Future Earth
A Student Journal on Sustainability and Environment

PERSPECTIVES ON THE ECONOMICS OF CLIMATE CHANGE

Online ISSN: 2819-7046 SPECIAL ISSUE: ECONOMICS OF CLIMATE CHANGE 2026

COMMENTARY

Insuring the Future: Catastrophe Bonds

TINOMUDA RENEE NHERUDZO
THOMPSON RIVERS UNIVERSITY

Climate change is exposing the limits of insurance markets. Premiums are rising, insurers are withdrawing from regions, and actuarial models built on historical stability are struggling to account for non-stationary climate extremes. Reinsurance costs, the backbone of insurer solvency, have surged, increasing price pressure on consumers and leaving many households unable to afford coverage (Collier et al., 2021; Moore, 2024; Al-Nimri, 2025). As climate disasters intensify, insurance is shifting from a widely accessible risk tool into a costly product that excludes vulnerable populations. The result is a widening protection gap and an urgent need for alternative financing. I argue that catastrophe (CAT) bonds, not traditional insurance, must become a central mechanism for managing climate-related risk.

Given these market pressures, traditional insurance alone cannot remain the primary solution. CAT bonds offer a new financial architecture capable of absorbing risk at a scale that the insurance sector no longer can. CAT bonds transfer climate risk (hurricanes, floods, wildfires) from insurers or governments to global capital markets. Investors receive interest payments but if a trigger event occurs, the bond principal is released immediately to fund recovery. This mechanism bypasses liquidity constraints that often delay payouts when insurers

https://doi.org/10.29173/bcelnfe769

face overwhelming claims. Evidence shows that CAT bonds increase underwriting capacity, stabilise balance sheets, and can lower sovereign borrowing costs after disasters (Huang et al., 2021; Maran, 2024). In a warming world, this speed and scale of funding are essential.

CAT bonds also distribute climate risk globally rather than concentrating it where disasters occur. Investors are geographically diversified and not clustered in hazard-prone regions, reducing systemic failure risk. Compared to traditional insurance, which becomes less affordable as events intensify, CAT bonds remain attractive to investors because climate risk is uncorrelated with financial returns, offering diversification value (Cummins, 2008).

Table 1: *Differences Between Traditional Insurance and Catastrophe Bonds Under Climate Stress*

Mechanism	Traditional Insurance	Catastrophe (CAT Bonds)
Risk Distribution	Concentrated among insurers and reinsurers	Spread across global capital markets
Response to Rising Climate Extremes	Premium hikes, market exits, and insolvency risk	Rapid liquidity when triggers occurs
Pricing Trend	Premiums increase and coverage decreases sharply in high-risk regions	Relatively stable, depends on investor appetite
Trigger Type	Claims assessment	Parametric or modelled loss thresholds
System Role	Reimbursement tool	Capital mobilisation instrument

Resilience bonds expand this model further, linking financing to adaptation projects such as flood defences or wildfire breaks (Pagano et al., 2020). This shifts climate finance away from merely compensating for loss toward reducing risk proactively.

However, CAT bonds are no silver bullet. They rely on accurate climate modelling, yet extreme events increasingly exceed historical records, complicating pricing and trigger design. Parametric triggers can misfire, either paying out when damages are minimal or failing to release funds when losses are severe. The market also currently advantages developed nations

with advanced regulatory data systems. Without support for climate-vulnerable developing countries, CAT bonds could reinforce global climate inequity (Roch et al., 2022).

Despite limitations, the alternative, relying exclusively on traditional insurance, is far more dangerous. Premiums will continue to climb, coverage will contract, and governments will face mounting post-disaster debt. CAT bonds, supported by public climate data and equitable market access, offer one of the few scalable pathways to climate resilience. They mobilise capital quickly, distribute risk broadly, and fund adaptation instead of only compensating damage. As climate volatility accelerates, financial tools must adapt accordingly.

The threat ahead is not uncertainty; it is the risk of meeting 21st-century disasters with 20th-century insurance models. Catastrophe bonds provide a future-ready foundation for climate risk finance.

Acknowledgment

The author contributed to the concept, analysis, writing, and editing of this commentary and takes full responsibility for its accuracy and integrity. ChatGPT was used to assist with structure, clarity, and formatting. Consensus AI supported the literature review. All interpretations and conclusions are solely the author's, and any errors or omissions remain the author's responsibility.

The author also thanks Professor Tsigaris for his guidance and feedback; all remaining errors are the author's own.

References

Al-Nimri, A. (2025). The impact of climate change on the U.S. insurance industry and means of prevention. *International Journal of Environment and Climate Change, 15*, 4692. https://doi.org/10.9734/ijecc/2025/v15i14692

Collier, S., Elliott, R., & Lehtonen, T. (2021). Climate change and insurance. *Economy and Society. 50*(2), 158–172. https://doi.org/10.1080/03085147.2021.1903771

Cummins, J. D. (2008). CAT bonds and other risk-linked securities: State of the market and recent developments. *Risk Management and Insurance Review, 11*(1), 23–47. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6296.2008.00127.x

Huang, S., Zhang, J., & Zhu, W. (2021). Storm CAT bond: modelling and valuation. *North American Actuarial Journal, 28*(4), 718–743. https://doi.org/10.1080/10920277.2023.2226734

Maran, R. (2024). Do investors reward sovereign catastrophe bond issuance? Evidence from disaster-prone countries. *Review of World Economics*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10290-024-00557-1

Melser, D., Le, T., & Ruthbah, U. (2024). Climate change and its impact on home insurance uptake in Australia. *Ecological Economics*, 108195. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2024.108195

Moore, F. (2024). Learning, catastrophic risk and ambiguity in the climate change era. *NBER Working Paper No. 32684*. https://doi.org/10.3386/w32684

Pagano, A., Romagnoli, F., & Vannucci, E. (2020). Quantitative and financial aspects of resilience bonds in recursive insurance contracts. Environmental and Climate Technologies, 24, 387–402. https://doi.org/10.2478/rtuect-2020-0111

Polacek, A. (2018). Catastrophe bonds: A primer and retrospective. Chicago Fed Letter, (405). https://www.chicagofed.org/publications/chicago-fed-letter/2018/405

Roch, F., Ando, S., Wiriadinata, & U., Fu, C. (2022). Sovereign climate debt instruments. *IMF Staff Climate Notes.* https://doi.org/10.5089/9798400210006.066

Author

Tinomuda Renee Nherudzo is a third-year undergraduate student in the Natural Resource Science program at Thompson Rivers University, with a strong interest in wildlife biology and conservation. Her academic interests focus on understanding animal ecology, wildlife management, and the relationships between wildlife populations and their environments. She is particularly interested in studying how environmental change, habitat loss, and human activity affect wildlife behaviour, population dynamics, and ecosystem balance. Through her studies, she has developed a passion for protecting biodiversity and

promoting science-based approaches to wildlife conservation. Looking ahead, she aspires to pursue a career in wildlife biology, where she hopes to contribute to the research, management, and conservation of wildlife species and their habitats, helping to ensure healthy ecosystems for future generations.