Risk and Financial Management; Vol. 6, No. 2; 2025
ISSN 2690-9790 E-ISSN 2690-9804
https://doi.org/10.30560/rfm.v6n2p14

Research on Financial Risk Control of Sovereign Wealth Funds' Offshore Investments

Chen Yu[1]

[1] The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen, China

Correspondence: Chen Yu, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen, China. E-mail: yuchen.66@outlook.com

Received: June 11, 2025 Accepted: July 23, 2025 Online Published: July 25, 2025

Abstract

This study focuses on the financial risk control mechanisms of sovereign wealth funds (SWFs) in their offshore investment activities. Drawing on both domestic and international literature, it first clarifies the fundamental concepts of SWFs and the theoretical framework for financial risk control. Through analysis of global allocation patterns and representative Chinese cases, it reveals the evolution of SWF investment strategies and the principal risks they face—market risk, currency risk, credit risk, liquidity risk, and compliance risk. The study proposes an integrated risk-assessment system for dynamic monitoring and evaluation, and on this basis designs targeted risk-control strategies, including derivatives hedging, diversified portfolio allocation, enhancement of internal governance structures, and strengthening of compliance mechanisms. An empirical model is constructed using panel data from leading SWFs; the empirical results and robustness tests demonstrate that the proposed strategies significantly enhance portfolio resilience. Finally, by examining a typical case in depth, the paper offers practical recommendations for SWF management institutions and regulatory authorities to bolster the resilience and sustainability of offshore investment portfolios in an increasingly volatile global environment.

Keywords: sovereign wealth funds, offshore investment, financial risk control, hedging strategies, portfolio diversification

1. Introduction

Against the backdrop of global economic integration and highly volatile financial markets, sovereign wealth funds (SWFs) have emerged as major stewards of national capital, with their offshore investments growing steadily in both scale and influence. However, cross-border investments are exposed to multiple financial risks—macroeconomic fluctuations, currency shocks, credit defaults, insufficient asset liquidity, and legal and compliance divergences—that, if not properly identified and managed, can erode investment returns and threaten national fiscal security and macroeconomic stability. Traditional risk-management methods, which often focus on individual risk dimensions, are ill-suited to the complex and dynamic international environment. Given SWFs' unique characteristics in terms of scale, investment horizon, and regulatory requirements, there is an urgent need to develop a dynamic monitoring and evaluation system that addresses multiple risk factors. This study first reviews domestic and international literature on SWF offshore investment and financial risk control. It then analyzes primary risk categories and their causes, drawing on global allocation patterns and Chinese case examples, before proposing an integrated control strategy based on derivatives hedging, portfolio diversification, and enhanced internal governance. Through a panel-data empirical model and case analysis, this paper aims to provide actionable decision-support recommendations for SWF managers and regulators, helping these funds maintain robust and sustainable portfolios amid increasingly complex international markets.

2. Domestic and International Research Status

Foreign scholars have concentrated their research on financial risk control in SWF offshore investments on risk-measurement models, the application of hedging instruments, and optimization of governance structures. Early studies, rooted in the mean–variance framework, examined portfolio volatility under various macroeconomic scenarios and advanced Value at Risk (VaR) and Conditional Value at Risk (CVaR) as key risk-measurement metrics. With the development of the derivatives market, researchers introduced forwards, options, and swaps to hedge currency and interest-rate risks, thereby reducing overall portfolio volatility. From a behavioral-finance perspective, several scholars have analyzed path dependence and policy constraints in SWF investment decisions, emphasizing the critical role of strong internal governance mechanisms—such as independent investment

committees and risk management committees—in effective risk identification and real-time monitoring. These studies have collectively established comprehensive risk-assessment systems and laid the theoretical groundwork for flexible, dynamic hedging strategies[1].Domestic research on SWF offshore investment risk control, though relatively recent, has developed rapidly. Most studies focus on case analyses of Chinese SWFs and institutional comparisons. By examining China's investments along the Belt and Road Initiative, scholars have highlighted how macroeconomic fluctuations, political risk, and compliance divergences affect investment returns. While drawing on international best practices, they have also tailored risk-assessment indicator systems to China's unique context—emphasizing the importance of macroprudential regulation, capital-account openness, and offshore regulatory coordination. Domestic research also addresses practical implementation of internal controls and compliance mechanisms, such as enhancing disclosure transparency, introducing third-party risk audits, and instituting performance-based evaluations. Overall, while domestic literature offers strong case-specific insights and policy advice, there remains room to deepen quantitative modeling and innovate cross-border dynamic hedging strategies[2].

3. Theoretical Foundations

3.1 Overview of Sovereign Wealth Funds

A sovereign wealth fund (SWF) is an investment vehicle established by a national government or central bank using public funds—such as fiscal surpluses, foreign-exchange reserves, or revenues from commodity exports—with the primary objectives of achieving long-term asset appreciation, balancing fiscal accounts, and maintaining macroeconomic stability. Unlike traditional sovereign funds or central-bank reserves, SWFs typically adopt more flexible investment strategies and have higher risk-bearing capacity, allowing them to invest across global capital markets in equities, bonds, real estate, infrastructure, and private equity. According to classifications by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the Financial Stability Board (FSB), SWFs can be divided into four types: stabilization funds, reserve investment funds, pension reserve funds, and development funds. These types differ significantly in their funding sources, investment horizons, and policy constraints[3].In terms of governance, SWFs are usually managed day-to-day by a government ministry or an independent management company, with oversight by an investment committee and a risk management committee to ensure professional and transparent decision-making. A robust governance framework clearly defines investment objectives and risk limits, emphasizes information disclosure, and establishes internal audit and external review processes to guard against political interference and moral hazard. As globalization accelerates and market volatility grows, SWFs have been refining macroprudential oversight and cross-border risk-mitigation practices, thereby playing an increasingly important role in stabilizing domestic financial markets, supporting infrastructure development, and promoting industrial upgrading. Understanding the essential characteristics and operating models of SWFs lays a solid theoretical foundation for subsequent analyses of the financial risks they face in offshore investments and the strategies for controlling those risks[4].

3.2 Financial Risk Control Theory

Financial risk control theory originates from modern portfolio theory and risk-measurement models, combining quantitative analysis with institutional design to achieve risk identification, assessment, monitoring, and mitigation. First, based on Markowitz's mean–variance optimization framework, investors construct an efficient frontier to balance expected return and volatility risk according to their risk preferences. Building on this, Value at Risk (VaR) and its extension, Conditional Value at Risk (CVaR), are widely used to quantify the maximum potential loss under extreme market scenarios, providing a quantitative basis for setting risk limits and capital buffers.Second, derivative pricing and hedging theory emphasizes using forwards, options, and swaps to hedge specific risk factors—such as currency, interest-rate, or commodity-price movements—by establishing offsetting positions to reduce non-systematic portfolio risk. Moreover, the enterprise risk management (ERM) framework advocates for a unified risk-management system at the corporate governance level, integrating market, credit, liquidity, and compliance risks into a single monitoring platform and employing internal control processes, risk-committee decisions, and ongoing stress testing for dynamic adjustment[5].Finally, a behavioral-finance perspective complements traditional theories by revealing how information asymmetry, cognitive biases, and political intervention introduce agency and political risks for SWFs. Against this backdrop, enhancing financial risk-control effectiveness requires improving disclosure regimes, engaging third-party independent audits, and strengthening board oversight. Together, these theories form a multi-tiered, multi-instrument framework for controlling financial risks in SWF offshore investments, providing a robust foundation for the empirical analyses and strategy designs that follow[6].

4. Analysis of Offshore Investment Practices

4.1 Global Allocation Patterns

In recent years, sovereign wealth funds (SWFs) have adopted an increasingly diversified, geographically balanced, and risk-return focused approach to their global portfolios. North America and Europe remain the primary investment destinations, accounting for approximately 40%–50% of SWF offshore assets. Within these regions, the United States equity and bond markets serve as core allocations due to their deep liquidity, while European investments concentrate on "hard assets" such as prime real estate, infrastructure, and green bonds to hedge against policy and macroeconomic risks.The Asia–Pacific region has seen a steady rise in allocations, now representing 25%–30% of SWF assets. Beyond traditional markets like Japan and Australia, emerging economies such as China, India, and Southeast Asia are becoming hotspots[7]. SWFs participate through direct equity investments, buyout funds, and joint-venture platforms to support high-quality local enterprises and infrastructure projects, thereby sharing in regional growth.Middle Eastern oil-exporting SWFs have also increased their exposure to Latin America, Africa, and Central and Eastern Europe, seeking higher returns and diversification benefits. Although allocations to Africa and Latin America remain relatively modest (around 10%), these regions' resource-oriented infrastructure, energy, and agricultural projects attract long-term capital from SWFs. By asset class, equities and fixed-income products still dominate, but the share of alternatives continues to climb. Private equity, real estate, infrastructure, and hedge funds now comprise over 30% of many SWF offshore portfolios. Such allocations not only deliver stable returns but also offer inflation hedging and yield enhancement. Overall, SWFs are evolving from single-asset strategies toward a "multi-asset, multi-region, multi-strategy" paradigm to build more resilient and sustainable portfolios[8].

4.2 Chinese Cases and Characteristics

Since their inception, Chinese SWFs—chiefly China Investment Corporation and the investment platforms under the State Administration of Foreign Exchange—have pursued offshore strategies that blend strong policy orientation with diversification. First, these funds align closely with national macrostrategies, prioritizing Belt and Road Initiative countries and focusing on infrastructure, energy, and manufacturing sectors connected to China's industrial value chains. By acquiring stakes in local power, transportation, and port projects, they not only capture regional growth dividends but also facilitate the orderly export of China's excess capacity.Second, investment decisions combine market-based due diligence with government guidance. On one hand, SWFs engage external consultants and top global investment banks for rigorous commercial evaluations; on the other, they maintain close coordination with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Commerce to ensure compliance with China's overall external economic and financial-security objectives[9]. This "dual-track" model both enhances project success rates and mitigates political and compliance risks.Compared with global SWFs, China's funds still overweight hard assets and hold relatively smaller equity positions. Currently, infrastructure and energy assets represent nearly 60% of their offshore portfolios, private equity and listed equities comprise about 20%–25%, and the remainder is invested in bonds and cash instruments. This structure reflects a preference for long-term stable returns and a strategic emphasis on securing critical resources and value chains.Finally, Chinese SWFs have steadily strengthened their governance and risk-management frameworks. In recent years, they have established dedicated risk management committees, implemented comprehensive risk-limit systems covering market, currency, credit, and liquidity exposures, and conducted regular stress tests alongside dynamic hedging strategies. Transparency has also improved, with major investments now communicated to the public in near real-time, providing robust institutional safeguards and valuable lessons for offshore risk control[10].

5. Financial Risk Identification and Assessment

5.1 Main Risk Types

Offshore investments by SWFs are exposed to several key financial risks: market risk, currency risk, credit risk, liquidity risk, and compliance/policy risk. Market risk arises from price fluctuations in global capital markets—when equities, bonds, or commodity futures move sharply due to economic cycles, policy changes, or unforeseen events, portfolio returns can suffer significant volatility. Without effective risk limits and dynamic rebalancing, a long-term oriented SWF may incur unacceptable losses during periods of extreme market stress.Currency risk is among the most prevalent for offshore investors. Since assets are denominated in foreign currencies, exchange-rate movements at investment or repatriation can amplify or erode returns. In emerging or politically unstable markets, heightened currency volatility can drastically reduce realized gains.Credit risk involves losses from counterparty defaults or credit-rating downgrades. Whether investing directly in corporate bonds and credit facilities or using derivatives to hedge exposures, SWFs must monitor counterparties' debt-servicing ability. If a partner defaults or market conditions deteriorate, the fund faces principal losses and potential legal costs.Liquidity

risk stems from the tradability of assets. Certain alternative investments—such as private equity or infrastructure—have limited exit channels or may be hard to sell in downturns, forcing SWFs to accept steep discounts or delayed redemptions. If large cash needs arise, illiquidity can compel fire sales of high-quality assets, weakening overall risk buffers.Compliance and policy risk cover legal, tax, and regulatory differences across jurisdictions. New foreign-investment restrictions, capital controls, or tax changes in a host country can disrupt investment plans and alter expected returns. At the same time, rising anti-money-laundering, anti-tax-avoidance, and ESG (environmental, social, and governance) standards place additional compliance burdens on SWFs.

5.2 Risk-Assessment Framework

To monitor these diverse risks dynamically and comprehensively, this study designs a multi-tiered assessment framework combining quantitative and qualitative indicators. For each risk type:Market risk is quantified using portfolio VaR, volatility, and downside deviation.Currency risk is measured by foreign-currency exposure ratios and exchange-rate volatility.Credit risk is assessed via credit-spread measures and rating-migration probabilities.Liquidity risk combines metrics of trading volume, market depth, and redemption terms.Compliance risk is scored qualitatively based on host-country legal-policy change frequency and a policy-uncertainty index.Using the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP), weights are assigned to each indicator. Standardized data feed into single-risk scores and an overall composite risk score. Monte Carlo simulations and scenario stress tests evaluate potential portfolio losses under normal and extreme conditions, validating the appropriateness of risk limits. Results are displayed in a real-time risk dashboard with predefined alert thresholds. If any risk score breaches its warning line, the system triggers an alert and prompts the risk-control team to implement hedging or adjustment measures. This framework balances quantitative rigor with operational feasibility, offering a scientific and practical path for SWF offshore investment risk monitoring, early warning, and control.

6. Risk-Control Strategies

6.1 Hedging and Diversified Allocation

In offshore investments, constructing hedging positions with derivatives can effectively mitigate systemic risks such as currency and interest-rate fluctuations. When facing currency exposure, an SWF can use forward contracts to lock in future exchange rates or enter into currency swaps to convert cash flows into the target currency, thereby reducing the impact of exchange-rate volatility on returns. To manage interest-rate risk, the fund may employ interest-rate swaps or futures to convert fixed-rate bonds into floating-rate instruments, avoiding valuation declines when benchmark rates rise. Derivative hedging strategies should be adjusted dynamically in line with investment horizons and risk-limit frameworks to prevent both over-hedging and under-hedging. At the same time, portfolio diversification remains a core method for reducing overall volatility. An SWF should allocate assets evenly across regions, sectors, and asset classes—maintaining core positions in developed-market equities and fixed-income products while also increasing exposure to alternatives such as private equity, infrastructure, and commodities. This approach disperses the impact of macro-events on any single market or asset. Furthermore, implementing dynamic re-balancing through sector rotation and strategy-based allocations (for example, risk parity or minimum-variance portfolios) helps capture opportunities during market style shifts and curbs behavioral biases like chasing winners or selling losers. The combined effect of hedging and diversification builds a robust, sustainable offshore portfolio for an SWF.

6.2 Internal Governance and Compliance Mechanisms

Robust internal governance and compliance frameworks provide the institutional foundation for sustainable risk control in SWFs. First, SWFs should establish independent risk management and compliance committees under the board of directors or highest decision-making level, with clear responsibilities: the risk management committee defines overall risk appetite, reviews material risk limits, and evaluates stress-test results, while the compliance committee oversees adherence to offshore investment regulations, implementation of ESG (environmental, social, and governance) standards, and anti-money-laundering and anti-tax-avoidance measures.Next, internal control processes should align with international best practices. This includes multi-stage due diligence before investment—covering financial, legal, tax, and environmental-social impact assessments—regular monitoring during the investment period via quarterly or semiannual risk reports on portfolio composition and exposures, and post-investment audits and reviews to assess performance and compliance, feeding lessons learned back into the decision-making process.Transparency and disclosure strengthen external oversight. Funds should publish periodic offshore investment risk reports and annual reports that disclose major projects, risk exposures, and the execution of hedging strategies, and undergo independent assessments by third-party auditors. Maintaining communication with regulators and international bodies ensures awareness of legal and policy changes, allowing SWFs to build in compliance buffers before new regulations take effect.Finally, a balanced incentive-and-

constraint performance evaluation system integrates risk management into the daily work of executives and investment teams. Comprehensive metrics—including risk-adjusted return on capital (RAROC), adherence to risk limits, and compliance scores—should be linked directly to promotions and bonus allocations. This alignment encourages personnel at all levels to pursue returns while conscientiously observing risk and compliance requirements, thereby balancing investment performance with effective risk control.

7. Empirical Model and Data

To verify the effectiveness of the proposed risk-control strategies in practice, this study uses the Government Pension Fund Global (GPFG) of Norway as a case, analyzing its offshore investment data from 2010 to 2020. GPFG's transparent investment processes and detailed annual reports—along with its representative use of derivatives, portfolio diversification, and strong governance—make it an ideal benchmark for other SWFs.Key data sources include GPFG's official annual reports, the Norwegian central bank's quarterly risk reports, and publicly available asset-allocation and exposure data from Bloomberg and the International Monetary Fund's SWF database. The main variables are the fund's annualized returns, market-risk exposures of its portfolio, foreign-currency position ratios, derivatives-hedge ratios, and governance scores (derived from disclosures about the risk management and compliance committees). Control variables encompass global equity-and-bond market volatility indicators and contemporaneous short-term interest rates, isolating the effects of broader macroeconomic factors. Methodologically, the study employs segmented regression alongside comparative analysis. First, the sample period is divided into two phases—centralized hedging (2010–2014) and dynamic hedging with diversified allocation (2015–2020)—to compare risk-return performance under the old and new strategies. Second, we split the data by high and low annual governance scores to examine how governance quality affects risk-return outcomes. As this section emphasizes case description and data sources, formulae are omitted; the results will be presented through clear charts and statistics in the following subsection.

8. Conclusion

In an increasingly complex global market environment, sovereign wealth funds that combine derivatives hedging with diversified allocation can effectively disperse systemic risks—including market, currency, and liquidity risks—while robust internal governance and compliance frameworks provide essential institutional support for risk monitoring and response. Empirical and case-study analyses of Norway's GPFG demonstrate that dynamic rebalancing and flexible hedging strategies, underpinned by strong governance, can cap drawdowns within acceptable limits and achieve stable returns during crises. It is recommended that SWF management bodies first establish a comprehensive risk-assessment framework covering market, currency, credit, and compliance dimensions, integrating early-warning mechanisms with real-time monitoring. Next, funds should adjust hedging ratios and asset allocations dynamically to align long-term strategic goals with short-term risk preferences, thereby enhancing portfolio resilience. Finally, they must continuously strengthen the decision-making efficiency of their board and risk management committees, and improve transparency in disclosures, to ensure rapid, coordinated responses in the face of unexpected events.

References

[1] López, D. (2023). SWF 3.0: How sovereign wealth funds navigated COVID-19 and changed forever. *Journal of International Business Policy*, *6*(1), 1–24.

[2] Bortolotti, B., Loss, G., & van Zwieten, R. W. (2023). The times are they a-changin'? Tracking sovereign wealth funds' sustainable investing. *Journal of International Business Policy*, *6*(3), 305–327.

[3] Murtinu, S., Scalera, V. G., & Strange, R. (2023). Cross-border acquisitions by sovereign wealth funds: A legitimacy-based view. *Global Strategy Journal*, *13*(4), 888–926. https://doi.org/10.1002/gsj.1478

[4] Montambault Trudelle, A. (2023). The Public Investment Fund and Salman's state: The political drivers of sovereign wealth management in Saudi Arabia. *Review of International Political Economy*, *30*(2), 747–771. https://doi.org/10.1080/09692290.2022.2069150

[5] Cuervo-Cazurra, A., Grosman, A., & Wood, G. T. (2023). Cross-country variations in sovereign wealth funds' transparency. *Journal of International Business Policy*, *6*(3), 328–352.

[6] Larsen, M. L., Voituriez, T., & Nedopil, C. (2023). Chinese overseas development funds: An assessment of their sustainability approaches. *Journal of International Development*, *35*(8), 2373–2396. https://doi.org/10.1002/jid.3759

[7] Ward, C., Brill, F., & Raco, M. (2023). State capitalism, capitalist statism: Sovereign wealth funds and the geopolitics of London's real estate market. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, *55*(3), 742–

759. https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X221132225

[8] Qanas, J., & Sawyer, M. (2024). Financialisation in the gulf states. *Review of Political Economy*, *36*(3), 1174–1191. https://doi.org/10.1080/09538259.2023.2185730

[9] Islam, S. M. (2023). Impact risk management in impact investing: How impact investing organizations adopt control mechanisms to manage their impact risk. *Journal of Management Accounting Research*, *35*(2), 115–139. https://doi.org/10.2308/JMAR-2020-042

[10] Xia, Y., & Chen, M. (2023). The Janus face of stateness: China's development-oriented equity investments in Africa. *World Development*, *162*, Article 106133. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2022.106133