



Collective DC Decumulation

Meeting People's Needs



For Professional Clients Only

Contents

1 Foreword	2 Introduction	3 Methodology	4 Key Findings	5 Those with Initial Annuity Preference	6 Those with Initial Income Drawdown Preference	7 Conclusions
---------------	-------------------	------------------	-------------------	--	---	------------------

Foreword

In May 2025, the Pensions Minister confirmed that the Government will be publishing final regulations for multi-employer Collective Defined Contribution schemes in Autumn 2025. He also confirmed the Government will then turn its attention to a Decumulation Only version of Collective Defined Contribution schemes.

In 2023, Aegon and Aon published consumer research which focused on the characteristics of post-retirement solutions that matter to individuals. A key question we wanted to answer was the extent to which a decumulation-only Collective Defined Contribution pension (which we refer to here as a 'CDC pension') may form a valued addition to the existing choices available to people on retirement from a defined contribution (DC) pension plan. Our findings revealed that, there could be significant demand for CDC pensions as an alternative to drawdown and annuities.

We believe the findings remain highly relevant to the Government's further considerations and wanted to share these again to highlight the potential consumer demand for this exciting future market development.

Since the original research was carried out, the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) issued its consultation **Extending Opportunities for Collective Defined Contribution Pension Schemes – January 2023**. The proposals there remain aligned to the concepts we had explored. Indeed, the Pension Schemes Bill's 'default pension benefit solutions' may lead to more interest in CDC pensions by trustees. Our research clearly shows different solutions appeal to different customer groups, but CDC pensions might be part of the solution for a particular membership segment.

“

With the ever-increased importance of DC pensions, it's necessary to explore the options individuals have for turning their accumulated pot into a retirement income. Trustees facing new responsibilities to design and implement 'default pension benefit solutions' will also want to explore all options, recognising that different solutions will have varying appeal to different membership groups.

Steven Cameron

Pensions Director at Aegon


“

CDC has the potential to deliver better outcomes to millions of individuals in the UK, so we were glad to work with Aegon on this important piece of research. As multi-employer CDC schemes become closer to a reality, we welcome the opportunity to inform the development of a successful CDC pension alternative alongside current retirement options.

We are very excited by the opportunities that CDC and Decumulation Only CDC present and hope that our research insights inform the ongoing debate and advancement of this important innovation.

Matthew Arends

Head of UK Retirement Policy at Aon



The DC market has been through significant change over the last decade. With further developments ahead, including ‘default pension benefit solutions’, we believe there is room for further innovation in the post-retirement market to help people achieve the level of retirement security and flexibility that suits their individual desires and needs.

The UK market has currently settled on two options for providing long-term income from a DC arrangement — annuity or drawdown income. The most popular option at retirement (if we exclude small pots being taken as a cash sum) is income drawdown* despite the risks involved (notably investment and longevity) and the onus on the individual to make decisions throughout their retirement.

The macro-economic backdrop of recent years has also not been conducive to the development and provision of innovative products. That includes those which provide a reasonable level of income certainty, with the possibility of upside in favourable investment markets. This is because the cost of providing a ‘guaranteed’ base income certainty has been relatively expensive. While potentially popular in concept, such products have not been recommended by financial advisers and/or bought by individuals in large numbers — all of which has made them commercially unviable.

We are now seeing a new option emerge by way of decumulation-only CDC, which the DWP recently confirmed it is actively progressing. A key challenge will be for legislation to balance the need to protect savers, while enabling the effective operation of CDC by providers on commercial terms.

While there is a way to go yet, CDC pensions have the potential to help pension savers meet the goal of efficiently achieving a lifetime income from their DC savings, without having to make complex decisions in retirement. By operating on a pooled basis, the time horizon of a typical CDC fund will be longer than the lifespan of an individual retiree. This, coupled with the absence of a ‘guarantee’ or Solvency II reserving requirements, allows for a less conservative investment strategy. This means that CDC pensions are expected to provide higher initial income (on average) in retirement than from annuity purchase, while still providing the certainty of an income continuing for life, which drawdown cannot give.

As a result of a longer investment horizon, CDC schemes generally, including decumulation only CDC pensions, may lend themselves to a greater focus on illiquid investments, aligning with the Government’s agenda for DC pensions to support UK economic growth.

In this report, we focus on the perceived demand from individuals, based on our survey. We hope that our research will both help inform Government and help the wider market to explore the viability of decumulation-only CDC pensions. It may also be of interest to trustees considering default pension benefit solutions for different segments of their scheme membership.

*Source: the FCA’s retirement income market data 2021, 2022

Methodology

We surveyed 1,150 respondents in June and July 2022 in an online survey conducted within Aegon's feedback community. 80 percent of those surveyed are Aegon customers and compared to the general population, the feedback community included a higher proportion of males (62 percent) and over-55s (also 62 percent).

Initially, participants were required to choose a preference between annuity and income drawdown. They were then split into two groups and asked to make carefully constructed trade-offs of features of:

- CDC pension versus income drawdown, or
- CDC pension versus annuity

Throughout the research, we avoided using the labels 'annuity,' 'income drawdown' and 'CDC' but instead described various features.

The trade-offs an individual was presented with depended on their initial preference for either annuity or income drawdown.

We felt a trade-offs methodology was a better way to assess appetite for different options because it put the participant into a more realistic frame of mind. This is compared to asking standard single- and multiple-choice questions, which do not provide the reference points that are necessary when expressing preferences.




Key Findings

- Before viewing information on the relative features of a CDC pension, 33 percent of participants preferred the option with features of an annuity, compared to 67 percent preferring income drawdown features.
- Those most likely to choose an annuity were those of lower-than-average wealth and therefore with a higher degree of dependency on State pension (42 percent).
- Among those whose initial preference was the annuity option, after viewing the full trade-off series, 49 percent now preferred the CDC pension while 51 percent still preferred an annuity.
- Among those aged 55 and over (where self-reported understanding of the trade-offs was higher), a slightly higher share retained preference for an annuity (56 percent).
- Among those whose initial preference was income drawdown, after viewing the full trade-off series, 79 percent still preferred income drawdown while 21 percent now preferred the CDC pension. There were no significant differences between under- and over-55s.
- Overall, CDC pensions were less likely to be chosen by those with higher-than-average levels of wealth.
- In the main, those who preferred annuities over CDC pensions explained their choice as being due to the lower risk provided by an annuity.
- Those who preferred income drawdown over CDC in the main explained that this was due to the ability to “provide for a partner or enable my family to inherit my savings when I die.”

Overall 30%

or almost **one in three** of the overall sample — ended up after the trade-offs with a preference for CDC pension.



Those with Initial Annuity Preference

Participants who expressed an initial preference for an annuity were invited in five separate exercises to trade off features of an annuity against features of a CDC pension. The labels 'annuity' and 'CDC' were not mentioned. Instead, they were neutrally labelled 'Option A' and 'Option B' to allow a focus on features only. We varied the order of CDC and annuity features so that one option was not always featured first.

We made an assumption that CDC pension would pay a higher income than an annuity.* The annuity income level was based on a purchase price of £200,000 which we felt was reasonable for the potential target market. We used a single life annuity rate (although in practice we would anticipate individuals being offered a choice of single or joint) with inflation increases.

Using competitive rates from the MoneyHelper annuity website in April 2022 for a 65-year-old in good health, we arrived at an annuity income of £480 per month. We assumed a CDC pension would pay out £666 a month. This was derived from a decision to not differentiate between CDC pension income and drawdown income and using the assumption that 4 percent withdrawals might be sustainable.

We would stress that these were designed to be illustrative and may not represent actual levels in the future. Clearly, the actual income levels achievable from CDC pension and from drawdown depend on the asset performance actually achieved and, in the case of drawdown, the individual's lifespan.

*Although CDC pension incomes would generally be higher than annuity incomes due to investing in more return-seeking assets, this will not always be the case. For example, in the event that markets significantly underperform.




The key elements of trade-off we explored are summarised below. Option A is CDC pension and Option B is annuity.


	Option A: CDC Pension	Option B: Annuity
Income per month	£666 per month*	£480 per month*
When I die, will there be any payments to go to someone of my choosing?	No.	No.
What choices do I have around income?	You'll not have any choice. You'll be explained what's intended throughout your future life (and of a partner, if you choose) and it may vary up or down based on market performance.	You'll decide what form of income you want at outset: level or increasing (perhaps for inflation) and you want it to continue on your death to a partner. But once you've purchased, there's no flexibility to change thereafter.
What's the risk this might go down? Might it go up?	It could be a little less or more than that if markets rose or fell. There are, however, safeguards in place that ensure you'd get an income for life.	There's no risk. This income is guaranteed. It won't go down, but it will go up each year if you select an increasing or inflation-protected variant.
Can I choose if I want inflation protection?	You will get inflation protection automatically.	You can choose to have it or not. If you choose this, your starting income will be lower than if you pick a level variant.
Am I responsible for investment decisions?	No, you have no choice; a professional will do this.	No; there are no investment decisions.
Could I gain/lose based on how investment markets perform?	Yes — everyone who buys this product will share in rises and falls in investments. The aim is to avoid any pronounced changes year on year.	No.

*Single life variant

Those whose preference remained annuity selected the following top three reasons:



Those who chose a CDC pension selected the following top three reasons:



*We used this factor for both annuity and income drawdown — clearly for annuities, providing for a partner is the more technically accurate statement.

Once participants viewed five individual trade-offs, a final trade-off with all details was shown as above. On that final trade-off, 51 percent of these people still preferred an annuity while **49 percent** now preferred a CDC pension. As 33 percent of individuals initially chose annuity over drawdown, this 51 percent represents 16.8 percent of the overall sample, or one in six.

Those most likely to prefer the CDC pension type over annuity are those who typically possess below-average wealth or higher state-dependency (55 percent, compared to the average of 50 percent).

Those who were older than 55 (and who had a higher self-reported understanding of the options) were still more likely to prefer annuities (56 percent).

The results demonstrate the risk/reward trade-off between the additional level of income offered by CDC pension over annuity and the potential variation in income.

Approximately 80 percent of respondents felt they understood the features of their preferred option.

Those with Initial Income Drawdown Preference

Participants who expressed an initial preference for the features of income drawdown were asked to trade off elements of income drawdown versus the CDC pension.

We made a number of assumptions which may have influenced the choices.

We assumed income levels from CDC and income drawdown would be identical. Some argue that CDC should be able to deliver a higher income because of investing longer term, but we decided not to introduce that variability at this stage, meaning that the key differences between the two options presented were longevity protection, inheritance, investment choice and income flexibility.




The key differences we drew out are summarised below. Option A is CDC pension and Option B is drawdown.


	Option A: CDC Pension	Option B: Drawdown
Income per month	£666 per month*	£666 per month
When I die, will there be any payments to go to someone of my choosing?	No.	Yes, your remaining pension pot can be distributed to your loved ones.
What choices do I have around income?	You'll not have any choice. You'll be explained what's intended throughout your future life (and of a partner, if you choose) and it may vary up or down based on market performance.	You decide how much to take initially and you can vary it up or down whenever you want; however, if you take too much, you could run out.
What's the risk this might go down? Might it go up?	It could be a little less or more than that if markets rose or fell. There are, however, safeguards in place that ensure you'd get an income for life.	You can choose how much you take each year. But if you want to have an income for life, you may need to reduce it if markets don't do well; you could also be able to sustain more if markets do well.
Can I choose if I want inflation protection?	You will get inflation protection automatically.	You can plan to start lower and gradually take more as inflation affects you.
Am I responsible for investment decisions?	No, you have no choice; a professional will do this.	Yes, and you have a wide choice.
Could I gain/lose based on how investment markets perform?	Yes — everyone who buys this product will share in rises and falls in investments. The aim is to avoid any pronounced changes year on year.	Yes — you are directly affected based on which investments you choose.

*Single life variant

Those who continued to prefer drawdown selected the following top three reasons:



Those who preferred CDC pension selected the following top three reasons:



*Here, we assumed the CDC pension could provide the option for continuation to a partner or beneficiary.

When viewing the final trade-off with all details included, 79 percent still preferred income drawdown, while 21 percent now preferred the CDC pension.

Those most likely to prefer the CDC pension over income drawdown were groups with below-average wealth and a higher likelihood of state dependency (28 percent, compared to the average of 21 percent).

Among participants who expressed an initial preference for income drawdown, 21 percent opted for a CDC pension in our trade-off series. While this is a relatively low percentage, it is a proportion of the 67 percent of members preferring drawdown over annuity at outset and so represents 14 percent, or one in seven, of the overall sample. This is close to the 16.8 percent of the overall sample who switched from an initial annuity preference to CDC pension.

Conclusions

This research shows there could be considerable demand for decumulation-only CDC alongside annuity and income drawdown. **From the overall sample, 30 percent, or almost one in three, ultimately ended up preferring a CDC pension.**

A lower proportion of people who initially selected drawdown, compared to initially selecting annuity, ultimately switched their preference to CDC pension. However, because more people initially selected drawdown over annuity, the numbers moving from annuity to CDC pension and the numbers moving from drawdown to CDC pension are quite similar.

It would appear individuals identified and understood the risk/reward trade-off when choosing between the various options. With almost one in three selecting CDC, this suggests a good degree of comfort with the concept, even if purchasing 'direct' without an advisor.

The research assumed a binary trade-off between annuity or income drawdown and CDC pension. Individuals could potentially take a mixture of more than one at retirement, but this was not tested.

This research shows some evidence of greater attraction to CDC pensions for the less wealthy. We believe this is an area worthy of further research.

The results will, to a degree, be influenced by the assumptions made, including the likely starting incomes of the three options. Annuity rates, for example, have risen significantly since the research assumptions were set.

There will be other refinements as the policy development on decumulation-only CDC evolves and details are finalised — for example, medical underwriting.

Our research looked solely at the demand for CDC, not the appetite of potential providers to deliver CDC. Further research into both the demand and supply aspects will be needed.

Our key conclusion is that there could be significant demand for CDC pensions.





Contact Us

Matthew Arends

Head of UK Retirement Policy

+44 020 7086 4261

matthew.arends@aon.com

About Aon

Aon plc (NYSE: AON) exists to shape decisions for the better — to protect and enrich the lives of people around the world. Through actionable analytic insight, globally integrated Risk Capital and Human Capital expertise, and locally relevant solutions, our colleagues provide clients in over 120 countries with the clarity and confidence to make better risk and people decisions that help protect and grow their businesses.

Follow Aon on [LinkedIn](#), [X](#), [Facebook](#) and [Instagram](#). Stay up-to-date by visiting Aon's [newsroom](#) and sign up for news alerts [here](#).

aon.com

Copyright © 2025 Aon Solutions UK Limited and Aon Investments Limited. All rights reserved.

Aon Wealth Solutions' business in the UK is provided by Aon Solutions UK Limited (registered in England and Wales under registration number 4396810) and Aon Investments Limited (registered in England and Wales under registration number 5913159). Registered office:

The Aon Centre, The Leadenhall Building, 122 Leadenhall Street, London EC3V 4AN. Tel: 020 7623 5500. Aon Investments Limited is authorised and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority.

This document and any enclosures or attachments are prepared on the understanding that they are solely for the benefit of the addressee(s). Unless we provide express prior written consent no part of this document should be reproduced, distributed or communicated to anyone else and, in providing this document, we do not accept or assume any responsibility for any other purpose or to anyone other than the addressee(s) of this document. In this context, “we” includes any Aon Scheme Actuary appointed by you. To protect the confidential and proprietary information included in this document, it may not be disclosed or provided to any third parties without Aon's prior written consent.

Disclaimer:

This document and any due diligence conducted is based upon information available to us at the date of this document and takes no account of subsequent developments. We will not provide any updates or supplements to this document or any due diligence conducted unless we have expressly agreed with you to do so.

In preparing this document we may have relied upon data supplied to us by third parties (including those that are the subject of due diligence) and therefore no warranty or guarantee of accuracy or completeness is provided. We cannot be held accountable for any error, omission or misrepresentation of any data provided to us by third parties (including those that are the subject of due diligence). This document is not intended by us to form a basis of any decision by any third party to do or omit to do anything.

Notwithstanding the level of skill and care used in conducting due diligence into any organisation that is the subject of a rating in this document, it is not always possible to detect the negligence, fraud, or other misconduct of the organisation being assessed or any weaknesses in that organisation's systems and controls or operations.

Any opinions or assumptions in this document have been derived by us through a blend of economic theory, historical analysis and/or other sources. Any opinion or assumption may contain elements of subjective judgement and are not intended to imply, nor should be interpreted as conveying, any form of guarantee or assurance by us of any future performance. Views are derived from our research process and it should be noted in particular that we cannot research legal, regulatory, administrative or accounting procedures and accordingly make no warranty and accept no responsibility for consequences arising from relying on this document in this regard. Calculations may be derived from our proprietary models in use at that time. Models may be based on historical analysis of data and other methodologies and we may have incorporated their subjective judgement to complement such data as is available. It should be noted that models may change over time and they should not be relied upon to capture future uncertainty or events.