

Why Tax Planning Fails Without Implementation

A technically correct recommendation produces no tax benefit until someone actually carries it out. Implementation is part of the planning result.

Owen S. Arnoff, EA, NTPI Fellow

OwenArnoff.com

CENTRAL IDEA

A recommendation is not complete when it is presented. It is complete when the required actions are clearly assigned, carried out, objectively confirmed, and incorporated into the taxpayer's ongoing record.

Educational and practitioner-use material. Verify current authority, deadlines, and taxpayer-specific facts before relying on any strategy.

WHAT THIS PAPER EXAMINES

A technically correct recommendation produces no tax benefit until someone actually carries it out. Implementation is part of the planning result.

Implementation turns advice into an observable result

A sent instruction is not evidence that the transaction occurred. Define the evidence before the task is assigned.

“A recommendation is not complete when it is presented. It is complete when the required actions are clearly assigned, carried out, objectively confirmed, and incorporated into the taxpayer’s ongoing record.”

Executive perspective

Tax professionals devote substantial attention to authority, calculations, and recommendation quality. Yet many planning failures occur after the recommendation is delivered. An election is not filed. Payroll never begins. A contribution misses the deadline. A deed is signed but not recorded. A custodian executes a transfer differently from the instructions. A client assumes the attorney handled the filing; the attorney assumes the tax professional did. Everyone believes the transaction was completed until the next tax season reveals otherwise.

The implementation problem is predictable because tax planning often crosses professional and operational boundaries. A single strategy may require a taxpayer, tax practitioner, attorney, payroll company, plan administrator, investment custodian, lender, appraiser, state agency, charity, bookkeeper, or insurance professional. Unless responsibility and evidence are explicit, the recommendation can dissolve into a chain of assumptions.

A complete planning process therefore treats implementation as a controlled workflow: translate the recommendation into actions, assign ownership, set deadlines, identify prerequisites, confirm completion, measure the result, and remediate failures.

The implementation gap

The implementation gap is the distance between “this is what we recommend” and objective evidence that the required action actually occurred. It exists even when the technical analysis is flawless.

Common causes include:

- ambiguous responsibility
- unclear deadlines
- third-party dependencies
- client misunderstanding
- recommendations written as concepts rather than actions
- missing prerequisites
- changes in facts after the recommendation
- failure to obtain proof of completion
- no follow-up mechanism
- assuming that a sent instruction equals a completed transaction.

Convert recommendations into observable actions

“Consider an S corporation” is not an implementation step. “File Form 2553 effective January 1, establish payroll by March 15, register for state payroll accounts, adopt an accountable plan, and update bookkeeping procedures” is closer to an action plan.

Every material recommendation should be decomposed into the filings, elections, transfers, contributions, payroll changes, account openings, notices, valuations, agreements, payments, registrations, or other concrete tasks required to make the recommendation real.

This decomposition often reveals hidden complexity before the client commits. If a strategy requires six third parties and several deadline-sensitive steps, the implementation burden belongs in the economic analysis.

Assign one owner to every material action

Action ledger field	Purpose
Action	What must happen
Responsible party	Who owns the step
Due date	When it must be done
Prerequisites	What must happen first
Evidence	What proves completion
Follow-up date	When the file is checked again

Shared responsibility frequently becomes no responsibility. Each action should have a primary owner even if others participate. The owner may be the practitioner, client, attorney, payroll provider, custodian, plan administrator, or another party.

A simple action ledger can contain:

The practitioner does not need to perform every action. The practitioner does need to know which actions are inside the engagement, which are outside it, and how open dependencies will be communicated.

- action
- responsible party
- due date
- prerequisites
- third-party dependency
- expected evidence of completion
- status

- follow-up date
- notes on deviations from the original plan.

Define the evidence before the task is assigned

KEY INSIGHT

If nobody knows what evidence is expected, implementation tends to stop at “I think it was done.”

One of the easiest ways to improve implementation is to decide in advance what will prove completion. The evidence may be:

If nobody knows what evidence is expected, implementation tends to stop at “I think it was done.”

- IRS acceptance of an election
- state entity or tax registration confirmation
- payroll report and W-2 setup
- custodian statement showing a completed conversion or contribution
- executed and recorded legal document
- retirement-plan adoption agreement
- charitable acknowledgment
- valuation report
- bank confirmation
- updated accounting ledger
- signed client election or consent.

Deadlines are part of the recommendation

A strategy that works on December 31 may not work on January 1. Elections, contributions, payroll corrections, entity filings, charitable transfers, distributions, valuations, and state actions can all be time-sensitive. The implementation record should distinguish legal deadlines, administrative lead times, and internal target dates.

Internal target dates should be earlier than the legal deadline when third parties are involved. A year-end charitable transfer initiated on December 30 may fail even if the client acted before year-end because the custodian did not complete the transfer. The action plan should account for operational reality.

Third-party handoffs require closed-loop communication

Tax planning frequently depends on professionals the tax practitioner does not control. The solution is not to assume responsibility for another professional's work. It is to make the handoff explicit.

Closed-loop communication means the receiving party understands the requested action, the taxpayer understands who is responsible, and the planning file ultimately receives confirmation that the action was completed—or records that it was not.

Where confidentiality and professional boundaries allow, copying the taxpayer on handoff communications and requesting a copy of final documentation can materially reduce ambiguity.

Client communication should be operational

A planning memorandum can be technically excellent and still be unusable. The taxpayer should be able to identify:

The client-facing version need not reproduce the full technical analysis. It should convert the analysis into understandable actions while the practitioner workpaper preserves the deeper authority and reasoning.

- what must happen
- why it matters
- who must do it
- what documents are required
- what deadline applies
- what the practitioner needs back
- what happens if the facts change.

Implementation verification is also a tax-return control

Many implementation records become source documents for the next return. A confirmed Roth conversion affects Form 8606 and income reporting. A completed S election changes the entity return. A retirement-plan contribution affects deductions and plan reporting. A state registration changes filing obligations. A property transfer changes ownership and potentially basis or depreciation.

Preserving implementation evidence therefore improves both planning continuity and return preparation. It reduces the risk that next year's preparer must reconstruct what happened from memory.

Measure the actual result

Projected tax savings are not realized tax savings. When the recommendation is material, compare what was modeled with what actually occurred. The taxpayer may have implemented only part of the recommendation, changed the timing, earned more income, moved states later than expected, or incurred costs not included in the original analysis.

A simple actual-versus-projected review answers three questions: 1 What was expected? 2 What was actually implemented? 3 What was the economic result and why did it differ?

This protects against overstating planning success and produces better assumptions for the next cycle.

“Projected tax savings are not realized tax savings.”

Remediation: failed implementation is not always final

When implementation fails, the next question should be whether a correction remains available. Depending on the issue, possibilities may include a late election procedure, amended filing, plan correction program, penalty relief, appeal, reformation, administrative correction, state remedy, or a different transaction that preserves part of the original objective.

Remediation should be documented with the same rigor as the initial recommendation: facts, authority, deadline, action owner, cost, expected result, and evidence of completion.

Worked example: a Roth conversion that did not happen as planned

Assume a practitioner recommends a \$90,000 Roth conversion in November after modeling taxable income, Medicare exposure, and cash available for tax. The client is told to contact the custodian. At tax time, the

practitioner discovers that the client moved \$90,000 from one traditional IRA to another traditional IRA because the client misunderstood the instruction.

Under a weak process, the file contains the original recommendation and an email saying “please complete the conversion.” Under a strong process, the action ledger would have specified the destination account, execution deadline, custodian confirmation required, and follow-up date. The practitioner would have requested the transaction confirmation before year-end, creating a chance to detect the error while corrective action might still have been possible.

The lesson is not that the practitioner must execute investment transactions. It is that a tax result dependent on a third-party transaction should have a verification checkpoint.

Worked example: S corporation implementation drift

Assume a business owner elects S status and begins payroll, but the bookkeeping remains on the old sole-proprietor structure, personal and business expenses continue to mix, shareholder health insurance is not handled correctly, and retirement-plan contributions are calculated from the wrong compensation base. The entity election succeeded, but the broader implementation did not.

This is why the implementation plan should include accounting, payroll, benefits, distributions, retirement plan, and state compliance—not merely Form 2553. Tax planning is often a system change, not a form filing.

Implementation maturity levels

Level	Control
1 - Recommendation	Advice is delivered; follow-up is informal.
2 - Assignment	Actions, owners, and deadlines are identified.
3 - Verification	Evidence of completion is collected and preserved.
4 - Measurement	The realized result is compared with the projection and fed into the next planning cycle.

Practices can think about implementation maturity in four levels:

The objective is not bureaucracy for its own sake. It is to match the control level to the materiality and complexity of the recommendation.

- Level 1 — Recommendation: advice is delivered, but follow-up is informal.
- Level 2 — Assignment: actions, owners, and deadlines are identified.
- Level 3 — Verification: evidence of completion is collected and preserved.
- Level 4 — Measurement: the realized result is compared with the projection and fed into the next planning cycle.

Scope of engagement should match the implementation promise

Implementation tracking can create confusion if the engagement letter says the practitioner provides analysis only while the client assumes the practitioner will ensure every third party acts. The scope should state whether the practitioner is responsible for filing, coordinating, monitoring, or merely advising on each major action.

This is not only risk management. It improves service. Clients are more likely to complete a plan when they understand which steps the firm will handle and which remain their responsibility.

Status should be explicit, not inferred

USEFUL STATUSES

Proposed • Approved • Assigned • In progress • Awaiting third party • Completed • Verified • Declined • Superseded • Failed / remediation required

An implementation system benefits from a small number of clear statuses: proposed, approved, assigned, in progress, awaiting third party, completed, verified, declined, superseded, or failed/remediation required. “Open” is often too vague. Explicit status makes it easier to identify stalled work before deadlines pass.

The status record should also distinguish completion from verification. A client may report that a transfer occurred; verification happens when the file contains objective evidence. Both can be recorded without implying distrust of the client.

Recurring recommendations need recurring controls

Some strategies are not one-time events. Reasonable compensation, retirement-plan funding, quarterly estimates, accountable-plan reimbursements, charitable distributions, residency documentation, and basis tracking may require recurring attention. The implementation plan should identify whether the action is one-time, annual, quarterly, monthly, or event-driven.

A one-time checklist cannot manage a recurring strategy. The control should regenerate the next required action or review date after completion.

Exception handling is part of implementation design

Real clients deviate from plans. They change amounts, miss dates, switch custodians, obtain financing, sell assets unexpectedly, or decide not to proceed. A mature implementation process records the exception and routes it back to analysis when the deviation is material.

For example, if a client completes only half of a planned Roth conversion, the file should not merely mark the task “done.” It should record the actual amount, update the projected tax, and determine whether any remaining action is appropriate. The implementation record should reflect reality, not the binary completion of a checklist item.

Implementation data become institutional memory

In a multi-practitioner firm, implementation history is part of succession and continuity. If the original adviser retires, becomes unavailable, or transfers the relationship, the next practitioner should be able to see not only the recommendation but also the client’s pattern of follow-through, third-party contacts, unresolved items, and prior remediation. That history can materially improve future planning.

Practice takeaway

A recommendation is not complete when it is presented. It is complete when the required actions are clearly assigned, carried out, objectively confirmed, and incorporated into the taxpayer’s ongoing record. Implementation discipline is what turns technical planning into realized planning.

Primary references and further reading

PROFESSIONAL-USE NOTICE

Educational and practitioner-use material only. Engagement scope, professional responsibility,

filing deadlines, and correction procedures vary by matter. Verify current authority and clearly define responsibility for taxpayer-specific implementation. © 2026 ARNCO DEVELOPMENT LLC.

- IRS Office of Professional Responsibility and Circular 230
- IRS tax-professional best-practice guidance

CONTINUE THE CONVERSATION

Tax Practitioner Intelligence — Real cases. Better questions. Authority-grounded answers.
OwenArnoff.com