

### **The complaint**

G, a company, complains that Wise Payments Limited charged a fee for receipt of an international SWIFT payment, without having warned of this in advance.

Mr S, the director of G, makes the complaint on G's behalf.

### **What happened**

In July 2025 G received an incoming payment of Euros. Mr S noted that a fee of €2.39 had been deducted from the payment. He complained to Wise about this. He pointed out that he had previously received international payments without any fee being charged.

Wise said that it had advised its customers in February 2025 by email containing a blogpost, which had details of the fees for various types of transfers including receipt of SWIFT payments. The fee is a flat fee and applied from May 2025, so any incoming payment prior to that wouldn't have incurred the fee. Its records showed that Mr S had opened the relevant email.

Wise said that its Customer Support had initially misinformed him and offered £10 compensation for the misinformation. Though from what I can see I think that relates to a different transaction

Mr S asserted that Wise was in breach of the Consumer Duty in respect of providing fair value and clear outcomes to all clients.

On referral to the Financial Ombudsman Service, our Investigator said they wouldn't be asking Wise to do anything further.

Mr S disagreed and advised that he challenged the view on the basis that the Consumer Duty hadn't been properly considered.

The matter has been passed to me for an Ombudsman's consideration.

### **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.

The Consumer Duty is a new standard for firms which was introduced by the regulator, the Financial Conduct Authority. It sets a higher standard for firms in terms of how they are interacting with their customers, and it applies to events from 31 July 2023. The Duty does not replace or substitute other applicable rules, guidance or law and doesn't ask firms to act in a way that's incompatible with any legal or regulatory requirements. As I'm required to do, I've had the Consumer Duty in mind when considering G's complaint, along with relevant law and regulations, regulators' rules, guidance and standards, codes of practice and (where appropriate) what I consider to have been good industry practice at the relevant time.

This Service is an alternative dispute resolution service. Our function is to resolve complaints

informally. I will consider the individual complaint made by G, whether Wise gave reasonable and adequate notice to Mr S of its intention to charge fees. And whether the price, for G, was reasonable compared to the overall benefits.

However I don't think it's appropriate to ask Wise to provide justification for its decision to charge fees or the way it communicated the fees. As this was a commercial business decision, I can't ask Wise to review its process or to carry out any review of its decision to apply fees. In keeping with the informal nature of this Service, I don't consider it necessary to go through each and every regulation or parts of the Consumer Duty that Mr S has set out individually.

#### *information given*

The business 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.

In respect of the notice given, this was in a blog sent by email in February 2025. I haven't seen that email correspondence wasn't suitable for Mr S. I'm also satisfied that he opened the email in question.

The blog itself is headed "*February fee review — here's what's changed*" then further down the first page:

*"The rest of this post outlines the currencies and payment methods that have changed, and why.*

*Use our fee calculator to see if your route was impacted by this change and how much your next transfer will cost."*

If the customer clicks on fee calculator, they are given four options to check, including "*Receive money*" and clicking on that shows the fees that will be charged in the next transfer (although I understand they weren't put in place until May 2025).

Also the customer can scroll down admittedly some way through the blog to find this information.

I think the information about fees was clear and I think the heading reasonably alerts the customer to find out what the new fees were. I also think the information was reasonably clear and not misleading. And adequate notice was given before the change came into effect.

#### *price*

The price customers pay for a product or service should be reasonable compared to the overall benefits.

Mr S disputes that the price was reasonably charged. He believes the service costs Wise nothing. And that other banks don't charge the fee.

Wise has told us of the logic and reason behind the payment. And that appears to me to be a reasonable explanation of why it applies the charge here. The fact that some providers choose not to charge for incoming payments doesn't show that Wise is the only provider to make such a charge. The fee is a flat fee of €2.39 which for the €50,000 odd receipt in this case is in my view reasonable.

Mr S can make an informed decision about future transactions. I understand he has an account with a bank that doesn't make such a charge.

*fee not charged for other transaction*

Mr S says G wasn't charged for a similar transaction. I'm not clear why, as there are no details on the face of that transaction. While Mr S points to this being an inconsistency, G hasn't made any loss in this respect. And I haven't seen any details of any other transactions made by G.

*compensation*

As I haven't found that Wise has made any error here, I won't award any compensation. Though I would observe that Wise has offered £10 which Mr S rejected. But, looking at the online chat, this was concerning an outbound transaction with a different number which did involve a currency exchange. Unfortunately, the Final Response letter does conflate the two transactions, and it seems that the advice about the currency exchange was mistakenly thought to refer to the inbound transaction. That said Wise hasn't withdrawn the offer so Mr S is free to contact it if he wants to accept it. And that would more than compensate him for the fee charged here.

**My final decision**

I don't uphold the complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask G to accept or reject my decision before 23 December 2025.

Ray Lawley  
**Ombudsman**