CIO Brief

FX Hedging for Equity Portfolios – What Actually Matters

What works, what doesn't, and why

Version 2, December 2025

By Mike Duncan, Para Bellum Advisors

www.parabellumadvisors.com

Executive Summary

Foreign exchange hedging in equity portfolios is one of those topics that attracts strong opinions and surprisingly little clarity. Rolling short-dated FX forwards are often criticised as simplistic, mismatched, or evidence of weak risk management. Yet they remain the dominant hedge structure across institutional equity portfolios globally.

That persistence is not an accident. It reflects how equity portfolios behave, how organisations are governed, and the real constraints under which investment teams operate. The issue is not whether rolling forwards are "right" or "wrong", but whether their role and limitations are properly understood.

This brief sets out the practical economics behind equity FX hedging, the reasons common prescriptions fail, and how CIOs should think about structuring FX risk in a way that is both defensible and effective.

Equity FX Risk Is Structurally Open-Ended

Equity portfolios create a fundamentally different FX hedging problem to bonds or loans. There is no contractual maturity, no principal repayment, and no defined exit date. FX exposure persists for as long as the portfolio exists, which in many cases is effectively indefinite.

As a result, there is no such thing as a "perfect" FX hedge for equities. Every approach involves trade-offs between volatility reduction, carry cost, flexibility, and governance simplicity. Many of the failures seen in practice stem from applying fixed horizon hedging logic to an exposure that has no natural termination point.

The task is not to eliminate FX risk, but to shape it in a way that aligns with portfolio objectives and organisational realities.

Why Rolling FX Forwards Persist

Despite frequent criticism, rolling short-dated FX forwards dominate institutional practice for good reasons. They are deeply liquid, cheap to transact, and scalable to very large portfolios. They allow hedge sizes to be adjusted as equity allocations change, and they minimise the risk of crystallising large mark-to-market losses when portfolios are restructured or mandates change.

Long-dated FX hedges may appear more theoretically aligned with long-term equity holdings, but in practice they introduce termination risk, consume counterparty credit, amplify mark-to-market volatility, and reduce flexibility. For portfolios with uncertain holding periods or active rebalancing, these costs often outweigh any theoretical benefits.

Rolling forwards survive because they are operationally robust, not because they are optimal in every dimension.

What Rolling Forwards Actually Achieve

Rolling FX forwards are effective at reducing short-term FX volatility and smoothing reported returns. They dampen the amplification that occurs when equity markets fall and currencies move against the investor at the same time. For governance, reporting, and risk-control purposes, this matters.

What they do not do is neutralise long-term FX risk. Over time, cumulative FX movements and interest-rate differentials continue to affect outcomes. Rolling forwards shape the path of returns, but they do not stabilise terminal base-currency outcomes.

Many governance debates arise because these two objectives – short-term volatility control and long-term FX neutrality – are conflated.

Hedge Ratios Are Not Constants

There is no universally optimal hedge ratio for equity portfolios. In practice, most institutions operate somewhere between partial hedging and near-full hedging, depending on base currency, liabilities, risk tolerance, and regulatory environment.

Fully hedged equity portfolios are often driven by governance optics rather than economics. Persistent carry drag, loss of diversification benefits, and constant resizing costs can quietly erode long-term performance.

More robust frameworks treat hedge ratios as ranges rather than fixed points, allowing positioning to reflect carry economics and changing market conditions while remaining within governance limits.

Carry Is the Dominant Long-Term Driver

Over long horizons expected FX returns tend toward zero. Hedge costs do not.

Interest-rate differentials compound year after year and often dominate FX hedging outcomes. For investors based in low-rate currencies, hedging foreign equities can impose a persistent and material drag on returns. For those in higher-rate currencies, hedging may simultaneously reduce volatility and enhance returns.

Ignoring carry does not remove its impact. It simply embeds it invisibly into portfolio performance.

Why Tenor Matching Fails for Equities

Tenor-matched FX hedging is appropriate for assets with known maturities, such as bonds. For equities, it introduces new risks rather than eliminating existing ones. Long-dated hedges are harder to unwind, more volatile on a mark-to-market basis, and less liquid outside major currency pairs.

Rolling structures acknowledge the reality that equity portfolios evolve and that flexibility has economic value.

The Role of FX Options

FX options are not a substitute for forwards. They are a convexity tool.

Used selectively, they allow portfolios to retain upside participation, protect against extreme downside scenarios, and reduce pro-cyclical behaviour during periods of stress. In environments where carry is unfavourable or tail risks are elevated, options can materially improve risk-adjusted outcomes relative to forwards alone.

Their value lies in how they behave during the path, not in eliminating FX exposure entirely.

When FX Hedging Is Mandatory

In regulated environments where FX hedging is prescribed, optimisation gives way to compliance. Rolling forwards become the default instrument because they are simple, liquid, and auditable. Carry drag becomes unavoidable.

In these cases, options often represent the only remaining lever to reduce second-order damage without breaching constraints.

Implications for CIOs

FX hedging for equity portfolios is not about finding a perfect structure. It is about making trade-offs explicit, defensible, and aligned with real portfolio behaviour.

Rolling forwards are not wrong – they are incomplete. Carry matters more than volatility over time. Hedge ratios should be flexible, not dogmatic. Options add value when used with intent. Governance clarity is as important as technical design.

The objective is not to eliminate FX risk, but to manage it intelligently under real-world constraints.

Further Reading and Practitioner Resources

Para Bellum Advisors publishes practitioner papers and CIO Briefs: www.parabellumadvisors.com/insights.

About Para Bellum Advisors

Para Bellum Advisors is an independent advisory firm specialising in derivatives, collateral, and balance-sheet efficiency for institutional investors.

The firm works with lean investment teams managing complex, long-dated portfolios across FX, rates, credit, equity, and volatility risk. Its focus is not on product distribution or transaction volume, but on structure: how hedges are designed, how capital is consumed, and how portfolios behave under stress.

Para Bellum Advisors is practitioner-led. Its work draws on decades of experience across trading, structuring, and portfolio management in banks, asset managers, and insurance balance sheets. The objective is not theoretical optimisation, but durable improvement in capital efficiency, liquidity resilience, and realised outcomes.

For more information, visit www.offers.parabellumadvisors.com

For discussion or enquiries contact with **Mike Duncan** at **mike.duncan@parabellumadvisors.com**.

Published by Para Bellum Advisors | Singapore