CIO Brief

When Diversification Fails: How Convexity Becomes Liquidity

Why tail hedges only work if they are monetised – and why most programmes fail before they matter

Version 1, October 2025

By Mike Duncan, Para Bellum Advisors

www.parabellumadvisors.com

Executive Summary

Institutional portfolios are built on a quiet assumption: that diversification will protect capital when markets come under stress.

Every major crisis has exposed the same flaw – portfolios optimised for normal markets fail when liquidity disappears.

Across every major crisis of the past three decades, correlations have converged, liquidity has evaporated, and portfolios constructed for stability have suffered deep – and often permanent – impairment. The institutions that emerged in better shape were not those with the most sophisticated asset allocation frameworks, but those that had access to liquidity when others were forced sellers.

This CIO brief distils the central lesson of *The Tail Hedge Playbook*: tail hedges are not about market views or cosmetic drawdown smoothing. They are liquidity instruments. Their sole purpose is to convert dislocation into usable cash fast enough to stabilise the portfolio and preserve decision-making capacity.

Most programmes fail not because convexity doesn't work, but because governance, structure, and monetisation discipline are missing.

The mistake institutions keep repeating

Tail hedging is rarely designed badly. It is usually framed badly.

In practice, tail-risk programmes are treated as static insurance allocations, philosophical expressions of risk aversion, or sleeves intended to be "held through the crisis". Each of these framings misses the point.

Convexity is a wasting asset. Once policy intervention arrives, liquidity returns, or volatility mean-reverts, the value embedded in tail hedges decays rapidly. Instruments that looked powerful at the trough can lose relevance within weeks, even while the core portfolio remains impaired.

This is why mark-to-market evaluation is misleading. Marks do not fund margin calls, collateral requirements, redemptions, or operating expenses. Only realised cash does.

A hedge that is never monetised is not protection. It is narrative comfort.

What history actually shows

The Playbook examines eight major crises spanning 35 years, from 1987 through to 2022. The triggers differ, but the structural pattern does not.

In 2008, 2020, and again in 2022, portfolios that looked diversified on paper discovered that liquidity, not allocation, was the constraint.

Diversification fails precisely when it is needed most. Bonds and alternatives do not reliably hedge systemic stress. Liquidity, not valuation, becomes the limiting factor. Pre-positioned convexity works, while reactive hedging is expensive or impossible.

In every episode, institutions that owned explicit convex exposures had options. Those that did not were forced into pro-cyclical decisions at the worst possible time.

The critical distinction is not whether a hedge "made money", but whether it created liquidity early enough to matter.

Why tail hedges exist at all

The purpose of tail hedging is not to generate returns.

It exists to protect the portfolio's ability to compound.

That protection comes through several channels. Limiting catastrophic drawdowns avoids permanent impairment. Creating liquidity under stress prevents the forced sale of core assets at precisely the wrong moment. Stabilising governance allows boards and CIOs to act deliberately rather than reactively. Preserving optionality keeps the door open to selective re-risking when prices are genuinely dislocated.

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

Not all tail risks are the same

One of the most persistent failure modes identified in the Playbook is the treatment of "tail risk" as a single category.

In reality, institutional portfolios face different families of tail events, each with distinct behaviour. Sudden exogenous shocks generate rapid price gaps and volatility spikes. Endogenous collapses emerge from leverage, funding, and balance-sheet fragility and cascade through markets. Policy and regime shifts break long-held correlation assumptions without producing classic crash dynamics.

Each requires different forms of convexity. A single hedge cannot protect against all of them.

The governance implication is straightforward. If an institution cannot articulate which tail risks it is hedging, it is unlikely to own the right protection when stress arrives.

Why monetisation matters more than selection

Many programmes own sensible instruments and still fail.

The reason is almost always the same: there is no pre-commitment to monetisation.

Convexity pays when markets break, but it decays fastest once conditions stabilise. Waiting for clarity, confirmation, or the "right moment" reliably destroys value. The window to act is often measured in days or weeks, not quarters.

Effective programmes remove discretion at the point of maximum uncertainty. They define in advance when hedges are monetised, how monetisation occurs – typically in stages rather than all at once – and what the proceeds are for.

When this is agreed beforehand, execution becomes procedural rather than heroic.

The role of structure and plumbing

Tail hedges only work if they can be converted into cash under stress.

Execution certainty, clearing access, counterparty resilience, and operational redundancy matter as much as convexity itself. A hedge that cannot be monetised when volatility is high and balance sheets are constrained is not a hedge. It is theoretical protection.

From a CIO perspective, this is not a trading detail. It is a balance-sheet risk.

Proceeds discipline – where programmes really fail

The most common governance failure occurs after the hedge has worked.

Cash feels powerful. The temptation to redeploy aggressively can overwhelm balance-sheet discipline. This is precisely why the use of proceeds must be agreed before the crisis, not debated during it.

The hierarchy is simple and non-negotiable. First, extend the liquidity runway. Second, stabilise the balance sheet. Only then should selective re-risking be considered.

If this order is not explicit, it will not be followed.

The uncomfortable conclusion

Most institutions do not fail because they lacked convexity.

They fail because they lacked authority to monetise it, triggers to force action, and a clear purpose for the liquidity once it arrived. The outcome is familiar: impressive hedge marks, disappointing realised outcomes, and post-crisis reviews filled with hindsight rationalisations.

What this brief is asking CIOs to decide

Not whether to hedge tails.

But which tail risks actually threaten this portfolio, what form of convexity addresses those risks, under what conditions the CIO is authorised to act, and what the liquidity being created is ultimately for.

Until those questions are answered explicitly, tail hedging remains an idea rather than a capability.

Closing perspective

Tail hedging is not about predicting crises.

It is about ensuring that when markets break, the institution has the one thing nobody sells cheaply:

liquidity.

Liquidity buys time.
Time preserves compounding.
Until liquidity creation is treated as a capability rather than a position, tail hedging will remain an idea – not a defence.

Further Reading and Practitioner Resources

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

For a detailed implementation framework see the accompanying Practitioner Paper: *The Tail Hedge Playbook - How CIOS Buy Liquidity When Everyone Else Is Bleeding*.

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**.