

WHITEPAPER

FEBRUARY, 2022

Author

Alasdair Thompson
Associate Director – Insurance Research

Contact Us

Americas
+1.212.553.1658
clientservices@moodys.com

Europe
+44.20.7772.5454
clientservices.emea@moodys.com

Asia (Excluding Japan)
+85 2 2916 1121
clientservices.asia@moodys.com

Japan
+81 3 5408 4100
clientservices.japan@moodys.com

Constructing Climate Pathway Scenarios to Assess the Financial Impact of Climate Risk

Climate risk is a rapidly moving space, where regulatory and business requirements are accelerating. To address these demands insurers and pensions funds need coherent, and transparent scenarios which allow them to quantify the financial impact from physical and transition risks.

The release of the phase 2 scenarios by the Network for Greening the Financial System (NGFS) in June 2021 represented a significant step forward in understanding the potential risks and uncertainties associated with different climate pathways, but there is still a long way to go.

To use a set of standard scenarios such as those produced by the NGFS to assess the impact on your asset and liability valuations, a series of additional modeling steps are required. Energy and climate variables must be converted into macroeconomic effects, and then into financial market variables such as interest rates, inflation, and asset class returns.

On climate, economic, and financial assessments, there are many significant unknowns. Basic facts such as the climate sensitivity (how much warming we will see for a doubling of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere), and economic sensitivity (how much damage we see given a level of warming) are both uncertain within a wide range. Technology costs and fiscal responses to climate shocks and carbon prices can further impact the overall results. While the NGFS scenarios may appear to have only a limited number of narratives, the total universe of possible outcomes is much larger when each of these assumptions is considered. Analyzing just one or two scenarios will not be enough to grasp the sensitivity to these underlying assumptions, and to assess the full range of plausible outcomes.

Setting Transparent Macroeconomic Assumptions

The first step in expanding a climate scenario is to consider the macroeconomic impacts. Macroeconomic modeling of climate change often concentrates principally on the impact on GDP, but this focus can obscure the real magnitude of the costs¹. Acute physical risks like flooding or storm damage can produce significant damages, but reconstruction provides a rebound boost to GDP. Similarly, investments in new transport stock or retrofitting buildings will show as a contribution to overall output. In both cases, however, these are more correctly viewed as opportunity costs, reducing investment available elsewhere or consumption.

To reflect the climate risks in financial markets, we calculate the total impact of these opportunity costs on consumption within a given region. These costs can be classified as adaption costs/physical damages (caused by or in response to physical risks), abatement costs (spending on decarbonization), and allowance costs (carbon taxes, permits, or prices). This “three A” approach to accounting for climate costs aims to quantify the primary impact on economic activity of different climate pathways.

In the phase 2 release the NGFS have expanded the range of macroeconomic modeling they provide. Partnering with the National Institute of Economic and Social Research (NIESR) and using their econometric model NiGEM to produce a range of expanded macro and financial variables. A key assumption in the NiGEM results is the choice of fiscal response. As the NGFS phase two documentation attests, whether carbon tax revenues are used to pay down debt, to offset taxes elsewhere, or are directly reinvested by governments, can even change whether a given scenario is positive or negative for overall output. Given how important the choice of response, and the implicit assumptions about fiscal multipliers are, it is unfortunate that the NGFS scenarios do not offer a range of NiGEM outcomes, making it hard to disentangle the effects of the climate shocks from the fiscal response and to analyze the sensitivity to these assumptions.

In addition to the fiscal rules applied to a given scenario, the technology costs, and availability of different technologies are also critical inputs. The NGFS runs three different integrated assessment models (IAMs): REMIND-MaGPIE, GCAM, and MESSAGE-GLOBIOM. These models differ on a range of modeling inputs, from regional granularity, to land use policies, the potential for carbon capture and storage (CCS), energy system capital costs and their optimization methods. As a result, the energy mix can vary significantly between models, for the same narrative, as can the carbon price, and hence the abatement costs. For example, carbon prices in the Below 2C scenario reach a level of \$420 per ton of CO₂ to achieve net zero in the REMIND-MaGPIE model, but surpass \$850 per ton in GCAM for the same target.

Comparing results across IAMs can help to examine the impact of these variations on overall transition costs and financial returns. In future releases, there will hopefully be a greater range of scenarios focused on different technology pathways: For example scenarios without any significant CCS, or with a more substantial role for hydrogen could produce different results than the current narratives.

The High-Level View

Given the range of uncertainties and layers of modeling used in climate risk analysis it is important to take time to understand the scenarios and the materiality of each assumption before diving too deeply into detailed modeling of the results.

Traditionally, investors have managed their exposure to risk through allocations at the asset class level, and it is a good place to start with climate risk as well. Shocks to consumption can be formally linked to interest rates and to risk premia through a combination of the Ramsey rule and the consumption capital asset pricing model. These shocks will cascade into individual asset classes, providing specific impacts to returns on each class; these impacts will vary across classes and geographic regions.

¹ Focusing on growth in economic output is often critiqued by environmentalists and economists on the basis that many of the economic costs associated with climate change are non-monetary. Further, they argue that focusing on output as a measure of welfare is overly narrow, and that perpetual growth in output cannot be sustainable given finite resources. Our critique is more narrowly applied to the monetary impacts, focusing just on growth in output misses important opportunity costs and investment requirements arising from climate change.

In addition to the impacts from changes to consumption, another channel which can provide a more immediate effect, is inflation. Energy prices increase significantly in transition scenarios, in some cases more than doubling, as carbon prices are passed through to consumers. Energy prices are a direct component of inflation, but also produce secondary effects as higher energy prices are themselves passed along the production chain. While impacts on consumption from abatement spending, or physical damages can take time to accumulate, inflationary effects are often immediate. The drag on consumption, lowering real returns, while energy inflation rises, can create a wedge between nominal and real returns, causing them to move in different directions.

Drilling Down to Individual Sectors

After we have understood the impact of our climate pathways at the asset class level, and determined which scenarios will be of most concern, the next step is to consider how to respond. At this stage, it's natural to drill down into individual sectors. Even in a transition scenario which looks relatively benign at the macro level, there will be winners and losers in different industries.

There are four principal channels through which sector costs are impacted in a climate transition scenario:

- » **Demand:** Changes in the structure of the economy can alter demand across sectors. Cost pass-through can also impact overall demand depending on the level of elasticity in different markets. Input-output tables and national accounts of value added by sector can provide a starting point for demand.
- » **Energy Costs:** Final energy demand and energy prices are a crucial output from Integrated Assessment Models. Energy costs can increase significantly in early years of a transition scenario.
- » **Carbon Taxes:** Carbon taxes are the key driver of policy effects within climate models. Carbon taxes here represent the total direct costs of emitting carbon, and in practice could be implemented as tradeable permits, direct taxes, or regulations such as emissions standards which imply a shadow price. Tax rates can vary by sector and region, reflecting the degree of coordination and how orderly a transition is.
- » **Investment:** Significant investment will be required to restructure the economy in a transition scenario. In some sectors investment may be needed just to maintain current demand. As at the whole economy level for each sector and firm there will be trade-offs between paying direct taxes, or higher energy costs and making investments to reduce emissions.

Understanding all of these channels, and their interactions, is essential to provide an accurate assessment of transition costs. Some sectors, such as electricity supply, may currently have high emissions, and hence expect to pay large direct taxes, but they may also be able to decarbonize more easily than other sectors. Renewables are likely to experience significant growth in demand, but this growth does not come for free: debt will have to be raised, or earnings retained, to provide investment in new capital stock.

To maximize value, management and investors need to consider both the expected growth (or fall) in earnings for a given sectors, alongside the costs of capital.

The rate of reinvestment should depend on expected growth, and whether the return on invested capital (ROIC) is higher or lower than the weighted cost of capital (WACC). Growth adds value for existing owners when $ROIC > WACC$, but when costs of capital are greater than returns it may make more sense to carefully run down a business and return cash to owners. In a scenario where firms attempt to continue investment beyond the point where they can generate sufficient returns, they could end up with stranded assets which ultimately have to be written off.

Making Sense of NGFS Scenarios

Incorporating climate risk into business planning, risk management, and investment decisions poses a significant challenge for insurers and pension firms, but one which is of increasing importance for both internal and regulatory purposes. Scenario analysis built on the NGFS projections can be an invaluable tool in this process, but care must be taken to understand the range of underlying risks and uncertainties.

This is part of a series of papers on climate risk topics for insurers. Read the others here:

- » [Climate change – The biggest risk multiplier for the insurance industry](#)
- » [Incorporating ESG into P&C underwriting](#)
- » [Climate aware Own Risk Solvency Assessment](#)
- » [Incorporating Climate Risk into Strategic Asset Allocation](#)
- » [Exploring the impact of IFRS Sustainability Disclosure Standards on Insurers](#)

© 2022 Moody's Corporation, Moody's Investors Service, Inc., Moody's Analytics, Inc. and/or their licensors and affiliates (collectively, "MOODY'S"). All rights reserved.

CREDIT RATINGS ISSUED BY MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS AFFILIATES ARE THEIR CURRENT OPINIONS OF THE RELATIVE FUTURE CREDIT RISK OF ENTITIES, CREDIT COMMITMENTS, OR DEBT OR DEBT-LIKE SECURITIES, AND MATERIALS, PRODUCTS, SERVICES AND INFORMATION PUBLISHED BY MOODY'S (COLLECTIVELY, "PUBLICATIONS") MAY INCLUDE SUCH CURRENT OPINIONS. MOODY'S DEFINES CREDIT RISK AS THE RISK THAT AN ENTITY MAY NOT MEET ITS CONTRACTUAL FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS AS THEY COME DUE AND ANY ESTIMATED FINANCIAL LOSS IN THE EVENT OF DEFAULT OR IMPAIRMENT. SEE APPLICABLE MOODY'S RATING SYMBOLS AND DEFINITIONS PUBLICATION FOR INFORMATION ON THE TYPES OF CONTRACTUAL FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS ADDRESSED BY MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS. CREDIT RATINGS DO NOT ADDRESS ANY OTHER RISK, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO: LIQUIDITY RISK, MARKET VALUE RISK, OR PRICE VOLATILITY. CREDIT RATINGS, NON-CREDIT ASSESSMENTS ("ASSESSMENTS"), AND OTHER OPINIONS INCLUDED IN MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT STATEMENTS OF CURRENT OR HISTORICAL FACT. MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS MAY ALSO INCLUDE QUANTITATIVE MODEL-BASED ESTIMATES OF CREDIT RISK AND RELATED OPINIONS OR COMMENTARY PUBLISHED BY MOODY'S ANALYTICS, INC. AND/OR ITS AFFILIATES. MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS, ASSESSMENTS, OTHER OPINIONS AND PUBLICATIONS DO NOT CONSTITUTE OR PROVIDE INVESTMENT OR FINANCIAL ADVICE, AND MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS, ASSESSMENTS, OTHER OPINIONS AND PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT AND DO NOT PROVIDE RECOMMENDATIONS TO PURCHASE, SELL, OR HOLD PARTICULAR SECURITIES. MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS, ASSESSMENTS, OTHER OPINIONS AND PUBLICATIONS DO NOT COMMENT ON THE SUITABILITY OF AN INVESTMENT FOR ANY PARTICULAR INVESTOR. MOODY'S ISSUES ITS CREDIT RATINGS, ASSESSMENTS AND OTHER OPINIONS AND PUBLISHES ITS PUBLICATIONS WITH THE EXPECTATION AND UNDERSTANDING THAT EACH INVESTOR WILL, WITH DUE CARE, MAKE ITS OWN STUDY AND EVALUATION OF EACH SECURITY THAT IS UNDER CONSIDERATION FOR PURCHASE, HOLDING, OR SALE.

MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS, ASSESSMENTS, OTHER OPINIONS, AND PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT INTENDED FOR USE BY RETAIL INVESTORS AND IT WOULD BE RECKLESS AND INAPPROPRIATE FOR RETAIL INVESTORS TO USE MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS, ASSESSMENTS, OTHER OPINIONS OR PUBLICATIONS WHEN MAKING AN INVESTMENT DECISION. IF IN DOUBT YOU SHOULD CONTACT YOUR FINANCIAL OR OTHER PROFESSIONAL ADVISER.

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS PROTECTED BY LAW, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, COPYRIGHT LAW, AND NONE OF SUCH INFORMATION MAY BE COPIED OR OTHERWISE REPRODUCED, REPACKAGED, FURTHER TRANSMITTED, TRANSFERRED, DISSEMINATED, REDISTRIBUTED OR RESOLD, OR STORED FOR SUBSEQUENT USE FOR ANY SUCH PURPOSE, IN WHOLE OR IN PART, IN ANY FORM OR MANNER OR BY ANY MEANS WHATSOEVER, BY ANY PERSON WITHOUT MOODY'S PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT.

MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS, ASSESSMENTS, OTHER OPINIONS AND PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT INTENDED FOR USE BY ANY PERSON AS A BENCHMARK AS THAT TERM IS DEFINED FOR REGULATORY PURPOSES AND MUST NOT BE USED IN ANY WAY THAT COULD RESULT IN THEM BEING CONSIDERED A BENCHMARK.

All information contained herein is obtained by MOODY'S from sources believed by it to be accurate and reliable. Because of the possibility of human or mechanical error as well as other factors, however, all information contained herein is provided "AS IS" without warranty of any kind. MOODY'S adopts all necessary measures so that the information it uses in assigning a credit rating is of sufficient quality and from sources MOODY'S considers to be reliable including, when appropriate, independent third-party sources. However, MOODY'S is not an auditor and cannot in every instance independently verify or validate information received in the rating process or in preparing its Publications.

To the extent permitted by law, MOODY'S and its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors and suppliers disclaim liability to any person or entity for any indirect, special, consequential, or incidental losses or damages whatsoever arising from or in connection with the information contained herein or the use of or inability to use any such information, even if MOODY'S or any of its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors or suppliers is advised in advance of the possibility of such losses or damages, including but not limited to: (a) any loss of present or prospective profits or (b) any loss or damage arising where the relevant financial instrument is not the subject of a particular credit rating assigned by MOODY'S.

To the extent permitted by law, MOODY'S and its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors and suppliers disclaim liability for any direct or compensatory losses or damages caused to any person or entity, including but not limited to by any negligence (but excluding fraud, willful misconduct or any other type of liability that, for the avoidance of doubt, by law cannot be excluded) on the part of, or any contingency within or beyond the control of, MOODY'S or any of its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors or suppliers, arising from or in connection with the information contained herein or the use of or inability to use any such information.

NO WARRANTY, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, AS TO THE ACCURACY, TIMELINESS, COMPLETENESS, MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR ANY PARTICULAR PURPOSE OF ANY CREDIT RATING, ASSESSMENT, OTHER OPINION OR INFORMATION IS GIVEN OR MADE BY MOODY'S IN ANY FORM OR MANNER WHATSOEVER.

Moody's Investors Service, Inc., a wholly-owned credit rating agency subsidiary of Moody's Corporation ("MCO"), hereby discloses that most issuers of debt securities (including corporate and municipal bonds, debentures, notes and commercial paper) and preferred stock rated by Moody's Investors Service, Inc. have, prior to assignment of any credit rating, agreed to pay to Moody's Investors Service, Inc. for credit ratings opinions and services rendered by it fees ranging from \$1,000 to approximately \$5,000,000. MCO and Moody's Investors Service also maintain policies and procedures to address the independence of Moody's Investors Service credit ratings and credit rating processes. Information regarding certain affiliations that may exist between directors of MCO and rated entities, and between entities who hold credit ratings from Moody's Investors Service and have also publicly reported to the SEC an ownership interest in MCO of more than 5%, is posted annually at www.moody.com under the heading "Investor Relations — Corporate Governance — Director and Shareholder Affiliation Policy."

Additional terms for Australia only: Any publication into Australia of this document is pursuant to the Australian Financial Services License of MOODY'S affiliate, Moody's Investors Service Pty Limited ABN 61 003 399 657 AFSL 336969 and/or Moody's Analytics Australia Pty Ltd ABN 94 105 136 972 AFSL 383569 (as applicable). This document is intended to be provided only to "wholesale clients" within the meaning of section 761G of the Corporations Act 2001. By continuing to access this document from within Australia, you represent to MOODY'S that you are, or are accessing the document as a representative of, a "wholesale client" and that neither you nor the entity you represent will directly or indirectly disseminate this document or its contents to "retail clients" within the meaning of section 761G of the Corporations Act 2001. MOODY'S credit rating is an opinion as to the creditworthiness of a debt obligation of the issuer, not on the equity securities of the issuer or any form of security that is available to retail investors.

Additional terms for Japan only: Moody's Japan K.K. ("MJKK") is a wholly-owned credit rating agency subsidiary of Moody's Group Japan G.K., which is wholly-owned by Moody's Overseas Holdings Inc., a wholly-owned subsidiary of MCO. Moody's SF Japan K.K. ("MSFJ") is a wholly-owned credit rating agency subsidiary of MJKK. MSFJ is not a Nationally Recognized Statistical Rating Organization ("NRSRO"). Therefore, credit ratings assigned by MSFJ are Non-NRSRO Credit Ratings. Non-NRSRO Credit Ratings are assigned by an entity that is not a NRSRO and, consequently, the rated obligation will not qualify for certain types of treatment under U.S. laws. MJKK and MSFJ are credit rating agencies registered with the Japan Financial Services Agency and their registration numbers are FSA Commissioner (Ratings) No. 2 and 3 respectively.

MJKK or MSFJ (as applicable) hereby disclose that most issuers of debt securities (including corporate and municipal bonds, debentures, notes and commercial paper) and preferred stock rated by MJKK or MSFJ (as applicable) have, prior to assignment of any credit rating, agreed to pay to MJKK or MSFJ (as applicable) for credit ratings opinions and services rendered by it fees ranging from JPY100,000 to approximately JPY550,000,000.

MJKK and MSFJ also maintain policies and procedures to address Japanese regulatory requirements.