

Climate Resilience: The New Fortress of Modern Business

Author : Prof. Dr.Inten Meutia, MAcc., CA., CSRS., CSRS., CSF
Profile : Professor and Lecturer, Faculty of Economics, Universitas Sriwijaya
Member of the Board of Directors, Institute of Certified Sustainability
Practitioners (ICSP)
ICSP Member ID : 10262187



Introduction

Have you ever imagined a modern textile factory suddenly shutting down, not because it lost out to competitors, but because a clean water crisis crippled its production lines for months on end? Or picture a logistics company losing millions of dollars overnight because an extreme storm devastated the main port where its fleet was docked?

These scenarios are no longer the stuff of science fiction. Risk analysis reports from Munich Re (2026) record that economic losses from natural disasters worldwide, dominated by extreme weather phenomena, reach hundreds of billions of US dollars every year. Meanwhile, domestically, the Ministry of National Development Planning/Bappenas estimates that Indonesia's potential economic losses from climate change could surge sharply to exceed Rp2,005 trillion by 2029 if not accompanied by structured adaptation measures.

In the past, climate change was often dismissed as the concern of environmental activists or merely a charitable program for corporate image-building. But that script is now obsolete. The climate crisis has mutated into a genuine threat to corporate balance sheets and business survival (IPCC, 2023).

Amid this dynamic, the old business approach, focused solely on cost efficiency and sales growth, is no longer adequate. Companies now face a new reality: they must be "climate-fit." This is where the concept of Corporate Climate Resilience Assessment comes in. It is not merely a formality of filling out Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) documents, but

a strategic navigation instrument that separates corporations ready to survive the future from those merely waiting to be disrupted.

1. Identifying the Hidden Enemy: Physical Risks and Transition Risks

To build a truly resilient business fortress, corporate boards and management must first precisely understand the nature of the climate threats they face. In scientific literature and modern financial risk analysis, climate risks are divided into two broad categories (Karydas & Xepapadeas, 2022; Suciati et al., 2024):

A. Physical Risks

Physical risks are the direct impacts of changes in the natural landscape on business assets and operations:

- **Acute Risks**
Extreme weather events that strike suddenly but carry high destructive power, such as flash floods, forest fires, or tropical storms that damage factory infrastructure, cut off power grids, and halt work activities abruptly.
- **Chronic Risks**
Long-term, gradual, yet systematic shifts in climate patterns, for instance, rising average global temperatures increasing industrial cooling costs, rising sea levels threatening coastal industrial zones, and changing rainfall patterns disrupting supply in the agribusiness and commodities sectors.

B. Transition Risks

These risks arise not directly from natural disasters, but from the dynamics of the world's shift toward a low-carbon economy:

- **Regulations and Policy:**
The introduction of carbon taxes, increasingly stringent emission caps, and ever-tightening sustainability reporting obligations.
- **Market and Technology Disruption:**
The emergence of more efficient green technologies and a shift in consumer preferences away from high-emission products. Companies that are slow to adopt these innovations risk losing market share permanently.

Without systematic climate resilience assessment, organizations are vulnerable to climate myopia, a condition in which corporate leadership fails to identify the broad chain of risks extending far beyond their direct operations (Saraswathy et al., 2024).

2. Why Climate Resilience Assessment Has Become a Strategic Imperative

There are three primary drivers that have elevated climate resilience assessment to the top of the boardroom agenda:

A. Financial Reporting and Global Regulatory Pressure

Businesses can no longer hide behind annual reports adorned with green claims unsupported by evidence. The implementation of IFRS S2 (Climate-related Disclosures) by the International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB) demands a higher degree of transparency. Companies are required to quantitatively disclose how climate risks affect

financial performance, cash flows, and short- and long-term strategic assessments (Mlynarczyk, 2026).

B. Capital Access and Investment Risk

Financial institutions, institutional investors, and global banks are becoming increasingly selective. Through the mapping of financed emissions and the integration of climate risk matrices into credit analysis, banks are beginning to restrict capital flows to entities deemed vulnerable (Jena, 2024; Suciati et al., 2024). Companies without a clear climate resilience strategy will face significantly higher costs of capital, or may even lose access to funding altogether.

C. Supply Chain Protection

Modern production systems are highly interconnected. When a single vendor or raw material supplier in one region is hit by a climate disaster, the impact will directly paralyze production lines at the company's main operations (Biesbroek et al., 2025). Climate resilience assessment helps companies identify weak points, or bottlenecks, across their entire value chain.

3. Core Components of the Climate Resilience Assessment Framework

An effective climate resilience assessment process requires a multidimensional methodology to produce an accurate picture of risk:



Figure: Corporate Climate Resilience Assessment Framework

A. Asset-Level Exposure Mapping:

Leveraging spatial data technology and climate projection modeling to measure the vulnerability of factory locations, data centers, and logistics facilities to specific natural hazards (Soleimani Roudi et al., 2025).

B. Adaptive Capacity Evaluation:

Measuring the extent to which a company's internal structures, such as the availability of emergency funds, technological flexibility, and leadership readiness are capable of responding quickly to recover from climate shocks (Saraswathy et al., 2024).

C. Scenario-Based Financial Stress Testing:

Simulating the resilience of a business model across various future climate projections, such as the scenario framework of the Network for Greening the Financial System (NGFS). These stress tests calculate how much potential revenue could be eroded under conditions of an orderly transition, a disorderly transition, or the worst-case scenario a hot house world.

4. Strategic Execution: From Document to Concrete Action

Climate resilience assessment must not remain merely a thick document gathering dust in an archive. Assessment findings must be directly channeled into capital expenditure (CAPEX) allocations and day-to-day operational decisions:

A. Adaptive Infrastructure and Nature-Based Solutions:

Strengthening the structural resilience of factory buildings, elevating critical facilities, and implementing nature-based solutions, such as planting water absorption areas and protective vegetation around industrial zones to mitigate flood risk and erosion hazards.

B. Supplier Diversification:

Reducing dependence on a single vendor in high-risk regions by building a geographically distributed network of backup suppliers.

C. Leveraging Green Finance:

Accessing sustainable financing instruments, such as green bonds or sustainability-linked loans, that offer special interest rate incentives for investments in climate adaptation and mitigation projects (Behera et al., 2024; Suciati et al., 2024).

Conclusion

Corporate climate resilience assessment has now evolved from a matter of environmental goodwill into a central pillar of business defense strategy. The increasingly tangible climate crisis no longer affords any room for compromise or delay.

Companies that invest boldly in systematic and comprehensive Climate Resilience Assessment today are not only protecting their assets and shareholder value from potentially devastating losses, they are also positioning themselves at the forefront to seize new economic opportunities in an era of sustained global transition.

Postponing climate resilience assessment is equivalent to gambling on a bet you are certain to lose. Climate storms and tightening market regulations will not wait for your corporation to be ready; they will run over anyone who is slow to adapt. The choice for corporate leaders today is simple: audit your business vulnerabilities independently right now, or be forced to face a far harsher audit, delivered by disasters and markets, later.

References

- Behera, P., et al. (2024). The impact of green finance instruments on CO₂ emissions reduction and environmental sustainability in emerging economies. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 351, 119820.
- Biesbroek, R., et al. (2025). Assessment of existing datasets for tracking progress towards the Global Goal on Adaptation (and beyond). *Climate Policy*, 25(2), 145–162.
- IPCC. (2023). *Climate Change 2023: Synthesis Report*. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland.
- Jena, S. (2024). A Systematic Review of Scopus Database on the Climate Finance Strategies for Private Sector Engagement in Climate Mitigation and Adaptation. *SDMIMD Journal of Management*, 15(Special Issue), 45–58.
- Karydas, C., & Xepapadeas, A. (2022). Climate change financial risks: Insights from macroeconomic modeling and scenario analysis. *European Economic Review*, 148, 104240.
- Mlynarczyk, M. (2026). *Climate transition plans in corporate sustainability reporting: Regulatory compliance and strategic implementation under EU frameworks*. Stockholm University Press / DiVA.
- Munich Re. (2026). *Climate change presses on: Devastating wildfires and intense thunderstorms exacerbate losses for insurers*. Munich Re Corporate Communications.
- Saraswathy, V. P., et al. (2024). Climate Change and Industry: A Systematic Literature Review and Bibliometric Insights on Mitigation and Adaptation. *Sustainability*, 16(2), 724.
- Soleimani Roudi, A., et al. (2025). Determinants and indicators of healthy, climate-resilient systems: A scoping review. *Cities & Health*, 9(1), 88–105.
- Suciati, R., et al. (2024). The Role of Financial Stability in Mitigating Climate Risk: A Bibliometric and Literature Analysis. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, 17(8), 428.

This article is available in two languages. The Indonesian version is the author's original work (available at ICSP Website: <https://institute-csp.org/media/icsp-member-articles/260730-im/>). And the English translation is provided for the convenience of international readers. Please note that the translation was not prepared by the author and may not fully capture the intended nuance of the original text.