | $7 \%$ |
| $6$ <br> Senior Mgr | 135 | \$ 99,522 | 1.09 | 1.36 | \$ 45,826,178 | 22 \% |
| $7$ <br> Manager | 50 | \$ 91,160 | 1.25 | 1.25 | \$ 17,897,343 | 8 \% |
| $8$ <br> Supervisor | 141 | \$ 72,994 |  |  | \$ 38,489,693 | 18 \% |
| TOTAL | 423 |  |  |  | \$ 211,730,941 | 100\% |
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## Executive Pay Needs A Balanced Decision Making Process

- Can't Determine Equitable vs. Excessive Compensation unless Board of Directors have analysis / insight on 4 tests:
- External Pay Equity = Pay Relative to Truly Comparable Work across companies with compensation calibrated to reflect the level of role complexity \& job worth differences
- Internal Pay Equity = Differential Work across levels in the managerial hierarchy - see Moody's \& ISS Red Flags
- Pay Relative to TOTAL Wealth = Already granted or earned over 5 to 10 yrs a tally sheet fully loaded
- Pay Relative to 3 to 5 yr Performance = Absolute \& relative to proper industry sector or appropriate peer groups:
- Revenue Growth, NOPAT \& Economic Profit Growth (real earnings), Free Cash Flow
- Return on Invested Capital and or Return on Equity
- Total Shareholder Return \&/or Market Value Added relative to a proper peer group

