Iran. J. Insur. Res., **(*): *-*, ****** ***

Iranian Journal of Insurance Research
(IJIR)
Homepage: https://ijir.irc.ac.ir/?lang=fa

Fiscal Tempest: Climate Risk in Insurance Valuation – Stakeholder Perceptions in Emerging Markets

Keramatollah Heydari Rostami [1*], Yasaman Khalili[2]

[1] *Assistant professor, Management Department, Faculty of Administrative Sciences and Economics, Arak University, Arak, Iran.*

[2] *Assistant Professor, Department of Accounting, Faculty of Management, Economics and Accounting, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran.*

ARTICLE INFO

KEYWORDS:
Climate change
Emerging markets
Insurance valuation
Parametric Insurance
Stakeholder perceptions

ABSTRACT

BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES: Climate change poses profound risks to emerging markets, where socioeconomic vulnerabilities and limited adaptive capacity amplify financial instability. The insurance industry, a cornerstone of financial resilience, faces increasing pressure to integrate climate-related risks into valuation frameworks. However, data scarcity, regional heterogeneity, and stakeholder ambiguity remain significant barriers. This study introduces a pioneering transdisciplinary framework to integrate climate change risks into insurance valuation models, focusing on stakeholder perceptions and adaptive strategies in Iran—an emerging market characterized by diverse climatic zones (arid, semi-arid, and Mediterranean), water scarcity, and a developing insurance sector. The framework synthesizes environmental economics, risk management, and accounting to quantify climate impacts for actuarial and financial practices. Three core hypotheses are tested:(H1) Localized climate risk models significantly enhance insurance valuation accuracy and premium pricing;(H2) Stakeholder perceptions significantly influence the adoption and effectiveness of climate-responsive insurance products;(H3) Green accounting practices significantly enhance insurers' financial resilience by improving risk management and stakeholder trust.

METHODS: The study employs a sequential explanatory mixed-methods design, combining quantitative and qualitative phases. A semi-quantitative questionnaire was administered to 310 stakeholders across three strategically selected regions: Tehran (urban-industrial), Khuzestan (agriculture-oil), and Sistan and Baluchestan (arid-vulnerable). The sample included insurance professionals (29.0%), policymakers (22.6%), sectoral stakeholders (35.5%), and academic/NGO experts (12.9%), selected via stratified purposive sampling (Cochran's formula; 95% confidence, 5% margin of error; 80% response rate). The questionnaire captured climate risk awareness, perceived likelihood and severity (5- and 7-point Likert scales), adaptation preferences (ranking), and expectations for climate-responsive insurance products. Qualitative data were collected through 30 semi-structured interviews and three participatory workshops (15–20 participants each). Advanced computational modeling included autoregressive neural networks (ANN) with Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) units—trained on historical data (2000–2025; 70-20-10 split)—to forecast valuation outcomes under RCP4.5 and RCP8.5 scenarios.

Fuzzy cognitive maps (FCM) were developed in workshops to model causal relationships among climate risks, adaptation strategies, financial impacts, and social factors. Multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA) using the Analytic Hierarchy Process ranked adaptation strategies. Quantitative analyses comprised descriptive statistics, exploratory factor analysis (EFA; varimax rotation, KMO=0.82), confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), structural equation modeling (SEM; maximum likelihood), and hierarchical regression. Qualitative data were thematically analyzed using NVivo.

FINDINGS: Descriptive results showed high awareness of droughts (mean=4.35/5, 75.2% high) and floods (mean=4.12/5, 68.4% high), particularly in Sistan and Baluchestan (drought mean=4.65) and Tehran (flood mean=4.20). Perceived likelihood and impact were highest for droughts (likelihood mean=6.20/7, impact mean=6.45/7). Parametric insurance ranked as the most preferred adaptation strategy (mean rank=1.85/5, 64.5% top rank), followed by infrastructure upgrades (2.10) and green accounting (2.45). EFA extracted four factors explaining 72.6% of variance: Climate Risk Awareness (34.2%), Adaptation Strategy Preferences (24.1%), Financial Integration (14.3%), and Stakeholder Engagement (10.0%). CFA confirmed model fit (χ^2=128.45, df=84, p=0.002, CFI=0.94, RMSEA=0.05, Cronbach's $\alpha \geq 0.85$). SEM results supported all hypotheses: H1 (localized climate risk models → valuation accuracy; β=0.65, p<0.001), H2 (stakeholder perceptions → product adoption; β=0.60, p<0.001), and H3 (green accounting → financial resilience; β=0.58, p<0.001). An exploratory path (stakeholder engagement → product adoption; β=0.45, p<0.001) was also significant. Hierarchical regression showed incremental R^2 changes of 25% (localized models), 12% (stakeholder perceptions), and 8% (green accounting), with total R^2=0.45 ($F(3,306)$=83.45, p<0.001). MCDA confirmed parametric insurance as the top priority (weight=0.45), excelling in feasibility and risk reduction. The hybrid ANN-FCM framework successfully captured non-linear interactions and stakeholder ambiguities, offering robust projections for premium pricing, reserve allocation, and loss ratios under climate scenarios.

CONCLUSION: This study presents a validated, transdisciplinary framework integrating localized climate risk models, stakeholder perceptions, and green accounting to enhance insurance valuation and financial resilience in emerging markets. Parametric insurance—particularly for droughts and floods—emerged as the most viable adaptation tool for data-scarce regions. Policy recommendations include: (1) developing and piloting parametric insurance products using satellite-derived triggers (e.g., soil moisture indices), with initial pilots in Khuzestan and Sistan and Baluchestan; (2) adopting green accounting frameworks aligned with TCFD, supported by actuary training and voluntary CII guidelines; (3) enhancing stakeholder engagement through participatory workshops and a national climate risk dashboard; and (4) fostering InsurTech collaboration for real-time data integration and machine learning-based pricing. Limitations include reliance on simulated extensions due to the absence of disaggregated climate–insurance microdata (addressed via scenario-based stress testing), potential response bias (mitigated by triangulation), and regional focus. Future research should test the framework in other emerging markets (e.g., Sub-Saharan Africa), incorporate additional hazards (sea-level rise), explore blockchain for claims processing, and conduct longitudinal perception studies. Despite these constraints, high reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha \geq 0.85$) and robust model fit (CFI=0.93, RMSEA=0.05) underscore the framework's validity. This study bridges critical gaps by combining advanced simulation modeling with stakeholder-driven insights, offering actionable strategies for insurers, regulators, and policymakers to navigate the fiscal tempest of climate change in vulnerable regions.

Introduction

Climate change threatens global economies, ecosystems, and societal stability, with emerging markets like Iran facing heightened risks due to socioeconomic vulnerabilities and limited adaptive capacity. The insurance industry, crucial for financial resilience, requires innovative approaches to integrate climate risks into valuation models. This study introduces a pioneering, questionnaire-driven framework to capture stakeholder perceptions and adaptive strategies in Iran, synthesizing biophysical, financial, and social data through advanced modeling to address climate-related financial challenges.

Recent research underscores the need for climate risk integration. Laborda *et al.* (2025) merge biophysical and economic data to forecast sectoral vulnerabilities, emphasizing resilience. Dumitraşcu *et al.* (2025) and Falcescu *et al.* (2024) identify agriculture, water, and public health as vulnerable in Romania, noting awareness gaps among younger and lower-income groups, highlighting the need for tailored climate services. This study adopts a participatory approach to address these gaps. The insurance sector's role in adaptation is vital. Ferdous *et al.* (2024) and Ding *et al.* (2024) show firms with high climate risk adopt conservative accounting, especially in well-governed regions. Ahmad *et al.* (2023), Lee *et al.* (2022), and Edeki *et al.* (2023) advocate dynamic valuation and deposit insurance models to mitigate risks, informing the need for flexible financial tools.

Stakeholder perceptions are critical for adaptation. Ghirardelli and Tarolli (2025), Vijhani *et al.* (2023), and Cholakova and Dogramadjieva (2023) emphasize participatory frameworks and diverse perceptions in mountain and ski communities. Region-specific concerns, like drought in Zimbabwe (Mushawemhuka *et al.* 2022) and coral bleaching in Japan (Abe *et al.* 2022), underscore localized strategies, incorporated in this study. Advanced modeling captures climate risk complexity. Ignjacevic *et al.* (2020) and Contento *et al.* (2019) stress localized and multi-hazard models, while de Jong and Kok (2021) use fuzzy cognitive maps to address stakeholder ambiguities. This study combines autoregressive neural networks and stakeholder data for robust risk assessment. Management accounting and valuation enhance risk management. Bui and de Villiers (2017), Kumarasiri and Gunasekarage (2017), Barigou *et al.* (2019), and Chen *et al.* (2021) advocate accounting and dynamic valuation frameworks to mitigate climate risks. Stakeholder engagement challenges (Fine *et al.* 2025) highlight the need for cooperation and education, addressed here through a transdisciplinary approach.

A fundamental challenge in integrating climate change into insurance valuation in emerging markets is the absence of long, disaggregated, and publicly accessible climate–insurance datasets. As a result, forward-looking risk assessment increasingly relies on simulation-based and scenario-driven modeling frameworks rather than purely observational data. This study explicitly adopts such an approach to address real-world data constraints while preserving analytical rigor.

This research pioneers a methodology integrating stakeholder perceptions with climate risk modeling via semi-quantitative questionnaires, autoregressive neural networks, and fuzzy cognitive maps, offering a replicable model for emerging markets to enhance insurance resilience. The article is structured as follows: Section 2 reviews theoretical foundations, Section 3 details methodology, Section 4 presents statistical results, and Section 5 offers conclusions and policy recommendations.

Theoretical Framework

Climate change poses significant challenges to the financial stability of the insurance sector by disrupting natural resources, infrastructure, and socio-economic dynamics, necessitating accurate risk assessment and valuation. This framework integrates climate risks into insurance valuation models, addressing physical and regulatory uncertainties as well as stakeholder perceptions in emerging markets. By synthesizing insights from environmental economics, risk management, and accounting, it aims to quantify climate impacts for improved actuarial and financial practices (Hultgren *et al.* 2025; Laborda *et al*. 2025).

Localized risk models are essential for precise insurance pricing. Ignjacevic *et al.* (2020) demonstrate that models like CLIMRISK-RIVER, which incorporate local precipitation data, enhance flood damage projections. Similarly, Laborda *et al.* (2025) employ autoregressive neural networks to integrate biophysical and financial data, forecasting sectoral vulnerabilities under RCP4.5 scenarios and emphasizing the value of climate projections combined with financial stress tests. These approaches highlight the need to incorporate region-specific data to improve premium pricing and reserve allocation in climatically diverse areas like Iran.

Stakeholder perceptions play a pivotal role in shaping adaptation strategies. Hasibuan *et al.* (2020) show that farmers' risk perceptions require tailored insurance services to boost adaptive capacity. Vijhani *et al.* (2023) and Dumitraşcu *et al.* (2025) emphasize disproportionate impacts on marginalized groups, calling for inclusive strategies, while Cholakova and Dogramadjieva (2023) note divergent views in vulnerable sectors, advocating for balanced approaches that incorporate stakeholder feedback to ensure local relevance.

Accounting practices are evolving to address climate risks. Ding *et al.* (2024) and Ferdous *et al.* (2024) find that firms exposed to high climate risk adopt conservative accounting, enhancing transparency. Rakhmawati (2025) demonstrates that green accounting improves financial performance and sustainability by quantifying environmental costs, and Saeed and Nagriwum (2026) highlight eco-digitalization's role in efficient risk assessment.

Dynamic valuation models are critical for managing climate uncertainties. Barigou *et al.* (2019) and Chen et *al.* (2021) propose frameworks merging actuarial and market-consistent approaches for time-consistent valuations. Extensions of the Black-Scholes model (Edeki *et al.* 2023; Yang *et al.* 2025) and InsurTech innovations incorporating machine learning and real-time data (Mupa *et al.,* 2025; Quan *et al.* 2024) further improve risk classification. Comprehensive multi-hazard models (Contento *et al.* 2019) and participatory approaches (de Jong & Kok, 2021; Gonçalves *et al.,* 2021) underscore the value of combining scientific data with stakeholder insights.

This framework integrates localized risk models, stakeholder perceptions, green accounting, and advanced technologies to provide a scalable, data-informed solution for emerging markets, enhancing insurance resilience and stakeholder trust.

Hypotheses Development

Integrating climate change risks into insurance valuation models is crucial for addressing spatial and temporal heterogeneity in emerging markets. Ignjacevic *et al.* (2020) highlight localized flood risk models like CLIMRISK-RIVER, using precipitation for accurate economic impact assessments. Laborda *et al.* (2025) employ autoregressive neural networks to integrate biophysical and financial data, forecasting sectoral vulnerabilities under RCP4.5, emphasizing dynamic models for physical and financial risks. Hultgren *et al.* (2025) note adaptation mitigates agricultural losses, but residual risks require precise quantification. Localized models enable tailored premiums and reserves, enhancing financial stability. Barigou *et al.* (2019)

and Chen *et al.* (2021) advocate dynamic valuation frameworks combining actuarial and market-consistent approaches. Quan *et al.* (2024) emphasize InsurTech's role in integrating real-time data, improving accuracy in data-scarce regions.

Hypothesis 1: Localized climate risk models significantly enhance insurance valuation accuracy and premium pricing in emerging markets.

Stakeholder perceptions critically influence climate-responsive insurance product adoption. Hasibuan *et al.* (2020) show farmers' complex risk perceptions drive adaptive behaviors, necessitating tailored products. Vijhani *et al.* (2023) and Dumitraşcu *et al.* (2025) highlight disproportionate impacts on marginalized groups, requiring inclusive design. Cholakova and Dogramadjieva (2023) note divergent adaptation views in the ski industry, suggesting insurers balance priorities for acceptance. Osaka and Bellamy (2020) indicate perception biases complicate adoption, while Steeves and Filgueira (2019) advocate knowledge brokers to enhance uptake. Gonçalves *et al.* (2021) emphasize stakeholder feedback for relevance, and Saeed and Nagriwum (2026) highlight eco-digitalization for transparent engagement, underscoring participatory approaches.

Hypothesis 2: Stakeholder perceptions significantly influence the adoption and effectiveness of climate-responsive insurance products in emerging markets.

Green accounting enhances insurers' financial resilience. Rakhmawati (2025) demonstrates improved performance through cost efficiency and reputation. Ding *et al.* (2024) and Ferdous *et al.* (2024) find high climate risk drives conservative accounting, enhancing transparency in well-governed regions. Saeed and Nagriwum (2026) note eco-digitalization strengthens carbon performance, improving efficiency. Green accounting quantifies environmental costs, aiding risk management. Bui and de Villiers (2017) and Kumarasiri and Gunasekarage (2017) highlight proactive strategies and regulatory pressures, while White *et al.* (2024) support compliance with climate regimes, bolstering resilience in emerging markets.

Hypothesis 3: Green accounting practices significantly enhance insurers' financial resilience in emerging markets by improving risk management and stakeholder trust.

Research Background

Research on integrating climate change risks into insurance valuation models highlights key insights. Laborda *et al.* (2025) used autoregressive neural networks to forecast climate impacts, integrating biophysical and financial data for robust risk assessments. Hultgren *et al.* (2025) noted significant agricultural declines, with adaptation reducing but not eliminating risks. Rakhmawati (2025) showed green accounting enhances financial performance and sustainability. Saeed and Nagriwum (2026) emphasized eco-digitalization for environmental transparency in emerging markets. Mupa *et al.* (2025) and Quan *et al.* (2024) highlighted InsurTech and machine learning for improved risk classification using real-time data. Ding *et al.* (2024) and Ferdous *et al.* (2024) linked climate risk to accounting conservatism, boosting transparency. Vijhani *et al.* (2023) found marginalized groups in Himalayan communities need inclusive adaptation strategies. Cholakova and Dogramadjieva (2023) noted divergent stakeholder views in Bulgaria's ski industry, advocating balanced approaches. Edeki *et al.* (2023) extended the Black-Scholes model for deposit insurance pricing. Chen *et al.* (2021) and Barigou *et al.* (2019) proposed dynamic valuation frameworks. Gonçalves *et al.* (2021) and de Jong and Kok (2021) emphasized participatory adaptation. Ignjacevic *et al.* (2020) and

Contento *et al.* (2019) underscored localized and comprehensive risk models for precise valuation. Hasibuan *et al.* (2020) highlighted tailored insurance needs based on farmers' risk perceptions.

Research Methodology

Given structural data limitations in emerging insurance markets, this study adopts a hybrid empirical–simulation methodology. Aggregated historical climate and insurance indicators are combined with stakeholder survey data and scenario-based projections to generate simulated valuation outcomes. Rather than aiming for exact historical replication, the framework is designed to stress-test insurance valuation under plausible climate trajectories (RCP4.5 and RCP8.5).

This study employs a pioneering, transdisciplinary, mixed-methods approach to integrate climate change risk accounting into insurance valuation models, focusing on stakeholder perceptions and adaptive strategies in Iran, an emerging market with diverse climatic and socioeconomic challenges. Tailored to Iran's arid, semi-arid, and Mediterranean climates, water scarcity, and developing insurance market, the methodology leverages a semi-quantitative questionnaire, advanced computational modeling, and participatory techniques to address climate risk complexity. Targeting Tehran (urban-industrial), Khuzestan (agriculture-oil), and Sistan and Baluchestan (arid-vulnerable), it ensures diverse representation for generalizable findings, using tools like autoregressive neural networks, fuzzy cognitive maps, and multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA) to enhance valuation frameworks.

A sequential explanatory mixed-methods design integrates quantitative and qualitative phases. The quantitative phase uses a semi-quantitative questionnaire to collect data on stakeholder perceptions of climate risks, adaptation priorities, and financial implications for insurance valuation. The qualitative phase includes interviews and participatory workshops to validate findings and capture local knowledge. Data synthesis employs advanced modeling to develop a robust, stakeholder-informed climate risk valuation model, bridging biophysical, financial, and social dimensions for a scalable framework.

The target population includes insurance professionals (actuaries, underwriters), policymakers (from Iran's Central Insurance Agency, Ministry of Environment), sectoral stakeholders (farmers, business owners in agriculture, water, public health), and academic/NGO experts. A stratified purposive sampling ensures representation across regions and groups. Using Cochran's formula (95% confidence, 5% margin of error), a sample of 310 respondents is targeted, with 388 questionnaires distributed to account for an 80% response rate. Qualitative components involve 30 interviews and three workshops (15–20 participants each) with key informants.

The questionnaire captures stakeholder demographics, climate risk awareness (e.g., floods, droughts) via a 5-point Likert scale, perceived likelihood and severity using a 7-point Likert scale and open-ended questions, adaptation preferences (e.g., parametric insurance, green accounting) through ranking, and expectations for climate-responsive insurance products. Pre-tested with 20 participants for clarity and reliability (Cronbach's alpha ≥ 0.8), it is translated into Persian, validated by experts, and administered digitally and in-person for accessibility.

Qualitative data collection includes semi-structured interviews (30–45 minutes) exploring climate risks, adaptation barriers, and valuation challenges, and workshops using facilitated discussions and scenario analysis to co-design strategies and validate findings. Both methods ensure diverse stakeholder representation across regions and sectors.

Quantitative analysis summarizes demographics, risk awareness, and preferences using descriptive statistics. Exploratory factor analysis (varimax rotation) identifies risk perception and adaptation dimensions (KMO ≥ 0.7, Bartlett's test $p < 0.05$). Structural equation modeling tests hypothesized relationships, using maximum likelihood estimation and fit indices (CFI ≥ 0.9, RMSEA ≤ 0.08). MCDA, via the Analytic Hierarchy Process, ranks adaptation strategies based on cost, feasibility, and risk reduction.

Qualitative data are analyzed using thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) with NVivo, coding transcripts to identify themes (e.g., adaptation barriers) and triangulate with quantitative results. Fuzzy cognitive maps model stakeholder perceptions of risk interactions, capturing ambiguity via workshop-defined nodes and weighted edges.

Autoregressive neural networks forecast climate risk impacts, integrating biophysical (e.g., precipitation), financial (e.g., premiums), and stakeholder data. Trained on Iran's historical data (2000–2025) with a 70-20-10 split, they are optimized using backpropagation and mean squared error, predicting under RCP4.5 and RCP8.5 scenarios. A hybrid model combining fuzzy cognitive maps and neural networks captures ambiguity and quantitative projections, validated through sensitivity analysis and stress testing.

This section provides a more detailed description of the datasets used for the **autoregressive neural networks (ANN)** and **fuzzy cognitive maps (FCM)**, including biophysical (climate), financial (insurance-related), and stakeholder-derived variables. All models were trained on historical data spanning 2000–2025, with projections under RCP4.5 and RCP8.5 scenarios.

Data Sources and Variables for Autoregressive Neural Networks (ANN)

The study does not rely on a single fully observed micro-level dataset. Instead, it integrates aggregated observed indicators, proxy variables, and scenario-based extensions generated through modeling. This layered structure reflects the proprietary and fragmented nature of insurance data in emerging markets and aligns with standard climate stress-testing practices.

The ANN integrates biophysical, financial, and stakeholder data to forecast climate risk impacts on insurance valuation (e.g., premiums, reserves, and losses). Data were split 70-20-10 for training, validation, and testing, with optimization via backpropagation and mean squared error minimization.

- **Biophysical (Climate) Variables**:
    - Primary sources: World Bank Climate Change Knowledge Portal (historical climatology 1991–2020, extended to 2025 via observed data); Climatic Research Unit (CRU) gridded datasets; and Iranian Meteorological Organization station data for regional validation (Tehran, Khuzestan, Sistan and Baluchestan).
    - Key variables: Annual/monthly precipitation (mm), average/maximum/minimum temperature (°C), soil moisture indices, and extreme event frequencies (droughts, floods, heatwaves).
    - Projections: Downscaled CMIP6 models under RCP4.5 (moderate emissions) and RCP8.5 (high emissions) scenarios, incorporating expected declines in precipitation (5–10% regionally) and temperature rises (up to 2–3°C by mid-century).

- **Financial (Insurance) Variables**:
    - Primary sources: Annual reports from the Central Insurance of Iran (CII/Bimeh Markazi); aggregated sector data on gross written premiums, claims payouts, and loss ratios (available publicly via CII statistical yearbooks and Financial Tribune summaries).
    - Key variables: Regional insurance premiums (aggregated by line: e.g., property, agriculture, liability), claims volumes related to weather events (e.g., flood/drought losses), reserves, and payout ratios (historical average ~80–86%).
    - Proxy adjustments: Where granular regional claims data were limited, national aggregates were disaggregated using sectoral weights (e.g., higher agricultural claims in Khuzestan).
- **Stakeholder-Derived Variables**:
    - From the semi-quantitative questionnaire (n=310): Likert-scale scores on perceived risk likelihood/severity, adaptation preferences, and financial implications (e.g., expected premium adjustments).

These variables were normalized and fed into the ANN to predict sectoral vulnerabilities, premium pricing, and reserve needs under climate scenarios.

Data Sources and Variables for Fuzzy Cognitive Maps (FCM)

FCMs model stakeholder perceptions of risk interactions and ambiguities, using weighted directed graphs to capture causal relationships.

- **Primary Inputs**:
    - Workshop-derived nodes and edges: Defined by participants (30 interviews + 3 workshops, 15–20 participants each) across regions. Key nodes included climate risks (e.g., drought severity, flood frequency), adaptation strategies (e.g., parametric insurance uptake), financial impacts (e.g., premium increases, loss ratios), and social factors (e.g., marginalized group vulnerability).
    - Weights: Fuzzy values (-1 to +1) assigned via group consensus, representing causal strength (e.g., high drought perception → stronger preference for green accounting).
- **Integration with Quantitative Data**:
    - Augmented with ANN outputs and questionnaire aggregates (e.g., mean Likert scores for risk awareness) to hybridize qualitative ambiguities with biophysical/financial projections.
    - Validation: Sensitivity analysis compared FCM simulations against historical trends (e.g., increasing drought claims in Sistan and Baluchestan).

Additional Notes on Data Handling

- Regional Focus: Data were stratified by Tehran (urban-industrial), Khuzestan (agriculture-oil), and Sistan and Baluchestan (arid-vulnerable) to capture heterogeneity.
- Limitations and Mitigations: Historical climate data gaps were addressed via gridded reanalysis (e.g., CRU); financial data confidentiality limited granularity, mitigated by public aggregates and proxies.
- Ethical Considerations: All stakeholder data were anonymized; modeling ensured reproducibility with documented sources.

This enhanced transparency strengthens the replicability of the hybrid ANN-FCM framework for climate risk integration in insurance valuation across emerging markets.

Model Specifications and Limitations

To enhance replicability and address the inherent limitations of the modeling approaches, further details on the autoregressive neural network (ANN) and fuzzy cognitive map (FCM) specifications are provided below.

The ANN employed a recurrent architecture based on Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) units, suitable for capturing temporal dependencies in multivariate time series data involving climate and financial variables. The network consisted of two hidden LSTM layers with 64 and 32 units respectively, followed by a dense output layer. Dropout regularization (rate = 0.2) was applied to prevent overfitting, and the model used the ReLU activation function in hidden layers with a linear output for regression tasks (forecasting impacts such as premium adjustments and loss ratios). Training involved the Adam optimizer with a learning rate of 0.001, batch size of 32, and up to 200 epochs with early stopping (patience = 20) based on validation loss. The mean squared error (MSE) served as the loss function. Data normalization (min-max scaling) was applied, and the 70-20-10 split ensured robust evaluation. Sensitivity analysis tested alternative configurations (e.g., GRU units or additional layers), confirming the selected architecture's balance between complexity and performance on the historical dataset (2000–2025).

The ANN component functions as a forward-looking simulation engine. While trained on aggregated historical indicators, it generates simulated trajectories of premiums, loss ratios, and reserve adjustments under alternative climate scenarios. These projections are intended for stress-testing and sensitivity analysis rather than exact replication of realized historical outcomes.

For the FCM component, nodes (typically 15–25 per map, e.g., drought severity, flood frequency, premium increases, stakeholder trust, and adaptation preferences) were defined collaboratively in workshops. Causal edges were weighted on a fuzzy scale from -1 (strong negative influence) to +1 (strong positive influence), with 0 indicating no relationship, based on group consensus. Aggregation of individual stakeholder maps into collective regional FCMs used simple matrix addition, normalized to preserve the [-1, +1] range. Inference employed the cosine transfer function for iteration until convergence (maximum 100 iterations or stability threshold of 0.001 change). The hybrid integration augmented FCM weights with ANN-derived quantitative projections (e.g., scaling edges by forecasted risk magnitudes) to bridge qualitative ambiguities and numerical forecasts.

These specifications reflect standard practices for handling non-stationary, multivariate data in climate-financial forecasting while accommodating limited historical records in emerging markets. Limitations include potential overfitting in the ANN due to data scarcity (mitigated by regularization and cross-validation), sensitivity of FCM outcomes to participant framing in workshops, and assumptions of stationarity in transfer functions that may not fully capture extreme non-linearities under high-emission scenarios like RCP8.5. Future extensions could incorporate more advanced architectures (e.g., Transformers) or ensemble methods for improved robustness.

Statistical Results

The results presented in this section should be interpreted within the context of a simulation-enhanced analytical framework. Reported coefficients, paths, and rankings reflect internally consistent relationships within the modeled system rather than direct estimates from a single fully observed dataset. This perspective is appropriate for exploratory climate risk stress-testing under deep uncertainty.

This section presents a comprehensive statistical analysis of a stakeholder survey in Iran examining perceptions and adaptive strategies for integrating climate change risks into insurance valuation models. Employing a transdisciplinary mixed-methods approach, it combines semi-quantitative questionnaire data with advanced techniques like autoregressive neural networks, fuzzy cognitive maps, and multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA). The analysis divides into descriptive statistics—detailing demographics, risk perceptions, and adaptation preferences—and inferential statistics testing relationships among localized climate models, stakeholder perceptions, green accounting, and valuation outcomes. Targeting 388 stakeholders across Tehran (urban-industrial), Khuzestan (agriculture-oil), and Sistan and Baluchestan (arid-vulnerable), it achieved 310 responses (80% rate). Using Likert scales, rankings, and open-ended questions, methods include EFA, CFA, SEM, hierarchical regression, and MCDA for rigor.

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics provide a detailed overview of the sample characteristics, climate risk perceptions, adaptation preferences, and expectations for insurance products, laying the foundation for understanding stakeholder heterogeneity in Iran's emerging market.

Table 1: Sample Demographics by Region and Stakeholder Characteristics

Variable	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)	Tehran (n/%)	Khuzestan (n/%)	Sistan & Baluchestan (n/%)
Stakeholder Group	Insurance Professionals	90	29.0	40/33.3	30/27.3	20/25.0
	Policymakers/Regulators	70	22.6	30/25.0	25/22.7	15/18.8
	Sectoral Stakeholders	110	35.5	35/29.2	45/40.9	30/37.5
	Academic/NGO Experts	40	12.9	15/12.5	10/9.1	15/18.8
Gender	Male	190	61.3	75/62.5	65/59.1	50/62.5
	Female	120	38.7	45/37.5	45/40.9	30/37.5
Age Group	18–30	80	25.8	35/29.2	25/22.7	20/25.0
	31–45	140	45.2	50/41.7	50/45.5	40/50.0
	46–60	70	22.6	25/20.8	25/22.7	20/25.0
	>60	20	6.4	10/8.3	10/9.1	0/0.0
Education Level	High School or Below	50	16.1	10/8.3	20/18.2	20/25.0
	Bachelor's Degree	150	48.4	60/50.0	50/45.5	40/50.0
	Master's Degree or Higher	110	35.5	50/41.7	40/36.4	20/25.0

Table 1 provides a granular breakdown of the 310 respondents' demographics, segmented by region to highlight geographic diversity. The regional distribution—Tehran (38.7%, n=120), Khuzestan (35.5%, n=110), and Sistan and Baluchestan (25.8%, n=80)—ensures representation of urban-industrial, agricultural, and arid-vulnerable contexts, aligning with the study's focus on climatic heterogeneity. Sectoral stakeholders dominate (35.5%), particularly in Khuzestan (40.9%), reflecting the region's agricultural and oil-based economy, while insurance professionals (29.0%) and policymakers (22.6%) are prominent in Tehran, indicating its financial and regulatory hub status. Academic/NGO experts (12.9%) are evenly distributed, ensuring scientific and civil society perspectives. The gender balance (61.3% male, 38.7% female) is consistent across regions, with female representation notably strong in Khuzestan (40.9%), suggesting inclusivity in agricultural sectors. The age distribution peaks at 31–45 years (45.2%), with Sistan and Baluchestan showing no respondents over 60, likely due to its younger demographic and economic challenges. Education levels are high (83.9% with bachelor's or higher), particularly in Tehran (91.7%), reflecting the technical expertise required for climate and insurance discussions. The diverse sample enhances external validity, supporting generalizability across Iran's socioeconomic and climatic contexts, as emphasized by Vijhani *et al.* (2023).

Table 2: Climate Risk Awareness and Perceived Severity (5-Point Likert Scale)

Risk Type	Mean	Standard Deviation	Percentage High Awareness (4–5)	Tehran (Mean)	Khuzestan (Mean)	Sistan & Baluchestan (Mean)
Floods	4.12	0.82	68.4	4.20	4.15	4.00
Droughts	4.35	0.76	75.2	4.10	4.30	4.65
Heatwaves	3.98	0.89	62.3	3.95	4.00	4.10
Storms	3.65	0.94	54.8	3.80	3.70	3.45

Table 2 details stakeholder awareness and perceived severity of climate risks on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = very low, 5 = very high), segmented by region. Droughts exhibit the highest awareness (M = 4.35, SD = 0.76, 75.2% high), particularly in Sistan and Baluchestan (M = 4.65), reflecting acute water scarcity in arid regions, consistent with Ignjacevic et al. (2020). Floods follow (M = 4.12, SD = 0.82, 68.4% high), with higher awareness in Tehran (M = 4.20) and Khuzestan (M = 4.15) due to recent flooding events. Heatwaves (M = 3.98, SD = 0.89, 62.3% high) show elevated concern in Sistan and Baluchestan (M = 4.10), reflecting regional temperature extremes. Storms have the lowest awareness (M = 3.65, SD = 0.94, 54.8% high), with minimal concern in Sistan and Baluchestan (M = 3.45), likely due to lower storm prevalence. Low standard deviations (0.76–0.94) indicate consensus, reinforcing reliability. Regional variations align with Contento *et al.* (2019), emphasizing the need for localized insurance products tailored to specific risks, such as parametric insurance for droughts in arid regions.

Table 3: Perceived Likelihood and Impact of Climate Risks (7-Point Likert Scale)

Risk Type	Likelihood (Mean/SD)	Impact (Mean/SD)	Percentage High Likelihood (6–7)	Percentage High Impact (6–7)
Floods	5.85/1.12	6.10/1.08	62.3	68.7
Droughts	6.20/0.98	6.45/0.95	75.8	80.3
Heatwaves	5.60/1.15	5.90/1.10	55.2	60.0
Storms	5.30/1.20	5.50/1.18	48.7	52.6

Table 3 assesses perceived likelihood and impact of climate risks on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = very low, 7 = very high). Droughts rank highest in both likelihood (M = 6.20, SD = 0.98, 75.8% high) and impact (M = 6.45, SD = 0.95, 80.3% high), reflecting Iran's severe water scarcity challenges, particularly in agriculture-dependent regions like Khuzestan. Floods follow closely (likelihood: M = 5.85, SD = 1.12, 62.3% high; impact: M = 6.10, SD = 1.08, 68.7% high), indicating significant concern in urban and agricultural areas. Heatwaves (likelihood: M = 5.60, SD = 1.15, 55.2% high; impact: M = 5.90, SD = 1.10, 60.0% high) and storms (likelihood: M = 5.30, SD = 1.20, 48.7% high; impact: M = 5.50, SD = 1.18, 52.6% high) show moderate concern, with storms perceived as less impactful, consistent with regional exposure patterns. The low standard deviations (0.95–1.20) suggest strong stakeholder agreement, aligning with Hasibuan *et al.* (2020), who highlight complex risk perceptions influencing adaptation. These findings underscore the need for insurance products addressing high-likelihood, high-impact risks like droughts and floods.

Table 4: Adaptation Strategy Preferences (Ranked by Mean Score)

Strategy	Mean Rank (1–5)	Standard Deviation	Percentage Top Rank (1–2)	Tehran (Mean)	Khuzestan (Mean)	Sistan & Baluchestan (Mean)

Parametric Insurance	1.85	0.72	64.5	1.75	1.80	2.00
Infrastructure Upgrades	2.10	0.80	58.7	2.00	2.05	2.25
Green Accounting Practices	2.45	0.88	49.3	2.30	2.50	2.55
Community-Based Adaptation	2.78	0.95	42.6	2.65	2.80	2.90

Table 4 ranks adaptation strategies on a 5-point scale (1 = most preferred, 5 = least preferred). Parametric insurance leads (M = 1.85, SD = 0.72, 64.5% top rank), especially in Tehran (M = 1.75) and Khuzestan (M = 1.80), due to rapid payouts (Quan *et al.* 2024). Infrastructure upgrades rank second (M = 2.10, SD = 0.80, 58.7% top rank), with strong Tehran support (M = 2.00). Green accounting (M = 2.45, SD = 0.88, 49.3% top rank) is moderately preferred, higher in Tehran (M = 2.30) due to regulatory familiarity (Rakhmawati, 2025). Community-based adaptation ranks lowest (M = 2.78, SD = 0.95, 42.6% top rank), notably in Sistan and Baluchestan (M = 2.90), reflecting challenges (Gonçalves *et al.* 2021). Moderate standard deviations (0.72–0.95) suggest stakeholder variability, necessitating tailored insurance products.

Inferential analyses test hypotheses using exploratory factor analysis (EFA), confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), structural equation modeling (SEM), hierarchical regression, and multi-criteria decision analysis. EFA (KMO = 0.82, $p < 0.001$) identified four factors explaining 72.6% variance: Climate Risk Awareness (34.2%), Adaptation Strategy Preferences (24.1%), Financial Integration (14.3%), and Stakeholder Engagement (10.0%). CFA confirmed the model (Chi-square = 128.45, df = 84, p = 0.002, CFI = 0.94, RMSEA = 0.05, Cronbach's alpha ≥ 0.85), validating constructs for SEM, aligning with de Jong and Kok (2021). Results support localized risk models, stakeholder perceptions, and green accounting for enhanced insurance valuation.

Table 5: Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) Results

Path	Standardized Coefficient (β)	Standard Error	p-value	95% CI	Hypothesis
Localized Climate Risk Models → Valuation Accuracy	0.65	0.04	<0.001	[0.57, 0.73]	H1 Supported
Stakeholder Perceptions → Product Adoption	0.60	0.05	<0.001	[0.50, 0.70]	H2 Supported
Green Accounting → Financial Resilience	0.58	0.06	<0.001	[0.46, 0.70]	H3 Supported
Stakeholder Engagement → Product Adoption	0.45	0.07	<0.001	[0.31, 0.59]	Exploratory

Goodness-of-Fit Indices: Chi-square = 135.22 (df = 92, p = 0.002), CFI = 0.93, RMSEA = 0.05, SRMR = 0.04. The SEM results confirm all three hypotheses with robust model fit (CFI = 0.93, RMSEA = 0.05, SRMR = 0.04), indicating strong explanatory power.

Hypothesis 1: Localized Climate Risk Models → Valuation Accuracy (β = 0.65, $p < 0.001$)

The strong positive path coefficient (β = 0.65, 95% CI [0.57, 0.73]) confirms that localized climate risk models significantly enhance insurance valuation accuracy. This aligns with Ignjacevic *et al.* (2020) and Laborda *et al.* (2025), who advocate for region-specific models like CLIMRISK-RIVER and autoregressive neural networks to capture spatial heterogeneity in flood and drought risks. The result suggests that integrating biophysical data (e.g., precipitation, temperature) with financial metrics improves premium pricing and reserve allocation, critical for Iran's diverse climatic zones.

Hypothesis 2: Stakeholder Perceptions → Product Adoption ($\beta = 0.60$, $p < 0.001$)

The significant path ($\beta = 0.60$, 95% CI [0.50, 0.70]) supports the role of stakeholder perceptions in driving the adoption of climate-responsive insurance products. This aligns with Vijhani *et al.* (2023) and Cholakova and Dogramadjieva (2023), emphasizing participatory design to align products with local needs. The result highlights the need for insurers to incorporate stakeholder feedback, particularly from marginalized groups in Sistan and Baluchestan, to enhance product uptake.

Hypothesis 3: Green Accounting → Financial Resilience ($\beta = 0.58$, $p < 0.001$)

The path coefficient ($\beta = 0.58$, 95% CI [0.46, 0.70]) confirms that green accounting practices enhance financial resilience by improving risk management and stakeholder trust, supporting Rakhmawati (2025) and Ding *et al.*, (2024). This is particularly relevant in Tehran, where regulatory frameworks support environmental transparency, enabling insurers to quantify climate-related costs and benefits.

Exploratory Path: Stakeholder Engagement → Product Adoption ($\beta = 0.45$, $p < 0.001$)

The exploratory path ($\beta = 0.45$, 95% CI [0.31, 0.59]) highlights the role of stakeholder engagement, identified in EFA, in facilitating product adoption. This aligns with Gonçalves *et al.* (2021), emphasizing co-designed adaptation strategies to enhance resilience, particularly in community-based settings.

Table 6: Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Valuation Accuracy

Predictor	Step 1 (β)	Step 2 (β)	Step 3 (β)	ΔR²	p-value
Localized Climate Risk Models	0.50	0.48	0.46	0.25	<0.001
Stakeholder Perceptions	-	0.35	0.33	0.12	<0.001
Green Accounting Practices	-	-	0.28	0.08	<0.001

Model Fit: $R^2 = 0.45$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.43$, $F(3, 306) = 83.45$, $p < 0.001$.

The hierarchical regression analysis examines the incremental contribution of predictors to insurance valuation accuracy. In Step 1, localized climate risk models explain 25% of the variance ($\beta = 0.50$, $p < 0.001$), confirming their foundational role. Adding stakeholder perceptions in Step 2 increases R^2 by 12% ($\beta = 0.35$, $p < 0.001$), highlighting their complementary effect. Including green accounting in Step 3 adds 8% to the variance ($\beta = 0.28$, $p < 0.001$), resulting in a total R^2 of 0.45. The significant ΔR^2 values and robust model fit ($F(3, 306) = 83.45$, $p < 0.001$) validate the synergistic effect of these predictors, supporting Barigou *et al.* (2019) on integrated valuation frameworks.

Table 7: Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA) Results

Adaptation Strategy	Weight	Cost (Rank)	Feasibility (Rank)	Risk Reduction (Rank)	Overall Priority
Parametric Insurance	0.40	2	1	1	0.45
Infrastructure Upgrades	0.30	3	2	2	0.32
Green Accounting	0.20	1	3	3	0.15
Community-Based Adaptation	0.10	4	4	4	0.08

MCDA, using the Analytic Hierarchy Process, ranks adaptation strategies by stakeholder-weighted criteria. Parametric insurance leads (0.45), excelling in feasibility and risk reduction, ideal for data-scarce emerging markets (Quan *et al.* 2024). Infrastructure upgrades rank second (0.32), balancing feasibility and risk reduction (Contento *et al.* 2019). Green accounting (0.15) is favored for low cost but limited by regulatory barriers (Saeed & Nagriwum, 2026). Community-based adaptation ranks lowest (0.08) due to implementation challenges (Gonçalves *et al.* 2021).

A stakeholder-driven framework integrates localized climate risk models, green accounting, and engagement to enhance insurance valuation. Parametric insurance for droughts and floods, using real-time data, is critical, especially in Sistan and Baluchestan, with InsurTech and machine learning boosting efficiency (Mupa *et al.* 2025). Region-specific data with neural networks and fuzzy cognitive maps improve accuracy for Tehran and Khuzestan (Laborda *et al.* 2025). Green accounting in Tehran quantifies environmental costs, supported by actuary training (Rakhmawati, 2025). Participatory workshops in Khuzestan and Sistan and Baluchestan co-design products for marginalized groups (Vijhani *et al.* 2023). Regulatory support via Iran's Central Insurance Agency and education campaigns for rural stakeholders enhance adoption (Dumitraşcu *et al.* 2025; Saeed & Nagriwum, 2026). Statistical analyses confirm high drought/flood awareness, with parametric insurance prioritized, supporting valuation accuracy, product adoption, and financial resilience.

Conclusions

This study presents a transdisciplinary framework integrating climate change risks into insurance valuation models, focusing on stakeholder perceptions and adaptive strategies in Iran, an emerging market with significant climatic and socioeconomic challenges. Using a mixed-methods approach, it synthesizes quantitative and qualitative data to enhance insurance resilience against escalating climate risks. The findings confirm that localized climate risk models, stakeholder perceptions, and green accounting significantly improve valuation accuracy, product adoption, and financial resilience, offering actionable insights for insurers and policymakers in emerging markets.

Statistical analyses robustly support the framework. Hypothesis 1 ($\beta = 0.65$, $p < 0.001$) confirms that localized climate risk models, integrating region-specific data like precipitation via autoregressive neural networks, enhance valuation accuracy, aligning with Ignjacevic *et al.* (2020) and Laborda *et al.* (2025). Hypothesis 2 ($\beta = 0.60$, $p < 0.001$) verifies that stakeholder perceptions drive adoption of climate-responsive insurance, consistent with Vijhani *et al.* (2023) and Cholakova and Dogramadjieva (2023). Hypothesis 3 ($\beta = 0.58$, $p < 0.001$) supports green accounting's role in financial resilience, per Rakhmawati (2025) and Ding *et al.* (2024). An exploratory path ($\beta = 0.45$, $p < 0.001$) underscores stakeholder engagement's importance, echoing Gonçalves *et al.* (2021). Descriptive statistics highlight high awareness of droughts ($M = 4.35$, 75.2% high) and floods ($M = 4.12$, 68.4% high), with parametric insurance (MCDA weight = 0.45) and infrastructure upgrades (0.32) as top strategies.

This study extends prior research by integrating advanced modeling with stakeholder insights, addressing gaps in isolated approaches. Unlike Ignjacevic *et al.* (2020), it covers multiple hazards (droughts, floods, heatwaves) across diverse regions, enhancing generalizability. Laborda *et al.* (2025) used neural networks, but this study adds fuzzy cognitive maps to capture stakeholder ambiguity, per de Jong and Kok (2021). The focus on marginalized groups in Sistan and Baluchestan deepens inclusivity insights, building on Vijhani *et al.* (2023). Parametric insurance prioritization aligns with Quan *et al.* (2024), while green accounting integration, per Rakhmawati (2025), embeds environmental transparency. Compared to Barigou *et al.* (2019) and Chen *et al.* (2021), this hybrid model incorporates actuarial and market-consistent approaches with stakeholder feedback for a holistic solution.

Actionable strategies include developing parametric insurance for droughts and floods in vulnerable regions like Sistan and Baluchestan, using real-time data for rapid payouts (Quan *et al.* 2024). Collaboration with InsurTech firms, integrating machine learning, enhances scalability (Mupa *et al.,* 2025). Adopting green accounting in Tehran quantifies environmental costs, supported by actuary training (Rakhmawati, 2025). Participatory workshops in Khuzestan and Sistan and Baluchestan co-design products for marginalized groups (Vijhani *et al.* 2023). Regulatory support via Iran's Central Insurance Agency incentivizes green accounting and parametric insurance (Saeed & Nagriwum, 2026). Education campaigns targeting younger and rural stakeholders bridge awareness gaps (Dumitraşcu *et al.* 2025). Future research should test this framework in other emerging markets like Sub-Saharan Africa, incorporating hazards like sea-level rise (Contento *et al.,* 2019). Exploring blockchain for claims processing could complement machine learning (Mupa *et al.,* 2025). Longitudinal studies on perception changes would extend Osaka and Bellamy (2020), while non-market valuation could quantify priorities. Public-private partnerships could address funding barriers (Essl & Mauerhofer, 2018).

Limitations include the sample size (n=310), which may not fully capture Iran's diversity, potential response bias mitigated by triangulation, and regional focus overlooking micro-level variations. A further limitation is the reliance on simulated extensions rather than fully disaggregated climate–insurance microdata, which are not publicly available in the study context due to confidentiality and regulatory constraints. However, simulation-based approaches are widely accepted in climate risk modeling, where future conditions cannot be directly observed. Neural network reliance on historical data (2000–2025) may not account for extreme scenarios like RCP8.5, and resource constraints limited workshop depth. Despite these, high reliability (Cronbach's alpha ≥ 0.85) and strong model fit (CFI = 0.93, RMSEA = 0.05) ensure robust findings. This study pioneers a framework integrating localized risk models, stakeholder perceptions, and green accounting, offering a scalable solution for emerging markets. By addressing climate risks through advanced modeling and participatory approaches, it equips insurers with resilience tools and policymakers with adaptation strategies, setting a foundation for global implementation.

This study provides actionable, stakeholder-informed strategies to integrate climate risks into insurance valuation and operations in Iran. The findings—highlighting high awareness of droughts and floods, strong preference for parametric insurance, and the significant roles of localized models and green accounting—translate into specific, feasible recommendations aligned with Iran's regulatory environment (overseen by the Central Insurance of Iran – CII) and regional vulnerabilities.

Priority should be given to developing and piloting parametric insurance products for high-impact risks, particularly droughts in Sistan and Baluchestan and floods in Khuzestan and northern provinces. For instance, a drought product could trigger automatic payouts when satellite-derived soil moisture or rainfall indices fall below predefined thresholds (e.g., less than 30% of historical average for 90 days), drawing on successful models from World Bank-supported initiatives in other emerging markets. Collaboration with InsurTech platforms could integrate real-time satellite data from sources like MODIS or Iran's meteorological feeds. Initial pilots might cover thousands of farmers in Khuzestan, with partial premium subsidies from government funds to boost uptake among low-income groups.

Insurers should adopt region-specific risk modeling through hybrid autoregressive neural network and fuzzy cognitive map frameworks to refine actuarial pricing and reserving. In practice, major insurers could train open-source neural networks on regional precipitation data from the Iranian Meteorological Organization combined with historical claims, enabling dynamic premium adjustments—such as surcharges in high-drought zones while offering discounts for resilience measures like efficient irrigation systems. A national climate risk dashboard, developed through CII-academic partnerships, could make downscaled projections and modeling tools accessible to all licensed insurers.

Green accounting practices should be gradually implemented to quantify environmental costs and enhance financial transparency and resilience. Larger firms, especially in Tehran, could begin disclosing climate-related provisions and expected losses in annual reports, aligned with international frameworks like TCFD, by incorporating projected impacts such as temperature-driven crop yield declines. This approach would improve investor confidence and facilitate access to sustainable financing options, with CII introducing voluntary guidelines initially and transitioning to mandatory requirements supported by actuary training programs.

Stakeholder engagement needs strengthening through ongoing participatory mechanisms to address perception gaps, particularly among marginalized rural communities. Regional workshops in vulnerable provinces, co-facilitated by insurers, NGOs, and local stakeholders, could co-design products and validate risk perceptions using approaches like fuzzy cognitive maps. A sustained national dialogue platform, supported by CII, would enable regular feedback and product refinement.

These recommendations are cost-effective, scalable, and consistent with Iran's national climate policies and international commitments. Effective implementation could substantially reduce uninsured losses in vulnerable sectors while strengthening the overall competitiveness of Iran's insurance market, fostering collaboration among regulators, insurers, InsurTech providers, and international partners.

Data Availability Statement

This study employs a combination of aggregated observed indicators, stakeholder survey data, and model-generated simulated outputs. Fully disaggregated climate–insurance microdata are not publicly available due to confidentiality and regulatory constraints. Simulation outputs, variable definitions, and model specifications are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable academic request.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article. In addition, ethical issues including plagiarism, informed consent, misconduct, data falsification, and re-publication and submission have been observed by the authors.

Acknowledgment

The authors would like to express their deepest gratitude to the esteemed reviewers of the article, who helped improve and enhance the content of the article with their valuable suggestions.

References

Abe, H., Mitsui, S., & Yamano, H. (2022). Conservation of the coral community and local stakeholders' perceptions of climate change impacts: Examples and gap analysis in three Japanese national parks. *Ocean & Coastal Management, 218*, 106042. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2022.106042

Ahmad, J., Bladt, M., & Furrer, C. (2023). Aggregate Markov models in life insurance: Properties and valuation. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics, 113*, 50–69. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.insmatheco.2023.07.006

Barigou, K., Chen, Z., & Dhaene, J. (2019). Fair dynamic valuation of insurance liabilities: Merging actuarial judgement with market- and time-consistency. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics, 88*, 19–29. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.insmatheco.2019.05.003

Bui, B., & de Villiers, C. (2017). Business strategies and management accounting in response to climate change risk exposure and regulatory uncertainty. *The British Accounting Review, 49*(1), 4–24. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bar.2016.10.006

Chen, Z., Chen, B., Dhaene, J., & Yang, T. (2021). Fair dynamic valuation of insurance liabilities via convex hedging. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics, 98*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.insmatheco.2021.01.001

Cholakova, S., & Dogramadjieva, E. (2023). Climate change adaptation in the ski industry: Stakeholders' perceptions regarding a mountain resort in Southeastern Europe. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism, 42*, 100611. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jort.2023.100611

Contento, A., Xu, H., & Gardoni, P. (2019). Risk analysis for hurricanes accounting for the effects of climate change. In *Climate Adaptation Engineering* (pp. 39–72). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-816782-3.00002-4

de Jong, C. E., & Kok, K. (2021). Ambiguity in social ecological system understanding: Advancing modelling of stakeholder perceptions of climate change adaptation in Kenya. *Environmental Modelling & Software, 141*, 105054. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2021.105054

Ding, R., Jacoby, G., Liu, M., Wang, T., & Wu, Z. (2024). Does climate risk shape firms' accounting conservatism? *Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money, 97*, 102081. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intfin.2024.102081

Dumitraşcu, M., Roznovieţchi, I., Sima, M., Grigorescu, I., Micu, D., Fălcescu, V., Bulai, A., & Cheval, S. (2025). Public perception of climate change impacts and sectoral adaptation in Romania. *Environmental Development, 44*, 101346. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envdev.2025.101346

Edeki, S. O., Fadugba, S. E., & Khalique, C. M. (2023). Valuation of deposit insurance Black–Scholes model using Banach contraction principle. *Partial Differential Equations in Applied Mathematics, 8*, 100571. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.padiff.2023.100571

Essl, I., & Mauerhofer, V. (2018). Opportunities for mutual implementation of nature conservation and climate change policies: A multilevel case study based on local stakeholder perceptions. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 183*, 898–907. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.01.210

Falcescu, V., Cheval, S., Micu, D. M., Dumitrescu, A., Roznovieţchi, I., Dumitraşcu, M., & Damian, N. (2024). Climate services in Romania − an analysis of stakeholders' perceptions and needs. *Climate Services, 34*, 100476. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cliser.2024.100476

Ferdous, L. T., Atawnah, N., Yeboah, R., & Zhou, Y. (2024). Firm-level climate risk and accounting conservatism: International evidence. *International Review of Financial Analysis, 95*, 103511. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irfa.2024.103511

Fine, J., Ettinger, J., Kotcher, J., Mildenberger, M., Leiserowitz, A., & Maibach, E. (2025). Advancing and integrating climate and health policy in the United States: Insights from national policy stakeholders. *The Journal of Climate Change and Health, 25*, 100485. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joclim.2025.100485

Ghirardelli, A., & Tarolli, P. (2025). Bridging the gap between science, policy, stakeholders: Delineating a virtuous framework for agriculture under climate change scenarios. *iScience, 28*(9), 113326. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isci.2025.113326

Gonçalves, C., Honrado, J. P., Cerejeira, J., Sousa, R., Fernandes, P. M., Vaz, A. S., ... & Santos, J. A. (2021). On the development of a regional climate change adaptation plan: Integrating model-assisted projections and stakeholders' perceptions. *Science of The Total Environment, 805*, 150320. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.150320

Hasibuan, A. M., Gregg, D., & Stringer, R. (2020). Accounting for diverse risk attitudes in measures of risk perceptions: A case study of climate change risk for small-scale citrus farmers in Indonesia. *Land Use Policy, 95*, 104252. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2019.104252

Hultgren, A., Carleton, T., Delgado, M., Gergel, D. R., Greenstone, M., Houser, T., ... & Yuan, J. (2025). Impacts of climate change on global agriculture accounting for adaptation. *Nature, 642*, 644–652. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-024-08200-2

Ignjacevic, P., Botzen, W. J. W., Estrada, F., Kuik, O., Ward, P., & Tiggeloven, T. (2020). CLIMRISK-RIVER: Accounting for local river flood risk in estimating the economic cost of climate change. *Environmental Modelling & Software, 132*, 104784. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2020.104784

Kumarasiri, J., & Gunasekarage, A. (2017). Risk regulation, community pressure and the use of management accounting in managing climate change risk: Australian evidence. *The British Accounting Review, 49*(1), 25–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bar.2016.10.009

Laborda, J., Suárez, C., Fernández, A., Wang, H., Cerdá, E., Ricci, L., & Quiroga, S. (2025). Unveiling how financial markets could intensify climate change risks. *Ecological Economics, 239*, 108773. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2025.108773

Lee, H., Ryu, D., & Son, J. (2022). Insurance-adjusted valuation, decision making, and capital return. *International Review of Financial Analysis, 84*, 102276. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irfa.2022.102276

Mupa, M. N., Tafirenyika, S., Nyajeka, M. R., Moyo, T. M., & Zhuwankinyu, E. K. (2025). Machine learning in actuarial science: Enhancing predictive models for insurance risk management. *IRE Journals, 8*(8), 443–459. https://www.irejournals.com/paper-details/1707214

Mushawemhuka, W., Fitchett, J. M., & Hoogendoorn, G. (2022). Stakeholder perceptions of climate change threats to the Zimbabwean nature-based tourism sector. *Environmental Development, 44*, 100779. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envdev.2022.100779

Osaka, S., & Bellamy, R. (2020). Natural variability or climate change? Stakeholder and citizen perceptions of extreme event attribution. *Global Environmental Change, 62*, 102070. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2020.102070

Quan, Z., Hu, C., Dong, P., & Valdez, E. A. (2024). Improving business insurance loss models by leveraging InsurTech innovation. *North American Actuarial Journal, 29*(2), 247–274. https://doi.org/10.1080/10920277.2024.2400648

Rakhmawati, H. (2025). The influence of green accounting on financial performance and corporate sustainability: Strategic accounting management perspective. *International Journal of Economic Literature, 3*(5), 443–459. http://sociohum.net/index.php/INJOLE/article/view/58

Saeed, U. F., & Nagriwum, T. M. (2026). Carbon accounting and climate change: Leveraging eco-digitalization and governance dynamics for environmental sustainability in emerging markets. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*. 17(2), 4843-4874. DOI: 10.1007/s13132-025-02750-5

Steeves, L., & Filgueira, R. (2019). Stakeholder perceptions of climate change in the context of bivalve aquaculture. *Marine Policy, 103*, 121–129. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2019.02.024

Vijhani, A., Sinha, V. S. P., Vishwakarma, C. A., Singh, P., Pandey, A., & Govindan, M. (2023). Study of stakeholders' perceptions of climate change and its impact on mountain communities in central Himalaya, India. *Environmental Development, 46*, 100824. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envdev.2023.100824

Yang, X., Han, Q., Ni, J., & Li, L. (2025). Research on the expansion of deposit insurance pricing model based on the Merton option pricing framework. *Computational Economics*. 67(2), 1-23. DOI:10.1007/s10614-025-10876-6