

## **complaint**

Mr and Mrs B complain about the advice they were given by Credit Suisse (UK) Ltd (“the business”) to invest in the AIG Life Premier Access Bond (PAB) Enhanced Variable Rate Fund (the “Enhanced Fund”). They say that they were informed that this was a low risk alternative to an instant access deposit account, but that this has proven not to be the case and that they were instead exposed to a fund which presented a higher risk than they were willing to take.

## **background**

Mr and Mrs B met with a representative of the business in December 2005, and acting on its advice, they invested approximately £1.8m into the Enhanced Fund in February 2006 via the PAB. In January 2007 a withdrawal was made from this investment and it was fully surrendered in March 2007.

In March 2007, a further investment of approximately £1.1m was made into an existing PAB. The consumers withdrew £430,000 from this in July 2007 and invested a further approximately £150,000 in July 2008.

On 15 September 2008, AIG Life suspended withdrawals from the Enhanced Fund for a period of three months, owing to the large number of withdrawal requests it had received. It subsequently announced that it would close the fund at the end of the three-month suspension period.

Following the announcement, AIG Life divided the fund in two, moving one half (the cash elements of the fund) into the Standard Variable Rate Fund (the Standard Fund) which investors could withdraw – known as the ‘initial switch’ – and offering investors a choice about what to do with the second half. Investors could:

- Surrender their investment or move it to the Standard Fund (known as the ‘exit plan’) by selling assets early at the best achievable market prices, which because of market conditions meant investors would receive less than the paper value of their investment. Investors could withdraw their money from the Standard Fund if they wished.
- Keep their investment (known as the ‘maturity plan’) in a new fund – the Protected Recovery Fund, which guaranteed that on 1 July 2012 investors would receive at least the full value of their investment as at 14 December 2008.

I understand that Mr and Mrs B opted for the ‘maturity’ plan, but transferred their funds away from this in 2009.

Mr and Mrs B submitted their complaint to Credit Suisse in December 2011. The business did not consider that the investment was unsuitable for the consumers, stating in summary that the fund was reasonably described as a low risk alternative to cash and that Mr and Mrs B were likely to have understood that it carried some risk.

Dissatisfied with the response, Mr and Mrs B referred the complaint to this service. The adjudicator who considered the matter was of the view that it should be upheld, stating in summary that the fund had been represented to Mr and Mrs B as being an alternative to a cash fund. The investments were described as being the “cash” part of the portfolio which would provide a variable rate of interest with capital security, it was stated. As such, the

adjudicator concluded that Mr and Mrs B would have been entitled to believe that the investment was a cash-type arrangement.

The business did not accept the adjudicator's assessment, however. In summary, the following points were raised:

- Mr and Mrs B were high net worth individuals, with a large amount held on deposit.
- Mr and Mrs B had experience of many and varied financial products.
- They were recorded as having a 'medium', or 'balanced' attitude to risk (ATR) and they had a medium term investment horizon.
- Mr and Mrs B had originally expressed concern that the initial investment proposal was too conservative and insisted that higher risks be taken to improve possible returns.
- Following further discussions, it was agreed that, for a small proportion of their capital, the Enhanced Fund investment represented a suitable low risk investment. The reasons for this were set out in the suitability report issued at the time.
- At the time of sale, the AIG fund competed with traditional bank or building society accounts.
- The consumers would have been aware that this was a 'low' risk investment rather than a risk free one. This was fully explained to them at the time of sale.
- The investment was not described as being instant access, but rather easy access and there was an important difference between the two. The terms should not be used interchangeably.
- Mr and Mrs B had already invested with AIG before their relationship with Credit Suisse began and so they were familiar with the type of investment. It had been clearly explained that the investment was not a cash account, nor was it intended to be used as such.
- It was also explained that, under certain circumstances, withdrawals could be deferred for a three month period. The Key Features Document (KFD) provided to Mr and Mrs B also outlined this and other risks.
- It had remained the business' view, up to the point of the fund's suspension – which was not foreseeable – that the investment represented a suitable low risk arrangement for Mr and Mrs B.
- The consumers' circumstances were materially different to those in our published decision.
- There were inconsistencies in this service's approach across cases which had similarities to that of Mr and Mrs B. The adjudicator's attention was drawn to specific cases and those complainants' circumstances.
- It was queried as to how this service could reasonably conclude that the Enhanced Fund, which was a relatively uncomplicated investment, would not have been understood by Mr and Mrs B.

I must decide this case on its individual merits. However, as noted above, we have considered complaints about the AIG Enhanced Fund before and published a decision which sets out our general approach to such complaints on our website. The decision is in the *investment* section of our *online technical resource* which can be found by clicking the *publications* tab.

## my findings

I have included only a brief summary of the complaint, but I have read and considered all the evidence and arguments available to me from the outset, in order to decide what is fair and reasonable in all the circumstances of this complaint.

I have noted the comments made by Credit Suisse regarding the reference made by the adjudicator to the published decision. However, I also note that the adjudicator explained that this was relevant as it included information about an adviser's responsibilities. It was noted that the consumers' circumstances were different, and the adjudicator considered this complaint in light of Mr and Mrs B's individual circumstances.

For my part, I should clarify for the avoidance of any doubt that, whilst I have taken account of the published decision, because this contains relevant information about the PAB and the Enhanced Fund, I have considered this case on its individual merits and taking into account Mr and Mrs B's circumstances.

When considering what is fair and reasonable, I am required to take into account relevant: law and regulations; regulator's rules, guidance and standards, and codes of practice; and, where appropriate, what I consider to have been good industry practice at the time.

Where the evidence is incomplete, inconclusive, or contradictory (as some of it is here), I reach my decision on the balance of probabilities – that is, what I consider is most likely to have happened in light of the evidence that is available and the wider surrounding circumstances.

There is no dispute that this was an advised sale of an investment product where Credit Suisse made a recommendation based upon Mr and Mrs B's circumstances and objectives.

Therefore, taking the relevant considerations into account, it seems to me that the overarching question I need to consider in this case is whether the recommendation to invest in the fund was a suitable recommendation for Mr and Mrs B in their individual circumstances.

In deciding this question, I need to take into account the nature and complexity of the investment and Mr and Mrs B's financial circumstances, needs and objectives; understanding and relevant investment experience; and tolerance to investment risk.

If, having considered all the relevant circumstances, I find that the recommendation was unsuitable for Mr and Mrs B, I then need to consider:

- whether they relied on the recommendation and have lost out as a consequence of that (by considering what they would have done 'but for' the inappropriate advice); and
- if they did, how fair compensation should be calculated in all the circumstances of the case.

As stated, in considering the suitability of the Enhanced Fund for Mr and Mrs B, I need to take careful account of their investment objectives at the time the investment was made. I will then compare this with what Credit Suisse knew (or should have known) as a professional business about the product it recommended.

At the time, according to the information provided by Credit Suisse, Mr and Mrs B had recently sold their business and most of the funds realised from this, around £6.1m, remained on deposit. Mr and Mrs B were seeking advice on how to invest this money.

Mr and Mrs B's attitude to risk was assessed as being 'medium' overall. This was qualified as being a '*pronounced attitude to risk for all or a portion of the investors' portfolio.*'

The 'Balanced' portfolio mandate was chosen which was described as '*seeking to increase your principal and at the same time generate income from one portfolio of securities which together have historically demonstrated a moderate to high degree of risk of loss of principal value.*' The asset mix chosen was 35% cash, 30% to 60% equities, 10% bonds, 20% alternatives and 5% emerging markets. Taking this into account, in addition to the record of their investment experience, I do not dispute that Mr and Mrs B were prepared to take some risk with a proportion of their capital.

However, the suitability letter produced in March 2006 explained why the investments were made into the PAB Enhanced Fund and listed Mr and Mrs B's key requirements in relation to the plan. These have already been outlined by the adjudicator, but I consider it to be worthwhile repeating these requirements, in light of the business' own comments:

- The investments were described as the cash part of the portfolio, with reference being made to cash remaining in the bond and invested in short term deposits with prime rated companies - predominantly banks and building societies.
- The fund was described as providing a variable rate of interest and was designed to provide capital security.
- It was a low risk investment which matched Mr and Mrs B's need for deposit based savings.
- It had a competitive return and the rate compared favourably with bank/building society deposits.
- It was an alternative to holding a cash reserve in a bank or building Society account.

For the investment in July 2008, the suitability letter said that Mr and Mrs B required a holding vehicle for part of their cash with instant access. It was stated that the fund met these requirements.

From the above, I consider it to be a reasonable conclusion that these investments represented what Mr and Mrs B considered to be a "cash" element of their portfolio. It is my view that, for this money in particular, they were seeking a cash equivalent investment and I consider that the descriptions as given above would have justifiably led them to believe that this was the case, albeit with returns over and above those obtainable from traditional bank or building society accounts.

I would not disagree that Mr and Mrs B were relatively experienced, high net worth investors who were able to invest over a medium time frame, but the crux of this issue is their objective for the funds which were to be treated as cash or cash equivalent. This appears to have been recorded as being a low risk, deposit based investment offering the aim of capital security and investing in short term deposits. Even to experienced investors, this would in my view reasonably imply a degree of cash-type security which simply wasn't present within the recommended fund.

Although I acknowledge the envisaged investment period of between two and five years, I note that Mr and Mrs B in fact had a history of investing and withdrawing their cash at fairly

short intervals. I also would not agree with the business' assertion that there exists a "substantial difference" between the terms "instant access" and "easy access". I further note the business' contention that the terms should not be used interchangeably, but I should perhaps draw attention to Mr and Mrs B's requirement, as recorded by the business in its own suitability letter, of "instant access" to the capital which was invested in 2008 into the Enhanced Fund.

I also acknowledge that the investment into the Enhanced Fund represented around one third of Mr and Mrs B's total wealth, but it was nevertheless an amount of approximately £2 million, albeit fluctuating over time. This was not therefore an insignificant part of their portfolio to be exposed to the types of risk represented by the Enhanced Fund.

I have also carefully considered the documentation relating to the PAB Enhanced Fund.

The Key Features document explained that:

*"The Premier Access Bond is a single premium life assurance Bond offering a range of unit linked funds that invest in a variety of financial and money market instruments in order to generate gross equivalent returns that are competitive against bank and building society deposits.*

It described the 'Risks Factors' as follows:

- *Your investment, and the return from it, is only as secure as the selected range of assets purchased by the funds you choose. Your investment is only at risk if any of these financial instruments fail to meet their obligations.*
- *The value of your investment can go down as well as up and you may get back less than you put in.*
- *For investments in the Notice Funds, if you require access to these funds and are unable to give us the required notice, there will be a withdrawal penalty.*
- *Investors cannot recover any tax paid by AIG Life; therefore the Premier Access Bond may not be suitable for non-tax payers.*
- *You must be aware of the tax position if you are, or become, a higher rate tax payer or entitled to Age Allowance.*
- *If large numbers of Bonds are encashed at the same time, the funds may incur costs in selling assets prior to the intended maturity date to meet these encashments, and these costs may cause a fall in the unit prices and therefore the return on your Bond. Alternatively AIG Life may defer encashments for up to three months if it considers that this would be more beneficial to Bondholders generally. This would only happen in very exceptional circumstances.*
- *The effect of inflation may reduce the spending power of your investment.*

Among other things, the PAB brochure provided information about the Standard Fund and the Enhanced Fund. The Enhanced Fund was described as:

*The Enhanced Variable Rate Fund (“the Enhanced Fund”) is similar to the Standard Fund but is aimed at achieving a slightly higher growth rate by investing in more sophisticated assets issued by a wide range of companies. The fund offers a high degree of safety by holding the highest quality assets commensurate with its enhanced yield.*

*The fund’s main objective is to produce a competitive return by investing in a wide range of high quality assets. While maintaining a high degree of security, unsurprisingly the fund will contain many of the same names as the Standard Fund, with most of the fund invested in assets issued by financial institutions. The Enhanced Fund will contain exposure mainly to AAA and AA rated assets, with the remainder in A rated assets, and will use a wide range of high quality instruments issued by the companies identified.*

*The fund should achieve a higher yield than the Standard Variable Rate Fund because it has access to:*

- (1) *a wider range of companies.....The companies are subject to strict quality checks and are still considered to be very safe investments.*
- (2) *a wider range of investments issued by the companies identified. These assets will have a slightly higher yield as they have a smaller target market and may be more difficult to sell before they mature. However, as the fund usually purchases assets to hold until maturity, it is in a position to take advantage of any yield enhancements.*
- (3) *a greater amount of sophistication ...*
- (4) *assets with slightly longer periods to maturity. This enables the fund manager to take advantage of a positive sloping yield curve which rewards longer investments with higher yields.*

*Although the fund carries slightly more risk than the Standard Fund it should still be considered to be a cautious fund. Although the criteria are clearly wider than those of the Standard Fund, the fund places high importance on the preservation of capital.*

The Financial Service Authority’s (FSA’s) Final Notice in respect of Coutts & Company (dated 7 November 2011) provides a helpful summary in slightly more accessible terms about the make up of the Enhanced Fund:

*‘The Fund was invested in financial and money market instruments, including certificates of deposit, bank deposits and commercial paper. However, unlike a standard money market fund, it was seeking to deliver an enhanced return by investing a material proportion of the Fund’s assets in:*

- (1) *asset backed securities. These comprised on average 27% of the Fund’s assets between 6 July 2005 and 28 December 2007 and reduced to between 23% and 15% in the period 1 February 2008 to 8 August 2008, varying over the Sales Period between approximately 31% and 14%. They were primarily backed by UK residential and commercial mortgages;*
- (2) *floating rate notes. These comprised on average 38% of the Fund’s assets between 6 July 2005 and 28 December 2007 and reduced to between 30% and 27% in the period 1 February 2008 to 8 August 2008, varying over the Sales Period between approximately 51% and 27%; and*

*(3) assets which had terms to maturity of between 3 and 5 years. Again, these comprised on average 54% of the Fund's assets between 6 July 2005 and 28 December 2007 and reduced to between 41% and 15% in the period 1 February 2008 to 8 August 2008, varying between approximately 65% and 15% of the Fund's assets.*

Of course the potential problems with these types of investments are now well known. So it is important to avoid the benefit of hindsight in the assessment of these matters today. That said, I think it is (and was) clear from AIG's own description and the other information readily available to Credit Suisse about the fund, that the Enhanced Fund was not a standard money market fund.

The fund presented some risk to capital. Investors could lose money if AIG Life failed, if the financial instruments failed to meet their obligations, or if it became necessary for the fund to sell assets prior to their intended maturity date to meet the encashment demands on the funds. But the extent of those risks was difficult to assess in the Enhanced Fund as the quality of the underlying investments was not clear.

And given the nature of the underlying investments and the significant holdings held, it should also have been apparent that liquidity issues could arise, thereby preventing investors accessing their funds in certain circumstances. Of course that possibility was at least in part reflected in the term that allowed AIG to defer payments in exceptional circumstances.

Even if the detail of these issues was not apparent to those outside AIG itself, the special nature of the funds and the opacity of some of the investments was (or at least should have been) clear to any professional adviser. In my view these factors were (or should have been) sufficient to place the adviser on notice that this was not a normal 'cash' fund suitable as an alternative to normal deposit accounts, but something distinctly more 'exotic'.

As the FSA explained in the Coutts Final Notice – any description of the product as a 'cash product' was inaccurate:

*"This was an inaccurate description of the Fund because it contained a significant proportion of non-cash assets, including the asset backed securities (which were backed by UK residential and commercial mortgages and generally had terms to their maturity of three to five years) and floating rate notes (which generally had terms to their maturity of one to three years).*

Nor should an adviser have suggested, at least not without further explanation, that the fund was 'an alternative to traditional banking and building society deposits'. As the FSA noted:

*"In order to generate an enhanced return, the Fund exposed customers to greater level of capital and liquidity risk than that typically associated with a traditional bank or building society account."*

Accordingly, in my view, to an experienced financial adviser and to a business like Credit Suisse, these investments would not and should not have appeared to represent a risk-free approach, nor would they have been suitable for investors looking to invest in cash, or for investors looking for instant access who were not prepared to accept the possibility that they might have to wait to access their money. I accept that the investment may not have been

conveyed to Mr and Mrs B as being risk-free, but I am persuaded that it was portrayed as being a suitable alternative to deposit based funds. As such, it would reasonably be assumed by Mr and Mrs B that it shared a number of traits relating to capital security and access to capital as would be present in such deposit based environments.

It was important for advisers to take these things into account when assessing the suitability of the product for an individual investor, and for potential investors to understand that the fund presented more risk than an ordinary cash fund. And Credit Suisse should have identified those risks and taken them into consideration when recommending the investment to Mr and Mrs B.

The business has stated that the risks of the investment were made clear to Mr and Mrs B, but it is also the case that they were entitled to rely on the recommendation that Credit Suisse made. However, for the sake of completeness, I have also considered whether the information that the business provided to Mr and Mrs B was sufficiently clear that it should have alerted them to the fact that the investment was not suitable for their needs.

Mr and Mrs B sought advice from Credit Suisse and they were entitled to rely on that advice. It is clear to me that this is precisely what they did. But even if they took care to read all the material that the business provided (and I have no reason to doubt that they did so), I do not consider that the warnings and description of the funds were sufficiently clear in the circumstances (and taking account of the overall representations made by Credit Suisse) to suggest to Mr and Mrs B at that time that they should act otherwise than on the advice of their professional adviser. This is especially so if I am to consider the content of the letters of recommendation, and the impression they would have created, as set out above.

Overall, I have concluded that Credit Suisse's advice to invest in the Enhanced Fund was not suitable for Mr and Mrs B. This is not a view reached with hindsight. I have based my findings on the product suitability for Mr and Mrs B based on what it knew or would have been expected to find out about the investment at the time of the sale and based on a reasonable expectation of how it would operate.

I therefore need to consider what Mr and Mrs B would have done 'but for' the advice they received. I have not seen anything which suggests to me – and I find it highly unlikely – that Mr and Mrs B would have invested in the Enhanced Fund if it had not been recommended to them.

When reaching that finding, I am mindful that some investors looking for cash-fund options – if properly informed about the enhanced risks associated with this fund – might have been prepared to accept those risks. The fund offered tax advantages, the possibility of higher returns than deposit accounts and some cash funds, with what was perceived to be fairly limited risk (notwithstanding the asset make-up) due partly to the spread of underlying investments.

Furthermore, the issues involved in investing over £2 million in cash are rather different from the cash investment issues that most customers face. The PAB offered some protection (under the Financial Services Compensation Scheme for policyholders) from the risk that AIG Life might fail. However, it should be remembered that, whilst in broad terms the scheme provided protection for up to 90% of the surrender value of the investment, the surrender value itself was not guaranteed.

In Mr and Mrs B's case, I am not persuaded that they would have agreed to the relevant capital being invested in the Enhanced Fund if they were aware of the risks involved. In short, I am not satisfied that they would have invested in the Enhanced Fund if they had understood that they might lose money and/or their money would become unavailable, depending on market conditions.

I have therefore considered what Mr and Mrs B would have done if they had not been advised to invest in the fund. In cases like this, the consumers' circumstances and objectives at the time of the advice often provide a good indication of what they would have done.

In this case, there is no compelling evidence from the time of sale to demonstrate *exactly* what Mr and Mrs B would have done if they had not invested their money in the fund. But for the reasons discussed earlier in this decision, it seems unlikely that they would have invested in any way which exposed their capital to risk (other than the minimum possible risk).

I therefore need to consider how I should assess fair compensation in all the circumstances of this case. My aim in terms of redress is to return Mr and Mrs B (as far as is possible and subject to limits on the amount of compensation I am able to award) to the financial position they would now be in if they had not invested in the Enhanced Fund.

Having considered their aims, intentions and circumstances at the time, I am satisfied that, on balance, they would most probably have invested their money in deposit type accounts because they required instant access and were not prepared to take anything more than a low risk. So I consider it fairest to assume that Mr and Mrs B would have invested their money in one of the higher interest rate paying instant access deposit accounts available from the UK Clearing Banks at the time (and would from time to time have searched out 'best rates' thereafter).

No doubt much time and effort could be expended by all concerned to identify precisely which accounts might have been used. Notwithstanding the sums involved I think it sensible to deal with this issue in a simplified manner rather than engage in further conjecture. When Mr and Mrs B made their initial investment, base rates were 4.5%. Of course the rate has fallen since – by the end of 2008 base rate had been reduced to 2.0% and since March 2009 of course it has been 0.5% per year.

However, for much of the last few years, readily achievable deposit rates have been in excess of base rate. Following a review of available rates during the period in question, I conclude that Mr and Mrs B's investment could reasonably have increased at the rate of 4.0% per year compounded annually until 6 November 2008 (when the base rate was reduced to 3%), by 2.5% per year compounded annually up to 5 March 2009 (when the base rate reduced to 0.5%) and 1.5% after this. I settled on these assumed rates of return following a review of historically available savings rates using 'Moneyfacts'.

I have also considered what award I should make in respect of interest, given that Mr and Mrs B's loss crystallised when they surrendered their funds within the maturity plan. In such cases, my usual approach is to require the financial business to add interest from the date the consumer should have had the money until the date the money is actually paid, to compensate the consumer for being deprived of that money.

In many cases, the effect on the consumer's finances can only be discovered by making speculative assumptions. So unless it is apparent what the consumer's borrowing cost (or

investment loss) actually were, I would be likely to award interest at 8% a year simple. This is not intended to be an interest rate in the way that a bank deposit account pays interest. Rather it is a rate which I consider to be a broadly fair yardstick for compensating consumers for a wide range of possible losses and lost opportunities they may have incurred.

The consumers might, for example, have:

- borrowed money, or continued to borrow money, at credit card or loan rates which they would not have done if the money had been available to them;
- saved or invested the money in some way producing a variety of possible returns;
- spent the money on holidays, home improvements, or any number of goods which might have given them an unquantifiable return;

or any combination of these things.

The 8% simple interest rate is gross and is subject to tax – and is a rate often (but not always) used by the courts in not dissimilar situations. There are, however, some cases, where there will be an identifiable loss or particular circumstances which may lead me to take a different approach.

The cost to Mr and Mrs B of being deprived of the money is not straightforward to assess. But it seems to me that it is unlikely to have involved the broad spectrum of possibilities and lost opportunities I have mentioned above. It seems unlikely, for example, that they would have borrowed unnecessarily or missed out on opportunities to take holidays or purchase goods. Rather, it seems likely that, in their particular circumstances, they would have invested the money in some way (as they did with their other money) and that they have been deprived of an opportunity to obtain a return on that money.

Having considered these things, I find that an interest rate of 8% may be excessive and I consider a fairer rate to reflect the fact that Mr and Mrs B have been deprived of this money would be an interest rate of 2.5% simple pa.

### **my final decision**

My final decision is that I uphold Mr and Mrs B's complaint for the reasons set out above.

In resolution of the complaint, Credit Suisse (UK) Ltd should pay Mr and Mrs B compensation of D+E where:

A = the capital invested in the Enhanced Fund, less any amounts paid out by way of withdrawals, distributions of capital or before-tax income and transfer to the standard fund as part of the initial switch;

B = a return on the amount from time to time of A at 4.0% per year until 4 November 2008, 2.5% per year until 5 March 2009 and then by 1.5% per year thereafter compounded annually from the date of investment to the date the investment in the Protected Recovery Fund was surrendered;

C = the amount Mr and Mrs B received when the investment was surrendered; and

D = A + B – C, representing the investment loss at the date of surrender.

E = interest on the amount of D at the rate of 2.5% simple per year from the date the money in the protected recovery fund was surrendered until the date compensation is paid.

If the business considers that it is legally obliged to deduct income tax from the interest element of my award, it must send a tax deduction certificate with the payment.

For the avoidance of doubt, A and B above should work as follows:

Any sum paid into the investment should be added to the calculation from the point in time when it was actually paid in so it accrues the 'reasonable rate of return' within the calculation from that point on. Any reduction to the investment should be deducted from the calculation at the point in time when it was actually deducted so it ceases to accrue the 'reasonable rate of return' within the calculation from that point on.

The business should pay to Mr and Mrs B the amount produced by the calculation (that is the amount of D) – up to a maximum of £150,000 - plus interest on that amount.

If D is more than £150,000, interest should be calculated from the date of the surrender until the date of payment. For the reasons explained above, interest should be calculated at 2.5% per year on that amount from the date that the investment matured until the date of payment.

Recommendation: If the amount I consider to be fair compensation exceeds £150,000, I am minded to recommend that, in this situation, the business pays Mr and Mrs B the balance.

This recommendation is not part of my determination or award. It does not bind the business. Whether Mr and Mrs B can accept my decision and go to court to ask for the balance is uncertain. Mr and Mrs B may want to consider obtaining independent legal advice before deciding whether to accept this decision.

Mr and Mrs B should also read our factsheet "compensation over £150,000", which explains our current award limit. It also explains certain implications of accepting our ombudsman's decisions. The factsheet can be found in the consumer factsheets section of our online technical resource which can be found by clicking the publications tab.

**Philip Miller  
ombudsman**