

Alexander Hughes Management Performance Survey Key Figures with Comparative Figures

October 2016





We have named this latest edition of the Alexander Hughes Management Survey: **The Management Performance Survey** – a complete presentation of the performance by the approx. 1,600 biggest companies in Denmark based on Management Diversity, Continuity and Innovation. This edition also presents comparative figures from last year's survey.

In addition, the last part of this Survey also presents the performance of the **TOP 10** and the **BOTTOM 10** companies compared to the average company performance.

As usual, the Survey has been produced on the basis of figures reported to the Danish Business Authority by the companies themselves collected through the commercial databases, BiQ and Bisnode. Hence, the figures are 100 % factual.

Enjoy the reading!



Content	Page
Introduction	2
Table of contents	3
The big numbers	4
Companies' Management	4
Key figures	4
CEOs:	
Length of Service	5
Gender	5
Nationality	6
Exited CEOs	6
Chairmen of the Board (COBs)	7
The Boards:	
Diversity by foreigners	8
Number of Board members	8
The Companies:	
By Business sectors	9
By Company sizes	10
By Geography	10
TOP10 and BOTTOM10 performance:	
Performance by CEO length of service	11
Performance by CEO gender	11
Performance by CEO nationality	12
Performance by Chairman of the Board (COB) profile	13
Performance by Board composition	14
Performance by Business sectors	15
Performance by Company size and Geography	16



The overall figures

Approx. 1,100 of the 1,600 companies covered by the Survey, reported their turnover in their latest annual report (2015). The total **Turnover** for these companies was almost **DKK 3,200 bn** in 2015 (DKK 2,550 bn in 2014).

The total **Net Result** for all companies covered by the Survey was approx. **DKK 168 bn** (DKK 149 bn in 2014).

The total **Balance** for the companies covered by the Survey was **DKK 15,390 bn** (DKK 11,400 bn in 2014) and the **Equity** was **DKK 1,850 bn** (DKK 1,500 bn in 2014). In other words, the Survey presents the performance of a significant part of the total Danish industry.

Finally, the Survey also shows that well over 82 % of the companies made a profit and the remaining approx. 17 % of the companies made a loss in 2015. The corresponding figures for 2014 was 80 % and 20 %.

Executive Company Management

As in previous Surveys, we analyze and present company performance in terms of Executive and Non-Executive Management by diversity, continuity and innovation. In addition to this, we also analyze and present company performance by Business Sectors, Company Size and Geography.

Key Figures

To compare Company performance in terms of the composition of Executive and Non-Executive Management across Business Sectors, Company Size and geography, we do this by means of the commonly known and acknowledged key figures: ROIC (Return on Invested Capital), Profit Rate, Solvency and ROE (Return on Equity).

These figures are presented in the following format:

All Companies	% of all	comp.	RC	DIC	Profit rate		Solvency		ROE	
	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015
All companies	100	100	6.7	7.5	4.1	4.6	34.8	33.4	8.5	11.3

On the following pages, we present the Key Figures in the above table format in three different categories: By CEO profile, by COB (Chairman of the Board) profile and by the profile of the full Board of Directors.

Following the above, we also present the key figures by Business Sector, by Company Size and by Geography.



CEOs:

Length of Service

CEO length of	% of al	% of all comp.		ROIC		Profit rate		Solvency		DE
service	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015
>1 yr - 1 yr	15	16	2.5	3.0	2.3	2.1	32.5	33.0	-7.6	1.4
+1 - 3 yrs	20	22	5.1	6.6	3.2	4.7	33.2	33.5	4.8	8.9
+3 - 5 yrs	16	15	6.1	5.7	4.5	5.0	31.6	33.4	13.4	3.4
+5 - 10 yrs	26	24	8.6	9.9	5.1	6.6	36.9	31.2	10.6	20.4
+10 - 15 yrs	12	12	8.6	9.2	4.1	5.6	35.7	30.9	15.3	16.6
+15 yrs	10	11	9.7	10.3	6.4	1.3	39.6	36.8	18.5	12.9
All Companies	100	100	6.7	7.5	4.1	4.6	34.8	33.4	8.5	11.3

Last year, the conclusion on the above table was: the longer the length of service of a CEO, the higher ROIC is achieved. This year's table shows a deviation in that pattern since CEOs with 1 to 3 years of service perform a higher ROIC than the one performed by CEOs with 3 to 5 years of service.

Obviously, a successful CEO will tend to remain in his/her position thus continuously perform better and better the longer the service. A non-successful CEO would obviously eventually be replaced depending of the patience and priorities of the Board of Directors, hence a shorter length of service.

As mentioned above there is a deviation in this year's figures since CEOs with 1 to 3 years of service perform better than CEOs with 3 to 5 years of service.

As always however, the purpose of this Survey is not to draw conclusions but simply to present the facts. Therefore, we will leave it entirely up to the reader to draw his/her own conclusions on the above.

Gender

CEO Gender	% of (all comp.	RC	ROIC		t rate	Solvency		ROE	
	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015
Male	93	93	6.8	7.8	3.4	5.3	34.6	33.4	8.7	11.5
Female	7	7	5.2	4.0	0.5	-4.8	37.2	33.6	5.6	8.3
All	100	100	6.7	7.5	3.2	4.6	34.8	33.4	8.5	11.3

The above table shows that companies with a female CEO continuously perform the highest average Solvency Rate while companies with a male CEO continuously perform the highest average ROIC.

As it will show in a later section of this Survey the same applies for companies with a female respectively male Chairman of the Board.



Nationality

CEO Nationality	% of all	comp.	RC	ROIC		t rate	Solvency		ROE	
	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015
Danish	92	93	6.9	7.6	3.3	4.5	34.9	32.9	9.6	11.9
Foreign	8	7	4.2	6.1	2.1	5.2	33.0	39.7	-3.1	3.3
All	100	100	6.7	7.5	3.2	4.6	34.8	33.4	8.5	11.3

Last year's Survey showed that companies with a Danish CEO performed better than foreign CEOs on all Key Figures.

This year the Survey shows that companies with a Danish CEO perform better on ROIC and ROE while foreign CEOs are the better performers on Profit Rate and Solvency Rate. Be aware however, that due to the relatively small number of foreign CEOs, the percentage figures should be considered with some reservation.

Exited CEOs

CEO	% of all comp.		RC	ROIC		Profit rate		ency	ROE	
	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015
Exited	13	14	1.8	4.1	4.0	3.0	33.5	33.1	-10.1	2.6
All	100	100	6.7	7.5	3.3	4.6	34.9	33.9	8.3	11.3

The above table shows that in 2014 the CEO exited/was exited in 188 companies of the total approx. 1,600 companies comprised by the Survey. This equals 13 % of the companies. In 2015, the corresponding figures were 223 companies equaling 14 %.

Companies with an exited CEO clearly show a significantly lower ROIC and ROE than the average for all companies. It is obvious to conclude that the weaker performance illustrated by these lower Key Figures is the main reason for the CEO exit.



Chairman of the Board (COB):

СОВ	% o comp	f all anies	ROIC		Profit	: Rate	Solv	ency	ROE	
	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015
Length of Service:										
>1 yr - 1 yr	20	19	6.7	6.0	3.8	3.4	34.7	33.1	6.6	7.5
+1 - 3 yrs	29	30	4.8	6.4	2.8	4.6	33.5	35.2	4.3	15.1
+3 - 5 yrs	17	17	6.9	6.3	5.2	1.9	34.3	37.2	14.8	7.6
+5 - 10 yrs	21	22	8.9	9.0	4.8	5.7	34.9	28.4	9.9	11.3
+10 - 15 yrs	7	8	8.5	4.8	6.0	4.3	39.4	30.0	7.3	9.4
+15 yrs	6	4	8.0	8.3	4.7	5.8	39.2	38.3	10.5	11.3
Gender:										
Male	93	94	6.9	7.1	3.4	4.2	34.6	33.5	8.3	11.9
Female	7	6	6.6	6.9	1.1	3.5	39.9	43.1	7.6	5.0
Nationality										
Danish	72	70	7.0	7.4	3.0	5.3	34.1	32.8	9.4	11.5
Foreign	28	30	6.4	6.3	3.8	1.8	37.1	37.0	5.6	11.3
All Companies	100	100	6.8	7.0	3.2	4.2	34.9	34.1	8.3	11.5

Apart from one single factor, the above table like last year's survey shows, that there are no clear patterns or trends in company performance related to the COB nationality, gender og length of service.

For 2015 as well as for 2014 the single factor is the Solvency Rate in companies with a female COB. These companies perform a significantly higher Solvency Rate than companies with a male COB. In 2015, the difference is even bigger than it was in 2014 – 28 % respectively 15 %.



The Board of Directors

Diversity by nationality

Like last year's Survey, we also present company performance by the percentage of foreign members of the Board of Directors. The figures are shown in the table below:

% of foreigners in		% of comp		ROIC		Profit Rate		Solvency		ROE	
Board	Ź	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015
0 %		58	59	6.5	7.5	2.2	4.7	32.9	32.3	9.5	10.7
1-25 %		10	10	7.4	8.0	5.3	6.2	40.1	41.8	10.7	14.2
26-50 %		15	14	7.7	7.1	6.4	6.5	37.8	36.3	6.5	10.4
51-75 %		11	12	7.4	5.8	2.5	-2.7	36.1	32.6	6.6	15.5
76-99 %		1	1	-1.2	3.1	3.7	5.8	36.2	54.0	-2.4	-5.2
100%		4	4	4.8	8.0	2.4	4.3	36.8	41.3	-0.7	6.7

Last year's Survey showed that the best forming companies by ROIC were companies with 25 to 50 % foreign Board members. The best performing companies by ROE were companies with up to 25 % foreign Board members.

This year's Survey shows that companies with 50 to 75 % foreign Board members are the best performing by ROE while companies with up to 25 % and companies with 100 % foreign Board members respectively are the best performing by ROIC.

Number of Board members

Number of Board members	_	% of all companies		ROIC		Profit Rate		Solvency		ROE	
board members	2014	2014 2015		2015	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015	
1 - 2	1	1	3.5	-0.8	5.8	-9.2	42.0	20.1	11.8	5.9	
3	25	25	8.0	9.0	2.9	5.0	31.6	30.3	12.6	16.1	
4	14	15	6.7	6.1	3.8	4.8	33.3	30.9	8.1	1.9	
5	22	21	7.4	7.9	3.4	5.5	36.9	37.7	9.3	12.9	
6	16	15	7.3	7.4	5.1	5.5	38.4	37.6	7.6	9.5	
7-9	17	17	4.9	6.5	2.8	1.8	36.1	38.2	4.4	14.1	
+10	6	5	2.4	4.0	-2.0	4.0	30.8	34.0	-1.1	6.7	

Companies with three Board members are the best performing by ROIC in this year's Survey as well as they were in last year's Survey. The same also applies by ROE.



The companies

Most people if not all would agree that the single most important factor for the success and performance of a company is the employees and in particular the executive management (the board of directors and the executive committee) who's responsibility it is to decide and execute the strategy for the company to achieve its goals.

Therefore – and because it is the core competence of Alexander Hughes Executive Search Consultants to assist companies in finding and attracting top talent for their Executive Management teams, this Survey so far has analyzed company performance based on the composition of the management teams focusing on diversity, seniority and innovation.

Obviously, it is also interesting to see how companies perform by business sector, by company size and by the geographical region, in which they are located. Regardless of the composition of Executive Management.

Below, company performance in terms of Key Figures will be presented based on the above categories:

Business sectors

Business Sectors	% of all	comp.	RC	DIC	Profi	t rate	Solv	ency	RC	DE
	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015
Manufacturing, Raw materials, Agriculture and Forestry	37	36	8.3	8.8	5.6	5.6	39.7	39.3	11.2	10.0
Retail, Wholesale, Transportation, Distribution	29	27	4.1	5.8	3.3	3.7	32.1	33.0	-0.7	9.8
Proff. Services, Hotels, Restaurants, Media etc.	22	25	8.7	9.3	4.5	2.3	32.4	25.9	18.2	18.3
Finance and Real Estate	7	7	3.6	3.8	-1.3	7.5	26.4	30.3	4.3	12.1
Public Service, Utilities, Waste Mngt.	5	5	4.8	3.7	5.7	6.8	36.1	35.9	3.8	-8.9
All Companies	100	100	6.7	7.5	4.1	4.6	34.8	33.4	8.5	11.3

This year's Survey like last year's Survey shows that companies in the Professional Services Business Sector are the best performing in terms of ROIC and ROE.

Last year's Survey showed that companies within the Finance & Real Estate Business Sector had the weakest performance in terms of ROIC and ROE. The above table shows that this year the Public Services, Utilities etc. Business Sector is the weakest performing.



The Business Sector "Industry" continuously holds the largest number of companies representing almost 40 % of all companies in Denmark. These companies generate a ROIC above average while they generate a ROE slightly below average.

Companies by size

Company size	% of all	comp.	RC	ROIC		Profit rate		Solvency		ROE	
	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015	
100-250	58	61	6.9	7.8	4.1	3.4	34.0	32.2	9.3	11.6	
251-500	20	18	6.2	7.7	3.6	5.6	35.4	34.0	6.5	9.5	
501-1000	11	11	5.4	5.3	2.4	3.8	35.4	36.4	7.9	10.3	
1001-2500	7	6	7.1	8.1	5.0	7.4	36.5	37.6	12.6	15.4	
2501-5000	2	2	5.5	6.8	6.7	8.3	23.6	31.3	4.6	18.7	
+5001	2	2	9.4	7.9	11.3	7.5	36.6	37.7	8.1	2.5	
All companies	100	100	6.7	7.5	4.1	4.6	34.8	33.4	8.5	11.3	

Companies with 1001 to 2500 employees, perform the best ROIC at 8.1 %. Last year, the best performing companies were in the +5000 employees' category with an ROIC of 9.4 %

This year's Survey shows that companies with 1001 to 2500 and companies with 2501 to 5000 employees by far perform the best ROE. Last year the best performing companies in terms of ROE were in the 1001 to 2500 employees' category.

Geography

Geography	% of al	% of all comp.		ROIC		Profit rate		Solvency		ROE	
	2014	2014 2015 2		2015	2014	2015	2014	2015	2014	2015	
Greater Cph	40	39	6.0	6.4	3.4	3.2	32.2	31.0	6.4	9.4	
Zealand	10	11	6.1	8.8	2.2	6.4	40.2	39.5	8.5	6.9	
Funen	7	7	4.7	7.1	5.1	4.9	34.3	35.0	-2.7	5.3	
Sth. Jutland	20	21	7.8	7.9	4.7	4.8	35.7	37.2	10.9	9.6	
Mid Jutland	15	15	7.9	8.8	5.9	6.2	35.6	29.1	14.3	21.3	
Nth. Jutland	8	7	7.2	8.1	5.3	6.0	36.8	34.6	11.4	17.1	
All companies	100	100	6.7	7.5	4.1	4.6	34.8	33.4	8.5	11.3	

Distributed by geography, the picture in terms of performance by ROIC is quite different from last year. This year, companies in Zealand and Mid Jutland perform the best ROIC while the best ROE is performed by companies in Mid- and North Jutland.

The weakest ROIC is performed by companies in the Greater Copenhagen area which was also the case last year. This year companies in Funen perform the weakest ROE, which was also the case last year.



Average company performance compared to TOP10 and BOTTOM10

Company performance by CEO Length of Service

CEO Length of	% o	% of all companies	nies		ROIC			Profit Rate			Solvency			ROE	
Service	Top10	2015	2015 Bottom10 Top10	Top10	2015	Bottom10	Top10	2015	Bottom10	Top10	2015	Bottom10	Top10	2015	Bottom10
>1 yr - 1 yr	6	16	29	35.9	3.0	-24.0	20.8	2.1	-17.8	43.4	33.0	10.2	32.3	1.4	-76.5
+1 - 3 yrs	19	22	56	38.8	9.9	-14.6	37.5	4.7	-14.6	44.9	33.5	14.2	121.0	8.9	-96.1
+3 - 5 yrs	15	15	18	31.1	5.7	-25.5	14.6	2.0	-13.9	48.9	33.4	17.1	50.3	3.4	-106.7
+5 - 10 yrs	32	24	14	34.2	6.6	-22.8	17.8	9.9	-41.0	43.2	31.2	-74.7	91.9	20.4	-110.4
+10 - 15 yrs	14	12	∞	32.6	9.2	-7.5	14.3	5.6	-4.4	38.4	30.9	14.8	6.79	16.6	-64.2
+15 yrs	11	11	2	34.2	10.3	-23.9	19.9	1.3	-151.0	47.6	36.8	33.8	51.2	12.9	-125.6
All companies	100	100	100	35.8	7.5	-20.9	21.6	4.6	-25.0	45.0	33.4	2.3	80.5	11.3	-95.5

Company performance by CEO Gender

CEO Gender	% 01	% of all companies	anies		ROIC			Profit Rate	a _		Solvency			ROE	
	Top10	2015	Top10 2015 Bottom10 Top10	Top10	2015	Bottom10 Top10	Top10	2015	2015 Bottom10 Top10	Top10		2015 Bottom10 Top10	Top10	2015	2015 Bottom10
Male	91	93	87	36.4	7.8	-19.8	21.9	5.3	-17.8	45.4	33.4	9.0	80.0	11.5	-96.4
Female	6	7	13	27.5	4.0	-27.5	14.9	-4.8	-66.1	37.6	33.6	13.1	79.8	8.3	-85.6
All companies	100	100	100	35.8	7.5	-20.9	21.6	4.6	-25.0	45.0	33.4	2.3	80.5	11.3	-95.5

Ξ



Company performance by CEO nationality

CEO Nationality	% of all companies	npanies		ROIC			Profit Rate	o _		Solvency			ROE	
Top	10 2015	Top10 2015 Bottom10 Top10	Top10	2015	Bottom10 Top10	Top10	2015	2015 Bottom10 Top10	Top10		2015 Bottom10 Top10	Top10		2015 Bottom10
Danish 96	93	91	35.5	9.7	-21.1	21.7	4.5	-26.6	44.8	32.9	1.5	81.1	11.9	-97.5
Foreign 4	7	6	37.2	6.1	-17.7	15.5	5.2	-12.7	44.4	39.7	9.3	55.8	3.3	9.69-
All companies 100	0 100	100	35.8	7.5	-20.9	21.6	4.6	-25.0	45.0	33.4	2.3	80.5	11.3	-95.5



Company performance by Chairman of the Board (COB) profile

	-	:						:			-				
COB	%	% of all companies	anies		ROIC			Profit Rate			Solvency			ROE	
	Top10	2015	Bottom10	Top10	2015	Bottom10	Top10	2015	Bottom10	Top10	2015	Bottom10	Top10	2015	Bottom10
Length of Service:															
>1 yr - 1 yr	19	19	72	35.2	0.9	-17.9	16.3	3.4	-12.9	41.1	33.1	21.4	123.2	7.5	-98.6
+1 - 3 yrs	27	30	28	33.4	6.4	-28.4	20.4	4.6	-18.9	47.1	35.2	5.3	100.5	15.1	-68.7
+3 - 5 yrs	17	17	20	32.8	6.3	-25.6	16.1	1.9	-56.2	44.2	37.2	17.7	59.3	9.2	-91.2
+5 - 10 yrs	27	22	16	36.4	0.6	-17.9	18.6	5.7	-32.6	47.2	28.4	-72.8	55.1	11.3	-100.1
+10 - 15 yrs	7	8	7	17.0	4.8	-8.7	7.4	4.3	-17.0	30.2	30.0	13.2	25.6	9.4	-64.9
+15 yrs	4	4	1	31.5	8.3	-20.2	15.5	5.8	6.6-	50.4	38.3	18.1	49.6	11.3	-103.8
Gender:															
Male	91	94	91	34.3	7.1	-22.8	18.0	4.2	-27.9	45.0	33.5	-1.9	83.2	11.9	-88.2
Female	6	9	6	31.1	6.9	-13.2	14.5	3.5	-10.1	49.7	43.1	24.4	53.7	2.0	-78.5
Nationality:															
Danish	33	70	29	34.4	7.4	-21.5	18.5	5.3	-22.0	44.4	32.8	-7.6	78.0	11.5	-98.7
Foreign	29	30	11	33.4	6.3	-22.5	16.3	1.8	-30.2	47.5	37.0	11.8	85.5	11.3	-71.5
All companies	100	100	100	34.0	7.0	-22.0	17.7	4.2	-26.0	45.5	34.1	0.4	80.5	11.5	-87.4





Company performance by share of foreigners in the Board of Directors

% foreigners in	%	% of all companies	nies		ROIC			Profit Rate			Solvency			ROE	
boards	Top10	2015	2015 Bottom10 Top10	Top10	2015	Bottom10	Top10	2015	Bottom10	Top10	2015	Bottom10	Top10	2015	Bottom10
% 0	26	29	52	34.4	7.5	-20.4	17.8	4.7	-21.0	44.7	32.3	32.3	9.62	10.7	-95.1
1-25 %	11	10	11	34.1	8.0	-12.7	22.0	6.2	-14.8	48.7	41.8	41.8	52.3	14.2	-34.2
26-50 %	15	14	14	31.7	7.1	-23.0	16.2	6.5	-13.6	48.0	36.3	36.3	51.3	10.4	-77.8
51-75 %	15	12	18	38.4	5.8	-29.1	18.2	-2.7	-43.7	42.4	32.6	32.6	110.9	15.5	9.69-
% 66-92	0		1		3.1	-24.8		5.8	-15.0		54.0	54.0		-5.2	-118.0
100%	က		4	30.2	8.0	6.6-	13.4	4.3	-33.8	48.5	41.3	41.3	58.1	6.7	-123.8

Company performance by number of members in the Board of Directors

Number of Board	%	% of all companies	nies		ROIC			Profit Rate			Solvency			ROE	
members	Top10	2015	2015 Bottom10 Top10	Top10	2015	Bottom10	Top10	2015	Bottom10	Top10	2015	Bottom10	Top10	2015	Bottom10
1 - 2	က	1	4	29.4	-0.8	-29.7	5.4	-9.2	-42.0	37.9	20.1	-21.9	61.1	5.9	-54.5
3	30	25	24	35.0	0.6	-18.3	16.6	2.0	-11.8	44.5	30.3	-34.3	103.5	16.1	-95.7
4	17	15	23	35.2	6.1	-24.2	18.8	4.8	-11.6	43.2	30.9	2.7	41.5	1.9	-95.4
Ŋ	25	2.1	16	32.1	7.9	-26.8	15.6	5.5	-10.3	46.8	37.7	24.2	58.1	12.9	-80.3
9	12	15	14	30.8	7.4	-20.4	17.2	5.5	-13.2	44.2	37.6	24.0	50.5	9.5	-96.1
6-2	Ħ	17	17	41.2	6.5	-16.5	24.1	1.8	-59.4	49.2	38.2	21.4	137.5	14.1	-59.1
+10	3	2	3	37.2	4.0	-9.6	28.0	4.0	-40.5	51.4	34.0	45.7	44.0	6.7	-22.6



Company performance by Business Sector

Public Sector Properties Properties															
2015 Bottomilo Topilo 2015 2016	%	f all compa	nies		ROIC			Profit Rate			Solvency			ROE	
36 29 34.3 8.8 -15.6 20.0 5.6 -16.4 47.9 39.3 19.0 45.7 10.0 27 32 35.3 5.8 -26.4 30.8 3.7 -19.9 44.2 33.0 -1.6 109.1 9.8 25 28 36.6 9.3 -20.9 15.1 2.3 44.9 41.4 25.9 -17.2 100.9 18.3 7 3 35.3 3.8 -9.8 21.5 7.5 -35.1 56.6 30.3 15.1 52.4 12.1 5 9 37.7 3.7 -20.3 30.1 6.8 -15.5 43.6 35.9 17.5 55.8 -8.9 100 100 35.8 7.5 -20.9 21.6 -4.6 -25.0 33.4 2.3 80.5 11.3	Top10	2015	Bottom10	Top10	2015	Bottom10	Top10	2015	Bottom10	Top10	2015	Bottom10	Top10	2015	Bottom10
27 32 35.3 5.8 -26.4 30.8 3.7 -19.9 44.2 33.0 -1.6 109.1 9.8 25 28 36.6 9.3 -20.9 15.1 2.3 -44.9 41.4 25.9 -17.2 100.9 18.3 7 3 35.3 3.8 -9.8 21.5 7.5 -35.1 56.6 30.3 15.1 52.4 12.1 5 9 37.7 3.7 -20.3 30.1 6.8 -15.5 43.6 35.9 17.5 55.8 -8.9 100 35.8 7.5 -20.9 21.6 4.6 -25.0 33.4 2.3 80.5 11.3	34	36	29	34.3	8.8	-15.6	20.0	5.6	-16.4	47.9	39.3	19.0	45.7	10.0	-86.5
25 28 36.6 9.3 -20.9 15.1 2.3 -44.9 41.4 25.9 -17.2 100.9 18.3 7 3 35.3 3.8 -9.8 21.5 7.5 -35.1 56.6 30.3 15.1 52.4 12.1 5 9 37.7 3.7 -20.3 30.1 6.8 -15.5 43.6 35.9 17.5 55.8 -8.9 100 100 35.8 7.5 -20.9 21.6 4.6 -25.0 33.4 2.3 80.5 11.3	19	27	32	35.3	5.8	-26.4	30.8	3.7	-19.9	44.2	33.0	-1.6	109.1	9.8	-108.3
7 3 35.3 3.8 -9.8 21.5 7.5 -35.1 56.6 30.3 15.1 52.4 12.1 5 9 37.7 3.7 -20.3 30.1 6.8 -15.5 43.6 35.9 17.5 55.8 -8.9 100 100 35.8 7.5 -20.9 21.6 4.6 -25.0 33.4 2.3 80.5 11.3	39	25	28	36.6	9.3	-20.9	15.1	2.3	-44.9	41.4	25.9	-17.2	100.9	18.3	-91.2
5 9 37.7 3.7 -20.3 30.1 6.8 -15.5 43.6 35.9 17.5 55.8 -8.9 100 100 35.8 7.5 -20.9 21.6 4.6 -25.0	4	7	m	35.3	89.	8.6-	21.5	7.5	-35.1	56.6	30.3	15.1	52.4	12.1	4.5
100 35.8 7.5 -20.9 21.6 4.6 -25.0	4	S	6	37.7	3.7	-20.3	30.1	6.8	-15.5	43.6	35.9	17.5	55.8	6.8-	-110.6
	100	100	100	35.8	7.5	-20.9	21.6	4.6	-25.0	45.0	33.4	2.3	80.5	11.3	-95.5





Company performance by Company Size

Company size	% 01	% of all companies	nies		ROIC			Profit Rate	ø		Solvency			ROE	
	Top10	2015	Bottom10 Top10	Top10	2015	Bottom10	Top10	2015	Bottom10	Top10	2015	Bottom10	Top10	2015	Bottom10
100-250	89	61	64	34.9	7.8	-22.5	16.2	3.4	-36.3	44.6	32.2	-2.1	89.1	11.6	-107.1
251-500	20	18	21	34.9	7.7	-16.9	19.2	9.9	-10.3	39.8	34.0	10.5	64.1	9.5	-95.7
501-1000	9	11	6	37.5	5.3	-24.2	19.3	3.8	-18.6	50.1	36.4	-3.0	51.4	10.3	-39.9
1001-2500	4	9	4	43.0	8.1	-12.6	59.9	7.4	-19.1	63.3	37.6	26.0	71.9	15.4	-19.4
2501-5000	1	2	1	36.2	8.9	-6.4	27.3	8.3	-1.0	45.2	31.3	10.0	57.6	18.7	-48.8
+5001	2	7	2	46.5	7.9	-15.6	37.7	7.5	-18.9	46.9	37.7	22.9	51.1	2.5	-122.3
Alle	100	100	100	35.6	7.5	-20.8	21.3	4.6	-24.8	44.8	33.4	2.2	80.0	11.3	-94.9

Company performance by Geography

Geography	%	% of all companies	nies		ROIC			Profit Rate	d)		Solvency			ROE	
	Top10	2015	Bottom10 Top10	Top10	2015	Bottom10	Top10	2015	Bottom10	Top10	2015	Bottom10	Top10	2015	Bottom10
Greater Cph	45	39	54	38.9	6.4	-25.1	24.0	3.2	-34.1	44.7	31.0	5.7	91.0	9.4	-108.5
Zealand	12	11	7	31.9	80.00	-15.2	20.4	6.4	-12.3	47.7	39.5	20.5	53.3	6.9	-65.9
Funen	80	7	7	31.4	7.1	-18.4	18.3	4.9	-16.2	33.7	35.0	23.7	51.1	5.3	-117.2
Sth. Jutland	16	21	18	33.0	7.9	-16.7	17.5	4.8	-14.6	51.0	37.2	23.7	51.9	9.6	-82.8
Mid Jutland	16	15	11	33.8	80.00	-14.6	15.3	6.2	-7.1	44.1	29.1	-84.2	110.1	21.3	-73.3
Nth. Jutland	4	7	4	34.4	8.1	-11.0	24.4	0.9	6.9-	36.1	34.6	39.3	82.4	17.1	-34.7
All companies	100	100	100	35.6	7.5	-20.8	21.3	4.6	-24.8	44.8	33.4	2.2	80.0	11.3	-94.9