

AGRICULTURAL INSURANCE AND CLIMATE RISK REDUCTION

Dr. Samuel Okafor

Assistant Professor

Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Development

School of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences

University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya

Abstract

Climate variability and climate-related extremes are reshaping agricultural risk across rain-fed, irrigated, livestock, fisheries, and mixed farming systems. Droughts, floods, heat stress, irregular monsoons, cyclones, pest outbreaks, and seasonal shifts can reduce yields, damage productive assets, interrupt farm income, and weaken household food security. Agricultural insurance is one of the financial instruments used to reduce the economic consequences of these shocks. It can provide timely compensation after defined losses, protect working capital, support recovery, and reduce the need for distress sales of livestock, land, or productive equipment.

This review-based study examines the role of agricultural insurance in climate risk reduction through a farm-resilience and rural-development perspective. It discusses indemnity-based crop insurance, area-yield insurance, weather-index insurance, livestock insurance, and satellite-supported index products. The paper evaluates how product design, affordability, basis risk, claims settlement, data quality, extension support, digital delivery, gender inclusion, and public policy affect the usefulness of insurance for smallholders and commercial producers.

The analysis finds that insurance can strengthen climate resilience when it is linked with reliable risk data, transparent triggers, accessible enrolment, responsive grievance systems, and complementary investments in climate-smart agriculture. Insurance alone cannot eliminate production risk or replace irrigation, extension, credit, savings, social protection, and disaster preparedness. Its strongest contribution is as one component of an integrated risk-management strategy that helps farmers absorb shocks, maintain productive investment, and recover more quickly after climate-related losses.

Keywords: Agricultural insurance; Climate risk; Crop insurance; Index insurance; Risk reduction; Smallholder farmers; Climate resilience; Basis risk; Disaster recovery; Climate-smart agriculture

1. INTRODUCTION

Agriculture is exposed to a combination of production, market, financial, institutional, and environmental risks. Climate risk is especially significant because it can affect many farmers within the same locality at the same time. A late monsoon may delay sowing across an entire district; an extended dry spell may reduce germination and biomass; a flood may destroy standing crops, stored inputs, and farm infrastructure; and a heat wave may reduce livestock productivity, pollination, or crop quality. When such losses occur repeatedly, farm households can face declining income, growing debt, reduced capacity to purchase inputs, and pressure to adopt low-return but safer production choices.

Traditional farm responses include crop diversification, intercropping, water conservation, improved seed selection, staggered planting, on-farm storage, livestock

ownership, savings, and informal support networks. These measures remain important, but severe or widespread climate shocks can exceed the ability of households and local communities to cope. Formal insurance is intended to transfer a portion of that residual loss to insurers, reinsurers, or public risk-sharing arrangements. In principle, it can prevent a weather shock from becoming a long-term livelihood crisis.

Agricultural insurance takes several forms. Indemnity insurance assesses farm-level loss after an event, while area-yield products compensate when the average yield of a defined unit falls below a threshold. Weather-index products pay when an observable indicator, such as rainfall, temperature, wind speed, or vegetation condition, crosses a pre-agreed trigger. Livestock insurance may cover death, disease, or defined disaster-related losses, and bundled products may combine

insurance with credit, inputs, advisory services, or savings. Each model has strengths and limitations, and no single product is suitable for every crop, region, or farmer category.

The climate-risk value of insurance depends on more than the existence of a policy. Farmers need to understand what is insured, how premiums are calculated, when payments are expected, and what circumstances may not be covered. They also need confidence that claims will be assessed fairly and settled in time for the next production cycle. Public institutions, insurers, cooperatives, banks, mobile platforms, weather agencies, and agricultural extension systems therefore all influence whether insurance becomes a credible tool for resilience rather than a scheme that farmers join only because it is compulsory or subsidised.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature on agricultural insurance has developed around two central questions: whether insurance can reduce the welfare effects of agricultural shocks and whether farmers are willing and able to purchase products that provide meaningful protection. Research on weather-index insurance highlights potential advantages over conventional loss assessment. Index products can avoid costly farm-by-farm inspections, settle claims more quickly when reliable data are available, and reduce some forms of moral hazard and adverse selection. These features are especially relevant in areas with dispersed smallholders and limited crop-loss assessment capacity.

At the same time, evidence consistently identifies basis risk as a major challenge. Basis risk arises when the indicator used by the insurance contract does not match the actual loss experienced by a particular farm. For example, a rainfall station may record sufficient rainfall while a farm several kilometres away receives too little water, or a rainfall trigger may be reached even though a farmer's crop performs well because of irrigation or a different planting date. Where farmers experience losses without receiving a payment, trust in the product can decline sharply.

Studies also show that demand for insurance is shaped by liquidity constraints, product

knowledge, past claims experience, perceived fairness, trust in the insurer, household wealth, local social networks, and the availability of informal risk-sharing arrangements. Premiums that appear affordable in annual terms may still be difficult to pay at the start of the season, when households are also purchasing seed, fertiliser, labour, and fuel. This is why premium timing, credit linkages, group enrolment, digital payments, and targeted public support can influence participation.

A further theme concerns the relationship between insurance and productive investment. When farmers believe that climate losses will be partly covered, they may be more willing to use improved seed, fertiliser, irrigation services, or other inputs that have higher expected returns but also require upfront expenditure. However, this relationship is not automatic. Insurance can encourage investment only when coverage is credible, payouts are sufficiently predictable, and complementary services are available. Productive risk-taking without good agronomic advice or access to markets can create a different form of vulnerability.

2.1 CLIMATE RISK EXPOSURE AND THE PROTECTIVE FUNCTION OF INSURANCE

Climate risk reduction begins with an understanding of the hazards that farmers face and the pathways through which those hazards create loss. Drought can reduce yield through poor germination, moisture stress during vegetative growth, or inadequate water at flowering and grain filling. Excess rainfall can prevent field preparation, cause waterlogging, encourage disease, or destroy stored produce. High temperatures can reduce milk yield, poultry performance, seed viability, and labour productivity. Insurance is most effective when product triggers, coverage periods, and insured values reflect these local risk pathways rather than relying on generic seasonal assumptions. Insurance performs a protective function by converting an uncertain large loss into a known premium cost and a defined potential payment. This can stabilise cash flow after a shock, help farmers repay seasonal credit, maintain food consumption, and finance replanting or recovery. In livestock systems, protection against mortality or disaster-related loss can preserve a household's productive

asset base. In commercial value chains, insurance may also help processors, lenders, aggregators, and input suppliers manage systemic exposure created by extreme weather.

The timing of a payout is as important as its size. A payment received several months after crop failure may be less useful than a smaller payment made quickly enough to support replanting, debt repayment, or purchase of fodder. Parametric and index-based products are therefore often promoted for their potential speed. Yet speed must be balanced with accuracy and transparency. Farmers are unlikely to value rapid settlement if they do not understand the trigger or if the trigger repeatedly fails to reflect local conditions.

2.2 INSURANCE MODELS AND THEIR SUITABILITY

Indemnity-based crop insurance is designed around measured loss at the farm level. Its main advantage is that compensation can be linked more directly to the farmer's actual damage. It may be appropriate for high-value crops, concentrated production areas, or systems where reliable field assessment is feasible. Its limitations include administrative cost, delays in loss verification, and the difficulty of maintaining consistent assessments across many small and scattered plots.

Area-yield insurance uses the average yield of a defined geographic unit, such as a block, panchayat, or district, as the basis for compensation. It can reduce assessment costs compared with individual loss adjustment and may work well where crop-cutting experiments or trusted yield datasets are available. However, its usefulness depends on the size and homogeneity of the insurance unit. A large unit can produce substantial basis risk because individual plots may perform differently from the average.

Weather-index insurance uses a pre-defined weather variable and a contract formula. Rainfall deficits, excess rainfall, consecutive dry days, temperature thresholds, and wind speed are common examples. Satellite-derived vegetation indices and remote-sensing data are also increasingly used where ground stations are sparse. The operational appeal of index insurance lies in simpler claims processes and less need for field inspection. The core design

challenge is to build an index that is closely connected to the crop and livestock losses that matter to farmers.

Insurance models should not be compared only by administrative convenience. A product must be matched to crop biology, production practices, farmer preferences, data availability, hazard frequency, and the cost of verification. Hybrid systems can sometimes improve performance, for example by combining weather triggers with area-yield information or by using remote sensing to refine spatial estimates. Product design should also consider local planting calendars, irrigation access, crop varieties, and the possibility of multiple climate hazards occurring in the same season.

2.3 ADOPTION, TRUST, AND INCLUSION

Low enrolment is often treated as a demand problem, but it can also reflect concerns about product quality. Farmers may decline insurance because they have observed delayed settlements, unclear deductions from loans, confusing policy documents, inadequate local support, or payouts that did not match neighbouring losses. Building participation therefore requires more than advertising. It requires clear communication in local languages, easy access to policy information, field-level grievance channels, and visible evidence that the scheme operates fairly.

Women farmers, tenant cultivators, sharecroppers, pastoralists, and households with very small plots may face additional barriers. Land records, formal bank accounts, mobile-phone access, and eligibility rules can exclude people who carry production risk but lack formal proof of ownership. Inclusive insurance systems need enrolment procedures that recognise diverse forms of cultivation, provide gender-sensitive outreach, and avoid reliance on a single registration channel. Data privacy and informed consent are also important as insurance systems become more digital.

Trust is strengthened when farmers can independently verify weather data, understand payout calculations, and receive timely information before and after an event. Local institutions such as producer organisations, cooperatives, self-help groups, extension agencies, and village-level facilitators can help explain coverage and resolve disputes. They

should not, however, substitute for accountability by insurers and public agencies. A resilient system needs both community-level support and formal mechanisms for oversight, audit, complaint resolution, and product improvement.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The primary objective of this study is to examine how agricultural insurance can reduce climate-related risk for farmers and contribute to farm-level resilience. The paper considers crop, weather-index, area-yield, livestock, and technology-enabled insurance models, with particular attention to their relevance for small and medium producers facing increasingly variable weather conditions.

The study evaluates the relationship between insurance access, loss recovery, production investment, credit continuity, household income stability, and post-disaster coping strategies. It also considers the operational conditions that influence insurance performance, including the quality of climate and yield data, contract design, premium support, distribution channels, claims settlement procedures, and farmer awareness.

A further objective is to identify the limitations of insurance-led risk management. The analysis recognises that coverage cannot substitute for investments in irrigation, soil health, resilient seed systems, extension services, storage, early warning, market access, and social protection. The study therefore positions insurance as one pillar within a broader climate-risk management framework.

3.1 INSURANCE COVERAGE AND CLIMATE-SHOCK RECOVERY

- Assessment of the climate hazards covered by crop, livestock, weather-index, and area-yield insurance products.
- Examination of how insured payments support replanting, debt servicing, purchase of feed or inputs, and recovery of productive assets.
- Evaluation of payout timing, claim verification, trigger transparency, and the adequacy of compensation after severe weather events.
- Consideration of the relationship between insurance coverage, household consumption smoothing, and avoidance of distress sales.

- Analysis of data sources used for contract design, including weather stations, crop-cutting results, satellite imagery, and remote sensing.

3.2 FARM RESILIENCE AND PRODUCTIVE INVESTMENT

- Assessment of whether credible insurance enables farmers to invest in improved seed, fertiliser, irrigation, livestock health, and climate-smart practices.
- Examination of how insurance interacts with seasonal credit, savings, input packages, and market participation.
- Evaluation of the role of premium affordability, subsidy design, enrolment timing, and payment methods in farmer participation.
- Consideration of basis risk, policy exclusions, and loss-assessment delays that may weaken the protective value of insurance.
- Analysis of differentiated effects across women farmers, tenant cultivators, pastoralists, rain-fed producers, and remote communities.

3.3 GOVERNANCE, TECHNOLOGY, AND INCLUSION

- Assessment of public-sector regulation, reinsurance arrangements, consumer protection, and grievance redressal mechanisms.
- Examination of digital enrolment, mobile payments, automated weather data, remote sensing, and their implications for transparency and access.
- Consideration of extension services, farmer organisations, and local institutions in building insurance literacy and trust.
- Evaluation of data quality, privacy safeguards, and independent verification of weather, yield, and claims information.
- Identification of policy measures that link insurance with adaptation planning, early warning, and disaster-risk reduction.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study adopts a review-based, descriptive, analytical, and comparative methodology. It synthesises published research on agricultural insurance, climate-risk management, crop loss, index design, rural finance, and farm resilience. The methodology is intended to assess the pathways through which insurance can reduce economic

vulnerability while also identifying the practical and institutional conditions that limit its effectiveness.

The review draws on peer-reviewed journal articles, multilateral development reports, agricultural risk-management guidance, policy documents, and programme evaluations. Evidence is interpreted through a framework that connects climate hazards, farm exposure, insurance design, enrolment behaviour, claims performance, and resilience outcomes. The analysis does not assume that any product works equally well in every context; instead, it compares the conditions under which particular approaches are likely to provide reliable protection.

The study gives attention to both ex-ante and ex-post dimensions of risk reduction. Ex-ante effects include changes in investment, borrowing, crop choice, and willingness to

adopt climate-smart technologies. Ex-post effects include the ability to manage debt, protect consumption, replace inputs, maintain livestock, and resume production after a climate shock. This distinction is important because a product may improve recovery without necessarily changing investment behaviour, or it may encourage investment but fail to protect farmers when losses occur.

A comparative lens is used to distinguish between individual loss assessment, area-yield, weather-index, and technology-enabled approaches. The comparison considers basis risk, administrative cost, speed of payout, data requirements, farmer understanding, inclusion, and accountability. The study also examines the role of public support, recognising that catastrophic climate risk is often too correlated and too costly to be managed by private insurers alone.

4.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

Component	Description
Research Type	Review-based, descriptive, analytical, and comparative
Approach	Climate-risk management, agricultural insurance, and farm-resilience analysis
Data Source	Peer-reviewed studies, policy reports, insurance guidance, and programme evaluations
Analysis Method	Thematic synthesis and comparative assessment of insurance design and resilience pathways
Focus Area	Climate shocks, insurance coverage, farmer adoption, claims performance, inclusion, and governance

4.2 SOURCES AND ANALYTICAL CATEGORIES

The study considers the following evidence categories for evaluation:

- Agricultural insurance studies covering indemnity, area-yield, weather-index, livestock, and satellite-supported products.
- Climate-risk, disaster-risk reduction, and agricultural adaptation literature relevant to drought, flood, heat, and rainfall variability.
- Research on insurance participation, financial inclusion, rural credit, farmer behaviour, and consumer protection.
- Policy documents on premium support, reinsurance, public-private partnerships, data systems, claims settlement, and grievance procedures.

Each evidence source is analysed with reference to:

- The hazard covered, production system, insured unit, and method used to measure or trigger losses.
- The size, timing, transparency, and perceived adequacy of payout mechanisms.
- The presence of basis risk, exclusion errors, data gaps, and operational delays.
- The affordability of premiums and access conditions for smallholders, women, tenants, and remote communities.
- The relationship between insurance and climate-smart investment, credit access, recovery, and long-term resilience.

5. DATA ANALYSIS

The analysis indicates that agricultural insurance can reduce climate risk most directly by protecting farm liquidity after a shock. For many smallholders, the immediate consequences of a failed season are not limited to lost output. Farmers may lose the cash

needed for the next sowing, become unable to repay informal or formal loans, reduce food expenditure, withdraw children from school, sell livestock, or postpone health care. A reliable payment can interrupt this chain of negative coping responses and preserve the resources needed to continue farming.

The effectiveness of protection depends on the fit between the insurance contract and the farm's actual exposure. A rainfall product designed around total seasonal rainfall may not protect farmers whose main risk is a dry spell during germination or excess rain during harvest. Similarly, an area-yield scheme may not provide meaningful cover where soil quality, irrigation access, and cropping practices vary widely within the insured unit. Product design must therefore be based on agronomic evidence, local hazard histories, and consultation with farmers, extension officers, and technical specialists.

Index insurance offers efficiency advantages but requires careful management of basis risk. The potential for faster settlement and lower loss-adjustment costs is valuable in remote areas, yet it cannot compensate for a weak correlation between the index and farm loss. Improvements may include denser weather-station networks, blended ground and satellite data, crop-stage-specific triggers, smaller insurance units where feasible, and transparent disclosure of historical payout patterns. Independent technical review is useful because farmers need confidence that the formula is not designed primarily for administrative convenience.

Insurance may support productive investment when coverage is credible and linked to a practical production strategy. Farmers who expect to recover part of a climate-related loss may be more willing to purchase certified seed, fertiliser, fodder, or irrigation services. Lenders may also be more willing to finance seasonal production if insured risk is understood. However, the evidence suggests that insurance should not be sold as a stand-alone solution. Investment benefits are more likely when farmers also receive timely weather information, extension advice, access to inputs, and viable output markets.

The analysis also highlights distributional concerns. Better-resourced farmers may be more able to pay premiums, understand

contracts, own smartphones, and navigate digital enrolment. Without deliberate inclusion measures, insurance can reinforce rather than reduce existing inequalities. Premium subsidies, assisted enrolment, flexible documentation, group-based outreach, local-language communication, and gender-responsive service channels can improve access. These measures should be designed transparently so that public support reaches vulnerable producers without encouraging poor-quality products or weakening accountability for claims performance.

Finally, insurance requires a strong institutional foundation. Climate shocks are correlated across regions and may generate claims that exceed the capacity of a local insurer. Reinsurance, catastrophe reserves, public backstops, and transparent fiscal planning are therefore important. Regulators need to monitor solvency, product disclosure, complaint resolution, and data governance. Weather agencies, agricultural departments, banks, insurers, and local governments must also coordinate so that farmers receive consistent information before, during, and after an extreme event.

6. DISCUSSION

The findings support the view that agricultural insurance is best understood as a climate-risk financing tool rather than a complete adaptation strategy. It does not prevent drought, flood, heat stress, or cyclone damage. It reduces the financial consequences of such hazards when a contract is well designed and honoured. This distinction matters because unrealistic expectations can undermine both farmer confidence and policy design. Insurance should be framed as one layer of protection alongside risk reduction, risk retention, savings, credit, emergency assistance, and post-disaster recovery.

Climate-smart agricultural practices and insurance are mutually reinforcing when implemented together. Soil-moisture conservation, diversified cropping, resilient varieties, water harvesting, fodder planning, agroforestry, and improved livestock management can reduce the probability or severity of loss. Insurance then protects farmers against residual risk that remains even after reasonable preventive measures are taken. Some products may also encourage

adoption of these practices by recognising lower risk or by being bundled with technical guidance. However, incentive design must be carefully tested so that it does not exclude farmers who lack the capital to adopt new technologies.

Basis risk remains the most important technical and ethical issue in index-based products. A farmer who experiences a serious loss but receives no payout may consider the product unfair even when the contract operates exactly as written. This is not simply a communication problem; it is a product-quality problem. Better data, improved index construction, crop-stage calibration, and accessible grievance mechanisms can reduce but not completely remove basis risk. Programmes should therefore avoid overstating the precision of a parametric product and should clearly explain what it does and does not insure.

Public support is often necessary because catastrophic agricultural risk is expensive and highly correlated. Premium subsidies can expand participation, but they should be accompanied by clear performance standards. Governments need to ask whether a subsidised scheme provides meaningful coverage, settles claims within the production calendar, reaches vulnerable groups, and uses public funds efficiently. Subsidies that merely increase enrolment figures without improving risk protection may create a false sense of security. Independent monitoring, public reporting, and farmer feedback are essential for accountability.

Digital tools offer substantial opportunities but also create new risks. Mobile enrolment, digital payment systems, satellite monitoring, automated weather stations, and remote sensing can lower transaction costs and improve speed. Yet digital exclusion, poor connectivity, opaque algorithms, inaccurate geolocation, and weak data privacy can disadvantage the very farmers that insurance is intended to protect. Technology should therefore be deployed with assisted channels, local verification, transparent data practices, and simple methods for farmers to access policy and payout information.

The discussion further suggests that risk communication should be continuous rather

than limited to a one-time enrolment campaign. Farmers need pre-season guidance on insured perils and triggers, in-season information about weather conditions and policy status, and post-event explanation of how payouts were calculated. Extension services can support this process, but insurers and public agencies must retain responsibility for the accuracy of information. Clear communication is particularly important where enrolment is linked to credit or government benefit systems, because farmers may otherwise assume they are protected without understanding the scope of coverage.

7. CONCLUSION

This study concludes that agricultural insurance can contribute meaningfully to climate risk reduction when it provides reliable, understandable, and timely financial protection after climate-related losses. Crop, livestock, area-yield, weather-index, and remote-sensing-based products each have potential roles, but their value depends on their fit with local hazards, farming systems, data availability, and farmer needs. A policy that exists on paper but does not deliver credible protection at the time of loss cannot strengthen resilience.

The strongest insurance systems combine sound technical design with inclusive implementation. They use reliable weather and yield information, manage basis risk transparently, settle claims within the recovery period, protect consumer rights, and reach farmers who face barriers related to land tenure, income, gender, location, or digital access. Reinsurance, public oversight, and clear fiscal arrangements are needed because climate risk can create large, simultaneous losses across agricultural regions.

Agricultural insurance should therefore be integrated with climate-smart agriculture, extension services, early warning, savings, rural credit, disaster preparedness, social protection, and investments in water, soil, seed, and market systems. Through this integrated approach, insurance can help farmers avoid harmful coping strategies, maintain productive investment, recover after shocks, and participate more confidently in a changing climate.

8. REFERENCES

The University Academics: Under the Aegis of Swarn P3 Pvt. Ltd.

Peer-Reviewed Journal

1. Barnett, B. J., and Mahul, O. (2007). Weather index insurance for agriculture and rural areas in lower-income countries. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 89(5), 1241-1247. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8276.2007.01091.x>
2. Carter, M. R., de Janvry, A., Sadoulet, E., and Sarris, A. (2017). Index insurance for developing country agriculture: A reassessment. *Annual Review of Resource Economics*, 9, 421-438. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-resource-100516-053352>
3. Clarke, D. J. (2016). A theory of rational demand for index insurance. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, 8(1), 283-306. <https://doi.org/10.1257/mic.20140103>
4. Cole, S., Giné, X., Tobacman, J., Topalova, P., Townsend, R., and Vickery, J. (2013). Barriers to household risk management: Evidence from India. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 5(1), 104-135. <https://doi.org/10.1257/app.5.1.104>
5. Giné, X., Townsend, R., and Vickery, J. (2008). Patterns of rainfall insurance participation in rural India. *The World Bank Economic Review*, 22(3), 539-566. <https://doi.org/10.1093/wber/lhn015>
6. Dercon, S., Hill, R. V., Clarke, D., Outes-Leon, I., and Taffesse, A. S. (2014). Offering rainfall insurance to informal insurance groups: Evidence from a field experiment in Ethiopia. *Journal of Development Economics*, 106, 132-143.
7. Elabed, G., Bellemare, M. F., Carter, M. R., and Guirking, C. (2013). Managing basis risk with multiscale index insurance. *Agricultural Economics*, 44(4-5), 419-431.
8. Greatrex, H., Hansen, J., Garvin, S., Diro, R., Le Guen, M., Blakeley, S., Le Masson, A., and Osgood, D. (2015). *Scaling Up Index Insurance for Smallholder Farmers: Recent Evidence and Insights*. CCAFS Report No. 14. Copenhagen: CGIAR Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security.
9. Mahul, O., and Stutley, C. J. (2010). *Government Support to Agricultural Insurance: Challenges and Options for Developing Countries*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
10. Miranda, M. J., and Glauber, J. W. (1997). Systemic risk, reinsurance, and the failure of crop insurance markets. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 79(1), 206-215.
11. Morsink, K., Clarke, D., and Mapfumo, S. (2016). How to measure whether index insurance provides reliable protection against catastrophic losses. *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper* 7744.
12. World Bank. (2011). *Weather Index Insurance for Agriculture: Guidance for Development Practitioners*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
13. World Bank. (2014). *World Development Report 2014: Risk and Opportunity - Managing Risk for Development*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
14. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2021). *The State of Food and Agriculture 2021: Making Agrifood Systems More Resilient to Shocks and Stresses*. Rome: FAO.
15. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2017). *The Future of Food and Agriculture: Trends and Challenges*. Rome: FAO.
16. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2022). *Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
17. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2023). *Climate Change 2023: Synthesis Report*. Geneva: IPCC.
18. OECD. (2009). *Managing Risk in Agriculture: A Holistic Approach*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
19. United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction. (2015). *Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030*. Geneva: UNDRR.
20. Hazell, P., and Varangis, P. (2020). Best practices for subsidizing agricultural insurance. *Global Food Security*, 25, 100326.
21. Leblois, A., and Quirion, P. (2013). Agricultural insurances based on meteorological indices: Realizations, methods and research challenges. *Meteorological Applications*, 20(1), 1-9.
22. Jensen, N. D., Barrett, C. B., and Mude, A. G. (2016). Cash transfers and index insurance: A comparative impact analysis from northern Kenya. *Journal of Development Economics*, 129, 49-61.

23. Lichtenberg, E. (2022). *Index insurance and basis risk: A reconsideration*. *Journal of Development Economics*, 159, 102985.
24. Aina, I., Akinyemi, O., and colleagues. (2024). *Crop index insurance as a tool for climate resilience*. *Natural Hazards*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-023-06388-x>
25. Madaki, M. Y., and colleagues. (2023). *Agricultural insurance as a climate risk adaptation strategy: Awareness and adoption among smallholder farmers*. *Climate Policy*.
26. Government of India, Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare. (2016). *Pradhan Mantri Fasal Bima Yojana: Operational Guidelines*. New Delhi: Government of India.
27. Agricultural Insurance Company of India Limited. (2024). *Annual Report 2023-24*. New Delhi: AIC of India.
28. World Meteorological Organization. (2023). *State of Climate Services 2023: Health*. Geneva: WMO.
29. United Nations. (2015). *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. New York: United Nations.
30. Meuwissen, M. P. M., Feindt, P. H., Midmore, P., Wauters, E., Finger, R., Appel, F., Spiegel, A., Mathijs, E., Termeer, C. J. A. M., and Reidsma, P. (2019). *A framework to assess the resilience of farming systems*. *Agricultural Systems*, 176, 102656. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2019.102656>