



Flexibility is a retirement-income requirement, not a feature

Retirement-income design often treats flexibility as secondary to the promise of regular income. That is the wrong hierarchy. For a retiree, flexibility should not be a nice-to-have feature. It should be a core requirement because retirement rarely unfolds in a straight line.

Spending needs change. The early years may involve travel, home improvements or support for adult children. Later years may involve medical costs, aged-care deposits, home modifications or additional support for a spouse. A retiree may downsize, suffer illness, receive an inheritance, change living arrangements, or need to draw a large amount at short notice. A retirement-income strategy that cannot absorb these events may look stable on paper but fail in practice.

This is where many retirement-income conversations may become too narrow. They focus on whether an income stream is regular or guaranteed, without measuring what the retiree gives up in exchange. Certainty has value but so does control. Liquidity has value. Estate flexibility has value. The ability to reset the income path after a major life event has value. These values should not be treated as afterthoughts.

The real test is whether the retiree can fund both planned income and unplanned life. That requires more than a projection of annual payments. It requires a year-by-year view of accessible capital, income by source, expected residual balance, Age Pension interaction, and the impact of additional withdrawals. A retiree who needs \$50,000 for health, housing or family reasons should be able to see how that decision affects the remaining 30-year income course.

MyRI is designed to make those trade-offs visible. It allows a retiree, with or without a financial planner, to test additional drawdowns, lump sums, income targets, Age Pension settings, investment choices and product overlays before committing to a course. It does not treat flexibility as an abstract preference. It shows the real-dollar impact of flexibility decisions on income sustainability and remaining capital.

ABCD IQ then gives the ABP pathway the operating discipline needed to support that flexibility. Its Asset-Liability Management technique prepares for adverse events before they occur by maintaining liquid and stable retirement income drawdowns. When markets are stressed, the methodology can help support income without forcing unnecessary sales of growth assets at the wrong time. After recovery, the process seeks to restore the initial chosen investment allocation, so the retiree is prepared for the next disruption.

That matters because flexibility without risk management can be dangerous. A static ABP may provide access to capital, but if sequencing risk is unmanaged, early drawdowns during poor markets can permanently impair the plan. Conversely, a lifetime product may manage longevity framing but restrict access when the retiree needs capital most. Neither extreme is sufficient. The better solution is a managed ABP strategy that preserves flexibility while actively supporting the income drawdowns.

Conclusion: Retirees do not need income promises that ignore real life. They need a course that can fund regular spending, absorb irregular needs, protect access to capital and remain sustainable through market and inflation shocks. MyRI measures those trade-offs. ABCD IQ manages them within the ABP.