

## **Comments on Candidate Performance on Taxation Elective (Sept 2017)**

Overall, most candidates appear to have fully understood the situations presented in the cases. The majority of candidates were able to sufficiently address, analyze and discuss the directed requirements of the cases and also provided responses with an appropriate balance of quantitative and qualitative analysis.

While most candidates appropriately demonstrated their technical knowledge when addressing the required elements of the case, some candidates appeared to struggle to with the technical knowledge required to provide a complete and accurate analysis. Specifically, certain candidates appeared to struggle with evaluating (or even identifying) eligibility for the lifetime capital gains exemption and/or to identify implications related to the change-in-use of a principal residence.

Candidates are also encouraged to ensure they are properly planning their responses to ensure they are allowing sufficient time to sufficiently address all required elements of the case.

### **Comments on Skills**

**Identification:** While most candidates identified and/or attempted to address all of the required elements of the cases it appears that certain candidates would have benefited from spending additional time planning their responses to ensure all required elements of the cases were being sufficiently addressed. Alternatively, perhaps technical weaknesses led certain candidates to avoid addressing all of the required elements.

**Analysis:** Candidates varied widely in their analysis of the issues. While most candidates provided a rich analysis of the issues, some candidates provided a very superficial analysis that would not be useful for their client. For example, for purposes of evaluating the lifetime capital gains exemption, certain candidates failed to provide a complete analysis as they did not fully address all of the criteria.

**Integration:** While the majority of candidates properly applied case facts in order to add depth to their response, certain candidates failed to do so. This resulted in generic responses which, for example, would have been of limited value to their client.

**Conclusion:** Despite the cases specifically requesting a recommended course of action, many candidates failed to provide an overall conclusion or recommendation by integrating various components of their response. In some instances, conclusions were unsupported and/or did not align with a candidate's analysis.

**Communication:** Nearly all candidates adequately communicated within their response. Language used was appropriate and quantitative information was well presented.