

# *Incorporating satellite data into weather index-based insurance*

Article

Accepted Version

Black, E. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1344-6186>, Greatrex, H., Maidment, R. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2054-3259> and Young, M. (2016) Incorporating satellite data into weather index-based insurance. Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 97 (10). ES203-ES206. ISSN 1520-0477 doi: 10.1175/BAMS-D-16-0148.1 Available at <https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/66460/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

To link to this article DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-16-0148.1>

Publisher: American Meteorological Society

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

[www.reading.ac.uk/centaur](http://www.reading.ac.uk/centaur)

**CentAUR**

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online



# AMERICAN METEOROLOGICAL SOCIETY

*Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*

## **EARLY ONLINE RELEASE**

This is a preliminary PDF of the author-produced manuscript that has been peer-reviewed and accepted for publication. Since it is being posted so soon after acceptance, it has not yet been copyedited, formatted, or processed by AMS Publications. This preliminary version of the manuscript may be downloaded, distributed, and cited, but please be aware that there will be visual differences and possibly some content differences between this version and the final published version.

The DOI for this manuscript is doi: 10.1175/BAMS-D-16-0148.1

The final published version of this manuscript will replace the preliminary version at the above DOI once it is available.

If you would like to cite this EOR in a separate work, please use the following full citation:

Black, E., H. Greatrex, M. Young, and R. Maidment, 2016: Incorporating satellite data into weather index-based insurance. *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.* doi:10.1175/BAMS-D-16-0148.1, in press.



# **Incorporating satellite data into weather index insurance**

Emily Black\* (1,2)

Helen Greatrex (3)

Ross Maidment (1,2)

Matthew Young (1,2)

1. Department of Meteorology, University of Reading, Reading RG6 6BB, UK

2. Climate Division of the National Centre for Atmospheric Science (NCAS-Climate), UK

3. International Research Institute for Climate and Society, Columbia University, Palisades, NY 10964-8000, USA

\* Corresponding author, [e.c.l.black@reading.ac.uk](mailto:e.c.l.black@reading.ac.uk)

## **Incorporating satellite data into weather index-based insurance**

University of Reading, 16-17 February 2016

**Title: The first TAMSAT/IRI Weather Index Insurance Workshop**

**What:** Twenty-three people from six countries came together to discuss how drought insurance based on remotely sensed data can reduce the impact of weather shocks on some of the poorest people in the world. Participants were drawn from the financial and agricultural sectors, non-governmental and governmental organizations, as well as from universities.

**When:** February 16-17 2016

**Where:** Reading, UK

Farmers are highly vulnerable to weather shocks, particularly in regions such as Africa where there is a high reliance on rain-fed agriculture. It is therefore unsurprising that a lot of attention has been paid to developing climate risk management tools for farmers to mitigate and transfer the risk of weather shocks such as drought and flood. In recent years, agricultural insurance has become part of this tool-kit, particularly weather index-based insurance (WII). Rather than compensating observed damage, compensation in WII is determined on the basis of an independent index (such as the cumulative precipitation falling in a certain window of time, or the average yield over a district). The trigger for this index is determined in advance of the season.

39

40 WII has shown to be a cost effective tool for agricultural climate risk  
41 management, particularly for “single peril” situations where there is one  
42 overriding and externally measurable peril impacting farmers (e.g. low rainfall at  
43 the start of the season). Millions of farmers are now covered by WII contracts  
44 (Greatrex et al. 2015). A major challenge to scaling WII has been the absence of  
45 comprehensive ground based rainfall and crop data, necessary for index design,  
46 pricing and validation. WII cannot be extended to regions with low gauge  
47 density if it only works in areas covered by existing rain gauges with long  
48 histories (Norton et al. 2012).

49

50 Remotely sensed data, such as satellite based rainfall estimates have become a  
51 key tool in allowing WII to scale to levels where it could meaningfully impact  
52 poverty. They have been used directly in the creation of indices, in validating  
53 existing indices, in tracking insured seasons and in assessing basis risk (where  
54 the compensation does not match the damages). Hundreds of thousands of  
55 farmers are now insured under indices based on remotely sensed datasets,  
56 particularly across Africa (Greatrex et al. 2015). For example, the R4 Rural  
57 Resilience Initiative currently insures 32,000 poor smallholder farmers using  
58 satellite based rainfall and vegetation. Commercial companies such as  
59 Agriculture and Climate Risk Enterprise (ACRE), the Ghana Agricultural  
60 Insurance Pool and PlaNetGuarantee are also investing heavily in satellite  
61 derived indices, covering hundreds of thousands of farmers.

62

63 Satellite derived WII is still a very new field however, with many challenges to  
64 overcome. Addressing these requires collaboration between academic and  
65 industrial actors, including data providers, agro-meteorologists, insurance  
66 aggregators (who design and implement indices), insurance and reinsurance  
67 companies (who price them) and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) who  
68 can link directly to farmers.

69

70 In order to bring these communities together, the Tropical Applications of  
71 Meteorology using SATellite data and ground-based observations (TAMSAT)  
72 group and the International Research Institute for Climate and Society (IRI) led a  
73 workshop on Index Insurance at the University of Reading, UK, 16-17 February  
74 2016. Twenty-three people participated, including scientists specializing in  
75 rainfall and land surface remote sensing, experts in climate risk management  
76 and index insurance, insurance aggregators and reinsurers. The workshop  
77 consisted of short introductory talks followed by in depth discussion in break  
78 out groups. A key output is an extension of the TAMSAT/IRI's *Practitioners'*  
79 *Guide to using satellite data for index insurance*.

80

81 A challenge when using satellite data is choosing which of the many satellite  
82 products to use (see Table 1 in Maidment *et al* 2014). Satellite rainfall providers,  
83 are, moreover, keen to facilitate the use of their data by the insurance industry.  
84 Such datasets include TAMSAT (Tarnavsky *et al.* 2014; Maidment *et al.* 2014),  
85 Climate Hazards Group InfraRed Precipitation with Station data (CHIRPS) (Funk  
86 *et al.* 2015), ENACTS (Dinku *et al*, 2016) and Africa Rainfall Climatology (ARC2)  
87 (Novella *et al*, 2013). The characteristics that make remotely sensed data

suitable for WII was a recurring theme of the workshop. For a dataset to be useful to the insurance industry, it must have adequate temporal and spatial resolution, low latency, sufficient length of record, and be easily accessible. The exact requirements depend on the context. For example, although a horizontal resolution of 0.5° might be suitable for a national insurance program, finer resolution is required for schemes administered at the community level.

Beyond the basic criteria listed above, datasets must also represent variability in the insured index skillfully enough to pay out at the appropriate time. During the insured season, missing data affects the decision as to whether the index has triggered. A sensitivity study presented at the meeting showed that even a low proportion of missing data (<5%) significantly denigrates the accuracy of payouts. Unlike gauge-based datasets, satellite-based rainfall datasets, such as TAMSAT and CHIRP/CHIRPS, rarely contain missing values operationally – a clear advantage of using such data. TAMSAT, for example, has had no missing days since 2006. All African rainfall datasets, however, contain missing historical records. This has the potential to distort pricing because historical data are used to assess how often payouts occur (a historical “burn analysis”). Average payouts can then be used to establish premium levels. Missing historical data impacts the historical burn analysis. If the missing data would have triggered the index, then the premium should have been higher.

The workshop provided a forum for data providers and insurers to discuss the treatment of missing data and to agree on revised guidelines for data providers. Data providers and insurers have different priorities when accounting for



missing data. Data providers aim to estimate missing points as accurately as possible. Insurers, of course, need accurate data. However, they also need to constrain the effect of missing data on pricing - for example, by carrying out burn analyses with missing data filled using several different techniques. Following the workshop discussion, it was agreed that data providers should fill missing data as accurately as possible, but that all filled points should be clearly flagged. In addition, dataset documentation should contain a description of the methodology used for filling data.

Reduced missing data is clearly an advantage of satellite-based rainfall products. However, remotely sensed rainfall is only a proxy for actual rainfall. It is crucial that indices based on satellite-based rainfall are designed to maximize the skill of the estimation methodology. Aggregation over space as well as over time generally improves skill (for example, Maidment *et al* 2013). It is important, however, that indices represent the local conditions experienced by the policy-holders. It is necessary, therefore, to balance the improvements in skill gained by aggregating against the loss of representativity of local conditions (Black *et al.* 2016). For instance, satellites may represent rainfall aggregated over a 1000 x 1000 km box accurately (i.e. have good skill), but the aerially averaged rainfall is not representative of conditions experienced by an individual farmer living within the region (i.e. representativity is low).

At the workshop, the scientific community and data providers emphasized the need to aggregate satellite-based rainfall to maximize skill. The insurance industry participants and other stakeholders highlighted the need for clear

guidance from data providers as to the spatial scale that can “trusted.” The participants agreed that the final choice of scale for aggregation is highly context dependent. The need to evaluate both skill and representativity of aggregated indices was acknowledged by all.

The workshop closed with a discussion of new products, platforms and datasets. A range of datasets was discussed, including ENACTS (Dinku et al. 2016), CHIRPS (Funk et al. 2015), and the Climate Change Initiative soil moisture (Liu et al. 2012). The discussion focused on the importance of using multiple data sources for validation of WII indices, especially in regions where groundtruth data are sparse. Cross comparison of data is a challenge for the insurance industry, and this has motivated the development of a number of platforms, including the NASA-Interdisciplinary Research in Earth Science (NASA-IDS) Remote Sensing for Agricultural Insurance platform, and the Satellite Technologies for Improved Drought-Risk Assessment (SATIDA; Enenkel et al. 2016). These complement training resources, such as the IRI Weather Index Insurance Educational Tool (WIJET; <http://wiiet.iri.columbia.edu/WIJET/>) and more general drought early warning systems, such as the [Famine Early Warning Systems Network](http://earlywarning.usgs.gov:8080/EWX/index.html) (FEWSNET) Early Warning Explorer (EWX; <http://earlywarning.usgs.gov:8080/EWX/index.html>).

In conclusion, remotely sensed data can be used to extend weather index insurance to millions of farmers in Africa and beyond – potentially mitigating their exposure to climate-related risk. On the other hand, inappropriate use of these data could cause great harm. This workshop enabled key players in the

weather index insurance industry to engage directly with data providers and scientists. As a result, data providers now have a clearer idea of the way that their products are being used. The insurance industry, moreover, has a better understanding of both the opportunities and pitfalls of using remotely sensed data. Following the success of this workshop, the participants agreed that deeper engagement between data providers, scientists and the weather index insurance industry would be of benefit to all parties. Further workshops, projects and collaborations are planned.

## **Acknowledgements**

This workshop was supported by the Natural Environmental Research Council SatWIN-Scale project (NE/M008797/1), and the Climate Division of the UK National Centre for Atmospheric Science (NCAS-Climate) core programme.

The work presented was also implemented as part of the CGIAR Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS), which is a strategic partnership of CGIAR and Future Earth. It was carried out with funding by CGIAR Fund Donors, the Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA), Australian Government (ACIAR), Irish Aid, Environment Canada, Ministry of Foreign Affairs for the Netherlands, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), Instituto de Investigação Científica Tropical (IICT), UK Aid, Government of Russia, the European Union (EU), New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, with technical support from the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). The views expressed in this document cannot be taken to reflect the official opinions of CGIAR or Future Earth.

188

189 We are grateful to the University of Reading Statistical Services Centre for  
190 hosting the meeting, and to all the participants for their hard work during the  
191 workshop.

192 Black, E., E. Tarnavsky, R. Maidment, H. Greatrex, A. Mookerjee, T. Quaife, and M.  
193 Brown, 2016: The Use of Remotely Sensed Rainfall for Managing Drought  
194 Risk: A Case Study of Weather Index Insurance in Zambia. *Remote Sens.* , **8**,  
195 doi:10.3390/rs8040342.

196 Dinku, T., R. Cousin, J. Corral, P. Ceccato, M. Thomson, R. Faniriantsoa, I.  
197 Khomyakov, and A. Vadillo, 2016: *The ENACTS Approach: Transforming*  
198 *climate services in Africa one country at a time*. New York,  
199 <http://www.worldpolicy.org/policy-paper/2016/03/16/enacts-approach>.

200 Enenkel, M., and Coauthors, 2016: A Combined Satellite-Derived Drought  
201 Indicator to Support Humanitarian Aid Organizations. *Remote Sens.* , **8**,  
202 doi:10.3390/rs8040340.

203 Funk, C., and Coauthors, 2015: The climate hazards infrared precipitation with  
204 stations—a new environmental record for monitoring extremes. *Sci. Data*, **2**,  
205 150066. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2015.66>.

206 Greatrex, H., J. Hansen, S. Garvin, R. Diro, S. Blakeley, M. Le Guen, K. Rao, and D.  
207 Osgood, 2015: *Scaling up index insurance for smallholder farmers: Recent*  
208 *evidence and insights*. Copenhagen, Denmark,  
209 <http://hdl.handle.net/10568/53101>.

210 Liu, Y. Y., W. A. Dorigo, R. M. Parinussa, R. A. M. de Jeu, W. Wagner, M. F. McCabe,  
 211 J. P. Evans, and A. Van Dijk, 2012: Trend-preserving blending of passive and  
 212 active microwave soil moisture retrievals. *Remote Sens. Environ.*, **123**, 280–  
 213 297.

214 Maidment, R. I., D. I. F. Grimes, R. P. Allan, H. Greatrex, O. Rojas, and O. Leo, 2013:  
 215 Evaluation of satellite-based and model re-analysis rainfall estimates for  
 216 Uganda. *Meteorol. Appl.*, **20**, 308–317, doi:10.1002/met.1283.  
 217 <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/met.1283> (Accessed February 17, 2014).

218 ———, D. I. F. Grimes, E. Tarnavsky, R. P. Allan, M. Stringer, T. Hewison, R.  
 219 Roebeling, and E. Black, 2014: The 30-year TAMSAT African Rainfall  
 220 Climatology And Time-series (TARCAT) Dataset. *J. Geophys. Res.*,

221 Norton, M. T., C. Turvey, and D. Osgood, 2012: Quantifying spatial basis risk for  
 222 weather index insurance. *J. Risk Financ.*, **14**, 20–34,  
 223 doi:10.1108/15265941311288086.  
 224 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/15265941311288086>.

225 Tarnavsky, E., D. Grimes, R. Maidment, E. Black, R. P. Allan, M. Stringer, R.  
 226 Chadwick, and F. Kayitakire, 2014: Extension of the TAMSAT Satellite-Based  
 227 Rainfall Monitoring over Africa and from 1983 to Present. *J. Appl. Meteorol.*  
 228 *Climatol.*, **53**, 2805–2822, doi:10.1175/JAMC-D-14-0016.1.

229