PRIN: RESEARCH PROJECTS OF RELEVANT NATIONAL INTEREST – Call 2020

Prot. 20205L79R8

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

Report on the potential impact of the introduction of innovative RM tools at farm level. (Task 5.c)

Deliverable 5.2

Document Title	Report	Author	Simone Severini Luigi Biagini
Document type	Deliverable	Due date	32 M – 01/02/2025
First issue		Ref.	
Dissemination level	Internal	Revised	

PROJECT	Towards a holistic approach to sustainable risk management in agriculture	Prot.	……
Call identifier Work Package	PRIN: RESEARCH PROJECTS OF RELEVANT NATIONAL INTEREST – 2020 Call for proposals Prot. 20205L79R8 WP5 – Task 5.c)		
Deliverable	Report on the potential impact of the introduction of innovative RM tools at farm level (Task 5.c).		
Principal Investigator WP Coordinator Project Start date Project Duration	Simone Severini UNIPD 01/06/2022 36 month		

Report on the potential impact of the introduction of innovative Risk Management at farm level

Task 5.c

Deliverable D5.2

The introduction of innovative risk management tools at the farm level has emerged as a critical strategy to enhance agricultural resilience amid increasing climate volatility, market instability, and systemic shocks. This report evaluates the theoretical and practical implications of these tools across the European Union (EU), United States (USA), and Italy, focusing on their capacity to mitigate production, price, and income risks. Drawing on recent policy reforms, empirical studies, and comparative analyses, the findings underscore the transformative potential of integrated risk management frameworks, parametric insurance models, and digital decision-support systems. However, challenges related to adverse selection, moral hazard, and equitable access persist, necessitating nuanced policy design to align farmer incentives with long-term sustainability goals.

1 Risk Management Paradigms in the European Union

The EU's CAP has progressively incorporated risk management instruments since the 2014–2020 programming period, emphasising insurance subsidies, mutual funds, and the Income Stabilisation Tool (IST). The IST, operationalised in Italy's Autonomous Province of Trento, compensates farmers when income falls below 70% of their three-year average, demonstrating a 15–20% reduction in income volatility for apple producers (Capitanio, 2022; Rippo & Cerroni, 2022). Despite its potential, uptake remains limited due to complex eligibility criteria and sparse income-tracking infrastructure outside specialized sectors (Capitanio, 2022).

1.1 Mutual Funds and Solidarity Mechanisms

Member States such as France and Hungary have prioritised mutual funds to address localised risks like adverse weather and disease outbreaks. These funds, supported by EU rural development budgets, pool contributions from participants to cover losses exceeding 30% of average production (Bellini, 2023; Tropea, 2016). In Italy's Emilia-Romagna region, winegrowers utilizing mutual funds reported a 25% improvement in

liquidity management during drought events (Capitanio, 2022). However, participation rates hover below 10% nationally, attributed to low trust in collective mechanisms and fragmentation among smallholders (Giampietri et al., 2020).

1.2 Digital Integration and Climate Adaptation

The EU's Farm Sustainability Tool (FaST) leverages satellite data and machine learning to provide real-time risk assessments, enabling farmers to adjust irrigation and planting schedules dynamically. Pilot programs in Spain and Germany have reduced yield variability by 12–18% for cereal crops (FAO, 2019; Lee, 2025). Nevertheless, adoption barriers persist among aging farmer populations, with 40% citing insufficient digital literacy as a primary constraint (Giampietri et al., 2020).

2 The U.S. Federal Crop Insurance Program (FCIP): Subsidies and Behavioral Incentives

2.1 Structural Dynamics of Premium Subsidies

The FCIP, administered by the USDA Risk Management Agency, subsidizes 60–65% of premiums, costing $11.6 billion annually (Motamed et al., 2018). Empirical analyses reveal that a 10% increase in premium subsidies raises insured acreage by 0.43%, with elasticity effects strongest for cotton and corn in high-risk states like Texas and Kansas (Bullock & Steinbach, 2023; Yu et al., 2018). This subsidy structure, however, distorts planting decisions, incentivizing monocultures on marginal lands and exacerbating soil degradation (Glauber et al., 2021).

2.2 Innovations in Parametric Insurance

Index-based insurance products, which trigger payouts based on predefined metrics (e.g., rainfall deficits), now cover 8% of U.S. cropland. In California's Central Valley, almond growers using parametric policies reduced revenue volatility by 22% compared to traditional yield-based plans (Bullock & Steinbach, 2023; Lieder & Schröter-Schlaack, 2021). Yet, basis risk—mismatches between index measurements and actual losses—remains a persistent challenge, affecting 30% of claimants in 2022 (Lieder & Schröter-Schlaack, 2021).

2.3 Policy Reforms and Equity Considerations

Proposed reforms to cap premium-to-liability ratios at 4.0% aim to alleviate financial burdens on high-coverage farmers, potentially saving $1.40 per acre for 85% coverage policies (Bullock & Steinbach, 2023). While this enhances affordability, critics argue it disproportionately benefits large-scale producers, who account for 70% of subsidized premiums (Glauber et al., 2021; Motamed et al., 2018).

3 Italy's Hybrid Approach: Blending National and Regional Solutions

3.1 The AgriCat National Mutual Fund

Italy's 2023–2027 CAP Strategic Plan introduced SRF.04, a €500 million national fund (AgriCat) to address catastrophic risks like wildfires and floods. Managed regionally, AgriCat complements existing EU-supported insurance schemes, covering losses exceeding 50% of production value (Bellini, 2023; Capitanio, 2022). Early data from Sicily indicate a 40% reduction in post-disaster debt accrual among olive growers (Capitanio, 2022).

3.2 Trentino-Alto Adige's IST Pilot

As the EU's sole operational IST implementation, Trentino's apple sector fund has enrolled 45% of local farmers, stabilising incomes through payouts triggered at 20% income drops (Rippo & Cerroni, 2022). Participating farms demonstrated a 12% higher investment rate in precision irrigation technologies compared to non-participants, highlighting the tool's role in fostering adaptive capacity (Rippo & Cerroni, 2022).

3.3 Challenges in Fragmented Landscapes

Despite these advances, Italy's agricultural sector remains bifurcated: 78% of IST beneficiaries are medium-to-large farms (>10 hectares), while smallholders (<5 hectares) rely on ad hoc disaster aid (Bellini, 2023; Giampietri et al., 2020). Regional disparities in administrative capacity further hinder tool accessibility, with southern regions lagging in claims processing efficiency by 30–45 days (Capitanio, 2022).

4 Comparative Analysis: Policy Design and Farmer Behavior

4.1 Subsidy Structures and Risk-Taking

The EU's emphasis on collective instruments (e.g., mutual funds) contrasts with the U.S. model of individual premium subsidies. While the former promotes solidarity, it struggles with free-rider problems; the latter exacerbates moral hazard, with insured U.S. farmers adopting riskier practices, increasing average loss ratios by 8% since 2015 (Glauber et al., 2021; Motamed et al., 2018). Italy's hybrid approach balances these extremes but faces coordination costs between national and regional entities (Bellini, 2023).

4.2 Digital Tool Adoption Trajectories

Precision agriculture adoption rates vary significantly: 65% of U.S. farms use predictive analytics for risk mitigation, versus 35% in the EU and 25% in Italy (Lee, 2025)[12]. This gap reflects differing policy supports—the U.S. offers tax incentives for technology investments, while EU programs prioritize training over hardware subsidies (FAO, 2019).

5 Implementation Challenges and Equity Considerations

5.1 Data Infrastructure Gaps

Effective tool deployment requires robust data on yields, prices, and climate variables. Italy's IST struggles with inconsistent income reporting, while 40% of U.S. parametric insurance policies rely on outdated rainfall indices (Lieder & Schröter-Schlaack, 2021; Rippo & Cerroni, 2022). The EU's FaST initiative aims to standardize data collection, but interoperability issues persist among national systems (Lee, 2025).

5.2 Adverse Selection and Moral Hazard

In both the EU and U.S., subsidized insurance attracts higher-risk producers, raising program costs by 15–20% (Bullock & Steinbach, 2023; Glauber et al., 2021). Italy's AgriCat mitigates this through mandatory regional participation thresholds, though enforcement remains uneven (Bellini, 2023).

6 Conclusion and Policy Recommendations

Innovative risk management tools demonstrate significant potential to stabilize farm incomes and enhance climate resilience. However, their efficacy hinges on addressing

structural inequities, improving data infrastructure, and balancing collective solidarity with individualized incentives. Policymakers should:

1. Integrate Digital Tools with Traditional Mechanisms: Combine parametric insurance with blockchain-based yield tracking to reduce basis risk(FAO, 2019; Lieder & Schröter-Schlaack, 2021).
2. Target Subsidies to Vulnerable Populations: Redirect CAP and FCIP funds to smallholders via means-tested premium supports (Giampietri et al., 2020; Glauber et al., 2021).
3. Strengthen Cross-Border Collaboration: Harmonize EU and U.S. data standards to facilitate multinational risk pools, particularly for transboundary pests and diseases(Capitanio, 2022; Tropea, 2016).

Future research must quantify long-term behavioral impacts, particularly how tool adoption influences sustainable practice uptake and intergenerational farm viability.

Reference

Bellini, M. S. (2023). Risk management policy in Italy. *Agricultural Insurance in the Current Climate Context: Situation and Prospect*, *October*.

Bullock, D., & Steinbach, S. (2023). Economic consequences of capping premiums in crop insurance. *Farmdoc Daily*, *13*(102).

Capitanio, F. (2022). Risk, uncertainty, crises management and public intervention in agriculture. *Rivista Di Economia Agraria*, *77*(2), 3–14. https://doi.org/10.36253/rea-13774

FAO. (2019). *Agricultural risk management tools*.

Giampietri, E., Yu, X., & Trestini, S. (2020). The role of trust and perceived barriers on farmer's intention to adopt risk management tools. *Bio-Based and Applied Economics*.

Glauber, J., Baldwin, K., Antón, J., & Ziebinska, U. (2021). Design Principles for Agricultural Risk Management Policies. *OECD Food, Agriculture and Fisheries Papers*, *157*(May).

Lee, S. (2025). *A Closer Look at Farm Risk Analysis Innovations*. Www.Numberanalytics.Com. https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/innovative-farm-risk-analysis

Lieder, S., & Schröter-Schlaack, C. (2021). Smart farming technologies in arable farming: Towards a holistic assessment of opportunities and risks. *Sustainability*, *13*(12), 6783.

Motamed, M., Hungerford, A., Rosch, S., O'Donoghue, E., MacLachlan, M., Astill, G., & Cessna, J. (2018). *Federal risk management tools for agricultural producers: An overview*.

Rippo, R., & Cerroni, S. (2022). Farmers' participation in the Income Stabilisation Tool: Evidence from the apple sector in Italy. *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, *August*. https://doi.org/10.1111/1477-9552.12508

Tropea, F. (2016). *Briefing New income stabilisation tools and price volatility in agricultural markets*. *October*. http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2016/593484/EPRS_BRI(2016)593484_EN.pdf

Yu, J., Smith, A., & Sumner, D. A. (2018). Effects of crop insurance premium subsidies on crop acreage. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, *100*(1), 91–114. https://doi.org/10.1093/ajae/aax058