BUILD BACK BETTER INITIATIVE · SUDAN & EAST AFRICA

Evidence for Resilience - Policy. Communities. Change.

Europe Can't Insure Its Way Out of a $953 Billion Climate Bill. Sudan Shouldn't Be Asked to Try.

Europe's own $953 billion climate-disaster bill is barely a quarter insured. Sudan's donor-backed risk-financing pilot expires this year, mid-war — with no market left to hand its lessons to.

2026-08-19 · Research Team

Contents

Europe's own $953bn climate-disaster bill shows insurance covers only a quarter of losses even in a mature market. Sudan's ADRiFi risk-financing pilot expires this year mid-war — 3Bi argues the FRLD's first grant round must prioritize grant, not loan or premium, finance for fragile states.

3Bi Research Team

The Ask

We're asking the Fund for Responding to Loss and Damage (FRLD) and Sudan's bilateral climate donors to reserve a fixed share of the FRLD's first grant round — the one its Board just cleared the path for in Manila on 8–10 July 2026 (FRLD, 10 July 2026) — for conflict-affected states with near-zero domestic insurance capacity, Sudan foremost among them, and to make that allocation grant-based rather than loan-based or premium-cofinanced.

Why Now

Two things are converging this year, and the gap between them is the story. First, attaqa.net's Energy Research Unit reported on 18 August 2026 that climate disasters have cost the European Union close to $953 billion since 1980 — and that even inside the world's most institutionally mature insurance market, only about a quarter of that damage was covered by insurance, falling below 5% in some member states (attaqa.net, 18 August 2026, citing the European Environment Agency and European Central Bank). Second, Sudan's own five-year pilot in exactly this kind of risk-financing — the African Development Fund's $8.56 million ADRiFi programme, built around parametric drought insurance through the African Risk Capacity — was designed to run 2022 to 2026 (AfDB, 9 July 2021) and is therefore expiring this year, in the middle of a war that has gutted the state capacity needed to carry its lessons forward.

If Europe, with functioning markets, a central bank actively designing a shared reinsurance backstop, and 88.9% of GDP in eurozone government debt still available to absorb shocks (attaqa.net, 18 August 2026, citing Eurostat and the ECB), cannot close its adaptation-finance gap through insurance and market mechanisms alone, then a financing model built around premiums and pooled risk was never going to be the primary answer for Sudan. Sudan needs the FRLD's first funding round, expected to begin approving $5–20 million grants from July 2026 onward (FRLD, accessed 19 August 2026), to say so explicitly — before the default administrative logic of "risk transfer" and "insurance-linked instruments" that dominates the wider adaptation-finance conversation gets applied to a country that cannot generate the premiums to participate in it.

The Evidence

Europe's own numbers make the case against relying on insurance. The European Environment Agency puts direct economic losses from extreme weather across the EU at roughly €822 billion ($953 billion) between 1980 and 2024, with €208 billion ($241 billion) of that — nearly a quarter of the 44-year total — landing in just the last four years (attaqa.net, 18 August 2026). The European Central Bank estimates insurance covers only about a quarter of those losses bloc-wide, and under 5% in some member states, which is why Germany had to find €30 billion ($34.7 billion) in public money after the 2021 floods and why Spain's 2024 floods — its worst in five decades — are projected to cost the equivalent of 0.7 percentage points of GDP in reconstruction through 2026 (attaqa.net, 18 August 2026). The EEA separately estimates the EU needs €53–137 billion a year in adaptation investment through 2050 for transport, energy and agriculture alone; committed funding currently runs at just €15–16 billion a year (attaqa.net, 18 August 2026). Brussels' own response is not "more insurance" — it's a European Commission package on the insurance gap expected by the end of 2026, an ECB proposal for an EU-wide public-private reinsurance pool, and Portugal moving toward mandatory home insurance backed by a state disaster fund rather than the private market alone (attaqa.net, 18 August 2026).

The global adaptation-finance gap is worse, and mostly debt. UNEP's Adaptation Gap Report 2025 puts developing-country adaptation costs at $310–365 billion a year by 2035, against international public adaptation finance flows of just $26 billion in 2023 — down from $28 billion in 2022, and moving the wrong direction even as the Glasgow Climate Pact's pledge to double adaptation finance by 2025 comes due (UNEP Adaptation Gap Report 2025, October 2025). That's a 12–14 times gap between need and flow. And of what does flow, 58% arrives as loans, including non-concessional credit (UNEP Adaptation Gap Report 2025, October 2025) — a structure a war-indebted state cannot use.

Africa's version of this gap is sharper still, and Sudan sits at its worst edge. Forty African countries face a combined $265 billion investment gap against $331 billion in adaptation needs identified in their own national climate plans through 2030 (ORF, accessed 19 August 2026). Insurance penetration across the continent runs below 1%, African countries lose an estimated 2–5% of GDP to climate impacts every year, some spend up to 9% of national budgets on disaster response, and less than 0.5% of climate losses are actually insured (World Economic Forum; African Sustainability Matters, accessed 19 August 2026). Sudan's ADRiFi pilot was meant to be this continent's proof of concept for closing that gap through parametric coverage: in 2021 the government signed a $4.2 million crop-insurance policy and a $3 million rangeland policy with the African Risk Capacity, with premiums subsidised by a UK- and Switzerland-backed multi-donor trust fund (AfDB, 9 July 2021). That five-year programme concludes this year against the backdrop of up to $3 billion in war damage to Sudan's electricity grid since April 2023, including the loss of roughly 40% of prior generating capacity — the Merowe Dam and El-Obeid thermal plant among the casualties (UNDP Sudan, 26 May 2026, previously verified). There is no functioning domestic insurance sector left to hand that pilot's lessons to.

Addressing the Counter-Case

The strongest objection is that parametric insurance and risk-pooling instruments like the African Risk Capacity are not meant to replace grants — they're meant to make scarce grant and premium-subsidy money go further by transferring predictable, recurring risk (like a bad harvest season) off government balance sheets, freeing grants for the unpredictable, catastrophic risk that insurance markets price poorly or not at all. That's a fair description of what ADRiFi was actually built to do, and Sudan's original 2021 design reflected it: donor-subsidised premiums, not donor-funded payouts. The gap in that logic is capacity, not concept. Insurance-linked instruments still require a counterparty government able to administer a risk pool, collect and report the underlying data, and maintain the institutional continuity to renew a multi-year policy — conditions Sudan's Ministry of Finance and central bank cannot currently guarantee under active conflict and fragmented territorial control. Europe's own experience reinforces this distinction rather than undermining it: the ECB and European Commission are not proposing to replace fiscal spending with insurance, they're proposing to build public backstops *because* private insurance alone under-delivers even where the administrative capacity is not in question. Sudan's problem is one step further upstream than Europe's — the administrative capacity itself is what the war has damaged — which is precisely why grant finance, not premium-based instruments, has to carry more of the load until that capacity is rebuilt.

What 3Bi Recommends, Specifically

First, the FRLD Board should designate a defined share — we'd suggest no less than 15% — of its initial $250 million funding envelope for active-conflict and immediate post-conflict states, evaluated on humanitarian severity and institutional fragility rather than on the risk-quantification data those same conditions make impossible to produce, so Sudan is not disqualified by the very fragility the fund exists to address.

Second, Sudan's own donor coordination bodies — the UN Sudan country team, UNDP Sudan, and the African Development Bank's Sudan portfolio — should submit an FRLD funding request this cycle that explicitly proposes using a grant to preserve, rather than replace, ADRiFi's institutional groundwork: the risk-quantification methodology and African Risk Capacity relationship built during 2022–2026, so that capacity is ready to reactivate once premium financing becomes viable again, instead of having to be rebuilt from zero after the war ends.

Third, bilateral donors funding Sudan's energy and grid reconstruction — the same donors 3Bi has tracked moving toward battery storage and mini-grid financing over recent months — should treat this as one integrated ask rather than two separate ones: physical reconstruction and climate-risk-financing capacity are the same investment, and funding one without the other leaves Sudan rebuilding a grid it still cannot afford to insure against the next flood or heatwave.

Sourcing & Contact

Primary trigger: attaqa.net, "☒☒☒☒☒ ☒☒☒☒☒☒☒ ☒☒ ☒☒☒☒☒ ☒☒☒☒☒☒ ☒☒ ☒☒☒☒☒☒ ☒☒☒☒☒ ☒☒☒☒☒☒" ["Europe's climate disaster bill approaches a trillion dollars"], 18 August 2026, citing the European Environment Agency, European Central Bank, and Eurostat. Extended via: UNEP, *Adaptation Gap Report 2025: Running on Empty*, October 2025; the Observer Research Foundation, "Financing Climate Adaptation in Africa," accessed 19 August 2026; World Economic Forum and African Sustainability Matters reporting on Africa's insurance protection gap, accessed 19 August 2026; African Development Bank press release on Sudan's ADRiFi programme, 9 July 2021; and UNDP Sudan's Solar Energy Value Chain Study and 26 May 2026 grid-damage press release (previously verified in earlier 3Bi publications). Questions or partnership inquiries: research@3bisudan.org.

This publication is produced with support from 3Bi's institutional donors; see the full funder list at 3bisudan.org.

This piece was produced through 3Bi's automated daily publications workflow, which monitors regional and international climate reporting.

Suggested citation: 3Bi Research Team (2026). "Europe Can't Insure Its Way Out of a $953 Billion Climate Bill. Sudan Shouldn't Be Asked to Try." 3Bi.
Publisher: 3Bi (Build Back Better Initiative)
Location: Khartoum, Sudan