

The complaint

Mr M complains about the suitability of the advice provided by Inspirational Financial Management Ltd (“IFM”) in November 2017 to transfer the value of his safeguarded benefits in the British Steel Pension Scheme (“BSPS”) to a personal pension plan (“PPP”).

Mr M is represented in this complaint by a legal firm (“Representative”).

What happened

Mr M built up safeguarded benefits in the BSPS while employed by Tata Steel UK Ltd (“Tata Steel”). The BSPS was a defined benefits (“DB”) pension scheme that provided a guaranteed lifetime income to members.

In March 2016, Tata Steel announced that it would be examining options to restructure its business including decoupling the BSPS from the company. The consultation with members referred to possible outcomes regarding their safeguarded benefits, one of which was a transfer to the Pension Protection Fund (“PPF”) – the PPF is a statutory fund designed to provide compensation to members of DB pension schemes when their employer becomes insolvent. Tata Steel closed the BSPS to further benefit accrual from 31 March 2017. By that point, Mr M had built up 6 years and 8 months’ pensionable service in the BSPS between September 2009 and May 2016. His aggregated annual scheme pension as at the date of leaving the scheme was £3,199.48. This would be revalued over the term to retirement by a prescribed amount (by September 2017 it had been revalued to £3,281.64).

In May 2017, the PPF announced that the terms of a Regulated Apportionment Arrangement (“RAA”) had been agreed. This was approved by The Pensions Regulator in August 2017 – under the announced plans, Tata Steel agreed to set up and sponsor a new DB pension scheme, the BSPS2, subject to certain conditions relating to funding and size being satisfied. Members were told that if the re-structure was approved, they would have three options regarding their safeguarded benefits:

1. Transfer to the PPF;
2. Transfer to the BSPS2; or
3. Transfer to an alternative pension plan such as a PPP

In September 2017, terms of the re-structure were confirmed enabling trustees of the BSPS to start to talk to members in detail. This led to the ‘*Time to Choose*’ communication pack being issued to members, including Mr M, in October 2017. The pack provided more detail about the three options available and was intended to help members choose an option.

Mr M was concerned about what the announced changes meant for the security of his safeguarded benefits and wanted advice on his options. He contacted another business (“Firm A”) to get advice. Since Firm A didn’t have the necessary regulatory permissions to advise on pension transfers, it introduced Mr M to IFM. A document titled ‘*Pension Review Questionnaire*’ was used by IFM to record information about Mr M. Large sections of that document weren’t completed or left unanswered. From the sections that were completed, the following information about Mr M was recorded in October 2017:

- He was aged 25, single and in good health. He didn't have anyone financially dependent on him;
- He was employed full-time by Tata Steel and paid gross annual income of about £35,000. He didn't expect his employment status to change in the foreseeable future.
- He didn't have any assets or liabilities;
- In addition to the value of his safeguarded benefits in the BSPS, he had been a member of Tata Steel's defined contribution ("DC") pension scheme since June 2017. The total annual contribution paid into his DC plan was 12% of his gross annual salary. The value of his DC plan at that time wasn't recorded. He was also on course to receive the full state pension at age 68; and
- Through his employment he had a lump sum death in service benefit of six times' his salary;

IFM's adviser issued his suitability report on 6 November 2017. This explained to Mr M that he had three options regarding his safeguarded benefits, as previously communicated by the BSPS. The BSPS offered Mr M a transfer value of £68,504.82 in respect of his pensionable service if he transferred to a PPP.

It was stated in the suitability report that Mr M's primary objective regarding his safeguarded benefits was to retire earlier than the BSPS normal retirement age of 65, preferably around age 55 if his financial situation allowed it. There was also reference to Mr M preferring to draw flexible benefits, obtaining control over the value of his benefits and investment choice, and to maximise death benefits. It was noted that on a scale of 1 to 6 where 1 (Risk Averse) was lowest risk and 6 (Aggressive) was highest risk, his risk profile was determined to be 3 or 'Conservative' risk. This was defined as, *"You understand that you need to take investment risk in order to be able to meet your long-term goals. On this basis, you are willing to take a risk with at least part of your available assets"*.

In reference to the critical yield, the adviser stated in the suitability report, *"I can confirm that our analysis to date of the British Steel Scheme has shown that annual investment returns of typically around 8.0% p.a. are required in order to match the benefits available at 65 from the 'current' British Steel scheme"*.

IFM's adviser discounted the PPF and BSPS2 options and instead recommended that Mr M accept the transfer value of £68,504.82 and transfer to a PPP provided by Royal London for the following reasons:

- *"You require the flexibility to control and tailor the frequency and amount of income you receive from your pension fund in retirement to suit your circumstances, needs and tax position, as opposed to the pre-set (albeit guaranteed) income that your existing defined benefits pension would provide."*
- *You want to ensure you can retire when you want and do not want to take the risk of having restrictions in place when the scheme enters the PPF or it becomes the 'new' British Steel Pension Scheme."*
- *You are prepared to accept more risk in return for greater flexibility over when and how benefits are withdrawn from your pension fund."*

The charges associated with the recommendation and deducted from the PPP fund value were as follows:

Initial advice charge

- 2.9% (or £2,000) – initial adviser charge for recommendation and implementation

Ongoing annual charges

- 0.45% investment annual management charge (the product charge was noted as “nil”)
- The basis of the recommendation was that following the pension transfer, Firm A, who introduced Mr M to IFM, would provide ongoing advice regarding the management and investment of the recommended PPP. In connection with this, IFM’s adviser stated in the suitability report, *“It is important that your funds and financial planning arrangements are reviewed at regular intervals to ensure that they remain suitable. I understand this service will be provided by [Firm A]. The cost of this provision can be paid directly by you or can be taken from your pension fund on an ongoing basis. This is something you and [Firm A] will need to discuss and agree on”*. The cost of that ongoing advice wasn’t stated in the suitability report.

Mr M accepted the recommendation, following which the transfer to the PPP was completed. IFM recommended that the PPP fund value be invested in Royal London’s ‘*Governed Portfolio 1*’ fund to align with Mr M’s ‘*Conservative*’ risk profile. According to the suitability report, the investment objective of the ‘*Governed Portfolio 1*’ fund was, *“This portfolio aims to deliver above inflation growth in the value of the fund at retirement, whilst taking a level of risk consistent with a cautious risk attitude over a long time period”*.

This complaint

During 2022, the Representative, on behalf of Mr M, complained to IFM about the suitability of the pension transfer advice it had given him in 2017. In its view, the pension transfer advice was unsuitable and had caused Mr M to suffer a financial loss.

IFM didn’t uphold this complaint. In summary, it stated that Mr M was concerned about the issues surrounding Tata Steel and the security of his safeguarded benefits in the BPS. It considered that the continuing uncertainty at the time was sufficient reason for Mr M to transfer away so that he could obtain control of his safeguarded benefits and benefit from the flexibility to withdraw variable amounts of money when he retired. Overall, it was satisfied it had adhered to and considered relevant FCA rules and guidance including providing Mr M with all the necessary information and risk warnings in good time to be able to make an informed decision. It didn’t believe the alternative options of the PPF or BPS2 could’ve met Mr M’s objectives. In its view, the pension transfer to the PPP was in his best interests and so was therefore suitable.

In March 2023, one of our investigators considered this complaint and recommended that it be upheld because, in her view, IFM failed to demonstrate at the time that transferring to the PPP was clearly in Mr M’s best interests compared to the alternative options. She thought suitable advice would’ve been to transfer to the BPS2. To put things right, our investigator recommended that IFM carry out a redress calculation in line with the FCA’s guidelines on the basis that Mr M transferred to the BPS2, retired at age 65 and would be a 20% income taxpayer in retirement.

The Representative, on behalf of Mr M, accepted our investigator’s assessment but provided

some additional comments about the proposed redress methodology. Our investigator considered those comments but wasn't persuaded to change her mind. IFM didn't provide a response to our investigator. Since agreement couldn't be reached, this complaint has been referred to me to review and decide. This is the last stage of our process.

What I've decided – and why

I've considered all the available evidence and arguments to decide what's fair and reasonable in the circumstances of this complaint.

In deciding on what's fair and reasonable, I've taken into account relevant law and regulations, regulator's rules, guidance and standards and codes of practice, and what I consider to have been good industry practice at the time. And where the evidence is incomplete, inconclusive or contradictory, I reach my conclusions on the balance of probabilities – that is, what I think is more likely than not to have happened based on the available evidence and the wider surrounding circumstances.

I'd like to clarify that the purpose of this decision isn't to repeat or address every single point raised by the parties. If I haven't commented on any specific point, it's because I don't believe it's affected what I think is the right outcome.

IFM's response to this complaint

IFM issued a final response letter to Mr M rejecting this complaint. But it didn't provide a response to our investigator's assessment. It's unclear why. Regardless of its reasons, I've decided that IFM has had sufficient time to respond and provide any additional comments or evidence for me to consider. Based on the available contemporaneous evidence, I'm satisfied that I have sufficient information to be able to decide this complaint.

The FCA's applicable rules and guidance

The below isn't a comprehensive list of the rules and regulations which applied at the time of the advice but provides useful context for my assessment of IFM's actions here.

PRIN 6 : A firm must pay due regard to the interests of its customers and treat them fairly

PRIN 7: A firm must pay due regard to the information needs of its clients, and communicate information to them in a way which is clear, fair and not misleading

PRIN 9: A firm must take reasonable care to ensure the suitability of its advice and discretionary decisions for any customer who is entitled to rely upon its judgment

COBS 2.1.1R: A firm must act honestly, fairly and professionally in accordance with the best interests of its client (the client's best interests rule)

COBS 4.2.1R: A firm must ensure that a communication or a financial promotion is fair, clear and not misleading

The suitability rules and guidance that applied when IFM advised Mr M were set out in COBS 9.2. The relevant rules were COBS 9.2.1R and 9.2.2R.

The provision in COBS 19 which specifically relate to a DB pension transfer were as follows:

COBS 19.1.2R required the following:

“A firm must:

(1) compare the benefits likely (on reasonable assumptions) to be paid under a defined benefits pension scheme or other pension scheme with safeguarded benefits with the benefits afforded by a personal pension scheme, stakeholder pension scheme or other pension scheme with flexible benefits, before it advises a retail client to transfer out of a defined benefits pension scheme or other pension scheme with safeguarded benefits;

(2) ensure that that comparison includes enough information for the client to be able to make an informed decision;

(3) give the client a copy of the comparison, drawing the client's attention to the factors that do and do not support the firm's advice, in good time, and in any case no later than when the key features document is provided; and

(4) take reasonable steps to ensure that the client understands the firm's comparison and its advice.”

And COBS 19.1.3 G stated:

“In particular, the comparison should:

(1) take into account all of the retail client's relevant circumstances;

(2) have regard to the benefits and options available under the ceding scheme and the effect of replacing them with the benefits and options under the proposed scheme;

(3) explain the assumptions on which it is based and the rates of return that would have to be achieved to replicate the benefits being given up;

(4) be illustrated on rates of return which take into account the likely expected returns of the assets in which the retail client's funds will be invested; and

(5) where an immediate crystallisation of benefits is sought by the retail client prior to the ceding scheme's normal retirement age, compare the benefits available from crystallisation at normal retirement age under that scheme.”

Under the heading “Suitability”, the following was set out:

COBS 19.1.6G:

“When advising a retail client who is, or is eligible to be, a member of a defined benefits occupational pension scheme or other scheme with safeguarded benefits whether to transfer, convert or opt-out, a firm should start by assuming that a transfer, conversion or opt-out will not be suitable. A firm should only then consider a transfer, conversion or opt-out to be suitable if it can clearly demonstrate, on contemporary evidence, that the transfer, conversion or opt-out is in the client's best interests”

COBS 19.1.7G:

“When a firm advises a retail client on a pension transfer, pension conversion or pension opt-out, it should consider the client’s attitude to risk including, where relevant, in relation to the rate of investment growth that would have to be achieved to replicate the benefits being given up.”

COBS 19.1.7B:

“In considering whether to make a personal recommendation, a firm should not regard a rate of return which may replicate the benefits being given up from the defined benefits pension scheme or other scheme with safeguarded benefits as sufficient in itself.

COBS 19.1.8G:

“When a firm prepares a suitability report it should include:

(1) a summary of the advantages and disadvantages of its personal recommendation;

(2) an analysis of the financial implications (if the recommendation is to opt-out); and

(3) a summary of any other material information.”

Businesses are required to follow these rules and consider the guidance because the FCA considers safeguarded benefits to be valuable. Based on the above regulatory rules and guidance, businesses advising on pension transfers should start by assuming that the existing DB pension scheme is suitable and to only recommend a transfer, which converts safeguarded benefits into flexible benefits, if it can *clearly* demonstrate it’s in their client’s best interests.

In assessing the suitability of IFM’s advice to Mr M, it’s necessary for me to have due regard to the FCA’s rules and guidance stated above.

Mr M’s situation when IFM advised him

The situation for Mr M wasn’t normal because the existing DB pension scheme, the BSPS, was closing. So he was essentially forced to transfer the value of his safeguarded benefits to a new scheme. Three options were available, as stated by the BSPS in its ‘*Time to Choose*’ communication pack and repeated by IFM in its suitability report.

The BSPS was one of the largest DB pension schemes in the UK with approximately 125,000 members. It’s undeniable that it was a period of great uncertainty for BSPS members, many of whom had been largely passive pension savers and found themselves having to make major and irreversible choices about their financial futures. I think it’s fair to say that many members were in a vulnerable position due to the uncertainty surrounding the future of the BSPS. As a result, I think it was essential for any regulated adviser making a recommendation to a BSPS member to have a detailed understanding of each of the options available and of their customer’s personal circumstances.

The PPF and BSPS2 options provided guaranteed lifetime income but there were differences between them for deferred members like Mr M. The PPF was designed to provide members with at least 90% of their starting pension value but the BSPS2 was designed to provide members with 100%. The PPF was likely the better option for unmarried members who expected to retire early or take the maximum tax-free cash available even allowing for the 10% reduction in the starting entitlement. But the BSPS2 was likely the

better option for married members or those who expected to draw benefits at or close to the scheme normal retirement age of 65. The BSPS2 provided the potential for discretionary increases to the scheme pension, a higher level of spouse's pension and the option to transfer to a PPP at a later date, if then deemed suitable. The benefits available under the PPP option would be dependent on the performance of underlying investments and annuity rates available at retirement – in other words, there were no guarantees regarding the level of benefits paid.

I don't believe that the circumstances surrounding the BSPS altered the FCA's position or its expectations of firms. Given the FCA's view on safeguarded benefits and what was known at that time, it's my fair and reasonable opinion that IFM should've considered that the BSPS2 was likely to be the better option for Mr M based on his personal circumstances and the uncertainty about when he would be able to retire. And so it's my view that IFM should've only recommended a transfer to the PPP in favour of the BSPS2 if it could clearly demonstrate why it was in Mr M's best interests, as referenced in COBS 19.1.6G.

Having considered the evidence, I agree with the investigator's view that IFM's pension transfer advice to Mr M was unsuitable for largely the same reasons. My view can be summarised as follows:

- The primary purpose of a pension is to meet the income needs of an individual during retirement. Mr M's safeguarded benefits, accounting for 6 years and 8 months' pensionable service, represented his most valuable asset built up by that time. He didn't have any other assets which could be used to support his retirement income needs. I acknowledge that given his age and an investment time frame of at least 30 years, it was likely Mr M would build up significant DC pension savings elsewhere by retirement, thereby reducing the reliance on his safeguarded benefits. But that didn't mean it was suitable to relinquish valuable benefit guarantees at that time. In my view, Mr M had a limited capacity for loss at that point. So I think it was important not to expose the value of his safeguarded benefits to unnecessary risk by treating flexibility, control and maximisation of death benefits as a high priority at the expense of the primary income purpose when he couldn't access benefits for at least 30 years – unless there was a clearly suitable reason to do so;
- According to the suitability report, the primary aim of the pension transfer was so that Mr M could retire early, from around age 55 if his financial situation allowed it. But he was then aged 25 and so couldn't access any benefits until age 55 at the earliest under the PPP. In my view, with such a time frame until pension benefits could be accessed, it made the case for a pension transfer at that time – for the sake of achieving possible early retirement – more difficult to justify. Notwithstanding this point, it seems that there was some uncertainty about Mr M's planned retirement age. I say this because other sections in the suitability report indicated that the planned retirement age was 65. And in the document titled '*Pension Review Questionnaire*' a handwritten note stated "*Too young to say*" next to the section regarding Mr M's planned retirement age. So it's unclear where the target retirement age of 55 stated in the suitability report came from;
- IFM stated that early retirement at age 55 was allowed under the PPF and BSPS subject to a reduction in the annual pension income. I think it portrayed the reduction as a penalty. But it wasn't a penalty. Rather, the reduction was applied to reflect the fact that the scheme would have to support the income for longer than anticipated, and to protect the interests of scheme members generally. And so, based on what IFM said, it's likely Mr M incorrectly believed he would be unfairly treated if he took benefits early under the BSPS2 (or PPF);

- IFM portrayed the PPP option as allowing for early retirement earlier than age 65 without penalty. I think this was misleading. The reality was of course that the PPP would've had less time to grow if accessed earlier than age 65 and any resulting income would need to last longer. I cannot see that this was adequately explained to Mr M so that he could understand accessing any of the available options early would likely lead to reduced retirement income during his lifetime compared to taking benefits at age 65. So I think he made the decision to transfer from an uninformed position in this regard;
- As noted above, the basis of the advice wasn't to enable Mr M to retire immediately but instead at some indeterminate point in the future. The further away from retirement an individual is, the harder it is to establish a realistic income figure and whether early retirement would in fact be possible. I think it would've been difficult to calculate an accurate income figure with the 30-year time frame to age 55. There's no evidence that IFM recorded Mr M's target retirement income need when it advised him. Without understanding his retirement income need, I cannot see how IFM was able to clearly demonstrate that transferring to a PPP at that time was in Mr M's best interests;
- Overall, it's my view that IFM failed to obtain the necessary information relating to Mr M's financial situation including his anticipated income and expenditure during retirement when assessing whether it was suitable for him to transfer to a PPP to achieve his early retirement objective. It may well have been the case that Mr M's retirement income need could've been met by the BPS2 but IFM failed to establish this. Ultimately, however, there's insufficient evidence to demonstrate why it was in Mr M's best interests to transfer at that time to achieve his early retirement objective or whether he could in fact retire earlier than age 65;
- In connection with Mr M's investment knowledge and experience, IFM recorded that he had *"about as much understanding as the next person"*. I don't know what this vague description means or what it was based on. At the time of the advice Mr M didn't have any savings or investments that indicated he had experience of investing. I haven't seen any evidence that persuades me he understood the investment, inflation and longevity risks associated with his safeguarded benefits being transferred from the scheme to a PPP. Those risks would've been retained by the BPS2 had he transferred to that scheme – I cannot see that there was any compelling reason for Mr M to take on those risks at that time;
- Had IFM advised Mr M to transfer to the BPS2 he would've maintained safeguarded benefits and retained the option to transfer to a PPP at a later date, if then deemed suitable, when he could immediately access benefits and, crucially, determine his retirement income and lump sum needs with far greater accuracy than at age 25;
- IFM recorded that Mr M preferred flexible income rather than guaranteed lifetime income. It's unclear why Mr M apparently didn't value guaranteed income. He had received guaranteed income all his working life. So I think a guaranteed retirement income from another source such as the BPS2 before state pension age would've been valuable for an individual in his circumstances;
- IFM recorded that Mr M was *"prepared to accept more risk in return for greater flexibility over when and how benefits are withdrawn from your pension fund"*. Flexibility and control might sound attractive, but I can't see that Mr M had any concrete need for it. I'm not persuaded that it was appropriate for an inexperienced investor to relinquish the guarantees attached to his main retirement provision (built

up by that time) in exchange for more risk so that he could access flexible benefits many years in the future. There's no real evidence that Mr M required the flexibility of irregular lump sums or variable income during retirement. But if he did require it, then any flexible needs could've been met by his DC workplace pension. And he'd also have access to tax-free cash under the BPS2. This doesn't appear to have been adequately considered by IFM;

- IFM recorded that Mr M was concerned about the security of his safeguarded benefits and so wanted “control” over his pension. But he appears to have been a largely passive pension saver up until that point. There's no evidence he had experience of controlling, managing or investing large sums of money. In my view, Mr M had limited knowledge and experience to enable him to understand the risks involved in transferring his safeguarded benefits;
- It was noted that Mr M was concerned about a transfer to the PPF at a later date. While I understand that he may have been concerned about this, I don't consider a transfer to the PPF was an outcome to avoid. Under the PPF, Mr M would've received a minimum of 90% of his scheme pension. This contrasted with the recommended PPP where there's no promise of a minimum level of benefits payable. If Mr M was concerned about his safeguarded benefits being transferred to the PPF which would result in him losing 10% of the scheme pension, then I question why, as an inexperienced and ‘Conservative’ risk investor, he would accept the risk of transferring to a PPP which exposed his benefits to unlimited downside risks where the loss could be significantly greater than 10%. This doesn't make sense to me;
- The suitability report mentioned that Mr M wanted to ensure any unused pension benefits be inherited by his family. While I understand that death benefits are important to consumers, the priority here, in my opinion, was to advise Mr M about what was best for his own retirement provision. He was in good health at the time. Withdrawing money from the PPP to meet income and lump sum needs would likely mean that the size of the fund remaining in later years – when death is more likely – could be much smaller than expected. I can't see that this was explained to Mr M. Through his employment he had a generous lump sum death in service benefit. In addition, the value of his DC workplace pension plan would be payable as a tax-free lump sum. Notwithstanding these points, Mr M didn't have anyone financially dependent on him so it's unclear why death benefits were important to him. These factors don't appear to have been adequately considered by IFM;
- It's my view that Mr M had no health issues at the time IFM advised him which might reasonably have prompted him to relinquish the guarantees attached to his own retirement income for the sake of an enhanced safety net for people who weren't financially dependent on him. So I'm not convinced there was any real merit in him transferring to a PPP at that time to provide a lump sum death benefit at the cost of losing valuable benefit guarantees;
- There's no evidence that IFM obtained a Transfer Value Analysis (“TVAS”) report based on Mr M's specific circumstances in line with COBS 19.1.2R. Rather, in the suitability report, it inexplicably provided a generic critical yield figure. Its adviser stated, *“I can confirm that our analysis to date of the British Steel Scheme has shown that annual investment returns of typically around 8.0% p.a. are required in order to match the benefits available at 65 from the ‘current’ British Steel scheme”*. This compared with a discount rate of 4.7% at age 65, as explained by our investigator in her assessment. For further comparison, the regulator's upper projection rate at the time was 8%, the middle projection rate 5%, and the lower projection rate 2% per year. It's my view that a required investment growth rate of 8.0% was incompatible

with the discount rate, Mr M's '*Conservative*' risk profile and the recommended '*Governed Portfolio 1*' fund which was designed for investors with a cautious attitude to risk. I think these factors showed that it was likely Mr M would be financially worse off as a result of the pension transfer;

- In addition, the basis of the recommendation was that Mr M was seeking to take benefits at age 55. If that was the case then I would've expected IFM to also calculate the critical yield figure at age 55 to enable Mr M to make an informed decision. But it didn't. It instead provided a generic growth rate of 8.0% at age 65. I think this was a material oversight;
- The wording of the suitability report inappropriately downplayed the importance of the critical yield, stating that it will add "*no value to the process*" and "*the results of a TVAS are largely academic*". I think IFM's approach to the transfer analysis was improper and prevented Mr M from making an informed decision; and
- In my view, the suitability report failed to meet the fair, clear and not misleading requirements of COBS 4.2.1R. It was generic with templated wording to describe Mr M's objectives with the result that the recommendation wasn't sufficiently tailored to his individual circumstances. I think it lacked sufficient colour and detail. As noted above, it included a generic critical yield figure of 8.0% rather than the actual critical yield figure based on Mr M's circumstances, downplayed the importance of the transfer analysis and was unclear regarding whether the advice was based on a target retirement age of 55 or 65. And it failed to provide sufficient information on the alternative options to achieve his stated objectives. I think these inadequacies in the suitability report led to Mr M making an uninformed decision to proceed with a pension transfer when this was not in his best interests.

Conclusion

In my view, Mr M's objectives of achieving early retirement, income flexibility, flexible death benefits and control over investment choice were recorded in a generic way, suggesting that IFM used a standardised templated approach to pension transfer advice. There's no evidence that the stated objectives were properly explored, scrutinised and challenged by IFM to ensure they were appropriate and achievable, particularly the desire to retire early.

Overall, I don't think the contemporaneous evidence supports the position as to why Mr M's generic objectives would've been sufficiently compelling reasons for him to relinquish valuable benefit guarantees by transferring to a PPP at that time, especially in view of his age, good state of health and level of reliance on these monies to provide retirement income. Based on what I've seen, I think IFM failed to give adequate consideration to the risk that Mr M couldn't financially bear the risks involved in the pension transfer.

I haven't seen any evidence that shows the pension transfer to the PPP led to Mr M gaining any clearly defined advantage compared to the alternative option of transferring to the BPS2 at that time. As a result, I think it's fair and reasonable to uphold this complaint.

Putting things right

A fair and reasonable outcome would be for IFM to put Mr M, as far as possible, into the position he would now be in but for the unsuitable advice he was given.

Properly advised, I think Mr M would've transferred to the BPS2 and his benefits would now be preserved in that scheme. I acknowledge that it was recorded in the suitability report he wanted to retire at around age 55. However, he was about 30 years away from that target

retirement age when IFM advised him. I think it's fair to say that plans about retirement can change over such a long period of time. I'm not persuaded that there's sufficient contemporaneous evidence that supports the position Mr M would've started taking his safeguarded benefits which involved taking a regular income at age 55. And I'm not convinced it could be reasonably determined at the time that the PPF was the likely better option for Mr M. And so I think, given his age and the lack of clarity surrounding when he would retire, the BPS2 was likely the better option for him based on what was known at the time and that at age 65 the BPS2 would provide a higher level of benefits than the PPF. As such, the calculation on the basis of entering the BPS2 should be carried out. For clarity, compensation should be based on the BPS2's normal retirement age of 65 for the reasons explained.

IFM must therefore undertake a redress calculation in line with the rules for calculating redress for non-compliant pension transfer advice, as detailed in policy statement PS22/13 and set out in the regulator's handbook in DISP App 4:
<https://www.handbook.fca.org.uk/handbook/DISP/App/4/?view=chapter>.

IFM should use the FCA's BPS-specific redress calculator to calculate the redress. A copy of the BPS calculator output should be sent to the Representative, on behalf of Mr M, and our service upon completion of the calculation.

The calculation should be carried out using the most recent financial assumptions in line with DISP App 4. In accordance with the regulator's expectations, this should be undertaken or submitted to an appropriate provider promptly following receipt of notification of Mr M's acceptance of this final decision.

If the redress calculation demonstrates a loss, as explained in policy statement PS22/13 and set out in DISP App 4, IFM should:

- calculate and offer Mr M redress as a cash lump sum payment,
- explain to Mr M before starting the redress calculation that:
 - its redress will be calculated on the basis that it will be invested prudently (in line with the cautious investment return assumption used in the calculation), and
 - a straightforward way to invest the redress prudently is to use it to augment his PPP
- offer to calculate how much of any redress Mr M receives could be augmented rather than receiving it all as a cash lump sum;
- if Mr M accepts IFM's offer to calculate how much of his redress could be augmented, request the necessary information and not charge him for the calculation, even if he ultimately decides not to have any of his redress augmented; and
- take a prudent approach when calculating how much redress could be augmented, given the inherent uncertainty around Mr M's end of year tax position.

Redress paid to Mr M as a cash lump sum will be treated as income for tax purposes. So, in line with DISP App 4, IFM may make a notional deduction to cash lump sum payments to take account of tax that consumers would otherwise pay on income from their pension.

Typically, 25% of the loss could've been taken as tax-free cash and 75% would've been taxed according to Mr M's likely income tax rate in retirement – presumed to be 20%. So

My final decision

Determination and money award: I uphold this complaint and require Inspirational Financial Management Ltd to pay Mr M the compensation amount as set out in the steps above, up to a maximum of £170,000.

Recommendation: If the compensation amount exceeds £170,000, I also recommend that Inspirational Financial Management Ltd pays Mr M the balance.

If Mr M accepts this final decision, the money award becomes binding on Inspirational Financial Management Ltd. My recommendation wouldn't be binding. Further, it's unlikely that Mr M can accept this final decision and go to court to ask for the balance. Mr M may want to consider getting independent legal advice before deciding whether to accept this final decision.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr M to accept or reject my decision before 8 January 2024.

Clint Penfold

Ombudsman