PRIN: RESEARCH PROJECTS OF RELEVANT NATIONAL INTEREST – Call 2020

Prot. 20205L79R8

“Towards a holistic approach to Sustainable Risk management in agriculture” Sus-Risk

Report

Deliverable D1.1 - Report on the qualification and quantification of the risk and on the factors affecting risk (Task 1.a).

Document Title	Policy Brief	Author	Simone Severini, Biagini Luigi
Document type	Deliverable	Due date	01/06/2023
First issue		Ref.	
Dissemination level	Internal	Revised	

PROJECT	Towards a holistic approach to sustainable risk management in agriculture	Prot.	……
Call identifier	PRIN: RESEARCH PROJECTS OF RELEVANT NATIONAL INTEREST – 2020 Call for proposals Prot. 20205L79R8		
Work Package	1		
Deliverable n°	D1.1	Lead beneficiary:	
Coordinator			
Project Manager	…		
Project Start date	…		
Project Duration	36 month		

Report on the qualification and quantification of the risk and on the factors affecting risk

1 Introduction

Risk is a central feature of agricultural production. The volatility of yields and prices, erratic weather patterns, pest infestations, and the unpredictability of markets expose agricultural producers to substantial uncertainties that impact income, investment, and resource allocation. Risk management, therefore, is fundamental not only for securing farmers' livelihoods but also for achieving food security and efficient resource use. Among the primary instruments for risk management in agriculture, insurance plays a crucial role, shielding farmers against adverse events while influencing their behaviour in production and input use.

This comprehensive report addresses two interrelated themes:

- Qualification (identification and characterisation) and quantification (measurement and calculation) of risk;
- Analysis of key factors influencing risk in agricultural environments and insurance.

Drawing from a broad range of empirical and theoretical research, the report synthesises advances in economics, actuarial science, policy analysis, and behavioural research to provide a nuanced understanding relevant to farmers, policymakers, insurers, and researchers.

2 Qualification of Risk: Concepts, Types, and Approaches

2.1 Defining Risk

Risk, in the context of agriculture and insurance, is generally understood as the possibility that actual outcomes (yields, prices, incomes, or losses) will deviate from expected outcomes, particularly in an unfavourable direction. Agricultural risk encompasses(Just, Calvin and Quiggin, 1999; Bulte and Lensink, 2022):

- **Production risk**, often termed yield risk, encapsulates challenges like unpredictable weather patterns (e.g., droughts or floods), pest infestations, disease outbreaks, and even technological failures in equipment or irrigation systems. For instance, a sudden hailstorm can decimate a season's crops, while a malfunction in automated harvesting machinery might delay critical workflows.
- **Price risk** emerges from volatile market dynamics, where fluctuations in input costs (e.g., fertilisers, seeds) or output prices (e.g., grain, livestock) can erode profit margins. Farmers might face steep losses if global commodity prices drop unexpectedly due to trade policy shifts or oversupply.
- **Financial instability** compounds these challenges. Financial and credit risk refers to scenarios where liquidity shortfalls or debt repayment difficulties arise, particularly after poor harvests or price collapses. A farmer relying on loans for equipment upgrades, for example, might struggle to meet obligations if yields underperform.

- **Institutional and policy risk** adds another layer of complexity. Changes in government subsidies, environmental regulations, or disaster relief programs can abruptly alter the economic landscape. A shift in agricultural subsidies from crop insurance to direct payments, for instance, might leave farmers exposed to new vulnerabilities.
- **Environmental threats**, such as soil degradation, biodiversity loss, or long-term climate shifts, define environmental risk. These factors not only jeopardise immediate productivity but also threaten the sustainability of farming practices over decades.
- Finally, **behavioural and informational risks** highlight human and systemic frailties. Information gaps, such as farmers underestimating the likelihood of droughts or moral hazard in insurance markets (e.g., policyholders neglecting risk-mitigation practices), can exacerbate losses. These cognitive and structural inefficiencies often distort risk assessments and decision-making.

Collectively, these intersecting risks underscore why agriculture demands tailored risk management strategies, from diversified cropping systems to innovative insurance products, to buffer against its unparalleled biological and economic uncertainties(Capitanio and Adinolfi, 2009).

2.2 *Characterising (Qualifying) Risk*

Risk qualification begins by identifying and categorising sources and types of risk, which fall into several critical distinctions:

- **Systemic vs. Idiosyncratic Risk:** Systemic risks—like droughts or widespread pest outbreaks—affect many producers simultaneously, creating correlated losses that are hard to diversify through traditional insurance. In contrast, idiosyncratic risks, such as localised hail or isolated disease outbreaks, impact individual producers independently, making them easier to pool and insure due to their uncorrelated nature.
- **Measurable vs. Non-Measurable Risk:** Risks are further classified by how well their probabilities and impacts can be quantified. For example, weather-related risks often have extensive historical data for modeling, while emerging threats like novel pests or market disruptions lack reliable data, complicating risk assessment and pricing.
- **Risk-Increasing vs. Risk-Reducing Inputs:** Agricultural inputs can influence risk profiles. Fertilisers, for instance, may boost average yields but also increase yield variability (risk-increasing), whereas pesticides often stabilise outputs by reducing variance (risk-reducing). These dynamics shape farm-level decisions and insurance product design(Zhang, Yang and Li, 2023; Pietrobon, 2024).
- **Moral Hazard vs. Adverse Selection:** Insurance mechanisms face behavioral challenges: moral hazard arises when insured parties take fewer precautions (e.g., reducing pest control), while adverse selection occurs when higher-risk producers disproportionately seek coverage. Both can skew risk pools and threaten insurer solvency if unmanaged(Just, Calvin and Quiggin, 1999; Ramirez and Scott Shonkwiler, 2017)

2.3 *Analytical frameworks for qualifying risk include:*

To systematically evaluate risks, several models and concepts are widely applied:

- **Expected Utility Theory:** This foundational framework models how risk-averse decision-makers (e.g., farmers) weigh uncertain outcomes, forming the basis for understanding insurance uptake and risk mitigation strategies (Pratt, Arrow).

- **Risk Premium:** Derived from expected utility, the risk premium quantifies what a producer is willing to pay to avoid uncertainty. It reflects the interplay between potential losses, risk tolerance, and financial resilience(Enjolras, Capitanio and Adinolfi, 2012).
- **Risk Aversion Coefficients:** Arrow-Pratt measures of absolute and relative risk aversion parameterise individual risk preferences. These coefficients influence decisions on input use, insurance coverage, and risk transfer mechanisms, linking theoretical models to real-world behavior (Enjolras, Capitanio and Adinolfi, 2012).

2.4 *Challenges in Risk Qualification*

Accurate risk qualification faces significant hurdles due to three interrelated factors.

First, information asymmetries create imbalances, as farmers typically possess more detailed knowledge of their yields, risk exposures, and farming practices compared to insurers or policymakers. This disparity can distort risk assessments, fostering adverse selection and estimation biases that undermine the reliability of insurance models (Just, Calvin and Quiggin, 1999).Second, dynamic shifts in risk environments complicate long-term planning. Climate change drives unpredictable weather patterns, while market liberalisation, technological advancements, and evolving policies reshape agricultural landscapes in non-linear ways. These overlapping forces make it difficult to stabilise risk profiles over time. Finally, human behavior introduces additional unpredictability. Farmers' decisions are often shaped by subjective risk perceptions, historical experiences, and levels of trust in institutions—factors that may diverge from purely economic rationality (Koenig and Brunette, 2023). Together, these challenges demand adaptive frameworks to balance quantitative data with contextual nuance.

3 Quantification of Risk: Measures, Models, and Empirical Approaches

3.1 *Quantitative Measures of Agricultural Risk*

Agricultural risk management employs several quantitative approaches to assess and mitigate uncertainties in production and market dynamics.
Among the most established methods are **variance and standard deviation**, which measure historical variability in yields, prices, income, or profits. For example, the coefficient of variation—calculated as the ratio of standard deviation to mean—allows comparisons of risk levels between different crops, regions, or time periods by normalising dispersion metrics

(Wu, 1999).
In insurance contexts, the loss-cost ratio (LCR) serves as a critical indicator, representing the proportion of indemnity payouts relative to total insured liabilities. This metric helps insurers evaluate whether premium income adequately covers potential losses and quantifies their exposure to financial volatility within risk pools (Yu and Perry, 2023).
Probability distribution modeling provides foundational insights by estimating the likelihood of specific outcomes, such as yield shortfalls or price collapses. These distributions enable calculations of expected losses, variability (through variance), asymmetry (skewness), and tail risks (kurtosis), which are vital for anticipating catastrophic scenarios (Miranda and Glauber, 1997; Yu and Perry, 2023).
Behavioral aspects of risk are captured through concepts like risk premium and certainty equivalent. These measure the economic value individuals place on risk reduction, reflecting their willingness to pay for insurance rather than facing unmitigated uncertainties (Enjolras, Capitanio and Adinolfi, 2012).
Finally, stochastic simulation models analyse complex scenarios by generating probabilistic outcomes at farm or portfolio levels. By incorporating historical data or synthetic event sequences, these tools help insurers and policymakers assess systemic risks and prepare for low-probability, high-impact events(Miranda and Glauber, 1997).

3.2 *Quantitative Approaches in Insurance Design and Rating*

The actuarially fair premium represents the average expected indemnity payment calculated over the relevant probability distribution, typically adjusted to account for administrative expenses and risk loadings. In practice, insurers determine premiums through statistical models that incorporate historical yield data, loss records, regional yield variability, and systemic risk estimates (Miranda and Glauber, 1997; Aubert and Enjolras, 2014). Accurate crop yield trend modeling plays a critical role in setting insurance parameters, with modern approaches emphasising improved estimation techniques through smoothing methods, spatial data pooling, and robust statistical frameworks. Recent methodological advances advocate for spatio-temporal models that simultaneously analyse geographic and historical data patterns to enhance the precision of insurance guarantees and premium calculations (Wen, 2023).

Instrumental variable (IV) approaches have become essential tools for addressing econometric challenges in insurance research, particularly when analysing demand patterns and risk management behaviors. These methods help resolve endogeneity concerns that arise when premium rates correlate with unobserved risk factors, enabling clearer identification of causal relationships in agricultural insurance markets (Tsiboe and Turner, 2023a; Yu and Perry, 2023). Evaluating the effectiveness of risk mitigation strategies involves quantifying reductions in key financial metrics, including variance measures, downside risk exposure, and loss cost ratios (LCR) (Miranda and Glauber, 1997; Kuethe and Morehart, 2012). These quantitative assessments provide critical insights into how insurance products, hedging instruments, and diversification strategies stabilise farm incomes and operational outcomes.

3.3 *Limitations and Uncertainties in Risk Quantification*

Accurately measuring risk in agricultural systems faces significant hurdles due to several interconnected factors.

One major challenge stems from incomplete or fragmented data, such as short historical records, gaps in regional datasets, or rare extreme events. These limitations make it difficult to reliably estimate risks or set appropriate insurance premiums, as models may miss critical patterns or underestimate outlier impacts (Tsiboe and Turner, 2023a; Wen, 2023).

Another layer of complexity arises from spatial and temporal correlations in risks. For example, widespread threats like droughts or pest outbreaks often affect entire regions simultaneously, creating systemic risks. This interdependence reduces the effectiveness of traditional risk-pooling strategies and strains reinsurance mechanisms, as losses compound across many policies rather than remaining isolated (Miranda and Glauber, 1997).

Imperfect risk assessment further complicates the picture. Both insurers and farmers may miscalculate actuarially fair premiums due to modeling oversights or cognitive biases. When combined with government subsidy programs—which aim to incentivise coverage—these errors can distort insurance uptake rates, alter market dynamics, and lead to unintended redistributive effects in public spending (Ramirez and Shonkwiler, 2017).

Finally, human behavior introduces additional unpredictability. Psychological factors like risk underestimation among lower-risk farmers, skepticism toward institutional safeguards, or cognitive limitations in processing complex probabilistic information often drive real-world decisions (Koenig and Brunette, 2023).

These behaviors frequently diverge from theoretical predictions, creating gaps between modeled outcomes and actual insurance participation or risk-management choices

4 Factors Affecting Risk in Agriculture and Insurance

4.1 Production and Environmental Risk Factors

Weather variability and climate change stand as the most influential drivers of yield and revenue risk in agriculture. Droughts, floods, hail, heatwaves, and frost occur with growing frequency and severity, a trend amplified by climate change, according to studies (Bulte and Lensink, 2022; Koenig and Brunette, 2023). These climatic shocks disrupt production cycles and compound financial uncertainty for farmers globally.

Another critical aspect shaping risk exposure lies in crop selection and farming systems. Choices such as monoculture versus diversified cropping, reliance on irrigation, or the use of inputs that either heighten or reduce vulnerability directly impact resilience (Enjolras, Capitanio and Adinolfi, 2012). For instance, certain high-yield crops may offer short-term gains but increase susceptibility to market or environmental shifts.

Soil health and geographic conditions further influence production outcomes. Factors like soil fertility, land quality, topography, and local water availability create site-specific risks, as poor soil structure or inadequate drainage can magnify losses during extreme weather events (Wu, 1999; Wen, 2023). Regions with degraded land or limited freshwater access often face compounded challenges.

Technological adoption introduces a dual-edged dynamic. While improved seed varieties, precision fertilisers, and digital agriculture tools can boost average yields, their impact on risk varies. Some innovations reduce vulnerability, whereas others may increase yield variability depending on context (Bulte and Lensink, 2022). Additionally, insurance uptake itself can alter behavior—farmers might adopt riskier inputs due to perceived safety nets (risk-balancing) or become less cautious (moral hazard), as noted in research (Aubert and Enjolras, 2014; Bulte and Lensink, 2022).

Finally, farm management practices play a pivotal role. Timely planting, integrated pest control, soil conservation, and proactive weed management mitigate certain risks (Bulte and Lensink, 2022; Koenig and Brunette, 2023). Conversely, inadequate planning or poor execution can exacerbate vulnerabilities, potentially skewing insurance markets through adverse selection if higher-risk farmers disproportionately seek coverage (Just, Calvin and Quiggin, 1999).

4.2 Farmer Behavior and Decision-Making

A complex interplay of behavioral and socioeconomic factors shapes farmers’ approaches to risk management. Risk aversion, which reflects their willingness to tolerate uncertainty, plays a central role in decisions such as purchasing insurance, adopting new technologies, or adjusting input use. Studies indicate that individuals with higher risk aversion often prioritise safety nets, such as insurance, as they place a greater value on stability (Mishra and El-Osta, 2002; Enjolras, Capitanio and Adinolfi, 2012; Bulte and Lensink, 2022). However, the perceived benefits of such tools can vary widely depending on individual risk preferences (Smith and Goodwin, 2017; Pietrobon, 2024).

Education and experience introduce additional layers of nuance. While higher education levels typically enhance risk assessment skills and familiarity with management strategies, their impact on insurance adoption is not uniform. In some contexts, educated farmers may forgo insurance due to confidence in alternative methods or diversified income streams, highlighting the situational nature of these relationships (Mishra and El-Osta, 2002; Zhang, Yang and Li, 2023).

Income and wealth further differentiate risk responses. Affluent farmers often rely on self-insurance or liquidity buffers to absorb shocks, reducing their urgency for formal insurance products. In contrast, financially constrained households face heightened vulnerability, as limited resources restrict both their capacity to manage risks and their ability to afford coverage (Bulte and Lensink, 2022; Koenig and Brunette, 2023).

The availability of alternative strategies also influences the uptake of insurance. Practices like crop diversification, futures contracts, savings mechanisms, or government subsidies can serve as substitutes, potentially diminishing the appeal of insurance (Enjolras, Capitanio and Adinolfi, 2012; Kuethe and Morehart, 2012; Koenig and Brunette, 2023). For example, farmers with access to reliable forward contracts may perceive a lesser need for yield-based insurance.

Behavioural factors, including trust in insurers, habitual decision-making, and cognitive biases, further complicate risk management. Positive experiences with indemnity payouts may reinforce insurance participation, while distrust or past disputes could deter it. Psychological tendencies, such as inertia or misjudgments of risk likelihood, often lead to suboptimal choices, underscoring the gap between theoretical risk models and real-world behaviour (Koenig and Brunette, 2023).

4.3 Policy, Institutional, and Market Factors

A complex interplay of economic incentives, contractual design, and market dynamics shapes the effectiveness of agricultural insurance programs.

Government subsidies play a pivotal role in driving insurance participation by lowering upfront costs for farmers, making coverage more accessible across risk profiles (Yu and Perry, 2023). However, overly generous subsidies can distort risk pools by attracting both high-risk and low-risk participants indiscriminately while simultaneously creating moral hazard scenarios in which insured farmers reduce preventive measures (Just, Calvin and Quiggin, 1999; Glauber, 2013). These inefficiencies often strain program sustainability and actuarial balance, requiring careful calibration of subsidy levels.

Insurance contract mechanics, such as deductible amounts, coverage thresholds, and administrative requirements, directly impact adoption rates and the effectiveness of risk mitigation (Smith and Goodwin, 2017). Policies with excessive paperwork or rigid premium schedules may deter participation, even when financial protections appear attractive on paper (Koenig and Brunette, 2023).

Index-based insurance products introduce additional complexity through basis risk, where discrepancies between payout triggers and actual farm losses leave producers partially exposed to financial risk. This mismatch undermines trust in insurance mechanisms and complicates risk transfer calculations(Miranda and Glauber, 1997; Hinck and Steinorth, 2023).

Behavioural factors further complicate risk management strategies. Moral hazard emerges when insured farmers reduce proactive risk mitigation efforts, while adverse selection skews risk pools toward higher-risk participants. These phenomena increase operational costs for insurers and can destabilise programs over time (Just, Calvin and Quiggin, 1999; Ramirez and Scott Shonkwiler, 2017). Market structures amplify these challenges in regions with underdeveloped financial systems, and limited access to credit markets restricts farmers’ ability to invest in risk-reducing technologies or purchase comprehensive coverage (Bulte and Lensink, 2022).

In contexts where formal insurance markets are underdeveloped, farmers often rely on informal risk-sharing networks and relational contracts. Social capital and community-based agreements become critical safety nets, influencing decisions about crop diversification, technology adoption, and long-term investments (Bulte and Lensink, 2022).

These adaptive strategies highlight the interplay between institutional frameworks and localised coping mechanisms in shaping agricultural resilience.

4.4 Specific Empirical Findings on Factors Affecting Risk and Insurance Uptake

4.4.1 Participation and Risk Pool Composition

Empirical studies of the U.S. Federal Crop Insurance Program (FCIP) reveal nuanced relationships between subsidies, risk pools, and farmer behavior. When premium subsidies rise, they tend to broaden participation by drawing in lower-risk farmers alongside higher-risk ones. This shift reduces the average loss cost ratio (LCR) within the insured pool, which can stabilise actuarial performance over time. However, this pattern varies across policy types and coverage levels, as certain products may disproportionately attract specific risk profiles (Yu and Perry, 2023).

Research also highlights disparities in demand elasticity between risk categories. Lower-risk farms often respond more sharply to premium adjustments than their higher-risk counterparts, leading to measurable changes in pool composition as subsidy levels fluctuate. For instance, subsidised premiums may incentivise risk-averse but financially stable farmers to join programs they previously deemed uneconomical, altering the overall risk dynamics (Yu and Perry, 2023).

Program design features further shape outcomes. Coverage thresholds, deductible structures, and the availability of supplemental disaster aid collectively influence how farmers engage with insurance. Higher coverage levels may encourage uptake, but they also alter risk management behaviours; some producers might reduce on-farm mitigation efforts, relying instead on guaranteed payouts. Conversely, stringent deductibles or complex administrative requirements can suppress participation, even among farmers who stand to benefit most. These design choices create feedback loops, where insurance mechanisms indirectly affect both risk exposure and resilience (Smith and Goodwin, 2017; Koenig and Brunette, 2023; Yu and Perry, 2023).

4.4.2 Insurance and Input Use

The relationship between crop insurance and chemical input decisions reveals nuanced trade-offs between behavioural and environmental considerations. Farmers may adjust their fertiliser and pesticide use in response to insurance coverage, although the direction of these changes remains contested. Some studies suggest insured producers increase fertiliser application while cutting back on pesticides, leveraging insurance as a risk buffer that alters input priorities. Conversely, other research documents moral hazard scenarios in which comprehensive coverage leads to heightened chemical use, as reduced financial exposure diminishes the incentives for cautious input management. These divergent patterns often hinge on risk complementarities—for instance, insurance might substitute for certain preventive measures while amplifying reliance on yield-boosting inputs. Environmental consequences add complexity, as unintended outcomes, such as nutrient runoff or pesticide overuse, can emerge when insurance decouples risk perceptions from ecological stewardship (Zhang, Yang and Li, 2023).

Empirical findings about these dynamics resist universal conclusions, reflecting the interplay of regional and operational variables. Crop-specific factors, such as the inherent risk profiles of maise versus soybeans, shape how insurance influences input strategies. National policy environments also mediate outcomes—subsidised insurance programs in one country might drive fertiliser overuse, while regionally tailored designs elsewhere promote integrated pest management. Farmer risk aversion further modulates these effects: more cautious producers might pair insurance with precision agriculture technologies, whereas others adopt riskier input practices under the safety net of coverage. This contextual variability underscores why identical insurance products can yield opposing results across different agroecological and socioeconomic settings (Zhang, Yang and Li, 2023).

4.4.3 Contemporary and Emerging Risks

The evolving challenges of agricultural risk management are increasingly shaped by climate dynamics and systemic complexities. Climate variability and change now generate hazards that frequently exceed historical patterns, rendering traditional statistical models less reliable. Droughts, heat waves, and erratic rainfall patterns occur with unprecedented intensity, creating risk profiles that demand innovative solutions. This shift has spurred interest in parametric insurance, index-linked products, and novel reinsurance structures designed to address gaps in conventional coverage, as noted in studies (Bulte and Lensink, 2022; Koenig and Brunette, 2023). These tools aim to bridge the divide between historical data and emerging climate realities while maintaining actuarial viability.

Another critical challenge lies in managing systemic risks that affect entire regions simultaneously. Widespread events, such as multi-seasonal droughts or large-scale floods, create correlated losses, threatening insurer solvency and driving up premium costs. The sustainability of insurance systems increasingly hinges on effective risk diversification strategies and robust reinsurance mechanisms. Without access to global reinsurance markets or alternative risk-transfer instruments, localised programs often struggle to strike a balance between affordability and financial resilience (Miranda and Glauber, 1997).

Innovations in product design attempt to reconcile efficiency with farmer needs. Index-based and weather-linked insurance products reduce moral hazard by tying payouts to objective indicators rather than individual losses. However, these solutions face persistent hurdles—basis risk leaves farmers partially exposed when indices poorly match actual field conditions, while low uptake stems from distrust, liquidity limitations, or inadequate understanding of product mechanics (Bulte and Lensink, 2022).

Successfully addressing these barriers requires aligning technical precision with grassroots communication strategies and flexible payment structures.

5 Integrated Frameworks and Policy Implications

5.1 Linking Risk Qualification and Quantification in Decision Analysis

Integrated approaches employ expected utility maximisation under risk, recognising that risk management decisions (insurance purchase, input use, diversification, and credit allocation) are made under uncertainty and subject to constraints (liquidity, information, behavioural). Simulation models, econometric identification, and spatially explicit models are increasingly employed to improve both the qualification and quantification of risk, incorporating both tangible and intangible variables (Miranda and Glauber, 1997; Tsiboe and Turner, 2023a; Yu and Perry, 2023).

5.2 Policy Design: Efficiency and Equity Considerations

Balancing risk transfer efficiency requires nuanced subsidy architectures that stimulate participation while avoiding market distortions. Carefully calibrated subsidies can broaden insurance pools by attracting diverse risk profiles, yet excessive support risks inflating administrative costs and encouraging complacency. Phasing out subsidies gradually may help maintain resilience—low-risk farmers, often more price-sensitive, might exit first, but retaining core participants preserves the pool's actuarial viability. This approach prioritises long-term stability over short-term uptake, as abrupt subsidy cuts could destabilise entire programs (Ramirez and Scott Shonkwiler, 2017).

Another critical consideration involves curbing asymmetric information and perverse incentives. Precision in risk assessment—through individualised pricing models or claims-history adjustments—helps align premiums with actual exposure. Mechanisms like co-payments and deductibles introduce shared responsibility, discouraging reckless behaviour while maintaining accessible coverage. For instance, dynamic pricing that rewards risk-mitigation practices (e.g., soil conservation) can simultaneously reduce moral hazard and promote safer farming methods, strengthening both insurer solvency and farmer outcomes (Just, Calvin and Quiggin, 1999; Smith and Goodwin, 2017; Tsiboe and Turner, 2023b)

Equally vital are strategies to bridge cognitive and informational gaps. Targeted education campaigns can demystify insurance mechanics, correcting underestimation or overestimation of risks. Trust-building initiatives, such as transparent payout processes or community-led outreach, foster alignment between insurer offerings and farmer needs. When stakeholders share a common understanding of risk probabilities and mitigation benefits, participation becomes more purposeful, distributing program costs and benefits more equitably (Ramirez and Scott Shonkwiler, 2017; Koenig and Brunette, 2023).

Finally, harmonising risk management with ecological priorities is increasingly urgent. Traditional insurance models risk inadvertently promoting input-intensive or monoculture systems by shielding farmers from the environmental consequences of their actions. Emerging solutions tie coverage to sustainability benchmarks—for example, lower premiums for agroecological practices or parametric policies linked to biodiversity metrics. Such innovations not only reduce climate vulnerabilities but also incentivise practices that align private and public goods, ensuring risk mitigation supports rather than undermines planetary health (Capitanio and Adinolfi, 2009; Aubert and Enjolras, 2014; Zhang, Yang and Li, 2023).

6 Conclusion

Effective risk management in agriculture depends on the accurate identification, measurement, and strategic response to a variety of risks that arise from both natural and human sources. Modern approaches to qualification and quantification of risk, supported by robust data, advanced modeling, and empirical research, offer the promise of improved efficiency, equity, and resilience in global agriculture.

Key takeaways include:

- Risk in agriculture is multifaceted, including production, price, financial, behavioral, institutional, and environmental dimensions.
- Accurate risk qualification relies on both statistical models and the understanding of behavioral, informational, and systemic factors.
- Quantification of risk employs diverse tools—variance analysis, LCR, simulation, utility-based measures—while confronting practical constraints of data, correlation, and behavioral variability.
- A wide range of factors—including biophysical conditions, farmer characteristics, policy design, and market structure—affect both risk exposure and responses.
- Carefully designed insurance policies improve welfare and stability, but must adapt to emerging challenges such as climate change, market liberalisation, and evolving behavioral factors.

In a dynamic world where risk is ever-present and evolving, ongoing research, policy innovation, and stakeholder engagement remain essential to ensure that risk management frameworks not only protect farmers but also advance sustainability, equity, and rural development objectives.

References

Aubert, M. and Enjolras, G. (2014) ‘The Determinants of Chemical Input Use in Agriculture: A Dynamic Analysis of the Wine Grape–Growing Sector in France’, *Journal of Wine Economics*, 9(1), pp. 75–99. doi: 10.1017/jwe.2013.34.

Bulte, E. and Lensink, R. (2022) ‘Why agricultural insurance may slow down agricultural development’, *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 105(April 2021), pp. 1–24. doi: 10.1111/ajae.12353.

Capitanio, F. and Adinolfi, F. (2009) ‘The relationship between agricultural insurance and environmental externalities from agricultural input use: A literature review and methodological approach’, *New Medit*, 8(3), pp. 41–48.

Enjolras, G., Capitanio, F. and Adinolfi, F. (2012) ‘The demand for crop insurance: Combined approaches for France and Italy’, *Agricultural Economics Review*, 13(1), pp. 5–22.

doi: 10.2139/ssrn.1836798.

Glauber, J. W. (2013) 'The growth of the federal crop insurance program, 1990-2011', in *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, pp. 482–488. doi: 10.1093/ajae/aas091.

Hinck, S. and Steinorth, P. (2023) 'Insurance demand in the presence of loss-dependent background risk'. doi: 10.1111/jori.12426.

Just, R. E., Calvin, L. and Quiggin, J. (1999) 'Adverse Selection in Crop Insurance: Actuarial and Asymmetric Information Incentives', *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 81(4), pp. 834–849. doi: 10.2307/1244328.

Koenig, R. and Brunette, M. (2023) *Subjective barriers and determinants to crop insurance Adoption*. 2023 – 25.

Kuethe, T. H. and Morehart, M. (2012) 'The profit impacts of risk management tool adoption', *Agricultural Finance Review*, 72(1), pp. 104–116. doi: 10.1108/00021461211222178.

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), pp. 206–215. doi: 10.2307/1243954.

Mishra, A. K. and El-Osta, H. S. (2002) 'Managing risk in agriculture through hedging and crop insurance: What does a national survey reveal?', *Agricultural Finance Review*, 62(2), pp. 135–148. doi: 10.1108/00214930280001134.

Pietrobon, D. (2024) 'The dual role of insurance in input use: Mitigating risk versus curtailing incentives', *Journal of Development Economics*, 166(June 2022), p. 103203. doi: 10.1016/j.jdeveco.2023.103203.

Ramirez, O. A. and Scott Shonkwiler, J. (2017) 'A probabilistic model of the crop insurance purchase decision', *Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics*, 42(1), pp. 10–26.

Ramirez, O. A. and Shonkwiler, J. S. (2017) *Western Agricultural Economics Association A Probabilistic Model of the Crop Insurance Purchase Decision*, *Source: Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics*.

Smith, V. H. and Goodwin, B. K. (2017) 'Crop insurance, moral hazard, and agricultural chemical use', *The Economics of Agri-Environmental Policy*, 2(2), pp. 169–179. doi:

10.2307/1243714.

Tsiboe, F. and Turner, D. (2023a) ‘Econometric identification of crop insurance participation’, *Agricultural and Resource Economics Review*, pp. 1–22. doi: 10.1017/age.2023.13.

Tsiboe, F. and Turner, D. (2023b) ‘The Crop Insurance Demand Response to Premium Subsidies: Evidence from U.S. Agriculture’, *U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service*, 119(November 2022), p. 102505. doi: 10.1016/j.foodpol.2023.102505.

Wen, K. (2023) ‘A semiparametric spatio-temporal model of crop yield trend and its implication to insurance rating’, *Agricultural Economics (United Kingdom)*, (April 2022), pp. 1–12. doi: 10.1111/agec.12798.

Wu, J. (1999) ‘Crop Insurance, Acreage Decisions, and Nonpoint-Source Pollution’, *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 81(2), pp. 305–320. doi: 10.2307/1244583.

Yu, J. and Perry, E. D. (2023) ‘Premium subsidies and selection in the federal crop insurance program’, *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, (August 2022), pp. 1–18. doi: 10.1111/1477-9552.12555.

Zhang, L., Yang, Y. and Li, X. (2023) ‘Research on the Relationship between Agricultural Insurance Participation and Chemical Input in Grain Production’, *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 15(4). doi: 10.3390/su15043045.