A WEALTH COUNCIL WHITE PAPER

Why Financial Plans Fail
and Are a Must Do

Five structural failures in conventional financial planning, why a plan is still essential, and what it has to do instead.

Boris Blum
September 2026

Wealth Council · A PAG Alliance program · Private Client Solutions, LLC.

Rev 2 · September 25, 2026

The short version

Ask a simple question of any financial plan written more than a few years ago: where does it deal with AI as a force that could rewrite its owner's income model within 24 months, rather than as something to invest in? Almost none do. Not because the planners were careless, but because a static plan can only price the world its authors could imagine. AI is merely the newest reminder. Pandemics, inflation shocks, business failures and health events all make the same point: plans optimize for expected futures, while real lives are decided by unexpected ones.

Financial planning does not usually fail because the arithmetic is wrong. It fails because it manufactures certainty out of assumptions. There are no certainties in finance, only probabilities, and a document that hides that from the person holding it has done them a disservice, however carefully it was built.

47%
of Americans have no written financial plan of any kind.
Allianz, 2026 Annual Retirement Study

56%
of clients advised by a CFP professional are reviewed annually or less.
CFP Board, 2026

In a separate survey asking a different question, the CFP Board found that **53%** of Americans have ever worked with a financial planner at all. The three figures come from two organizations and are not two halves of one population.

CFP Board Consumer Sentiment Survey

This paper sets out five failures we can each point to evidence for, and what has to be true of a plan for it to survive contact with a real life. The argument runs in both directions, and the title means both halves of it. Financial plans fail, for structural reasons no amount of diligence fixes. And a plan is still a must do, because not having one does not take you out of the game. It only takes your eyes off it. It is the static plan that fails, and the answer is not a better forecast. It is a cycle: clarity about where you stand, the confidence that clarity earns, and the capabilities you then go after, repeated every time the world moves.

Failure one: the plan is wrong the moment it is created

Building a real financial plan is onerous. It takes several sessions, reams of collected data and months of back and forth. None of that is the problem. The problem is what all that effort resolves into: a single snapshot, fixed at the moment of production, and then filed.

And that snapshot is not built from facts. Every projection in it rests on assumptions: inflation, equity returns, bond yields, longevity, future needs. Any one of them slightly off produces a materially different answer, and being slightly off is the normal case rather than the exception. The plan does not become wrong later when markets move. It was wrong on the day it was handed over. What changes later is only how far wrong, and in which direction.

The review data is the tell. CFP Board reports that 44 percent of clients advised by a CFP professional receive plan reviews more frequently than annually, roughly double the 23 percent rate for clients of other advisors. Read that the other way around: even among the best served clients in the industry, a clear majority are reviewed once a year at most. For everyone with a less rigorous arrangement, the number is worse.

Life happens to everyone, and when it does your attention goes to what happened, not to your plan. By the time anyone reaches an annual review, if it happens at all, events are already in play and it is too late to have chosen differently.

Failure two: the wrong question is asked first

Conventional planning opens with capital, dates and a risk score. That order quietly assumes you already know what you want, and that what you say first is what you actually mean.

Morningstar tested exactly this. Participants were asked to name their top three financial goals, then shown a master list of common goals and asked to rank again. 73 percent changed at least one of their top three. People who had first answered in broad terms produced more specific and more personal goals the second time, moving from "retirement" to something closer to "feel secure about my finances in retirement."

The implication is uncomfortable. If roughly three quarters of people revise their priorities the moment they are prompted properly, then a plan built on the first answer is optimizing for goals its owner does not hold. Every projection after that point is precise and pointed at the wrong target.

Failure three: risk is collapsed into a single number

Most questionnaires produce one risk score, and most people land in the middle of it. But risk is not one thing. It is at least three, and they move independently. John Grable's psychometric review for the CFA Institute Research Foundation states it flatly: financial risk tolerance is distinct from risk perception, risk capacity, risk need and risk composure, and those terms are not interchangeable. Each is a separate input into a person's risk profile.

Risk tolerance. What you can psychologically live with. A relatively stable trait.

Risk capacity. What your balance sheet can absorb. A financial fact, indifferent to how you feel.

Risk perception. How risky this moment feels to you. Volatile, and highest exactly when markets have already fallen.

A single score averages a stable trait, a hard financial constraint and a temporary emotional state into one figure, and then uses it to set an allocation for decades. Someone with high capacity and currently low perception is not the same client as someone with low capacity and high tolerance, but one number cannot tell them apart.

Failure four: the single probability of success

The standard output of a modern plan is one number: a probability of success from a Monte Carlo simulation. It is the most confident sounding part of the entire document and the least defensible.

It is extremely sensitive to assumptions. Work by Wade Pfau published in the Journal of Financial Planning shows these scores move sharply with the assumed return distribution. The difference between an 83 percent and a 91 percent result can rest on a half point change in expected returns, an assumption no one can pin down in advance. Presented to one decimal place, it implies a precision that does not exist.

It hides the thing you actually care about. A probability of success says nothing about the magnitude of failure. A plan that fails by three months and a plan that fails by fifteen years both count as failures. The number you are given cannot distinguish an inconvenience from a catastrophe.

It assumes behavior most retirees do not exhibit. Employee Benefit Research Institute work finds that most retirees adjust spending in response to market conditions. Probability of success models generally assume fixed spending regardless of what markets do, which means they model a person most retirees are not.

And people cannot use it. An Investments and Wealth Institute survey reported that 68 percent of advisors say clients struggle to interpret probability based outputs, and more than half said the metric creates more anxiety than confidence during downturns. A number that the professional cannot explain and the client cannot act on is not an output. It is decoration.

One confident percentage is precise, comforting and indefensible. Worse, it is persuasive: it manufactures a sense of security that the underlying assumptions cannot support. Showing what is likely and probable, how it holds up across different regimes, and what failure would actually look like is less satisfying and far more honest.

Failure five: nothing in the plan knows the world changed

Even a well built plan usually assumes one regime: a long run average return, a steady inflation rate, an orderly sequence. Regimes do not work that way. Inflation, rates, growth and liquidity shift together and stay shifted for years, and the sequence in which returns arrive matters enormously to anyone drawing an income.

The clearest current example is the quietest one. Long term interest rates peaked in 1981 and fell for four decades, a bond bull market that flattered every conventional allocation and every planning assumption built on top of it. In 2022 that regime ended: the broad U.S. bond index posted a 13 percent loss, the worst calendar year in its history, and the diversification assumption at the heart of most plans failed at the exact moment it was needed. Yet the modeling convention across the industry is still to project forward from the very decades the new regime just closed the book on. The point is not that the last 40 years were wrong. It is that the next 40 are under no obligation to rhyme, and no one can tell you today how long the new regime lasts. A static plan simply assumes the question away.

A plan that cannot be re run under a different regime cannot tell you the one thing worth knowing: not whether it works, but where it breaks, and what you would do about it.

And yet a plan is a must do

Five structural failures invite a lazy conclusion: if plans go wrong this reliably, skip the exercise. That conclusion does not survive one honest look at the alternative. You have a financial plan whether you wrote one or not. Spending, saving, allocation, the date you stop working: the bets are being placed either way. Declining to write them down does not make them go away. It only means no one is watching them, including you.

The evidence points the same way. In Schwab's Modern Wealth Survey, among Americans who do have a written financial plan, 96 percent say they feel confident they will reach their financial goals. Confidence is not the outcome itself. It is what the outcome runs on: the willingness to look at your situation squarely, decide, act, and look again. That cycle starts the day the first plan is written, however imperfect that first plan is guaranteed to be.

Eisenhower, who oversaw the planning of the largest amphibious invasion in history, put the distinction precisely: plans are worthless, but planning is everything. The document decays on contact with reality. The discipline compounds. Failures one, four and five are failures of the noun, a static artifact trusted long after its assumptions expired. Failures two and three are failures of the verb, and those are the worse kind. Repeat that process faithfully, on schedule, every year, and you ask the same wrong question and collapse risk into the same single number, only on a fresher date.

A plan is a must do not because it will be right, but because it is the only instrument that tells you where you stand, what changed, and what to do about it. Skipping it does not protect you from being wrong. It only guarantees you find out late.

What a plan has to do instead

So the question is not whether to plan. It is what a plan has to do to deserve the trust the static version squanders. The answer is that it has to work the way life works, which means abandoning the idea that its job is to produce an answer and accepting that its job is to keep producing clarity.

The cycle

You cannot have confidence about the future unless you have clarity about your own situation. The world is uncertain enough on its own. Clarity is the only thing that is actually available to you, and it is what confidence is built on.

Clarity earns confidence. Confidence lets you go after the capabilities you need to close the distance between where you are and where you intend to be. Then something shifts, because something always does, and the clarity you had is no longer current. So you go round again, better informed than last time, and the bar rises.

Clarity leads to confidence. Confidence leads to capability. The world changes, and it begins again. This is what dynamic planning means. Not a forecast that is revised, but a cycle that never closes. The purpose is not to predict your outcome. It is to let you see, whenever you want to ask, how the odds of a favorable outcome are running and what would move them.

What that requires in practice

Start with why. Establish goals and values before capital, using a structured prompt rather than a blank question, because the first answer is usually not the real one.

Separate the three risks. Measure tolerance, capacity and perception independently and keep them visible as three controls, never one score.

Make assumptions movable. Every material input should be adjustable by the person whose life it describes, with historical context attached, and never locked.

Recompute continuously. Change an input and the consequence should appear at once. A plan you have to commission an update for is a document, not an instrument.

State probabilities, never certainties. What is likely and probable, grounded in historic norms. Resilience across named regimes, income coverage, and an explicit pre mortem asking what would have to happen for this to fail.

Record drift. Log every change so the owner can see how their own answers moved over time. Point in time decay should be visible, not invisible.

Raise the bar each turn. Every pass should leave the person with more clarity than the last one, not simply a fresher number. That is the measure of whether any of this is working.

Part of this is already built

Everything above is either a complaint or a specification, depending on whether anyone builds to it. Wealth Council built the first part of it. The instrument is Charting Your Course to Wealth™, it is free, it is public, and it is open now.

It begins where this paper says a plan has to begin: with why, before how much. You write your three most important financial goals down cold. Then you meet a master list of what other people name, and you rank again. You will find out whether you are one of the 73 percent, and either way you have learned something before a single dollar figure is entered.

Tolerance, capacity and perception stay three separate controls. Every material assumption is yours to set and yours to move, with historical context beside it, and the consequence appears while you watch. Move the year you stop working and the answer moves in front of you. That is what separates an instrument from a document.

What it returns is a gap. Two lines leave today: where you are on course to arrive if nothing changes, and what the life you described will cost on the day you need the money. The distance between them is a number you can see, move, and argue with. It is not a probability of success, because that number is the false certainty this paper is about.

Three constraints are worth stating plainly, because they are constraints rather than features. There is no account aggregation anywhere in it, so we never ask for banking credentials. Nothing is saved unless you choose to save it. And it does not make recommendations: it shows consequences and explains its own reasoning, which is a different job from telling anyone what to buy.

One thing it deliberately does not do is remember. The record of how your own answers moved, and why, is yours to keep. That is not an omission. A plan decays quietly when nobody is watching it, and the person best placed to watch yours is you.

Go and find out what your gap is.
It takes about ten minutes and it costs nothing. There is nothing to buy, now or later, and nobody will call you. Anyone who has been handed this paper can sit down with it today, at chartingyourcoursetowealth.com.

Sources

Every statistic cited in this paper is drawn from published research.

- Allianz Center for the Future of Retirement, 2026 Annual Retirement Study. Share of Americans with no written financial plan.
- CFP Board, Consumer Sentiment Survey. Share of Americans who have ever worked with a financial planner.
- CFP Board, 2026 research on CFP professional advised Americans. Plan review frequency, detailed retirement plans and comprehensive investment strategies.
- Morningstar behavioral research on goal setting and the master list method. 73 percent of participants changed at least one top three goal after prompting.
- Wade Pfau, Journal of Financial Planning. Sensitivity of Monte Carlo probability of success to capital market assumptions.
- Employee Benefit Research Institute. Retiree spending adjustment in response to market conditions.
- John E. Grable, Financial Risk Tolerance: A Psychometric Review. CFA Institute Research Foundation, 2017. Risk tolerance as distinct from risk perception, risk capacity, risk need and risk composure.
- Investments and Wealth Institute, 2024 advisor survey. Client difficulty interpreting probability based outputs.
- Charles Schwab, 2024 Modern Wealth Survey. Share of Americans with a written financial plan, and confidence in reaching financial goals among those who have one.
- Dwight D. Eisenhower, remarks to the National Defense Executive Reserve Conference, November 14, 1957. Plans are worthless, but planning is everything.
- Federal Reserve historical data and Bloomberg U.S. Aggregate Bond Index. Long Treasury yields peaked in 1981; the index's 2022 calendar year loss of roughly 13 percent was the worst in its history.

Wealth Council · A PAG Alliance program · Private Client Solutions, LLC
P.O. Box 777-262, Henderson, Nevada 89077

Rev 2 · September 25, 2026