THE CANTILLON INSTITUTE Working Paper Series: The Destination Thesis Working Paper No. 1 H.S. Myrdal 2026

The Architecture of Arrival: Singapore's Real-World Asset Policy as Sovereign Capital Strategy

Abstract

Between 2020 and 2023, single family office registrations in Singapore increased from approximately 400 to approximately 1,100, a 175 percent increase over three years, according to figures published by the Monetary Authority of Singapore. This paper examines that movement as the leading observable indicator of a structural reallocation of productive capital away from jurisdictions whose monetary and regulatory frameworks have become measurably less stable, and toward a jurisdiction that has built the infrastructure to receive it. Singapore's response to this inflow has not been passive. The Variable Capital Company framework, the Monetary Authority of Singapore's Project Guardian tokenised asset programme, and a sequence of targeted regulatory developments constitute a coherent sovereign capital strategy: the deliberate construction of institutional infrastructure designed to capture displaced productive wealth and convert initial residency into long-duration structural commitment. This paper proceeds in four stages. It presents the capital flow data that establishes the direction and velocity of movement. It identifies Switzerland's positioning as a destination for displaced European productive capital between 1933 and 1965 as the single closest historical precedent. It maps the specific policy mechanisms through which MAS has constructed infrastructure for institutional capture. It then identifies the two gaps that currently separate Singapore's framework from full institutional retention. These gaps are not evidence of strategic failure; they are the frontier of a strategy already in execution.

Introduction

Capital does not move without reason. It moves in response to specific signals: changes in legal certainty, monetary predictability, or the perceived durability of the frameworks that protect productive wealth from fiscal and monetary erosion. When those signals shift across multiple major jurisdictions simultaneously, the movement accelerates. The 175 percent increase in Singapore's single family office registrations between 2020 and 2023 is the observable result of precisely that condition.

The sequence of events that produced this movement is specific. The U.S. Federal Reserve's balance sheet expanded from approximately USD 4.2 trillion to USD 8.9 trillion between February 2020 and April 2022 (Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, 2022). The subsequent inflationary episode and the rate-tightening cycle of 2022 to 2023, the sharpest since 1981, forced a structural reassessment among capital holders whose allocation frameworks had been calibrated to a decade of zero interest rates. Hong Kong's National Security Law, enacted on 30 June 2020, altered the legal certainty calculus for capital domiciled in or transiting through that jurisdiction. The U.S. stablecoin legislative process, advanced through the GENIUS Act, has introduced structural uncertainty into the dollar-denominated payment infrastructure that had previously served as a neutral substrate for international capital movement.

Each of these events produced the same outcome at the level of capital allocation: productive wealth reassessed the stability of the frameworks that had previously held it in place.

Singapore did not simply receive this capital. The Monetary Authority of Singapore built infrastructure to intercept it, to structure it, and to retain it on terms favourable to long-duration commitment. The Variable Capital Company framework, Project Guardian, the Payment Services Act licensing architecture, and the Section 13O and 13U fund incentive structures constitute an integrated sovereign response; not a set of independent fintech initiatives, but a coherent strategy whose parts reinforce one another.

This paper maps that strategy, situates it within the closest available historical precedent, and identifies the two structural gaps that separate current policy from full institutional capture.

I. What the Data Already Shows

The family office registration figure is the starting point. The Monetary Authority of Singapore reported approximately 400 single family offices registered in Singapore at the end of 2020. By the end of 2023, that figure had reached approximately 1,100 (Monetary Authority of Singapore, 2024a). The acceleration was not uniform across the three-year period. The steepest gradient occurred in 2021 and early 2022, in the twelve months immediately following two concurrent disruptions: the enactment of Hong Kong's National Security Law and the Federal Reserve's initial pivot toward tightening.

The Hong Kong signal is legible in the registration timeline. Capital structures requiring political neutrality as a functional prerequisite had, by the middle of 2021, begun converting that requirement into a jurisdictional decision. Singapore's geographic proximity to Hong Kong, its common law legal system, its absence of capital gains tax, and its established infrastructure for international capital management made it the available alternative. The family office registration gradient reflects that decision series; it does not require further inference.

The Variable Capital Company data series reinforces the direction of movement. Launched in January 2020, the VCC is a Singapore-incorporated fund vehicle designed for investment funds, open and closed-ended, structured to accommodate the full range of family office and institutional investment mandates. A VCC may establish sub-funds within a single corporate structure, issue and redeem shares at net asset value without triggering full corporate dissolution procedures, and maintain segregated liability across sub-funds. By the end of 2023, over 900 Variable Capital Companies had been incorporated under the framework, with a substantial proportion representing structures relocated or newly established by capital previously domiciled in Cayman Islands or British Virgin Islands vehicles (Accounting and Corporate Regulatory Authority of Singapore, 2024).

The VCC registration series is the more precise indicator of structural commitment. A family office that registers a Singapore presence but retains its primary fund vehicle offshore has not made an architectural decision; it has made a contingency. A family office that migrates its fund structure into a VCC has committed to Singapore's legal perimeter. The VCC registration rate between 2021 and 2023 suggests that a meaningful proportion of the capital that arrived was not merely parking; it was converting.

Project Guardian provides a third data series. The Monetary Authority of Singapore launched the initiative in May 2022 as a collaborative programme with the financial services industry to explore the tokenisation of real-world assets and their application to capital markets infrastructure. By October 2023, the initiative had expanded to include 17 industry pilots across fixed income, foreign exchange, and asset management, with participating institutions including JPMorgan, DBS Bank, SBI Digital Asset Holdings, HSBC, UBS, Standard Chartered, and Citi (Monetary Authority of Singapore, 2023a). The 2024 Project Guardian report documented further expansion into fund distribution and wealth management tokenisation, with a broader set of global institutional counterparties (Monetary Authority of Singapore, 2024b).

The three data series, read together, describe a single phenomenon. Singapore is receiving capital flight. It is providing legal structures for its domestication. It is building tokenisation infrastructure for its long-duration deployment. These are not coincident developments; they are sequential stages in a strategy whose architecture was already visible in 2022 and whose execution is now observable in the registration data.

II. The Single Closest Historical Precedent

Switzerland's emergence as the primary destination for displaced European productive capital between 1933 and 1965 is the structural precedent most closely matching Singapore's current position. The conditions that produced the Swiss capital inflow were specific, and the mechanism by which Switzerland captured and retained that capital is directly instructive.

The National Socialist seizure of power in Germany in January 1933 immediately altered the legal certainty calculus for productive capital held in German-domiciled structures.

Austrian Anschluss in 1938 extended that disruption to a second major European financial centre. The Second World War suspended normal capital movement across the continent. Post-war European reconstruction, conducted under Bretton Woods disciplines, produced a protracted period of capital controls and currency inconvertibility across most Western European economies.

Switzerland provided the alternative. The Swiss Federal Banking Act of 1934 codified banking secrecy and depositor confidentiality at the legislative level, establishing legal predictability as a permanent jurisdictional feature rather than a policy preference subject to revision. Swiss political neutrality, demonstrated through two world wars, provided the geopolitical complement: capital domiciled in Switzerland was protected not only by law but by the persistent absence of the state from the military and political entanglements that had disrupted capital elsewhere.

The inflow was not temporary. Swiss banking sector assets as a proportion of GDP grew substantially over the 1933 to 1965 period, and the foundation built during those three decades remained structurally determinative for Swiss financial infrastructure through the end of the twentieth century (Cassis, 2006). The capital that arrived during the displacement era did not leave when conditions stabilised elsewhere. Permanence was the outcome because the legal and political infrastructure Switzerland had built was designed for retention rather than merely attraction.

Two differences from the Swiss precedent are relevant to the Singapore analysis. The velocity of the current movement is higher; Singapore's family office registration acceleration compressed into three years what Switzerland built across three decades. This compression reflects both the speed of the original displacement events and the maturity of Singapore's pre-existing institutional infrastructure, which required less construction time than Switzerland's 1930s framework. The second difference is more consequential: the asset class at the centre of Singapore's capture strategy has no direct historical parallel. Switzerland captured movable financial capital in the form of deposits, securities, and trust structures. Singapore is attempting to capture something structurally more complex: legal structures representing claims on physical and financial assets held globally, domesticated within Singapore's regulatory perimeter through tokenisation. Whether that capture holds across insolvency events and across borders depends on two gaps not yet fully closed.

III. The Mechanism of Sovereign Capital Capture

Three policy instruments constitute Singapore's sovereign capital strategy. They are distinct in design and complementary in function; no single instrument produces the full capture effect. The strategic architecture requires all three operating together.

The first is the Variable Capital Company framework. Prior to January 2020, Singapore's corporate law offered no fund vehicle combining the structural flexibility required by sophisticated family office operations: sub-fund compartmentalisation, net asset value redemption mechanics, and segregated liability. The VCC provided all three within a Singapore-incorporated structure. The design is directly competitive with Cayman Islands limited partnership and exempted company vehicles, which had served as the default architecture for internationally mobile capital since the 1980s. The VCC does not merely replicate the Cayman structure's functional characteristics; it adds Singapore's domestic regulatory legitimacy, its network of 100-plus double taxation agreements (Inland Revenue Authority of Singapore, 2024), and its proximity to the Southeast Asian asset base that represents the primary deployment target for capital arriving from Hong Kong and other displaced centres.

The second instrument is the MAS licensing architecture under the Payment Services Act 2019, substantially amended in 2021, and the capital markets services licensing regime under the Securities and Futures Act. Singapore's framework for digital payment token service providers is more clearly structured than any comparable framework in the Asia-Pacific region. The framework is not permissive; it is demanding. Capital adequacy requirements, technology risk management guidelines, and anti-money laundering obligations are rigorous relative to competing jurisdictions. The demanding character of the regime is the strategy. A rigorous licensing architecture creates a credibility signal that a permissive regime cannot. Institutional capital of the type Singapore is targeting does not move to regulatory vacuums; it moves to regulatory clarity. MAS has provided the latter with deliberate precision.

The third instrument is Project Guardian. Launched in May 2022 in collaboration with JPMorgan, DBS Bank, and SBI Digital Asset Holdings, Project Guardian is a structured

programme for developing the tokenisation of real-world assets within MAS's regulatory perimeter (Monetary Authority of Singapore, 2022). By October 2023, 17 industry pilots were active across fixed income, foreign exchange, and asset management, with participation from the major global custodians and asset managers (Monetary Authority of Singapore, 2023a). The 2024 programme expansion incorporated fund tokenisation and wealth management distribution, extending the scope from capital markets infrastructure into the family office and institutional allocation layer (Monetary Authority of Singapore, 2024b).

The strategic function of Project Guardian is definitional rather than experimental. By establishing the terms under which tokenised real-world assets are recognised, settled, and regulated within Singapore's legal system, MAS is defining the standard for the Asia-Pacific region. An asset tokenised under Project Guardian's evolving framework carries Singapore's regulatory imprimatur. For institutional capital seeking a jurisdiction in which to domicile tokenised representations of global assets, regulatory imprimatur is the primary locational advantage; it cannot be replicated by a jurisdiction that has not yet done the legislative and supervisory work to establish it.

The Singapore government has made its support for this architecture explicit in successive Budget statements. The 2023 and 2024 Singapore Budgets allocated specific provision for MAS's digital asset regulatory capacity and sustained the growth of family office activity through the Section 13O and Section 13U fund tax incentive structures (Ministry of Finance, Singapore, 2023; Ministry of Finance, Singapore, 2024). Both schemes were tightened in 2023 to require minimum local investment deployment and minimum fund size thresholds. The tightening is the signal. Singapore is screening for genuine long-duration commitment rather than nominal domiciliation: the minimum fund size and local business spending requirements under Section 13O and 13U filter for capital that will deploy into Singapore-domiciled structures and into regional assets, not capital that registers a presence and manages assets entirely from elsewhere.

The screening function is as important as the incentive function. The three instruments together produce a capture architecture rather than a simple attraction mechanism. A jurisdiction that attracts capital but does not retain it has gained nothing permanent. The VCC retains legal structure. Project Guardian retains asset management infrastructure.

The tightened incentive regime retains deployment commitment. The combination is designed to make departure costly once entry has been formalised.

IV. The Two Gaps

Two structural gaps separate Singapore's current framework from full institutional capture. Their resolution or non-resolution over the next three to five years will determine whether the capital Singapore has attracted converts into the permanent structural transformation that the Swiss precedent demonstrates is possible.

The first gap is the legal treatment of tokenised real-world assets under Singapore insolvency proceedings.

Project Guardian pilots have established technical and regulatory architecture for tokenising financial instruments within Singapore's regulatory perimeter. What has not yet been codified is the behaviour of a tokenised real-world asset claim in the event of issuer insolvency. The central question is bankruptcy remoteness: whether a holder of a tokenised instrument representing a claim on a real-world asset, whether property, infrastructure, private credit, or other physical or financial collateral, retains clean legal title to that underlying asset independently of the insolvency of the issuer or custodian that created the token.

Singapore's Insolvency, Restructuring and Dissolution Act 2018 provides a robust general insolvency framework. It does not yet speak with legislative precision to the property status of tokenised instruments as claims independent of their issuer. The common law approach to this question, under which Singapore courts would likely characterise a tokenised claim as a form of intangible property, provides working comfort for pilot-stage transactions. It does not provide the legislative certainty that institutional capital of the type Singapore is targeting requires before making long-duration commitments. Pension vehicles, sovereign wealth vehicles, and insurance-linked capital cannot commit on the basis of probable common law outcome; they require codified certainty.

The gap is not unique to Singapore. No jurisdiction has yet fully codified the insolvency treatment of tokenised real-world asset instruments at the legislative level. Singapore's

proximity to full institutional capture therefore means that the gap matters more here than elsewhere; the jurisdiction that legislates this clearly first will hold a structural advantage that compounds as institutional capital concentrates where legal certainty is more fully established.

The second gap is the cross-border enforceability of Singapore-issued tokenised instruments against underlying assets held in foreign jurisdictions.

A tokenised bond representing a claim on Southeast Asian infrastructure, a tokenised note backed by European commercial real estate, or a tokenised security backed by U.S. private credit may each be issued under Singapore law, structured through a VCC, and settled through Project Guardian infrastructure. The Singapore-law analysis of the holder's rights is increasingly settled. What remains structurally uncertain is whether those rights are enforceable in the jurisdictions where the underlying assets are physically located and legally registered.

Cross-border enforcement of financial claims operates through a combination of bilateral treaty arrangements, common law private international law principles, and domestic legislative recognition of foreign judgments. Singapore has a sophisticated treaty network and well-developed private international law jurisprudence. The specific question of whether a Singapore court order enforcing the rights of a tokenised instrument holder can be executed against a physical asset in Indonesia, Thailand, India, or an EU member state involves counterparty legal systems whose treatment of novel tokenised claims remains untested and, in several cases, unaddressed at the legislative level.

This gap cannot be resolved by Singapore acting unilaterally. It requires either bilateral legislative harmonisation with key counterparty jurisdictions or the development of a multilateral framework for cross-border recognition of tokenised asset claims. The Bank for International Settlements Innovation Hub's Project Nexus and related cross-border payment and settlement initiatives represent early-stage infrastructure working toward precisely this coordination problem (Bank for International Settlements, 2024). MAS is an active participant in that multilateral dialogue. The participation is not incidental; Singapore's domestic framework is being developed in alignment with the emerging multilateral architecture so that when cross-border recognition frameworks mature, Singapore's infrastructure is already compatible with them.

The two gaps are known to MAS. They are not evidence of strategic incoherence; they are the boundary conditions of a strategy whose first phase, attraction and initial domestication, is already in execution. The second phase requires legislative work in Singapore and cooperative work across multiple counterparty jurisdictions simultaneously.

Conclusion

Singapore's real-world asset regulatory framework is a sovereign capital strategy. The Variable Capital Company framework, Project Guardian, the Payment Services Act licensing architecture, and the Section 13O and 13U investment incentive structures form an integrated instrument set designed to capture productive wealth displaced by the instability of incumbent monetary architectures and to convert that capture into long-duration structural commitment.

The data establishes the direction and velocity of movement. The 175 percent increase in single family office registrations between 2020 and 2023, the growth in VCC incorporations past 900, and the expansion of Project Guardian to 17 industry pilots by October 2023 are observable in the record; they do not depend on projection. The Swiss precedent establishes what this type of jurisdictional inflection produces when the legal architecture supporting it is sustained: capital that arrived during a displacement period built the foundation for a financial infrastructure that remained structurally determinative for decades.

The two gaps identified here, insolvency treatment and cross-border enforceability, define the ceiling of Singapore's current capture architecture. Their resolution will determine whether the capital that has arrived converts into the permanent structural transformation that the Swiss record demonstrates is possible, or whether Singapore remains a first-generation destination for capital that continues searching for a more complete institutional offer.

The families, funds, and institutional vehicles whose capital arrived in Singapore between 2020 and 2023 made a decision about legal certainty, monetary stability, and the

durability of the frameworks designed to protect productive wealth. Whether the institutions they trusted to provide those things complete the architecture they have started is the question on which the permanence of that decision turns; and there are jurisdictions in the Gulf, in continental Europe, and in East Asia that are watching the same displacement flows, drawing the same conclusions, and building with the same intention.

References

Accounting and Corporate Regulatory Authority of Singapore. (2024). *Variable Capital Company statistics and incorporation data*. ACRA.

Bank for International Settlements. (2024). *Project Nexus: Connecting instant payment systems across borders*. BIS Innovation Hub.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. (2022). *H.4.1: Factors affecting reserve balances of depository institutions*. Federal Reserve Statistical Release.

Cassis, Y. (2006). *Capitals of capital: A history of international financial centres, 1780–2005*. Cambridge University Press.

Inland Revenue Authority of Singapore. (2024). *Singapore's network of comprehensive avoidance of double taxation agreements*. IRAS.

Ministry of Finance, Singapore. (2023). *Singapore Budget 2023: Together, a brighter future*. Government of Singapore.

Ministry of Finance, Singapore. (2024). *Singapore Budget 2024*. Government of Singapore.

Monetary Authority of Singapore. (2022). *Project Guardian: Enabling open and interoperable networks*. MAS.

Monetary Authority of Singapore. (2023a). *Project Guardian industry pilot report 2023*. MAS.

Monetary Authority of Singapore. (2023b). *Singapore asset management survey 2022*. MAS.

Monetary Authority of Singapore. (2024a). *Singapore family office statistics 2023*. MAS.

Monetary Authority of Singapore. (2024b). *Project Guardian industry pilot report 2024*. MAS.

Working Paper No. 1 in The Destination Thesis series. The views expressed are those of the named fellow and do not constitute investment advice. The Cantillon Institute, 2026.