Matt Samson
President & Financial Advisor
Business Phone/Text
402.204.0230
Cell Phone
402.980.5183
Matt.Samson@ilsfinancial.com

Asset Allocation vs. Portfolio Design

Why owning the "right mix" isn't the same as having the right portfolio

Asset allocation is widely recognized as a primary driver of long-term investment outcomes. However, many investors and professionals conflate asset allocation with comprehensive portfolio design. This paper distinguishes between the two concepts, explaining why allocation alone may be insufficient for high-income and high-net-worth individuals. It outlines the additional variables—taxation, account structure, liquidity, behavioral factors, and implementation mechanics—that transform allocation into a fully designed portfolio. The paper concludes with a practical framework for evaluating whether a portfolio is merely allocated or truly designed.

Why Asset Allocation Gets So Much Attention

Asset allocation refers to how investments are distributed across asset classes such as equities, fixed income, and alternatives.

Academic research has long demonstrated that allocation decisions explain a significant portion of portfolio return variability over time (Brinson et al., 1986; Brinson et al., 1991).

As a result, many investors reasonably conclude:

"If my allocation is right, my portfolio is right."

For early-stage accumulators, this assumption is often sufficient.

For higher-income and higher-asset households, it is not.

What Asset Allocation Actually Answers

Asset allocation primarily answers one question:

What types of assets do I own, and in what proportions?

It does *not* answer:

- Where those assets are held
- How they interact across accounts
- How taxes affect outcomes

- How cash flow is generated
- How risk is experienced in practice
- How the portfolio adapts over time

These gaps are where portfolio design begins.

Defining Portfolio Design

Portfolio design is the **intentional coordination of investments, accounts, taxes, and behavior** toward a specific outcome (CFA Institute, 2020).

While allocation is a component, design integrates additional dimensions:

- **Account structure** (taxable vs. tax-deferred vs. tax-free)
- **Tax efficiency** and after-tax returns
- **Liquidity planning**
- **Cash-flow timing**
- **Rebalancing mechanics**
- **Behavioral risk tolerance**
- **Implementation costs and constraints**

Two investors can hold identical allocations and experience materially different results due to differences in design.

The Role of Taxes in Portfolio Design

Taxes are one of the most significant differentiators between allocation and design.

Pre-tax returns are hypothetical.
After-tax returns are real.

High-income investors face:

- Higher marginal tax rates
- Capital gains exposure
- Net Investment Income Tax (NIIT)
- State and local taxes
- Timing decisions around realization

Research consistently demonstrates that tax-aware portfolio construction can meaningfully improve after-tax outcomes without increasing market risk (Poterba, 2001; Dammon et al., 2004).

Ignoring taxes does not simplify a portfolio—it obscures its true performance.

Asset Location: The Missing Layer

Asset location refers to placing investments in the most tax-appropriate account types.

For example:

- Tax-inefficient assets may be better suited for tax-deferred accounts
- Tax-efficient assets may belong in taxable accounts
- Growth-oriented assets may benefit from tax-free environments

Despite its importance, asset location is often an afterthought rather than a deliberate decision, particularly when accounts are opened over time without coordination.

Liquidity and Cash-Flow Considerations

Asset allocation models often assume liquidity that does not exist in practice.

Portfolio design accounts for:

- Required withdrawals
- Irregular income
- Emergency reserves
- Business or career risk
- Upcoming capital needs

Without this lens, portfolios may be forced to liquidate assets at inopportune times, increasing both tax costs and behavioral stress.

Behavioral Risk vs. Theoretical Risk

Risk tolerance questionnaires measure *theoretical* risk.

Portfolio design addresses *experienced* risk.

Experienced risk includes:

- Volatility during drawdowns
- Concentration exposure
- Illiquidity
- Uncertainty about outcomes

Behavioral finance research has shown that investor behavior often detracts from long-term returns, particularly during periods of stress (Barberis & Thaler, 2003).

Design aims to reduce the likelihood of poor decisions under pressure.

Rebalancing and Implementation Matter

Even well-allocated portfolios can suffer from poor implementation.

Design includes:

- Rules-based rebalancing
- Tax-aware rebalancing
- Transaction cost control
- Ongoing monitoring and adjustment

Without a clear framework, portfolios drift—sometimes subtly, sometimes significantly.

When Allocation Is Enough—and When It Isn't

Asset allocation alone may be sufficient when:

- Income is relatively low
- Accounts are limited
- Tax exposure is minimal
- Cash-flow needs are simple

Portfolio design becomes critical when:

- Income is high
- Assets span multiple account types
- Taxes materially impact outcomes
- Decisions involve tradeoffs
- Mistakes are costly

For many professionals, this transition occurs gradually and often unnoticed.

A Simple Diagnostic Framework

Consider the following questions:

1. Can you explain *why* each asset is held in its specific account?
2. Is your portfolio evaluated primarily on an after-tax basis?
3. Do your investments align with actual cash-flow needs?
4. Is rebalancing intentional or reactive?
5. Does your portfolio reduce the likelihood of emotional decision-making?

If several answers are unclear, allocation may exist without true design.

Asset allocation is necessary—but not sufficient.

Portfolio design transforms allocation into a coordinated system that reflects taxes, behavior, cash flow, and real-world constraints.

For higher-income and higher-asset households, this distinction is often the difference between acceptable outcomes and optimized ones.

Works Cited

Barberis, N., & Thaler, R. (2003). A survey of behavioral finance. *Handbook of the Economics of Finance, 1*, 1053–1128. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1574-0102(03)01027-6

Brinson, G. P., Hood, L. R., & Beebower, G. L. (1986). Determinants of portfolio performance. *Financial Analysts Journal, 42*(4), 39–44. https://doi.org/10.2469/faj.v42.n4.39

Brinson, G. P., Singer, B. D., & Beebower, G. L. (1991). Determinants of portfolio performance II: An update. *Financial Analysts Journal, 47*(3), 40–48. https://doi.org/10.2469/faj.v47.n3.40

Dammon, R. M., Spatt, C. S., & Zhang, H. H. (2004). Optimal asset location and allocation with taxable and tax-deferred investing. *The Journal of Finance, 59*(3), 999–1037. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.2004.00659.x

Poterba, J. M. (2001). Taxation and portfolio structure: Issues and implications. *National Tax Journal, 54*(2), 369–388. https://doi.org/10.17310/ntj.2001.2.12

Sharpe, W. F. (1994). The arithmetic of active management. *Financial Analysts Journal, 47*(1), 7–9. https://doi.org/10.2469/faj.v47.n1.7

CFA Institute. (2020). *Portfolio management and wealth planning* (CFA Program Curriculum, Level III). CFA Institute.