International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation.

Assessing the Financial Impact of Climate Risk: A Comprehensive Review

Samuel Dame [1*], Nkasi Earnest Etu [2]
[1] Department of Banking and Finance, Federal Polytechnic Bali, Taraba State, Nigeria
[2] Department of Accounting, Federal Polytechnic Bali, Taraba State, Nigeria

* Corresponding Author: **Samuel Dame**

Article Info

ISSN (online): 2582-7138
Volume: 05
Issue: 06
November-December 2024
Received: 03-09-2024
Accepted: 05-10-2024
Page No: 01-06

Abstract
Climate-related risks have ascended as a pivotal determinant exerting influence over financial markets and the stability of the global economy. This exhaustive examination evaluates the diverse financial ramifications associated with climate risk, delving into both physical and transition risks encountered by enterprises, investors, and policymakers alike. Qualitative research design was adopted utilizing a systematic literature review (SLR) approach. The methodology follows a structured framework for identifying, reviewing, and interpreting relevant research. Data were collected from academic journals, industry reports, policy papers, and regulatory guidelines. Major findings revealed that standardized climate risk disclosure frameworks, like the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD), improve transparency and comparability of climate-related financial information. Also suggested is the integrating of the assessments into credit risk evaluations and portfolio strategies which improves resilience against both physical and transition risks, and that regions investing in climate-resilient technologies and materials experience fewer disruptions and lower costs associated with climate impacts. Study recommended among others, that; financial institutions should incorporate climate risk assessments into all aspects of financial decision-making, including credit risk evaluations, asset management, and portfolio strategies and also encourage public and private investment in climate-resilient infrastructure, particularly in regions vulnerable to physical climate risks. This review offers valuable perspectives for investors, policymakers, and scholars, underlining the imperative for more robust financial models and policy instruments that incorporate considerations of climate risk into the decision-making process.

Keywords: Climate risk, financial implications, physical risk, transition risk, Assets values

Introduction

Climate risk has emerged as a paramount concern of the 21st century, with substantial ramifications for the global financial architecture. The escalating frequency and severity of climate-related phenomena such as floods, droughts, wildfires, and hurricanes—present formidable challenges not only to environmental integrity but also to economic stability, corporate viability, and financial markets. These risks, collectively termed "climate risk," are now broadly acknowledged as encompassing both physical and transitional dimensions. Physical risks emanate from the direct impairment of assets and infrastructure resultant from extreme weather occurrences, whereas transitional risks arise from the economic and policy adjustments requisite for transitioning to a low-carbon economy.

In the context of these challenges, the financial sector must integrate climate risk into its operational frameworks, pricing methodologies, and investment paradigms. Insufficient attention to climate-related risks may precipitate systemic financial instability, consequently jeopardizing sustained economic growth and wealth generation. This realization has catalyzed the development of an expanding corpus of literature investigating the financial ramifications of climate risk across diverse sectors, with an emphasis on risk management, asset valuation, and regulatory interventions.

Nonetheless, the comprehension of the mechanisms through which climate risks manifest into financial consequences remains disjointed, underscoring the necessity for a thorough examination of the extant scholarly work.

Statement of the Problem

Notwithstanding the augmented cognizance of climate risk, a substantial lacuna persists in the assimilation of climate considerations within the financial decision-making framework. Numerous investors, corporations, and policymakers continue to grapple with the intricacies of quantifying climate risks and translating these into actionable financial parameters. Moreover, there exists a deficiency in standardization regarding the assessment, reporting, and incorporation of climate risks into financial models, culminating in heterogeneous practices across various industries and markets.

This divergence between the acknowledgment of climate risk and its financial repercussions constitutes a significant hurdle. Financial markets are susceptible to the mispricing of assets should they neglect to adequately integrate climate risks, potentially engendering a "climate bubble" wherein assets are inaccurately valued due to incomplete information. Additionally, financial institutions face considerable risks of loss stemming from the unpredictability of climate impacts and the ongoing transition toward a low-carbon economy. While extant studies yield valuable insights, they frequently concentrate on isolated facets of climate risk rather than providing a comprehensive overview of its financial consequences. This review aspires to bridge that chasm by delivering an exhaustive analysis of the existing literature, elucidating key trends, challenges, and opportunities inherent in the integration of climate risk into financial systems.

Conceptual framework

The complex dynamics of climate change necessitate the amalgamation of diverse scientific fields. This segment investigates these fields to enhance the prediction and evaluation of forthcoming trends and consequences. It centers on three pivotal domains of scientific exploration: atmospheric sciences (Hyman, 2017; Rohli & Vega, 2018) [26, 37], climate impacts (Hain *et al*., 2023; ISIMIP, 2023) [23, 28], and economics and finance (Ahmed, 2022; BIS, 2021; Campiglio *et al*., 2023; TDCC, 2023) [2, 12, 17, 42]. Addressing climate change mandates, a comprehensive interdisciplinary strategy that encompasses not only atmospheric sciences but also physical, chemical, and biological investigations to thoroughly understand the ramifications of climate change. The framework presented underscores the augmented greenhouse effect as the primary catalyst for global warming. Greenhouse gases (GHGs) are naturally present in the atmosphere, regulating the planet's temperature by absorbing solar irradiance. Nevertheless, anthropogenic activities such as the combustion of fossil fuels, deforestation, and industrial operations have markedly elevated GHG concentrations, resulting in enhanced heat retention and global temperature rise (Reisinger *et al*., 2020) [36]. This temperature increase is heterogeneous, affecting disparate components of the climate system, modifying precipitation distributions, exacerbating extreme weather occurrences, and contributing to rising sea levels due to the melting of ice sheets and the thermal expansion of seawater. Atmospheric warming further disrupts ecosystems, influencing biodiversity, agricultural productivity, and freshwater resources (IPCC, 2021) [27]. The intricacy of climate science is additionally accentuated by the interdependence of Earth's systems, which modulate climate and amplify warming through feedback mechanisms. Two significant global modeling endeavors have arisen to enrich our comprehension of climate change: 1) climate models concentrating on variations, and 2) models scrutinizing physical and socioeconomic repercussions (Amendola *et al*., 2013; Guin, 2017; Monier *et al*., 2018) [5, 22, 33].

Risk Theory: An overview

The notion of risk possesses a historical lineage, with citations tracing back in excess of 2,400 years (Bernstein, 1996) [11] or potentially as far back as 3200 BC (Covello & Mumpower, 1985) [20]. Nevertheless, systematic discourse surrounding risk assessment commenced in the 17th century (Laplace, 1820; Ore, 1960) [31, 35]. As articulated by Aven (2015) [6], the methodical scientific examination of risk has only emerged within the last three to four decades (Hansson & Aven, 2014; Le Coze *et al*., 2014; Thompson *et al*., 2005) [24]. Aven delineates two principal dimensions of risk theory: the implementation of theoretical constructs and the scrutiny of the foundational principles underlying risk theory. Yet, as other scholars have observed (Heckmann *et al*., 2015; Tang & Nurmaya Musa, 2011), there frequently exists an indistinct boundary between these two fields of inquiry. Recently, the Society for Risk Analysis (SRA) has systematized essential risk concepts, thereby establishing a forum for discourse on risk theory. The SRA has additionally published a glossary that proffers a comprehensive definition of risk as “future activity with consequences on something that humans value.” Risk is conventionally quantified through an array of metrics, articulated as probabilities (to gauge uncertainty) or as anticipated outcomes (to assess potential damage or loss), frequently employing specific probability distributions. Aven (2015) [6] cautions that these metrics may be misappropriated, indicating that although expected consequences serve as a useful tool for evaluating risks to extensive populations, they may not be applicable in individual risk circumstances. Aven underscores the necessity of selecting the appropriate metric(s) for each unique decision-making scenario, rather than depending exclusively on a singular measure. He further critiques the excessive dependence on probabilistic methodologies for uncertainty management, positing that probability-centric strategies are not intrinsically efficacious. Moreover, the utilization of average values as risk metrics, without accounting for the comprehensive distribution or tail risks, may obfuscate critical information and mislead decision-makers. An overcomplicated approach to the analysis of risk metrics can dilute essential principles and potentially confound those engaged in pivotal decision-making.

Climate Risk: Definitions and Categories

Climate risk can fundamentally be categorized into two principal varieties: physical risk and transition risk. Physical risk refers to the tangible consequences of climate-related phenomena, such as hurricanes, floods, and wildfires, on tangible assets. Transition risk encompasses the financial uncertainties associated with the shift towards a low-carbon economy, which includes alterations in regulatory frameworks, advancements in technology, and transformations in market preferences (NGFS, 2020).

Physical Risk

Physical risks embody the most immediate and evident repercussions of climate change. These risks can result in substantial financial detriments due to the impairment of infrastructure, disruptions in supply chains, and escalated costs associated with insurance. For instance, the increasing frequency and intensity of hurricanes in the United States have incurred considerable losses for both insurers and reinsurers, thereby impacting their profitability and overall solvency (Kousky, 2018) [29].

Transition Risk

Transition risks are inherently more intricate and relate to the financial ramifications of progressing towards a low-carbon economy. Such risks may encompass stranded assets, in which investments in fossil fuel sectors become untenable due to shifts in regulations or changes in consumer preferences. The rapid advancement of renewable energy technologies coupled with escalating regulatory demands to reduce carbon emissions is anticipated to accelerate the transition towards a low-carbon economy, potentially resulting in significant financial detriments for carbon-intensive sectors (Caldecott *et al*., 2016) [16].

Financial Implications of Climate Risk

The financial ramifications of climate risk are extensive and multifaceted. They encompass influences on asset valuations, market volatility, credit risk, and investment approaches.

- **Impact on Asset Values**

Climate risk can induce considerable fluctuations in asset valuations, particularly for assets that are directly vulnerable to climate-related occurrences. For example, real estate situated in coastal areas is susceptible to the impacts of rising sea levels and increased storm activity, which can lead to a decline in property values and an uptick in insurance premiums (Bernstein *et al*., 2019) [10]. Moreover, assets affiliated with carbon-intensive sectors may undergo depreciation as the transition towards a low-carbon economy continues.

- **Market Volatility**

Climate risk can also exacerbate market volatility. Extreme weather phenomena and regulatory modifications can instigate abrupt alterations in market sentiment, culminating in pronounced price fluctuations. For instance, the implementation of more stringent carbon regulations can trigger a swift sell-off of equities in carbon-intensive sectors, thereby engendering market instability (Battiston *et al*., 2017) [8].

- **Credit Risk**

Climate risk has a significant impact on credit risk, as entities exposed to climate-related challenges may encounter heightened borrowing expenses or difficulties in obtaining credit. Financial institutions providing loans to these entities might experience elevated rates of default and resultant financial losses (Bolton *et al*., 2020) [14].

- **Investment Strategies**

Investors are increasingly cognizant of the necessity to incorporate climate risk into their investment methodologies. The proliferation of environmental, social, and governance (ESG) investing signifies a heightened awareness of the financial threats posed by climate change. Sustainable finance instruments, such as green bonds and climate funds, are garnering increasing popularity as mechanisms for investors to mitigate climate risk while facilitating the transition to a low-carbon economy (Busch *et al*., 2018) [15].

Regulatory and Policy Responses

Governments and regulatory bodies are increasingly recognizing the financial implications associated with climate risk through the implementation of diverse policy initiatives. These initiatives encompass compulsory climate risk disclosures, stress testing for financial entities, and the integration of climate risk considerations into monetary policy frameworks (Carney, 2019) [19].

Climate Risk Disclosures

Compulsory climate risk disclosures are essential for enhancing transparency and enabling investors to make well-informed decisions. The Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) has developed a structured framework for corporations to report on climate-related risks and opportunities within their financial statements.

Stress Testing

Regulatory authorities are incorporating climate risk into the stress testing protocols for financial institutions. Such stress tests assess the resilience of banks and insurers to climate-related shocks, thereby facilitating the identification of vulnerabilities within the financial system (Vermeulen *et al*., 2019) [43].

Integration into Monetary Policy

Central banking institutions are progressively integrating climate risk considerations into their monetary policy frameworks. For example, the European Central Bank (ECB) has commenced the inclusion of climate risk within its asset purchase programs and collateral frameworks, thereby recognizing the potential repercussions of climate change on financial stability (Schnabel, 2020) [38].

Empirical Review

Climate risk has emerged as one of the paramount threats to global economic stability. With the escalating incidence of extreme weather phenomena and the increasing acknowledgment of the long-term ramifications of climate change, the financial consequences of climate risk are garnering substantial interest from academics, policymakers, and financial institutions alike. Climate risk encompasses both physical risks (including floods, droughts, and heatwaves) and transition risks (such as regulatory alterations and shifts in consumer preferences). The empirical review is predicated on the following.

Climate Risk and Financial Markets

Climate risk exerts a significant influence on financial markets, particularly with respect to asset pricing mechanisms. Evidence suggests that investors are progressively incorporating climate-related risks into their investment decision-making processes. Bolton and Kacperczyk (2021) [13] offer empirical support indicating that firms with high carbon footprints experience elevated capital costs as a result of investor apprehensions regarding climate risk. Their results indicate that organizations with substantial carbon emissions tend to exhibit diminished stock valuations

relative to their peers, thereby reflecting investors' heightened cognizance of potential regulatory and transition risks as economies advance towards decarbonization. In a similar vein, Addoum and Ortiz-Bobea (2020) [1] conducted a cross-sectional analysis utilizing firm-level data and concluded that corporations more susceptible to climate risks demonstrated lower stock returns. Their examination of temperature fluctuations and extreme weather events illustrated that sectors such as agriculture, energy, and real estate are particularly vulnerable to pronounced stock price volatility stemming from adverse climatic conditions.

Corporate Finance and Climate Risk

Climate risk is increasingly shaping the financial decision-making processes of corporations, particularly in the realms of capital structure and investment methodologies. Enterprises encounter mounting pressure from regulatory bodies, investors, and stakeholders to assess and publicly disclose their vulnerability to climate-related risks. Krueger, Sautner, and Starks (2020) [30] uncovered that organizations which provide comprehensive disclosures regarding climate risk generally experience reduced capital costs. Their investigation indicates that transparency in climate-related disclosures mitigates uncertainty, consequently decreasing the cost of equity and debt for firms. Furthermore, Flammer (2021) [21] examined the manner in which climate risk influences corporate investment strategies. Her findings revealed that companies with heightened exposure to climate risks are more inclined to allocate resources towards sustainability and resilience initiatives designed to alleviate the effects of physical climate risks and adapt to prospective regulatory alterations that may elevate operational expenses.

Risk Management and Financial Institutions

Climate risk has become a fundamental component of risk management within financial institutions, encompassing banks, insurance companies, and asset management firms. These entities are progressively integrating climate risk into their risk evaluation frameworks. Battiston *et al*. (2017) [9] investigated the potential for climate-induced financial instability, modeling the transmission of climate risk throughout the financial system. Their research posits that climate shocks whether originating from policy changes or natural disasters have the capacity to induce systemic risks, particularly within interconnected financial markets. They underscore the significance of conducting climate risk stress tests for financial institutions and highlight the necessity for central banks to incorporate climate risk into their regulatory frameworks. In a similar vein, Alessi, Ossola, and Panzica (2021) [3] scrutinized the initiatives undertaken by European financial institutions to assimilate climate risk into their risk management practices. While progress has been made in the areas of climate stress testing and scenario analysis, they note that numerous institutions continue to grapple with the quantification of climate risks, owing to the uncertainties associated with climate forecasting and the protracted nature of these risks.

Climate Risk Disclosure

The Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) has been instrumental in advocating for climate risk reporting among corporations. Empirical evidence indicates that firms that comply with TCFD guidelines typically enjoy enhanced access to capital and foster improved relationships with investors. Carbone, Yao, and Zhang (2022) [18] explored the ramifications of TCFD-aligned disclosures on corporate performance, discovering that organizations adopting TCFD recommendations realized positive short-term abnormal stock returns as well as long-term profitability enhancements. This implies that investors tend to favor firms that take proactive measures in managing climate risks. Similarly, Ameli *et al*. (2021) [4] examined the financial sector's embrace of TCFD-aligned disclosure practices, revealing that banks and insurers with robust climate disclosures reported superior loan performance and diminished default rates in sectors heavily impacted by climate risks.

Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative research design, utilizing a systematic literature review (SLR) approach. The focus is on synthesizing existing academic and industry research concerning climate risk and its financial implications across sectors. The methodology follows a structured framework for identifying, reviewing, and interpreting relevant research.

Data Collection: Data were collected from academic journals, industry reports, policy papers, and regulatory guidelines. The sources include databases such as Scopus, Scispace, JSTOR, and Google Scholar. Key search terms include "climate risk," "financial implications," "physical risk," "transition risk," "sustainable finance," "climate-related financial disclosures," and "ESG."

Findings

This research work came up with the following findings from the literature reviewed as follows;

1. **Enhancing Climate Risk Disclosure Frameworks**

Research highlights that standardized climate risk disclosure frameworks, like the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD), improve transparency and comparability of climate-related financial information. Studies show that enhanced disclosure frameworks lead to better-informed investment decisions and risk management practices.

2. **Incorporating Climate Risk Assessments into Financial Decision-Making**

Study revealed that integrating these assessments into credit risk evaluations and portfolio strategies improves resilience against both physical and transition risks. For example, banks that integrate climate risk into their credit assessments are better prepared for extreme weather events and regulatory changes.

3. **Encouraging Investment in Climate-Resilient Infrastructure**

This research show that regions investing in climate-resilient technologies and materials experience fewer disruptions and lower costs associated with climate impacts. For instance, investments in upgraded infrastructure can reduce damage from floods and storms, leading to significant long-term savings and improved community resilience.

4. **Supporting Sustainable Finance Instruments**

Evidence indicates that sustainable finance instruments, such as green bonds and climate funds, play a crucial role in financing climate resilience and sustainability projects. Research highlights that tax breaks, subsidies, and regulatory

support can enhance the attractiveness and adoption of these instruments. For example, green bonds have been shown to attract a diverse range of investors and finance significant environmental projects, improving overall market efficiency and sustainability.

5. Strengthening Regulatory Supervision of Climate Risk

This study found that strengthened supervisory mechanisms, including climate risk stress testing and integration into capital requirements, enhance the stability and resilience of the financial system. Studies reveal that rigorous regulatory oversight helps prevent systemic risks and ensures that institutions are prepared for climate-related financial challenges.

Conclusion

Climate risk represents an evolving and complex challenge with far-reaching financial implications across various sectors. This research underscores the necessity for a multifaceted approach to understanding and managing climate-related risks, highlighting their impact on asset values, market volatility, credit risk, and corporate investment strategies. The empirical evidence indicates that climate risks, whether physical or transitional, are becoming increasingly integrated into financial markets and corporate decision-making. As companies and investors respond to regulatory changes, consumer preferences, and extreme weather events, the financial landscape is progressively reshaping to incorporate climate considerations.

This study reaffirms the importance of climate risk disclosure and proactive risk management within financial institutions. The integration of climate risks into stress testing and financial regulations is pivotal to enhancing the resilience of the global financial system. Furthermore, the growth of sustainable finance instruments like green bonds and climate funds reflects a broader commitment to mitigating climate risks and facilitating the transition to a low-carbon economy. However, the ability to manage climate risks effectively remains constrained by uncertainties in climate modeling and the challenges of quantifying long-term risks. Regional and sectoral variations in the impact of climate change further complicate the ability to draw universal conclusions, necessitating more granular and forward-looking data to guide decision-making.

Finally, the financial implications of climate risk are vast, yet they also present opportunities for innovation in sustainable finance. By enhancing disclosure frameworks, encouraging investment in climate-resilient infrastructure, and supporting regulatory measures, financial markets can better navigate the uncertainties posed by climate change, ensuring long-term stability and sustainability.

Recommendations

1. Enhance Climate Risk Disclosure Frameworks through the development and standardizing mandatory climate risk disclosure frameworks globally, building on existing initiatives like the TCFD. Encourage more granular and forward-looking data to better inform investors and financial institutions.
2. Financial institutions should incorporate climate risk assessments into all aspects of financial decision-making, including credit risk evaluations, asset management, and portfolio strategies. This should involve scenario analysis and stress testing for both physical and transition risks.
3. Encourage public and private investment in climate-resilient infrastructure, particularly in regions vulnerable to physical climate risks. This includes adopting new technologies and materials designed to withstand extreme weather events.
4. Support the development and scaling of innovative sustainable finance instruments, such as green bonds, climate funds, and insurance products designed for climate risks. Incentivize their adoption through tax breaks, subsidies, or regulatory support.
5. Regulators should strengthen supervisory mechanisms to ensure that financial institutions are adequately managing climate risk. This includes enforcing climate risk stress testing and ensuring that climate considerations are integrated into capital requirements.

Study Limitations

This research acknowledges limitations, including the reliance on existing literature, which may not capture real-time developments in climate risk management or regulatory changes. Furthermore, variations in regional and sectoral data availability may have constrain the ability in drawing universal conclusions.

References

1. Addoum JM, Ngo DT, Ortiz-Bobea A. Temperature shocks and earnings news. Journal of Financial Economics. 2020;137(3):894-914.
2. Ahmed K. The impact of climate on economics and finance. Economics and Finance Journal. 2022;45(2):123-145.
3. Alessi L, Ossola E, Panzica R. What greenium matters in the stock market? Journal of Financial Stability. 2021;54:100884.
4. Ameli N, Drummond P, Bisaro A, Grubb M, Chenet H. Climate finance and disclosure for institutional investors: Why transparency is not enough. Climate Policy. 2021;21(4):501-517.
5. Amendola A, Gueye A, Ouarghi K. Global climate modeling and uncertainty: Integrating physical and socioeconomic impacts. Journal of Climate Impact. 2013;18(1):67-82.
6. Aven T. Risk Analysis. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons; c2015.
7. Aven T. Foundational Issues in Risk Theory and Practice. Cham, Switzerland: Springer; c2016.
8. Battiston S, Mandel A, Monasterolo I, Schütze F, Visentin G. A climate stress-test of the financial system. Nature Climate Change. 2017;7(4):283-288.
9. Battiston S, Mandel A, Monasterolo I, Schütze F, Visentin G. A climate stress-test of the financial system. Nature Climate Change. 2017;7(4):283-288.
10. Bernstein A, Gustafson M, Lewis R. Disaster on the horizon: The price effect of sea level rise. Journal of Financial Economics. 2019;134(2):253-272.
11. Bernstein PL. Against the Gods: The Remarkable Story of Risk. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley; c1996.
12. Bank for International Settlements. Climate-related financial risks: A literature review. BIS Working Papers; 2021:(1008).
13. Bolton P, Kacperczyk M. Do investors care about carbon risk? Journal of Financial Economics. 2021;142(2):517-

549.
14. Bolton P, Despres M, Pereira da Silva LA, Samama F, Svartzman R. The Green Swan: Central Banking and Financial Stability in the Age of Climate Change. Bank for International Settlements; c2020.
15. Busch T, Johnson M, Pioch T. Corporate carbon performance data: Quo vadis? Journal of Industrial Ecology. 2018;22(6):1245-1258.
16. Caldecott B, Howarth N, McSharry P. Stranded Assets in Agriculture: Protecting Value from Environmental Risks. Oxford: Smith School of Enterprise and the Environment; c2016.
17. Campiglio E, Dafermos Y, Monnin P, von Jagow A, Volz U. Central banking and climate-related financial risks: An emerging research agenda. Journal of Financial Sustainability. 2023;32(4):765-789.
18. Carbone S, Yao Q, Zhang W. Impact of climate risk disclosures on firm performance. Environmental Economics and Policy Studies. 2022;24(2):325-344.
19. Carney M. Fifty shades of green. Bank of England. 2019.
20. Covello VT, Mumpower J. Risk analysis and risk management: An historical perspective. Risk Analysis. 1985;5(2):103-120.
21. Flammer C. Corporate green bonds. Journal of Financial Economics. 2021;142(2):499-516.
22. Guin J. Advances in climate change modeling. Journal of Global Climate Research. 2017;25(3):155-172.
23. Hain CR, Smith AT, Anderson MC. Climate impacts on environmental systems: Recent findings from the ISIMIP project. Climate Science Review. 2023;20(1):47-68.
24. Hansson SO, Aven T. Is risk analysis scientific? Risk Analysis. 2014;34(7):1173-1183.
25. Heckmann I, Comes T, Nickel S. A critical review on supply chain risk: Definition, measure, and modeling. Omega. 2015;52:119-132.
26. Hyman PM. Atmospheric Sciences and Climate Modeling. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; c2017.
27. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Sixth Assessment Report: Climate Change Impacts and Adaptation. Geneva: IPCC; c2021.
28. ISIMIP (Inter-Sectoral Impact Model Intercomparison Project). Annual Report on Climate Impact Modeling. ISIMIP Publications; 2023.
29. Kousky C. Financing flood losses: A discussion of the national flood insurance program. Risk Management and Insurance Review. 2018;21(1):11-32.
30. Krueger P, Sautner Z, Starks LT. The importance of climate risks for institutional investors. The Review of Financial Studies. 2020;33(3):1067-1111.
31. Laplace PS. A Philosophical Essay on Probabilities. London: Longman; c1820.
32. Le Coze JC, Duijm NJ. Foundational studies on risk: Key debates. Safety Science. 2014;61:16-23.
33. Monier E, Kicklighter DW, Sokolov A. Assessing the future climate risk using a multi-model ensemble. Climate Risk Journal. 2018;29(4):421-437.
34. Network for Greening the Financial System (NGFS). Guide to Climate Scenario Analysis for Central Banks and Supervisors. NGFS; c2020.
35. Ore O. Pascal and the invention of probability theory. American Mathematical Monthly. 1960;67(5):409-419.
36. Reisinger A, Clark H, Howden M. The intensified greenhouse effect: Causes and consequences. Global Warming Science Review. 2020;35(2):214-236.
37. Rohli RV, Vega AJ. Climatology. Burlington, MA: Jones & Bartlett Learning; c2018.
38. Schnabel I. When markets fail–the need for collective action in tackling climate change. Speech by Isabel Schnabel, Member of the Executive Board of the ECB, at the European Sustainable Finance Summit; c2020.
39. Society for Risk Analysis. Glossary of key risk terms [Internet]. Society for Risk Analysis; c2023 [cited 2023 Oct 10]. Available from: https://www.sra.org.
40. Tang CS, Nurmaya Musa S. Identifying risk issues in supply chain management. Journal of Supply Chain Risk. 2011;24(6):291-307.
41. Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD). Final Report: Recommendations of the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures. TCFD; c2017.
42. TDCC (The Data Center for Climate). Climate Data for Economics and Finance. TDCC Publications; c2023.
43. Vermeulen R, Schets E, Lohuis M, Kölbl B, Jansen DJ, Heeringa W. The heat is on: A framework for measuring financial stress under disruptive energy transition scenarios. DNB Working Paper; 2019:(625).