The Tail Hedge Playbook: How CIOs Buy Liquidity When Everyone Else is Bleeding

Version 3 - December 2025

By Mike Duncan, Para Bellum Advisors

mike.duncan@parabellumadvisors.com

www.parabellumadvisors.com

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Institutional portfolios are sold the diversification dream. The story is always the same: mix equities, bonds, alternatives, sprinkle in some private markets, and your drawdowns will be "managed."

Consultants show tidy charts of historical correlations, trustees nod, CIOs breathe easier.

But every crisis of the past 35 years has told the opposite story: **diversification fails when you need it most.**

- *1987:* equities fell 20% in a day; balanced portfolios still lost 15–20%.
- *1998:* LTCM blew up; supposedly "uncorrelated" trades all failed together.
- *2008:* equities collapsed 40%, credit spreads exploded, alternatives bled; only explicit convexity worked.
- *2011:* US equity puts were the wrong tool; sovereign and bank CDS were the only effective hedges.
- *2015:* RMB devaluation shocked global markets; FX and EM credit convexity paid.
- *2018:* short-vol ETNs were obliterated; long-vol delivered crisis protection.
- *2020:* COVID wiped 35% off equities in six weeks; convexity delivered cash when it mattered.
- *2022:* inflation killed the bond hedge; 60/40 had its worst year since 1931.

The message is simple: **correlations converge to one under stress, liquidity evaporates, and traditional diversification turns into marketing spin.**

Resilience over P&L. Tail hedging only makes sense when viewed from the lens of *total portfolio resilience*. As Judith Rodin[1] notes, resilience is the ability to prepare, absorb shocks, adapt and turn disruption into opportunity. Convexity provides exactly that: liquidity to survive the drawdown, stability for decision-making, and the optionality to re-risk when conditions settle.

The hedge is not the win – **the stronger portfolio you finish with is the win.**

Tail hedging solves this by explicitly adding convexity to portfolios. Convex exposures accelerate in value as markets break. They don't diversify in normal times – they dominate in stress.

Well-structured tail hedges provide:

- **Drawdown defence –** protecting compounding power.
- **Liquidity creation –** cash inflows exactly when others are forced sellers.
- **Psychological stability –** boards can hold their nerve because they see protection working.

- **Strategic optionality:** –the firepower to buy distressed assets while competitor's de-risk.

It is not free. Carry costs are real. Tail hedging programmes often look like wasted premium in calm years. But the cost is trivial compared to the devastation of an unhedged systemic drawdown.

This paper sets out a practitioner's framework for tail hedging:

- Why diversification fails and why tail risk is misunderstood.
- How convexity works in practice.
- What eight crises teach us about what works and what doesn't.
- Strategic implementation: dedicated sleeves, dynamic overlays, embedded convexity.
- Costs, behavioural barriers, and governance design.

Introduction

Tail risk is the silent killer of institutional portfolios. It's not the 5% correction or the routine bear market. It's the extreme events – the crashes, liquidity freezes, funding shocks – that take portfolios down 30–50% in weeks (or worse in days).

The destruction comes in two forms:

- **Mathematical:** A 40% drawdown requires a 67% gain to break even. The mathematics is straightforward but brutal: a portfolio falling from $100 to $60 requires a subsequent 67% return to recover ($60 × 1.67 = $100). More generally, after a drawdown of D%, the required recovery return is R = 1/(1-D) - 1. This asymmetry means that large losses create disproportionate recovery burdens. A 50% loss demands a 100% gain. An 80% loss requires a 400% gain – essentially impossible for diversified institutional portfolios. That lost time, often measured in years, is compounding that never comes back. Insurers, pensions, and sovereign funds don't get do-overs.
- **Psychological:** Trustees and boards panic under stress. CIOs are fired. Managers de-risk at the bottom. Long-term strategic plans are abandoned. Much of the damage is crystallised not by the crash itself but by the poor decisions made inside it.

The standard defence is diversification. On paper, diversification reduces volatility by combining uncorrelated assets. But this relies on two assumptions: that correlations stay low, and that liquidity is available. Both collapse in crises.

- In March 2020, equities, credit, commodities, and even Treasuries sold off together[2].
- In 2022, equities and bonds fell in tandem for the first time in decades. The "hedge" became another source of pain[3].

This is why **diversification is fragile**. It's not risk management. It's a fair-weather construct.

Tail hedging is different. It doesn't rely on stable correlations. It buys convexity outright: positions that accelerate in value when stress increases. This convexity serves three roles:

1. **Preserve capital:** Avoid catastrophic drawdowns.
2. **Provide liquidity:** Hedges pay out when everything else bleeds.
3. **Preserve conviction:** Fiduciaries can hold their strategy because the hedge proves protection is real.

The challenge is cost. Hedging bleeds premium. Many Tail Heding programmes are cut after a few years of negative carry. Boards hate seeing a line item that "loses money."

But the alternative, systemic drawdowns with no convex defence, is ruinous.

Why Resilience Matters More Than P&L

Tail hedging is often framed as a cost – a bleed or a drag on annual performance. That framing is wrong. The purpose of convexity is to protect the portfolio's *ability to compound*, not to turn a hedge sleeve into a profit centre.

Three realities make this explicit:

1. **Large drawdowns destroy compounding power**
   A 40% loss requires a 67% gain to recover. An 80% loss requires 400%. Once the compounding engine is damaged, the portfolio never catches up to peers who avoided the hit.

2. **Liquidity during a crisis accelerates recovery**
   Cash raised from convexity lets you buy quality assets at distressed levels while competitors de-risk. The recovery path starts earlier and finishes stronger.

3. **Convexity transforms a crisis from threat to opportunity**
   Hedges monetised correctly turn panic into optionality. You stabilise the balance sheet and quietly re-risk while others are still selling.

This is the real resilience dividend: not merely surviving the drawdown, but *emerging stronger* because convexity funded the decisive actions that others couldn't take.

Mechanics of Convexity: Why Tail Hedges Work

Convexity is what makes tail hedges unique. Unlike linear exposures (stocks, bonds), convex instruments like options and volatility derivatives accelerate in value as the underlying market moves against you.

Take a simple put option. Say the S&P is at 4,000. You buy a six-month 3,000 strike put for 1% of notional.

- If the market stays flat, you lose that 1%.
- If the market drops 10% (to 3,600), your put might double to 2% – covering part of the loss.
- If the market drops 25% (to 3,000), your put explodes in value – worth 7–8% or more, offsetting a huge slice of portfolio losses.

That's convexity: **small cost in calm times, explosive payoff in crises** (think of it like fire insurance).

Other hedging tools work similarly:

- **Credit Default Swaps (CDS):** Premiums are modest in calm markets. When credit spreads gap wider in crises, CDS protection multiplies in value.
- **VIX Calls / Variance Swaps:** Cheap in low-volatility regimes, they pay off massively when volatility spikes (e.g., VIX 15 → 80 in March 2020)[4].
- **Trend-following CTAs:** Flat or modest cost in benign markets but deliver convex returns in strong crisis trends.

- **Bespoke Convex Funds[5]:** These funds are tailored to deliver asymmetric payoffs by exploiting market convexity. Typically, they maintain low ongoing costs in stable conditions but achieve outsized gains from market dislocations, crisis events, or rapid shifts in risk premia, making them a valuable complement to traditional hedging tools.
- **Quantitative Investment Strategies** (QIS): Systematic strategies that dynamically adjust exposures based on quantitative signals. In stable markets, QIS tend to show steady, often low volatility returns with controlled costs. During market stress or regime shifts, they can enhance portfolio convexity by capturing momentum, mean reversion, or factor-based anomalies that conventional strategies may miss.

The critical feature: **tail hedges are long gamma, long vega.** They benefit from acceleration and volatility.

The trade-off is theta – the bleed from premium decay. That bleed is the cost of insurance.

In practice, effective tail programs:

- Size allocations at 2–5% of portfolio value.
- Accept the bleed as insurance cost.
- Structure spreads (put spreads, collars) to reduce cost without killing convexity.
- Monetise payoffs during spikes to recycle capital.

Historical Crises: What Worked, What Failed

1987 Black Monday

On 19 October 1987, the S&P 500 fell ~20.5% in a single session, while the Dow dropped 22.6% – still the largest one-day percentage decline on record. The selloff was global and disorderly; market plumbing struggled under order imbalances. The Fed responded quickly to supply liquidity and reassure dealers.

Portfolio impact:

- Balanced portfolios: –15–20% in a day.
- Bonds offered ~+1–2% relief – irrelevant against equity losses.

What failed:

- Balanced portfolios: double-digit losses in a day were common; the equity leg swamped everything.
- Treasuries rallied on flight-to-quality, but the move was small relative to equity damage

What worked:

- Deep OTM puts[6]. A 3,000-strike put (with S&P at 4,000 equivalent today) costing ~1% of notional could return 8–10x overnight. A 2% allocation reduced drawdowns by ~10 percentage points.

Lesson:

Gap risk needs **already-owned** convexity. Dynamic hedging that depends on continuous markets is unreliable when markets don't trade continuously

1998 LTCM Collapse

In August 1998, Long-Term Capital Management – a hedge fund run by Nobel laureates and legendary traders[7] – nearly collapsed the global financial system. The fund had levered itself 25-to-1 on convergence trades: betting that spreads between similar securities would narrow.

When Russia defaulted on its domestic debt, every "safe" arbitrage exploded simultaneously. Spreads didn't converge. They blew out. Correlations that LTCM's models said were impossible spiked to one.

Portfolio impact:

- LTCM lost $4.6 billion in four months - 90% of its capital.
- Diversified funds down 10-15% as credit spreads gapped wider.
- Equity volatility surged. Treasury yields collapsed as investors fled to safety.
- Liquidity evaporated across fixed income markets.

What failed:

- **Diversification and correlation models**: LTCM held hundreds of "uncorrelated" positions. All moved together. Mortgage spreads, swap spreads, merger arb, equity volatility – every convergence trade unwound at once[8].
- **Value at Risk (VaR):** LTCM's risk models relied on short-term historical correlations. They missed tail risk entirely. When asked about extreme scenarios, the fund's risk managers said such events were statistically impossible.
- **Leverage assumptions:** The fund assumed it could unwind positions in liquid markets. In a crisis, there were no buyers. Market-making banks pulled back. Leverage became a noose.

What worked:

- **Long volatility / convex positions:** Investors holding explicit volatility protection or credit default swaps (CDS) [9] – still a young market in 1998 – posted gains as implied volatility spiked and credit spreads widened dramatically.
- **Outright long Treasuries:** Flight-to-quality pushed long-duration US Treasuries up sharply, cushioning portfolios that held them as ballast rather than just for yield.
- **Explicit hedges on leverage:** A handful of sophisticated funds had bought protection against spread widening. These positions exploded in value and provided liquidity when everything else froze.

Lesson:

LTCM proved[10],[11] that "model diversification" is a myth. You can't diversify away tail risk by adding more complicated trades. The fund held positions in Danish mortgages, Russian debt, Italian swaps, and S&P volatility and still got wiped out because the underlying driver was global risk aversion.

Tail hedging protects against this. It doesn't rely on correlations staying low. It buys explicit convexity: instruments that accelerate when stress appears, regardless of what "diversification" the rest of the portfolio pretends to offer.

2008 Global Financial Crisis

The 2008 crisis[12] was the big one. Subprime mortgages defaulted. Securitised credit collapsed. Lehman Brothers failed. The S&P fell 57% from peak to trough. Credit markets seized. Liquidity vanished. It was the worst crisis since the Great Depression[13].

Diversified portfolios didn't just suffer. They were eviscerated.

Portfolio impact:

- **Equities:** S&P 500 down 37% in 2008, total peak-to-trough decline of 57% by March 2009.
- **Credit:** Investment-grade spreads widened from 90bps to 650bps. High-yield spreads exceeded 2,000bps. Credit losses mounted across the board.
- **Alternatives:** Hedge funds down 19% (HFRI Index). Private equity marks collapsed. Real estate fell 30%+. Every "diversifier" bled in tandem.
- **60/40 portfolios:** Lost 25–30% despite being "balanced." The cushion from bonds was minor compared to equity destruction.

What failed:

- **Diversification:** Correlations spiked to 0.8–0.9 across equities, credit, commodities, and real estate. "Uncorrelated" strategies all sold off together as funds deleveraged and redemptions hit.
- **Risk parity:** These portfolios levered into bonds and "low vol" assets. When credit spreads blew out and equity volatility exploded, the leverage amplified losses. The theory of diversification by risk contribution collapsed under stress.
- **Model-based hedging:** Dynamic hedging strategies failed. Volatility markets dislocated. Dealers widened spreads. Execution became impossible during the worst days. Investors who tried to hedge reactively paid 3x-5x normal costs and still couldn't get fills.

What worked:

- **Explicit put protection:** Investors running dedicated put sleeves[14] saw hedges revalue 5x-10x. A 2% allocation to rolling OTM puts turned into 10-20% portfolio

offsets. Those hedges gave portfolios breathing room and capital to redeploy at the bottom.

- **VIX calls / long volatility strategies:** VIX spiked from 15 to 80. Long volatility funds posted +50-100% gains in 2008, providing exactly the convex payoff they promised.
- **CDS sleeves:** Credit default swap protection on investment-grade and high-yield indices exploded in value as spreads gapped out. Portfolios with explicit credit hedges weathered the storm far better than peers.
- **Trend-following CTAs:** Systematic trend strategies captured the sustained equity downtrend and flight into Treasuries. Many CTA funds were up 10-20% in 2008, offering true crisis alpha.

What made the difference:

The institutions that survived and thrived had **pre-positioned convexity**. They weren't trying to buy hedges in October 2008 when the VIX was 80 and put skew was insane. They had been bleeding 50-100bps annually on rolling protection for years.

When Lehman failed, they had cash inflows from hedges precisely when everyone else was forced to sell. They could buy distressed credit at 50 cents on the dollar. They could reload equity exposure at S&P 666. The hedge wasn't just defence. It was the capital for offence.

Lesson:

2008 obliterated the myth that you can construct a portfolio diversified enough to avoid tail hedging. Correlations go to one in systemic crises. Liquidity disappears. Models break. The only reliable protection is explicit, pre-positioned convexity: instruments designed to pay off when everything else collapses.

2011 Eurozone Crisis

The 2011 Eurozone Crisis centred on Greek sovereign debt fears threatening the integrity of the euro area, leading to sharp market selloffs.

Portfolio impact:

- European equities declined by approximately 20%.
- European bank stocks plunged 30–40%.
- Sovereign credit spreads doubled, signaling rising default risks across peripherals.

What failed:

- US equity puts offered poor hedging performance, as they were misaligned with the dominant risk of European sovereign debt and banking sector instability.

What worked:

- Sovereign credit default swaps[15] (CDS) on European peripheral countries offered substantial payoffs, providing effective insurance against sovereign defaults.
- Bank CDS positions yielded massive gains as investors fled systemic banking risks.

Lesson:

Tail hedges must align closely with the prevailing risk drivers; sovereign and banking sector credit hedges proved superior to equity puts in this scenario.

2015 China Devaluation

In August 2015, the People's Bank of China implemented a surprise RMB exchange rate reform that devalued the renminbi by over 3%, causing global market dislocations.

Portfolio impact:

- Global equities declined 10–15%.
- Commodity markets experienced sharp price declines, reflecting fears of slowing Chinese demand.
- FX volatility spiked markedly, creating large moves in emerging markets and currency pairs linked to RMB trade flows.

What worked:

- RMB options and currency derivatives[16] doubled or tripled in value, providing direct hedging gains against the devaluation.
- Emerging market credit hedges mitigated credit spread widening linked to growth concerns.
- Commodity put options protected against sharp downside moves in industrial metals and energy.

Lesson:

Global portfolios require tailored currency and regional hedges to manage shock transmission from major economic reforms or devaluations.

2018 Volmageddon

On February 5, 2018, the VIX index abruptly spiked from approximately 12 to 50 within a few days, driven by a perfect storm of low liquidity, aggressive short-vol positioning, and market volatility shocks. Many short-vol Exchange-Traded Notes (ETNs) and volatility strategies imploded, causing significant losses for leveraged investors.

Portfolio impact:

- Equities experienced sharp declines, with some indices falling around 10% in the days following the spike.
- Short-vol ETNs, which were designed to track inverse VIX movements, lost up to 90% of their value overnight, effectively wiping out many leveraged positions.
  What failed:

What failed:

- Short-vol positioning: Investors who had written VIX calls or held inverse volatility ETNs faced catastrophic losses because their hedges amplified the market decline without sufficient convexity or proper risk management.
- Underestimating tail risk: The market's complacency had led many to underestimate the risk of sudden volatility spikes, and interventions or hedges were insufficient when the event struck.

What worked:

- Long volatility strategies[17]: VIX call options, which increase in value as volatility spikes, gained 400–600%, providing meaningful offset to equity losses for strategic allocators.
- Long-vol funds: Many dedicated long volatility funds delivered 15–20% gains, acting as effective tail hedges.
  Payoff math:
- A modest 1% allocation to VIX call options could have offset roughly 3–4% of equity losses, illustrating the effectiveness of explicit volatility positioning against tail events.

Lesson:

- Short-vol strategies, while seemingly low-cost during calm markets, are highly asymmetric and risky. Penny-wise, the potential for catastrophic losses makes them unsuitable as tail hedges unless properly managed.
- Pre-positioned convexity in volatility instruments offers essential protection during market stress, while reactive hedging during the event often proves too costly and ineffective.

2020 COVID Crash

COVID-19[18] delivered the fastest equity drawdown in history. From February 19 to March 23, 2020, the S&P 500 dropped 34% in 23 trading days[19]. Volatility exploded. Credit spreads gapped. Oil went negative. The entire global economy shut down[20].

It was textbook tail risk: a genuine black swan that no model predicted.

Portfolio impact:

- **Equities:** S&P 500 fell 34% in five weeks. Fastest 30%+ drawdown ever recorded.
- **Volatility:** VIX spiked from 15 to 82 - the highest reading outside of 2008. Realised volatility hit levels not seen in decades.
- **Credit:** Investment-grade spreads widened 250bps in three weeks. High-yield spreads blew out to 1,100bps. Even Treasuries sold off initially as investors scrambled for cash.
- **Correlations:** Everything moved together. Equities, credit, commodities, even gold initially sold off. The only thing that worked was cash and explicit hedges.

What failed:

- **Diversification (again):** Multi-asset portfolios fell 20-30%. Alternatives, real estate, private equity all collapsed in March. Bonds offered minor relief but couldn't offset equity losses.
- **Risk parity strategies:** Leverage amplified losses as both stocks and bonds sold off together initially. Forced deleveraging created additional pain.
- **Late hedging attempts:** Investors who tried to buy protection in late February and early March paid catastrophic premiums. VIX calls and puts were priced at crisis levels. It was too late.

What worked:

- **Rolling put protection:** Funds with dedicated OTM[21] put sleeves saw hedges revalue 300-500%[22]. A 2% allocation became 6-10% of portfolio value at the trough, providing massive liquidity.
- **VIX calls and variance swaps:** Long volatility strategies posted 100-200% gains in Q1 2020. These instruments paid off exactly as designed.
- **Trend-following CTAs:** Systematic trend strategies captured the sharp equity decline and flight into Treasuries/gold. Many posted double-digit gains during the panic.
- **Explicit credit hedges:** CDS protection on credit indices spiked in value, cushioning portfolios with credit exposure.

The monetisation challenge:

Here's where many programs failed despite having the right hedges. The March bottom was March 23. By early April, markets had recovered 25%+ from lows. VIX collapsed from 82 to 40 in three weeks.

Funds that didn't have **pre-defined monetisation rules** watched their hedge gains evaporate. They held puts hoping for another leg down. They waited for "better" prices. By May, much of the convexity had bled away.

The disciplined investors - those with clear triggers like "sell when VIX hits X" or "monetise 50% of hedge at Y% portfolio drawdown" - captured the hedge payoff and redeployed into equity at S&P 2,400. They bought the panic. The undisciplined watched gains disappear.

The lesson:

COVID proved two things:

1. **Explicit hedges deliver in genuine black swans.** The put buyers and vol longs got paid massively and had liquidity when it mattered most.
2. **Monetisation discipline is as important as hedge construction.** Having the hedge is step one. Capturing the payoff and redeploying requires governance, pre-commitment, and operational discipline.

The funds that ran tail hedging programs correctly emerged from COVID with smaller losses and capital to redeploy. The unhedged portfolios suffered 30%+ drawdowns and had no dry powder at the bottom. That difference in positioning defined the next five years of relative performance.

2022 Inflation / Rates Shock

2022 was supposed to be impossible[23]. Stocks and bonds aren't supposed to fall together. That's the entire foundation of the 60/40 portfolio[24]. For forty years, bonds hedged equity risk. Diversification "worked."

Then inflation returned[25]. The Fed hiked aggressively. Both stocks and bonds collapsed simultaneously. 60/40 portfolios suffered their worst year since 1931[26].

Portfolio impact:

- **Equities:** S&P 500 down 18%. Nasdaq down 33%. Growth and tech obliterated.
- **Bonds:** Bloomberg Aggregate Bond Index down 13%. Long-duration Treasuries down 25-30%. The worst bond performance in generations.
- **60/40**[27] **portfolio:** Down 16-18% – no cushion, no relief, no diversification benefit.
- **Alternatives mixed:** Commodities up (energy +50%, grains strong). Real estate down. Private equity marks lagged but eventual markdowns came. Hedge funds down modestly.

What failed:

- **The bond hedge:** The foundational assumption of modern portfolio construction – that bonds hedge equities – shattered. Rising rates crushed bonds while fear and recession concerns hit equities. Correlations between stocks and bonds flipped positive for the first time in decades[28].
- **Traditional diversification:** Multi-asset portfolios offered no protection. Equities, bonds, growth, value, international – everything bled as central banks hiked and growth slowed.
- **Equity volatility strategies (mostly):** Implied volatility stayed relatively subdued despite equity drawdowns. VIX peaked at 35, not crisis levels. Long vol strategies didn't pay off the way they had in 2008 or 2020.
- **Risk parity:** These strategies, designed to balance risk across assets, got hammered as both equity and bond risk spiked simultaneously. Leverage amplified pain.

What worked (barely anything):

- **Cash:** Holding dry powder was the best "hedge." Cash yielded nothing for years, but in 2022, it was the only major asset class that didn't lose value.

- **Commodities and real assets:** Energy, grains, and inflation-linked assets posted gains. But these aren't tail hedges - they're inflation hedges. They don't provide convexity or liquidity in equity crashes.
- **Trend-following CTAs (selectively):** Some trend strategies captured the sustained Treasury selloff and commodity rallies. Performance was mixed – not the crisis alpha seen in 2008 or 2020.
- **Explicit equity puts (limited):** Deep OTM puts offered some cushion during the June and October drawdowns, but with VIX never reaching panic levels, payoffs were muted compared to true crisis hedges.

The structural lesson:

2022 was a different kind of tail event. Not a panic. Not a crash. But a grinding, relentless, two-asset meltdown that destroyed the core assumption underpinning institutional portfolios: that stocks and bonds are negatively correlated.

This has profound implications:

1. **Bonds are no longer a reliable equity hedge.** In inflationary regimes, rising rates kill both bonds (duration) and equities (valuation multiples). The 60/40 portfolio may be structurally broken for the next decade.
2. **Diversification alone is insufficient.** When the "diversification" is between two assets that can both fall 15-20% in the same year, you don't have diversification. You have two sources of pain.
3. **Explicit convexity becomes more essential.** If bonds no longer hedge equities, portfolios need explicit convex hedges – puts, volatility, trend strategies – to provide the protection bonds used to offer.

The forward-looking implication:

2022 wasn't a traditional "crash" but it may be the most important crisis for institutional investors to study. It revealed that the bedrock assumption of modern portfolio theory – the stock-bond negative correlation – can vanish for years at a time.

Going forward, portfolios can't rely on bonds for protection. They need explicit tail hedges. Not as a nice-to-have. As a structural replacement for the equity hedge that bonds no longer provide.

The investors who learned this lesson in 2022 will build portfolios accordingly: lower equity/bond exposure, higher explicit hedge allocations, structural positions in inflation protection and convexity. Those who don't will face the next inflationary regime or policy shock with the same broken 60/40 framework that failed in 2022.

Takeaways: Eight Crises, One Message

We've now examined eight major crises spanning 35 years:

- 1987: Black Monday flash crash
- 1998: LTCM and global credit seizure
- 2008: Global financial crisis and systemic collapse
- 2011: Eurozone Crisis
- 2015: China Devaluation
- 2018: Volmageddon
- 2020: COVID-19 pandemic and fastest crash in history
- 2022: Inflation shock and the death of 60/40

The pattern is undeniable. **Every crisis tells the same story:**

1. **Diversification fails under stress.** Correlations spike. Liquidity vanishes. Assets that are "uncorrelated" in normal times all move together when it matters most.
2. **Traditional hedges disappoint.** Bonds couldn't offset equity losses in 1987. They failed entirely in 2022. Alternatives and multi-asset strategies bleed alongside equities in genuine crises.
3. **Explicit convexity delivers.** In every crisis, the portfolios with pre-positioned tail hedges - puts, VIX calls, CDS, trend-following - had liquidity when competitors were forced sellers. They defended capital when others suffered catastrophic losses.
4. **Reactive hedging is expensive and often impossible.** Trying to buy protection during a crisis costs 3x-5x normal premiums and often can't be executed at any price. The time to hedge is when markets are calm and hedges are cheap.
5. **Monetisation discipline matters as much as hedge design.** Having the hedge is step one. Capturing the payoff and redeploying at crisis lows requires governance, pre-commitment, and operational rigour.

The evidence is overwhelming. Tail risk is not a theoretical concern. It's a recurring reality that destroys unhedged portfolios every few years. The institutions that survive and compound wealth over decades are those that pay the insurance premium consistently and harvest the payoff when the world breaks.

With this historical foundation established, we now turn to the practical question: how do we implement tail hedging in institutional portfolios?

Synthesis: Taxonomy and Implementation

We've now examined eight major crises spanning 35 years. The pattern is undeniable: **diversification fails under stress, and explicit convexity delivers.** But not all tail risks are the same and treating them as interchangeable leads to expensive protection that doesn't protect.

The next step is developing a clear taxonomy: mapping the specific types of tail risk your portfolio faces, then matching each type with the right hedging instruments. Only then can we build practical implementation frameworks that boards will fund and practitioners can execute.

Taxonomy of Tail Risks (Expanded)

Boards and investment committees like crisp categories. But "tail risk" as used in many governance packs is both overbroad and under-specified: a single line labelled "tail risk" invites a single hedge – and that hedge will be the wrong hedge more often than not. The first job of any serious tail program is taxonomy: deliberately map the *type* of tail risk you are protecting against and then design tools that are fit for that type. There are three distinct families that matter for most institutional portfolios **exogenous shocks**, **endogenous collapses**, and **policy & regime shifts** – and each behaves differently in markets, demands different instruments, and triggers different governance language. Treat these as separate insurance lines, not as an interchangeable "tail" bucket.

A note of caution. As per a Convex Strategies Risk Update[29] *"The only true alpha is convexity"*. Many so-called Portable Alpha or Factor-Based "hedges" still lean on correlation stability, model assumptions, or manager skill (and slick marketing). That's cyclical at best and misleading at worst – especially if you treat them as substitutes for genuine convexity

Convexity is the only defence whose payoff accelerates **because** the system is breaking, not despite it.

1) Exogenous Shocks – the headline disasters

Definition & characteristics. Exogenous shocks arrive from outside the financial system: pandemics, wars, terrorist attacks, major cyber incidents, or natural disasters of systemic scale. They tend to be high-impact and rapid. The defining features are sudden price gaps, dramatic realised volatility, and immediate liquidity stress because market participants try simultaneously to preserve cash and mark to market.

Historical lessons. Two anchor cases: 9/11 and COVID-19. Post-9/11, markets were closed for days and then reopened into a new risk environment; those holding discrete convex instruments (deep puts) showed immediate balance-sheet relief. COVID-19 is the clearest modern example: the S&P plunged roughly 34% in 23 trading sessions, realised vol spiked >80, and many nominally "liquid" instruments had meaningful trading friction. Central to the story is not just the drop but the speed – a fast crash amplifies margin calls and forces liquidity sales that amplify the decline[30].

Market mechanics and payoffs. In exogenous events implied volatility (IV) typically lags realised volatility early, and then IV re-prices aggressively upward. Index puts bought months earlier as "insurance" often reprice to many multiples of premium cost; VIX calls/variance swaps spike; delta and gamma exposures on professionally retained option books become dramatically positive. In plain numbers: a rolling sleeve of 3-month, ~25-delta index puts that costs ~1.5–2.0% annualised can produce returns in

the 300–500% range during a fast, broad equity selloff – precisely the cash needed when liquidity is most scarce.

Practical hedging approach. Exogenous risk is most cleanly and cheaply hedged with dedicated convex instruments: deep OTM index puts, short-dated VIX calls (or long variance) and, in cross-asset portfolios, commodity or FX options depending on the shock vector. The architecture is simple: keep convexity available and ensure execution and counterparty plumbing so that hedges can be monetised quickly. Panels of dealers, waterfall triggers for monetisation, and pre-agreed exercise/close-out rules are governance essentials.

Board language. This is insurance against "the unexpected X-factor." For trustees, the selling point is intuitive: pay a small, explicit premium to preserve capital and optionality when the headline shock hits. The governance trade is explicit cost vs defined benefit: "we spend X bps to reduce a 1-in-20 loss by Y%."

2) Endogenous Collapses – the system implodes from within

Definition & characteristics. Endogenous events are financial-system maladies. They begin in markets, balance sheets or plumbing: leverage, maturity mismatches, repo stress, concentrated positioning, or hidden counterparty exposures. These events can simmer, present misleading calm for years, then cascade as funding dries and correlation across assets swiftly rises toward one.

Historical lessons. LTCM (1998) and the 2007–2009 Global Financial Crisis are primary examples. LTCM's positions were "statistical" and levered; a shock to Russian yields and liquidity cascaded through funding markets. In 2008, mortgage-loss realisation, counterparty failures and an opaque credit web caused both equity and credit markets to collapse together. The crucial observation: endogenous events often blow up less like a meteor and more like systemic rot – slow to incubate, furious when they unwind.

Market mechanics and payoffs. Endogenous collapses are better hedged with instruments that protect against credit and funding stress and those that capture the rapid widening of spread and volatility. Credit Default Swaps (CDS) on indices or key sectors, concentrated single-name CDS for exposures, and long volatility strategies (variance swaps or long-dated puts on credit-sensitive indices) are most effective. In 2008, CDX IG and iTraxx products produced multiples as spreads moved from low single digits to highs measured in hundreds of basis points; a small CDS allocation materially offset equity losses by addressing the root cause rather than the symptom.

Practical hedging approach. The architecture for endogenous risk requires credit overlays, funding-specific protection, and dispersion/volatility plays. A good program holds a modest notional of index CDS (size calibrated to portfolio credit sensitivity), perhaps paired with a dynamic liquidity reserve rule: if particular dealer funding or repo indicators spike, monetise the credit hedge into cash and redeploy. Managed volatility funds (long-vol providers), dispersion trades that capture a widening between single-name vol and index vol, and certain CTA/trend overlays also perform well as secondary lines.

Board language. This is "structural" insurance – against the system crumbling beneath the portfolio. The governance message must be different: it's not 'fire insurance' for individual acts; it's termite treatment for balance-sheet integrity. Boards should measure the program by how much potential permanent impairment it avoids, not by year-to-year P&L.

3) Policy & Regime Shocks – macro assumptions broken

Definition & characteristics. Policy/regime shocks are when the operating macroeconomic assumptions change rapidly – central bank policy pivots, sudden inflation regime changes, FX regime shifts, or abrupt regulatory recalibrations. These shocks are dangerous because they can flip correlations that institutions take for granted: for example, the historical negative correlation between equities and bonds can invert.

Historical lessons. The Taper Tantrum (2013) and more recently the 2021–2022 inflation shock underscores the risk: in 2022, rising rates and inflation expectations led to simultaneous, sustained losses in both equities and bonds across many developed markets. The classical 60/40 cushion failed, and institutions with no macro convexity suffered worst[31].

Market mechanics and payoffs. Here the useful instruments are cross-asset convex structures: payer swaptions (convex to rates rising), FX options to guard against currency regime moves, commodity calls and options for inflationary pressures (gold, agricultural, energy). These instruments tend to be priced more expensively when markets anticipate policy tightening, so dynamic timing and precise strike choice is vital. The payoff is not necessarily explosive like a gap crash, but it is stoic and persistent: the hedge may produce steady upward mark as the regime shifts rather than a single spike.

Practical hedging approach. Build cross-asset convexity into the portfolio. That means modest allocations to payer swaptions, targeted FX options for countries likely to suffer regime shifts, and selective commodity convexity. Importantly, since these markets are linked to the economic policy cycle, combine option structures with macro regime indicators (inflation surprises, yield-curve changes) to decide when to scale.

Board language. This is "macro insurance." Boards need to understand that their old assumptions about independent bond cushions may not hold in a world of fast regime change; the conversation should pivot from "do bonds hedge equities?" to "what instruments protect us when established correlations reverse?"

Taxonomy closing note. When you map tails this way you enable two practical gains:

1) instrument fit – you're buying the right tool for the revealed driver; and

2) governance clarity – you can explain explicitly to trustees which tail you're protecting and why that protection looks the way it does. Wrong taxonomy = wrong program = expensive comfort, not protection.

Dedicated Tail Hedge Sleeves (Deep Dive)

A dedicated tail hedge sleeve is the cleanest, most transparent way for an institution to hard-wire convexity into the portfolio. It's simple to explain to boards, measurable in cost, and powerful when markets break. But the simplicity is deceptive – most sleeves fail because they're built reactively, underfunded, or governed poorly. A proper sleeve needs three things: the right instruments, the right size, and the right rules for turning convexity into cash when you need it most.

What follows is the practitioner's blueprint: how to design the sleeve, where to sit on the smile, how to size it, and the monetisation discipline that prevents the classic "hedge worked but we didn't capture it" failure that cripples most programmes.

Design principle – what the sleeve must do

A dedicated sleeve must:

1. Deliver true convexity in large market moves – not soft cushions, but non-linear payoffs.
2. Remain politically legible – boards must see the cost, the logic, and the benefit.
3. Be executable at scale with standard instruments across multiple dealers.

The canonical build: rolling equity index puts (S&P, MSCI World, regional equivalents), supplemented where appropriate with VIX/variance and credit overlays for non-equity tails.

Strike selection: where to sit on the smile

Strike choice determines both cost and effectiveness. Institutional sleeves generally ladder strikes:

- **Primary layer (core convexity):** 25–30% OTM puts (roughly 10–20 delta). Cheap in calm markets and explosive in a genuine crash.
- **Secondary layer:** 10–15% OTM for shallower corrections. Only used by funds wanting more frequent soft protection.
- **ATM or near-ATM:** rarely included – too expensive as a permanent sleeve.

Para Bellum rule: bias towards deeper strikes. You're not hedging noise; you're buying survival.

Maturity and roll mechanics

Maturity determines how fast convexity reacts and how much bleed you wear:

- **Short-dated (1–3 months):** high gamma, high carry, high admin.
- **Intermediate (3–6 months):** the institutional workhorse – best balance between cost, convexity, and roll cadence.
- **Long-dated (9–12 months+):** lower theta but slower response; useful when volatility is structurally high and short options are overpriced.

Rolls should be staggered to avoid cliff edges, executed across dealers, and done away from expiry-week liquidity squeezes.

Listed vs OTC Derivatives for Tail Hedges

Tail hedging isn't just about convexity – it's about whether you can actually *monetise* that convexity when the system is breaking. The choice between listed and OTC derivatives is one of the most important architectural decisions in any tail-hedging programme, yet it's routinely glossed over in normal markets. When volatility is low and balance sheets are fat, both venues look fine. When markets fracture, the differences become brutal.

Listed derivatives: reliable when stress hits

Listed options – NDX, XND, VOLQ, SPX, VIX, and index variance – offer something OTC markets simply can't: **execution certainty**.

- You transact against a central counterparty, not a dealer with a dodgy balance sheet.
- Liquidity remains visible and continuous.
- Market makers may widen spreads, but they don't disappear.
- You can monetise quickly – with a click, not a negotiation.

When your hedge is moneymaking and the portfolio is bleeding, that speed and reliability matter more than theoretical customisation.

OTC derivatives: useful, but fragile in crises

OTC options, swaptions, single-name and index CDS offer customisation you can't get on exchange. They're essential for **credit-driven** or **sovereign** tail risks.

But the weaknesses are structural:

- **Dealer intermediation risk:** You only trade if a dealer is willing and able to quote.
- **Balance sheet rationing:** Dealers widen spreads, shrink size, or quietly step away.
- **Opaque pricing:** No consolidated order book. You get whatever price you're quoted.
- **Operational friction:** Execution depends on phone calls, risk approvals, internal committees.
- **Counterparty exposure remains a real hazard.**

In calm markets, OTC looks attractive. In a crisis, its fragility shows.

The Para Bellum rule of thumb

- **Equity crash risk** → Listed first.
- **Credit/funding stress** → OTC CDS and swaptions.

- **Policy/regime shifts** → A mix but listed where possible.

A single-venue tail hedge is a single point of failure. Use each venue for what it's good at.

Central Clearing: Counterparty Risk Is a Tail Event Too

The distinction between listed and OTC derivatives becomes existential during crises. OTC positions don't usually fail because strikes or maturities were poorly chosen – they can fail because the *execution mechanism* collapses when you need it most.

This isn't theory. I've lived this.

2008: the wake-up call

When Lehman went down, the problem wasn't market direction – it was counterparty survival.

Billions of dollars of OTC positions instantly became bankruptcy claims. Clients who thought they were hedged discovered they were unsecured creditors.

Try monetising a hedge when the entity on the other side no longer exists.

Even when the remaining dealers were alive, quoting dried up as internal risk committees slammed the brakes on balance-sheet usage. Prices widened to the point of absurdity. Some desks simply didn't answer the phone.

2020: the same story, faster

The March 2020 air-pocket was another reminder. Listed index options and VIX products kept trading. Liquidity wasn't pretty, but it was there.

Some OTC structures? Spreads blew out so far, they may as well have been untradeable. Managers sat on positions that were "in theory" profitable – but practically illiquid.

A tail hedge that cannot be monetised is not a hedge. It's a fantasy.

Important operational point: OTC options are not fungible

One operational detail that's routinely overlooked: **OTC options are bilateral contracts. They are not fungible.**

To realise a gain or unwind the position, you must execute the close-out **with the same dealer who sold it to you**. That means:

- if that dealer is not quoting,
- or is rationing balance sheet,
- or is widening spreads to absurd levels,
- or is fighting for survival,

you are effectively stuck.

An OTC option showing a mark-to-market gain is just a number on a screen until the original counterparty agrees to take it back. In stress markets, that assumption can fail spectacularly.

This is why, in 2008 and again in March 2020, many institutions held hedges that were theoretically profitable but practically unmonetisable.

Why central clearing changes everything

With listed markets, the counterparty is the clearing house – not a dealer clinging to its internal VAR limits.

- The OCC guarantees performance. You are not exposed to a single dealer's solvency.
- You get transparent quotes. Price discovery happens in real time, not through selective dealer callbacks.
- Liquidity consolidates, not fragments. When one market maker steps back, others step in to capture flow.
- Execution routing is robust. Brokers can push orders to the exchange even when conditions are chaotic.

This infrastructure is built for chaos. The OTC world is less so.

When everything is correlated, bilateral credit is the last thing you want

In a real contagion event, correlations spike to one, liquidity evaporates, and counterparty risk becomes another source of pain. When your portfolio is down 30%, your board is panicking, and you need liquidity *now*, the last thing you want is to discover your hedge is tied to the solvency of a dealer fighting for its life.

In those moments, central clearing isn't a technical detail. It's the difference between a hedge that pays out and a hedge that dies on the table.

Practical requirement: multiple clearing and execution brokers

One final point often ignored until it's too late: **you can't run a serious tail-hedging programme with a single clearing or execution broker**. In stress, operational redundancy is not optional – it's survival.

- **Have at least two clearing brokers for listed derivatives.** If one broker restricts risk, suffers a tech outage, or hits its own capital limits, you need another pathway to clear trades immediately.
- **Have at least two clearing arrangements for OTC clearing** (e.g., cleared index CDS, cleared swaptions). Clearing houses work, but access to them still depends on your clearing member's balance sheet and operational capacity.
- **Use multiple execution brokers for both listed and OTC markets**. Execution dependency is a hidden single point of failure. In every major crisis, some brokers pull size, widen aggressively, or simply go quiet. Redundancy ensures you always have a route to hit the bid or lift the offer.

This isn't overkill – it's basic operational hygiene.

When volatility spikes, you want optionality in execution, redundancy in clearing, and a structure that doesn't rely on a single institution behaving rationally under stress.

Sizing: how much to allocate

Institutional sleeves usually sit between **2–5% of portfolio capital**. This range reflects the trade-off between annual carry and crisis-period impact.

- **2%** is the minimum for a globally diversified portfolio to see a meaningful offset in a major drawdown.
- **3–4%** materially reduces long-horizon drawdowns; the seatbelt becomes obvious in decade-level simulations.
- **5%+** is for institutions with ultra-low risk appetite or explicit crash-protection mandates – expensive, but defensible in certain regimes**.**

A numeric example:

For a **$10bn portfolio**, a **2% allocation** is a **$200m annual premium budget**.
This is a *dollar budget*, not a "notional allocation."

With standard pricing for rolling 6-month, ~25-delta index puts (around **1–1.5% per year** of notional), that $200m budget buys roughly **$13–20bn of put notional** annually.

In a crisis akin to 2008 – where deep OTM puts can reprice **5–6×** – that sleeve can generate **$1bn+** of liquid gains. That cash is what boards care about: immediate liquidity when everyone else is bleeding, and the ability to re-risk at distressed levels without forced selling.

Monetisation and reuse discipline

Most programmes fail not at construction – but at **conversion**. A put worth 5× premium in the panic is useless unless it's turned into cash before convexity decays.

The common failure mode is predictable: committees hesitate, wait for "clarity," then miss the window. Volatility mean-reverts, policy backstops land, and the hedge bleeds back to mediocre marks.

Pre-commitment beats heroics

Success requires pre-defining three things before crisis arrives:

Three elements must be approved *before* the crisis:

1. **Trigger framework – three simultaneous lenses:**
    - Portfolio lens: monetise tranches at defined drawdown thresholds (e.g., −8%, −12%, −18%).
    - Hedge lens: monetise when hedge gains cover 50%, 75%, and 100% of contemporaneous portfolio losses.

- Market-structure lens: act immediately when decay signals flash (VIX term structure flip, policy interventions, bid–ask snap-tightening).

2. **Tranched execution – humility encoded:**

- 30% on first trigger
- 30% on second
- 40% when policy backstops appear or term structure normalises

3. **Proceeds waterfall – no improvisation:**

- Bucket 1: Liquidity runway (extend 6–9 months)
- Bucket 2: Defensive ballast (short-dated government paper, de-risking)
- Bucket 3: Opportunity baskets (only once the first two are secure)

Reloading for the second leg

After monetising, retain a small, cheap residual hedge – long-dated deep OTM puts or a light VIX strip. If the first bounce is a head fake, you avoid freezing.

Execution & counterparty risk

Operational execution must be institutional grade:

- Use multiple dealers to avoid concentration
- Implement ISDA and CSA arrangements with clear collateral rules.
- Stagger counterparties across maturities and stripes.
- Maintain a collateral buffer to avoid forced selling in stress if counterparties call.

Counterparty risk is not theoretical – it's the Achilles heel. In 2008 counterparty squeezes amplified losses. Good governance requires periodic counterparty stress tests.

Reporting & governance language

The single most important governance decision is how the sleeve is reported:

- **Separate P&L line:** Hedge costs and realised gains should be shown independently, not lumped into total returns. This prevents political decisions based on headline noise.
- **Insurance budget:** Express expected annualised bleed in basis points and link it to explicit drawdown reduction metrics – e.g., "This 2% sleeve is expected to cost 25–60bps/year and reduce a 1-in-20 drawdown by X–Y%."
- **Pre-commit clause:** Board should adopt a pre-commitment policy that prevents the sleeve from being cancelled except under pre-specified governance actions (e.g., a super-majority decision).

Common failure modes and how to avoid them

1. **Underfunding:** Small sleeves get chopped before payoff. Avoid “token” allocations.
2. **Ad hoc buying:** Buying puts reactively during turmoil is expensive. The sleeve must be systematic.
3. **Poor monetisation:** No pre-defined rules lead to missing the moment.
4. **Counterparty concentration:** Single-dealer reliance leads to execution and credit risk in stress.
5. **Bad reporting:** If boards see only annual losses without context, political pressure will eliminate the program.

A dedicated sleeve is the clearest hard-dollar way to buy survival. It requires moral courage from the board and institutional discipline in execution. It’s not glamorous. It’s not cheap.

But when a crisis hits, it is the most obvious source of liquidity that allows a disciplined investor to buy into the panic rather than being forced to sell. If you decide to build one, budget its cost explicitly, staff execution to an operational standard, and hardwire monetisation and governance rules into policy.

Further Reading: Operational Implementation for Tail Hedges

Strategy without execution is theory. This paper has established why tail hedging matters, how convexity works, what eight crises teach us, and how to structure dedicated programs. But knowing you need a hedge and knowing how to monetise it when markets break are different problems.

The critical moment arrives when the portfolio is down 15%, your put sleeve has revalued 400%, the board is in emergency session, and dealers are widening spreads. **What do you do in the next two hours?**

Most institutions discover they have no protocol. Committees debate. Teams wait for clarity. By the time they act, volatility has mean-reverted and the hedge that was worth five times premium cost is worth two times and falling.

Pre-commitment solves this. The best programs define triggers, tranches, and proceeds discipline in advance – so when dislocation arrives, investment teams execute doctrine, not improvisation.

Turning Convexity into Cash: The Discipline of Active Tail-Hedge[32] Management

A companion paper for practitioners

The question that separates experienced practitioners from slideware: when the dislocation arrives and the hedge moves sharply into the money, how do you turn that mark-to-market into cash, and how do you redeploy that cash, so the institution finishes the episode stronger rather than merely less damaged?

This operational guide lays out protocols that boards can approve in advance and investment teams can execute in hours, not weeks.

What the paper covers:

Crisis execution fundamentals

- Success defined as cash, not marks – liquidity bridge, drawdown containment, option to attack
- Pre-commitment frameworks that remove procedural friction
- Real-time crisis dashboards: what matters on one screen

The three-lens trigger system

- Portfolio lens: drawdown thresholds that fire automatically (-8%, -12%, -18%)
- Hedge lens: coverage ratios that trigger tranched monetisation (50%, 75%, 100%)
- Market-structure lens: decay signals that demand immediate conversion

Tranched execution mechanics

- Why experienced desks sell in steps (30% / 30% / 40%)
- Instrument-specific considerations: equity puts vs CDS vs swaptions vs VIX
- Numerical examples with actual position sizing and P&L attribution

Proceeds discipline

- The waterfall: liquidity runway → defensive ballast → opportunity baskets (in that order)
- Why "ballast before bravado" prevents governance failures after successful monetisation
- Reloading protocols: keeping cheap residual hedges for second-leg risk

Operational infrastructure

- Counterparty lines, CSAs, and variation margin modelling
- Order templates pre-filled with instruments, maturities, sizes, routing
- Communications trees: who calls whom, who approves what, who logs trades
- Removing self-inflicted friction so execution happens in minutes, not meetings

Real-world scenarios

- **Equity air-pocket narrative**: March 2020-style liquidity shock with timestamped execution
- **Credit widening narrative**: Spread gap with policy backstop and basis management
- What NOT to do: the catalogue of avoidable errors

Governance essentials

- Behavioural guardrails that protect plans from committees' capacity for hope
- The policy paragraph boards should approve before storms arrive
- Two-page after-action review template: timelines, attribution, decay avoided, lessons

Bottom line: This paper provides the operating doctrine that turns a hedge position into liquidity that funds operations, stabilises balance sheets, and finances measured re-risking when competitors are forced sellers.

Available at: www.parabellumadvisors.com/insights/

About Para Bellum Advisors

Para Bellum Advisors is an independent institutional **derivatives advisory** firm supporting lean investment teams where structure, hedging, and execution materially affect outcomes.

We work with family offices, private credit managers, infrastructure and project-finance investors, boutique asset managers, and PM-led teams managing complex, long-dated portfolios. These are investors who move quickly, operate with real constraints, and need solutions they can implement immediately.

Our work sits at the intersection of derivatives, structuring, capital efficiency, and execution. We help clients eliminate performance drag, unlock trapped capital, and build hedges and structures that behave as intended when markets move.

Para Bellum is practitioner-led. We do not manufacture products or distribute risk. We act as an extension of the investment team, providing senior-level structuring and execution capability without adding permanent headcount.

Alongside our core offerings, we undertake **bespoke advisory mandates** for complex, sensitive, or non-standard situations that fall outside off-the-shelf solutions. These engagements are scoped tightly, executed discreetly, and led directly by senior practitioners.

Core Services

- **Para Bellum Hedge Rebuild™** – Cross-asset hedge redesign to minimise bleed, tighten execution, and ensure hedges deliver when they should.
- **Capital Drag Audit™** – A detailed assessment of liquidity, collateral, margin, and execution friction, quantifying trapped capital and identifying where performance is being lost.
- **Structuring-as-a-Service™** – An embedded structuring function for teams that need trade design, pricing, risk-transfer solutions, documentation support, and execution oversight.

Principle

No unnecessary complexity.
No padding.
No irrelevance.

Only structures and strategies that materially improve outcomes.

More detail on capabilities is available at:

https://parabellumadvisors.com/our-capabilities

Contact

Mike Duncan
Founder & Head of Advisory
mike.duncan@parabellumadvisors.com
linkedin.com/in/mikeduncan-structuring

Explore services:

https://offers.parabellumadvisors.com

References

[1] Rodin, J. (2014) *The Resilience Dividend: Being Strong in a World Where Things Go Wrong*. New York: PublicAffairs

[2] Dao, T.-L., Nguyen, T.-T., Deremble, C., Lempérière, Y., Bouchaud, J.-P. and Potters, M. (2016) 'Tail protection for long investors: Trend convexity at work', **arXiv preprint** arXiv:1607.02410. Available at: https://arxiv.org/abs/1607.02410

[3] Authers, J. (2023) 'Investors Have Good Reason to Look Back on 2022 in Anger', **Bloomberg Opinion**, 3 January. Available at: https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2023-01-03/stocks-bonds-gold-everything-had-a-terrible-2022

[4] Cheng, H. (2020). "Volatility markets underreacted to the early stages of the COVID-19 pandemic," *Cambridge Working Paper in Economics*.

[5] Dredge, D. (2025) Chief Investment Officer, Convex Strategies Pte Ltd, Singapore. Expert in volatility-driven investment strategies and bespoke convex funds management. Available at: https://convex-strategies.com/

[6] Shiller, R.J. (1989) **Market Volatility**. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

[7] Lowenstein, R. (2000) When Genius Failed: The Rise and Fall of Long-Term Capital Management. New York: Random House

[8] Jorion, P. (2000) 'Risk management lessons from Long-Term Capital Management', **European Financial Management**, 6(3), pp. 277-300.

[9] Jorion, P. (2000) 'Risk management lessons from Long-Term Capital Management', **European Financial Management**, 6(3), pp. 277-300.

[10] President's Working Group on Financial Markets (1999) Hedge Funds, Leverage, and the Lessons of Long-Term Capital Management. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

[11] Jorion, P. (2000) 'Risk management lessons from Long-Term Capital Management', European Financial Management, 6(3), pp. 277-300.

[12] Brunnermeier, M.K. (2009) 'Deciphering the liquidity and credit crunch 2007-2008', Journal of Economic Perspectives, 23(1), pp. 77-100.

[13] Gorton, G.B. (2010) Slapped by the Invisible Hand: The Panic of 2007. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[14] Bank for International Settlements (2009) 'The financial crisis and global imbalances', **BIS Quarterly Review**, June, pp. 1-14. Available at: https://www.bis.org/publ/qtrpdf/r_qt0906.htm .

[15] Bank use of sovereign CDS in the Eurozone crisis, *Stern NYU* and *ScienceDirect* analysis, 2011

[16] Hedging Against RMB Volatility, *China Briefing*, 2015; Emerging Market credit and commodity puts.

[17] Augustin, P., Cheng, I.-H., Van den Bergen, L. (2021) *Volmageddon and short volatility failure*, *Financial Analysts Journal*.

[18] Baker, S.R., Bloom, N., Davis, S.J., Kost, K.J., Sammon, M.C. and Viratyosin, T. (2020) 'The unprecedented stock market impact of COVID-19', NBER Working Paper No. 26945.

[19] Ramelli, S. and Wagner, A.F. (2020) 'Feverish stock price reactions to COVID-19', Review of Corporate Finance Studies, 9(3), pp. 622-655.

[20] Haddad, V., Moreira, A. and Muir, T. (2021) 'When selling becomes viral: Disruptions in debt markets in the COVID-19 crisis and the Fed's response', Review of Financial Studies, 34(11), pp. 5309-5351.

[21] Meketa Investment Group (2019) *Tail Risk Management*. White Paper. Boston, MA: Meketa Investment Group. Available at: https://meketa.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/Tail-Risk-Hedging-WP.pdf

[22] Baker, S.R., Bloom, N., Davis, S.J., Kost, K.J., Sammon, M.C. and Viratyosin, T. (2020) 'The unprecedented stock market impact of COVID-19', NBER Working Paper No. 26945.

[23] Baele, L., Bekaert, G., Inghelbrecht, K. and Wei, M. (2020) 'Flights to safety', Review of Financial Studies, 33(2), pp. 689-746.

[24] Bhansali, V., Harris, L., Dorsten, M. and Rebonato, R. (2022) 'Everyone's a Loser: The End of the Negative Stock-Bond Correlation', Journal of Portfolio Management, 48(10), pp. 1-20.

[25] Arnott, R.D., Harvey, C.R., Kalesnik, V. and Linnainmaa, J.T. (2021) 'Reports of value's death may be greatly exaggerated', Financial Analysts Journal, 77(1), pp. 44-67.

[26] Authers, J. (2022) 'How 2022 Became a Historic Year for Losses', *Bloomberg Opinion*, 29 December. Available at: https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2022-12-29/how-2022-became-a-historic-year-for-losses

[27] Mackintosh, J. (2022) 'The 60/40 Portfolio Is Having Its Worst Year on Record', *The Wall Street Journal*, 30 September. Available at: https://www.wsj.com/articles/the-60-40-portfolio-is-having-its-worst-year-on-record-11664514602

[28] Bhansali, V., Harris, L., Dorsten, M. and Rebonato, R. (2022) 'Everyone's a Loser: The End of the Negative Stock-Bond Correlation', Journal of Portfolio Management, 48(10), pp. 1-20.

[29] Convex Strategies (2025) *Risk Update: April 2025 – "Triggered"*, 14 May. Available at: https://convex-strategies.com/2025/05/14/risk-update-april-2025-triggered/

[30] Baker, S.R., Bloom, N., Davis, S.J., Kost, K.J., Sammon, M.C. and Viratyosin, T. (2020) 'The unprecedented stock market impact of COVID-19', *NBER Working Paper* No. 26945. Available at: https://www.nber.org/papers/w26945

[31] Bhansali, V., Harris, L., Dorsten, M. and Rebonato, R. (2022) 'Everyone's a Loser: The End of the Negative Stock-Bond Correlation', *Journal of Portfolio Management*, 48(10), pp. 1-20.

[32] Duncan, M. (2025) Turning Convexity into Cash – The Discipline of Active Tail-Hedge Management. Version 1 October 2025. Para Bellum Advisors. Available at: https://www.parabellumadvisors.com/insights/

Para Bellum Advisors – Disclaimer

This paper is provided for informational purposes only. It does not constitute investment advice, financial product advice, or a recommendation to transact. It is not tailored to any institution's objectives, financial position, risk appetite, or regulatory constraints.

All examples are illustrative. Markets move, assumptions change, and outcomes will differ. Past performance is not a guide to future results. Any views expressed reflect Para Bellum Advisors' judgement at the time of writing and may change without notice.

Institutions should obtain independent advice and conduct their own analysis before making any investment, hedging, or risk-management decision.