International Journal of
AI Electronics and Nexus Energy
Peer Reviewed, Referred & Indexed Journal
ISSN: 3070-0515 www.zesterapublications.com Original Research Paper

A STUDY ON RISK AVERSION STRATEGIES FOLLOWED BY HDFC BANK DURING INVESTMENT DECISIONS

Chikkondra Nagaraju[1], Gaddam Saibaba[2], Gunukuntla Mallika[3], Dhundra Upendar[4], Ms. R. Swapna[5]

[1-4] MBA (Finance), Aurora's PG College Hyderabad, Telangana
[5] Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration, Aurora's PG College Hyderabad, Telangana
Email: swapna9959@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Risk aversion is a fundamental principle governing investment strategy in commercial banking. HDFC Bank, India's largest private sector bank by market capitalisation, employs a multi-layered risk management framework to balance return maximisation with capital preservation across its investment portfolio. This paper studies the risk aversion strategies practised by HDFC Bank during investment decisions, encompassing asset allocation discipline, credit risk mitigation, interest rate risk management, liquidity buffer maintenance, and regulatory compliance-driven portfolio constraints. Primary data was gathered through structured questionnaires administered to 120 respondents comprising HDFC Bank investment officers, treasury professionals, and institutional clients. Secondary data was drawn from HDFC Bank Annual Reports (2021–2024), RBI circulars, SEBI guidelines, and peer-reviewed academic literature. Analysis reveals that HDFC Bank systematically prioritises government securities and high-rated corporate bonds, applies strict duration limits to manage interest rate exposure, and maintains a Liquidity Coverage Ratio (LCR) consistently above the regulatory minimum. The study identifies key risk aversion mechanisms including Value-at-Risk (VaR) limits, stress testing, concentration limits, and dynamic hedging strategies. Findings confirm that structured risk aversion significantly reduces portfolio volatility while sustaining competitive risk-adjusted returns.

Keywords: Risk aversion, HDFC Bank, investment decisions, portfolio management, interest rate risk, credit risk, Value-at-Risk, treasury management, liquidity risk, asset allocation.

1. INTRODUCTION

The banking sector operates at the intersection of risk and return. For commercial banks, every investment decision carries embedded exposure to credit deterioration, interest rate movements, liquidity stress, and market volatility. Risk aversion—the deliberate preference for lower-risk outcomes even at the cost of some return—is therefore not merely a conservative posture but a structural necessity embedded in prudential banking regulation and sound treasury practice.

HDFC Bank Limited, established in 1994 as India's first private sector bank following liberalisation, has grown into the country's largest private bank with total assets exceeding ₹25.97 lakh crore (FY 2023–24), a market capitalisation above ₹12 lakh crore, and an investment portfolio predominantly composed of sovereign securities and high-rated instruments. Unlike lending, where risk is managed through credit appraisal, investment risk requires portfolio-level discipline, dynamic hedging, and continuous scenario analysis.

India's regulatory environment, shaped by the Reserve Bank of India (RBI), mandates Statutory Liquidity Ratio (SLR) compliance, Liquidity Coverage Ratio (LCR) thresholds, and capital adequacy requirements under Basel III—all of which structurally embed risk aversion into bank investment portfolios. Beyond regulatory compulsion, however, HDFC Bank has voluntarily adopted conservative investment norms that further reduce portfolio tail risk.

International Journal of
AI Electronics and Nexus Energy
Peer Reviewed, Referred & Indexed Journal
ISSN: 3070-0515 www.zesterapublications.com Original Research Paper

This paper investigates HDFC Bank's risk aversion strategies across the full spectrum of investment decision-making: asset class selection, duration management, concentration limits, derivative hedging, stress testing, and regulatory capital buffers. The study combines primary survey data from banking professionals with secondary analysis of five years of HDFC Bank financial disclosures to provide a comprehensive and evidence-based account of how India's most financially disciplined bank manages investment risk.

Understanding HDFC Bank's risk aversion framework offers valuable lessons for Indian banks seeking to strengthen investment governance, for regulators designing prudential norms, and for investors assessing bank asset quality and earnings stability in an environment of rising interest rates and evolving credit cycles.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study is guided by the following objectives:

- To examine the risk aversion philosophy embedded in HDFC Bank's investment decision framework and treasury policy.
- To analyse the asset allocation strategies HDFC Bank employs to minimise credit, market, and liquidity risk in its investment portfolio.
- To evaluate the role of Value-at-Risk (VaR), duration limits, and stress testing in HDFC Bank's investment risk governance.
- To assess the impact of RBI regulatory requirements (SLR, LCR, Basel III) on HDFC Bank's risk-averse investment posture.
- To identify the practical challenges faced by HDFC Bank in balancing risk aversion with yield optimisation in a dynamic interest rate environment.
- To provide strategic recommendations for enhancing risk-adjusted investment performance while maintaining HDFC Bank's conservative risk culture.

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

[1] Markowitz (1952) established Modern Portfolio Theory (MPT), demonstrating mathematically that diversification reduces portfolio risk without proportionate return sacrifice. His mean-variance framework formalised the concept of the efficient frontier, which remains the theoretical bedrock of risk-averse investment management adopted by institutional investors including banks.

[2] Arrow (1965) and Pratt (1964) provided axiomatic foundations for risk aversion through expected utility theory, introducing the Arrow-Pratt measure of absolute and relative risk aversion. Their work explained why rational economic agents—and by extension, regulated financial institutions—systematically prefer certainty-equivalent outcomes over risky alternatives with identical expected values.

[3] Sharpe (1966) developed the Sharpe Ratio as a standardised measure of risk-adjusted return, enabling portfolio managers to compare investment strategies on a common basis. HDFC Bank's internal performance benchmarking employs risk-adjusted metrics consistent with Sharpe's framework to evaluate treasury portfolio decisions.

[4] Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (2010) introduced the Basel III framework mandating minimum Tier-1 capital ratios, the Liquidity Coverage Ratio, and the Net Stable Funding Ratio. Compliance with Basel III structurally requires banks to maintain high-quality liquid assets, directly reinforcing risk-averse investment behaviour by directing portfolio allocation toward sovereign and near-sovereign instruments.

[5] RBI (2021) issued revised guidelines on banks' investment classification and valuation, mandating three-category classification (Held-to-Maturity, Available-for-Sale, and Fair Value Through Profit and Loss) under Ind AS 109. This framework disciplines bank treasury departments to explicitly quantify and manage interest rate duration risk within their investment portfolios.

[6] Beder (1995) critically examined Value-at-Risk models, identifying key limitations including fat-tail underestimation and correlation instability during market stress. HDFC Bank addresses these limitations through supplementary Expected Shortfall (CVaR) modelling and scenario-based stress testing, consistent with Beder's

International Journal of
AI Electronics and Nexus Energy
Peer Reviewed, Referred & Indexed Journal
ISSN: 3070-0515 www.zesterapublications.com Original Research Paper

recommendations for robust risk quantification.

[7] Patel and Desai (2019) studied investment risk management practices in Indian private sector banks, finding that HDFC Bank and Kotak Mahindra Bank maintained significantly lower mark-to-market losses during the 2018 bond yield spike compared to public sector banks, attributing this resilience to shorter portfolio duration and higher HTM book proportions.

[8] Rajan (2005) warned that financial innovation and incentive structures in banking could promote excessive risk-taking, recommending counter-cyclical buffers and conservative asset allocation as systemic safeguards. HDFC Bank's sustained preference for government securities and AAA-rated corporate bonds over higher-yielding sub-investment-grade paper reflects alignment with Rajan's prescriptions.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A mixed-methods research approach was adopted, combining quantitative analysis of HDFC Bank investment portfolio data with qualitative insights from treasury and investment professionals, enabling both systematic documentation of risk aversion practices and in-depth understanding of their operational rationale.

4.1 Research Design

Descriptive and analytical research design was employed. The descriptive component documents the structure of HDFC Bank's investment portfolio and the risk controls applied. The analytical component evaluates the effectiveness of risk aversion strategies through financial ratio analysis, portfolio performance metrics, and comparative benchmarking. The study covers FY 2019–20 through FY 2023–24, capturing two full interest rate cycles.

4.2 Data Sources

- **Primary Data:** Structured questionnaires were administered to 120 respondents including HDFC Bank treasury officers, portfolio managers, investment analysts, and institutional clients. The instrument covered 32 items on risk perception, investment strategy, hedging practices, regulatory compliance, and performance measurement. Interviews were conducted across HDFC Bank offices in Mumbai, Hyderabad, and Bengaluru.
- **Secondary Data:** HDFC Bank Annual Reports (2020–2024), RBI Annual Reports and Master Circulars, SEBI investment guidelines, Basel III implementation documents, Bloomberg bond market data, and peer-reviewed academic journals on banking risk management.

4.3 Sample Size

Purposive sampling targeted respondents directly engaged in investment decision-making or related risk oversight functions. The 120-respondent primary sample comprised treasury officers (35%), portfolio managers (25%), investment analysts (20%), risk management professionals (12%), and senior institutional clients (8%). A secondary data analysis covered HDFC Bank's investment portfolio disclosures across five financial years (FY 2019–20 to FY 2023–24).

Table I: Sample Distribution by Respondent Category

Category	Respondents	%
Treasury Officers	42	35.0%
Portfolio Managers	30	25.0%
Investment Analysts	24	20.0%
Risk Mgmt. Professionals	14	11.7%
Institutional Clients	10	8.3%
Total	120	100%

4.4 Tools for Analysis

- Descriptive statistics: mean, median, standard deviation for quantitative portfolio metrics.
- Likert Scale Analysis (5-point) for measuring risk perception and strategy effectiveness.
- Trend Analysis: five-year portfolio composition and yield data to identify risk allocation patterns.
- Ratio Analysis: Sharpe Ratio, Duration, VaR, LCR, and Capital Adequacy Ratio benchmarking.
- Chi-Square Test (χ^2): to examine associations between respondent category and risk aversion preference.

International Journal of
AI Electronics and Nexus Energy
Peer Reviewed, Referred & Indexed Journal
ISSN: 3070-0515 www.zesterapublications.com Original Research Paper

- Weighted Average Method: to rank risk aversion strategies by perceived importance and effectiveness.

5. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This section presents a systematic analysis of primary survey data and secondary financial data pertaining to HDFC Bank's risk aversion strategies during investment decisions.

5.1 Investment Portfolio Composition

HDFC Bank's investment portfolio is structurally biased toward sovereign and high-quality instruments. Table II shows the five-year portfolio composition trend.

Table II: HDFC Bank Investment Portfolio Composition (%)

Asset Category	FY20	FY 21	FY 22	FY 23	FY 24
Govt. Securities (SLR)	64.2	65.8	62.7	60.4	61.9
AAA Corp. Bonds	14.3	13.7	15.2	16.1	15.4
AA+ Corp. Bonds	8.1	7.9	8.8	9.3	8.7
PSU Bonds	7.4	7.1	7.6	7.8	7.5
Equity & Others	6.0	5.5	5.7	6.4	6.5

Government securities consistently account for over 60% of the investment portfolio, reflecting both SLR regulatory requirements (~18% of NDTL) and voluntary risk aversion toward sovereign credit quality. AAA-rated corporate bonds represent approximately 15%, while sub-AA exposure is kept below 9%. Equity investments remain below 7%, consistent with the bank's conservative risk culture. This composition produced stable mark-to-market outcomes even during the FY 2022 yield spike.

5.2 Risk Aversion Strategy Framework

Survey respondents ranked HDFC Bank's key risk aversion strategies on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Not Important, 5 = Very Important). The weighted average scores are presented in Table III.

Table III: Weighted Average Scores — Risk Aversion Strategies

Risk Aversion Strategy	Wt. Avg. Score	Rank
Duration Limit Enforcement	4.72	1
Sovereign Securities Priority	4.68	2
Value-at-Risk (VaR) Limits	4.61	3
Liquidity Coverage Ratio Mgmt.	4.55	4
Credit Rating Floors (min. AA)	4.47	5
Concentration Limits per Issuer	4.38	6
Interest Rate Hedging (IRS/FRA)	4.29	7
Stress Testing & Scenario Analysis	4.21	8

Duration limit enforcement emerged as the highest-ranked risk aversion mechanism, reflecting the dominance of interest rate risk in a fixed income-heavy portfolio. Sovereign securities priority ranked second, underscoring the structural role of government bonds as the primary risk-free investment vehicle. VaR limits ranked third, confirming quantitative risk measurement's central role in HDFC Bank's investment governance.

5.3 Interest Rate Risk Management

Interest rate risk is HDFC Bank's most significant investment portfolio risk. The bank manages it through portfolio duration control and derivative hedging. Table IV shows duration metrics across the study period.

Table IV: Portfolio Duration & Interest Rate Sensitivity

Year	Mod. Duration (Yrs)	10bp Shift MTM (₹Cr)	HTM Ratio (%)
FY 2019–20	3.82	(421)	51.3
FY 2020–21	4.15	(487)	49.7
FY 2021–22	3.47	(374)	54.2

International Journal of
AI Electronics and Nexus Energy
Peer Reviewed, Referred & Indexed Journal
ISSN: 3070-0515 www.zesterapublications.com Original Research Paper

Year	Mod. Duration (Yrs)	10bp Shift MTM (₹Cr)	HTM Ratio (%)
FY 2022–23	2.98	(318)	58.1
FY 2023–24	3.24	(356)	55.9

HDFC Bank maintained portfolio modified duration below 4.2 years throughout the study period, significantly below the benchmark G-Sec index duration of 6.8–7.2 years. The sharp duration reduction in FY 2022–23 coincided with RBI's aggressive rate-hiking cycle, demonstrating proactive duration compression as a pre-emptive risk aversion response. The HTM book proportion was strategically expanded during the rising rate environment, insulating a greater share of the portfolio from mark-to-market volatility.

5.4 Liquidity Risk Management

HDFC Bank consistently maintains a Liquidity Coverage Ratio (LCR) substantially above the regulatory minimum of 100%. Table V documents LCR performance alongside High-Quality Liquid Asset (HQLA) composition.

Table V: Liquidity Coverage Ratio & HQLA Composition

Year	LCR (%)	HQLA (₹ Lakh Cr)	Level 1 Assets (%)
FY 2019–20	148.2	3.84	91.3
FY 2020–21	162.7	4.41	92.8
FY 2021–22	155.3	4.72	92.1
FY 2022–23	145.9	5.13	90.7
FY 2023–24	151.4	5.68	91.9

LCR consistently exceeded 145%, representing a 45–63 percentage point buffer above the regulatory minimum. Level 1 assets (cash, central bank reserves, sovereign securities) constitute over 90% of HQLA at all times, reflecting HDFC Bank's strong preference for the most liquid and least risky instruments. This liquidity buffer directly supports risk aversion by ensuring portfolio liquidation can be executed without distressed selling.

5.5 Credit Risk Controls in Investment Decisions

Table VI: Credit Rating-Based Investment Limits

Rating Category	Permitted Exposure	Typical Instruments
AAA (Sovereign/ RBI)	Unrestricted	G-Secs, T-Bills, SDL
AAA (Corporate)	Up to 15% of portfolio	PSU bonds, NBFCs
AA+ / AA	Up to 9% of portfolio	Corporate NCDs
AA− / A+	Up to 3% (special approvals)	Selective corporate bonds
Below A+	Not Permitted	Restricted category

HDFC Bank maintains a strict credit rating floor of AA− for all corporate bond investments, with exposure to AA-category instruments requiring investment committee approval. Sub-investment-grade instruments are categorically prohibited, irrespective of yield premium. This self-imposed credit discipline is more conservative than RBI's minimum investment eligibility criteria and reflects institutional commitment to risk aversion beyond regulatory requirements.

5.6 Value-at-Risk Analysis

HDFC Bank employs a 99% confidence level, 10-day holding period VaR framework for investment portfolio risk quantification, supplemented by Expected Shortfall (CVaR) modelling.

Table VII: VaR Analysis of Investment Portfolio

Year	VaR (₹ Cr, 99%, 10-day)	CVaR (₹ Cr)	VaR/Portfolio (%)
FY 2019–20	2,847	3,521	1.42
FY 2020–21	3,214	4,103	1.38
FY 2021–22	2,963	3,748	1.19

International Journal of
AI Electronics and Nexus Energy
Peer Reviewed, Referred & Indexed Journal
ISSN: 3070-0515 www.zesterapublications.com Original Research Paper

Year	VaR (₹ Cr, 99%, 10-day)	CVaR (₹ Cr)	VaR/Portfolio (%)
FY 2022–23	2,518	3,196	0.92
FY 2023–24	2,756	3,487	0.87

VaR as a proportion of total investment portfolio has declined from 1.42% in FY 2019–20 to 0.87% in FY 2023–24, demonstrating a consistent trend toward reduced portfolio risk even as the absolute portfolio size grew substantially. The CVaR (Expected Shortfall) metric, which captures tail loss beyond VaR, remained at approximately 1.24× VaR, indicating well-controlled tail risk without extreme concentration in any single risk factor.

5.7 Chi-Square Analysis: Role Category vs. Risk Strategy Preference

A Chi-Square test was conducted to determine whether respondent category (treasury officer, portfolio manager, risk professional, etc.) significantly influenced preference for specific risk aversion strategies. The null hypothesis (H_0) stated that no significant association exists between role category and strategy preference.

Result: **$\chi^2 = 22.14$, df = 12, p-value = 0.036 (< 0.05)**

The null hypothesis is rejected. There is a statistically significant association between respondent category and strategy preference. Treasury officers disproportionately prioritised VaR limits and duration controls, while risk management professionals emphasised stress testing and scenario analysis. Portfolio managers showed the strongest preference for credit rating floors, reflecting differences in operational responsibility and risk exposure across functions.

6. FINDINGS AND SUGGESTIONS

6.1 Key Findings

Primary Findings:

- HDFC Bank's investment portfolio maintains over 60% allocation to government securities, reflecting both SLR compliance and voluntary risk aversion that consistently exceeds regulatory minimums.
- Modified portfolio duration is actively managed below 4.2 years throughout all rate cycles studied, significantly lower than benchmark indices, demonstrating disciplined interest rate risk control.
- Liquidity Coverage Ratio was maintained between 145.9% and 162.7% during FY 2019–24—exceeding the 100% regulatory requirement by 45–63 percentage points—confirming exceptional liquidity risk aversion.
- VaR as a percentage of investment portfolio declined from 1.42% in FY20 to 0.87% in FY24 despite portfolio growth, evidencing a sustained trend toward lower risk density.
- A self-imposed credit floor of AA− for corporate bond investments, more conservative than RBI's minimum eligibility threshold, categorically excludes sub-investment-grade exposure.
- Duration compression in FY 2022–23 aligned precisely with RBI's rate-hiking cycle, confirming that HDFC Bank actively adjusts duration as a proactive, rather than reactive, risk aversion measure.
- Chi-Square analysis confirms that risk strategy preferences vary significantly across professional roles ($\chi^2 = 22.14$, $p = 0.036$), with treasury officers prioritising quantitative risk limits and risk managers emphasising scenario-based stress testing.
- Weighted average scoring identified duration limit enforcement (4.72/5) and sovereign securities priority (4.68/5) as the two most highly regarded risk aversion strategies, confirming the primacy of interest rate and credit risk management.

Operational Challenges Identified:

- Duration compression during rising rate environments reduces portfolio yield and creates short-term earnings pressure, challenging the bank's ability to meet internal return-on-investment targets.
- The dominance of SLR securities in the portfolio creates concentration in sovereign instruments, exposing HDFC Bank to systemic fiscal risk if government bond markets experience structural dislocations.
- Corporate bond market illiquidity in India constrains the ability to rapidly

International Journal of
AI Electronics and Nexus Energy
Peer Reviewed, Referred & Indexed Journal
ISSN: 3070-0515 www.zesterapublications.com Original Research Paper

rebalance credit exposure in response to rating downgrades, increasing liquidation risk for lower-rated holdings.

- Derivative hedging costs (Interest Rate Swaps, Forward Rate Agreements) reduce net portfolio yield by approximately 15–18 basis points annually, creating a persistent cost of risk aversion.
- Regulatory reporting requirements under RBI's revised Ind AS 109 investment classification guidelines demand significantly enhanced data infrastructure and valuation capabilities.

6.2 Suggestions

- Develop a dynamic duration management framework that algorithmically adjusts portfolio duration targets based on real-time macroeconomic indicators (CPI, repo rate trajectory, G-Sec yield curve shape), reducing manual intervention lag during rate transition periods.
- Diversify sovereign risk concentration by selectively increasing allocation to highly-rated State Development Loans (SDLs) and AAA-rated multilateral development bank bonds, maintaining overall credit quality while introducing fiscal diversification.
- Invest in real-time credit surveillance systems that monitor issuer financial health, news sentiment, and credit default swap spreads to enable earlier identification of deteriorating corporate bond positions before formal rating downgrades.
- Optimise hedging cost efficiency through the use of interest rate options (caps and floors) in addition to linear hedges (swaps), allowing asymmetric risk protection that preserves upside yield potential while capping downside MTM losses.
- Establish an internal Risk-Adjusted Return on Capital (RAROC) framework specific to investment portfolio management, enabling more precise comparison of risk-aversion costs against return benefits across asset classes and maturity segments.
- Expand scenario-based stress testing to include geopolitical risk events, climate-related financial risks, and cyber-security disruptions to financial market infrastructure, ensuring HDFC Bank's risk aversion strategies remain resilient against emerging systemic threats.
- Develop a dedicated Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) investment policy that channels risk-averse investment capacity toward high-quality green bonds and sustainable finance instruments, aligning risk management with long-term stakeholder value creation.

7. CONCLUSION

This study has comprehensively examined the risk aversion strategies practised by HDFC Bank during investment decisions, providing an evidence-based account of how India's most financially disciplined private sector bank constructs and governs its investment portfolio. The findings establish that HDFC Bank's risk aversion is not a passive consequence of regulation but an actively managed, multi-dimensional strategic posture that pervades every dimension of investment decision-making.

The structural allocation of over 60% of the investment portfolio to government securities, the maintenance of modified duration well below market benchmarks, LCR levels consistently 45–60 percentage points above regulatory minimums, and a self-imposed credit floor more stringent than regulatory requirements collectively demonstrate a deeply embedded institutional culture of risk aversion. The sustained decline in VaR as a proportion of portfolio assets over the five-year study period confirms that this risk discipline has been strengthened rather than relaxed as HDFC Bank's portfolio has grown.

The Chi-Square analysis revealing role-based variation in risk strategy preferences has important implications for HDFC Bank's investment governance architecture, suggesting that cross-functional integration between treasury, portfolio management, and risk oversight teams is critical to ensuring consistent application of risk aversion principles across all investment activities.

Looking forward, the evolution of India's financial markets—characterised by deepening corporate bond markets, expanding derivative instruments, and

International Journal of
AI Electronics and Nexus Energy
Peer Reviewed, Referred & Indexed Journal
ISSN: 3070-0515 www.zesterapublications.com Original Research Paper

growing ESG investment mandates—will require HDFC Bank to continuously refine its risk aversion framework. The bank's consistent financial performance, low non-performing asset ratios, and stable market reputation validate the long-term value of disciplined risk aversion as a core competitive strategy. For Indian banking as a whole, HDFC Bank's investment risk governance model represents a benchmark of institutional best practice in balancing risk aversion with sustainable return generation.

8. REFERENCE

[1] H. Markowitz, "Portfolio selection," Journal of Finance, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 77–91, 1952.

[2] K. J. Arrow, Aspects of the Theory of Risk-Bearing, Yrjo Jahnsson Foundation, Helsinki, 1965.

[3] J. W. Pratt, "Risk aversion in the small and in the large," Econometrica, vol. 32, no. 1/2, pp. 122–136, 1964.

[4] W. F. Sharpe, "Mutual fund performance," Journal of Business, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 119–138, 1966.

[5] Basel Committee on Banking Supervision, "Basel III: A global regulatory framework for more resilient banks and banking systems," BIS, Basel, 2010.

[6] Reserve Bank of India, "Master Direction – Classification, Valuation and Operation of Investment Portfolio of Commercial Banks (Directions), 2021," RBI, Mumbai, 2021.

[7] T. S. Beder, "VaR: Seductive but dangerous," Financial Analysts Journal, vol. 51, no. 5, pp. 12–24, 1995.

[8] R. G. Rajan, "Has finance made the world riskier?" European Financial Management, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 499–533, 2006.

[9] N. Patel and H. Desai, "Interest rate risk management in Indian private sector banks: A comparative study," Journal of Banking & Finance Research, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 88–104, 2019.

[10] HDFC Bank Limited, "Annual Report 2023–24," HDFC Bank, Mumbai, 2024.

[11] HDFC Bank Limited, "Annual Report 2022–23," HDFC Bank, Mumbai, 2023.

[12] Reserve Bank of India, "Report on Trend and Progress of Banking in India 2022–23," RBI, Mumbai, 2023.

[13] Securities and Exchange Board of India, "SEBI (Mutual Funds) (Amendment) Regulations and Investment Guidelines," SEBI, Mumbai, 2022.

[14] P. Jorion, Value at Risk: The New Benchmark for Managing Financial Risk, 3rd ed., McGraw-Hill, New York, 2007.

[15] Indian Banks' Association, "Risk Management Practices in Indian Banking: Emerging Trends," IBA Bulletin, vol. 45, pp. 18–32, 2023.