Proceedings of the 14th International Scientific and Practical Conference «Global and Regional Aspects of Sustainable Development»

(September 16-18, 2026). Copenhagen, Denmark

No 309

REGIONAL ECONOMY

Climate Change and Economic Risks to Global Food Security

Simeonov Ivailo[1]

[1]PhD in Department of National and Regional Security; *University of National and World Economy (UNWE)*; Bulgaria

Abstract. Food security is an increasingly important global challenge shaped by climate change, economic uncertainty, geopolitical instability and disruptions in international food systems. This article examines the relationship between climate change, economic risks and global food security, focusing on the effects of climate-related shocks on agricultural production, food prices, household purchasing power, trade and nutrition. The study applies a qualitative analytical approach based on a review and synthesis of scientific literature and institutional evidence. It considers the main dimensions of food security—availability, access, utilization and stability—and analyses their vulnerability to extreme weather events, water scarcity, inflation, poverty and supply-chain disruptions. The findings indicate that climate change represents not only an environmental challenge but also a systemic economic risk transmitted through production, prices, incomes and markets. The article emphasizes the need for integrated adaptation policies, resilient food systems, sustainable agricultural practices, social protection and international cooperation to reduce vulnerability and strengthen long-term food security.

Keywords: *food security, climate change, economic risks, food prices, agricultural production, food systems, resilience, sustainable development.*

Food security is increasingly understood as a multidimensional outcome of the interaction between food production, markets, household resources, institutions, ecosystems and public policy. The classical concern with aggregate food supply remains important, but it no longer provides a sufficient explanation of hunger and malnutrition. Food may be physically available in a country while particular households remain unable to obtain an adequate diet because of low income, high prices, geographical isolation, conflict or weak social protection. The contemporary analytical perspective therefore links agricultural performance to purchasing power, nutrition, infrastructure, trade, environmental sustainability and resilience.

The conceptual development of food security reflects this shift. The international debate that emerged from the food

REGIONAL ECONOMY

crises of the 1970s initially concentrated on supply and price stability. By the 1996 World Food Summit, the concept had broadened to encompass physical and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food for an active and healthy life. Later formulations explicitly included social access as well. This evolution moved the policy debate from the question of whether enough food exists towards the question of whether people can reliably obtain and use adequate food.

Climate change makes this multidimensional perspective indispensable. Higher temperatures, changing precipitation, droughts, floods, wildfires, ocean warming and other climate-related hazards can reduce crop, livestock and fishery productivity. Yet the consequences do not stop at the farm gate. Production losses can affect inventories, transport, processing, trade flows and prices. Higher prices can erode real household income and force consumers to substitute cheaper, less diverse diets. In vulnerable economies, the same shock may weaken farm incomes, increase fiscal pressure and intensify poverty.

The recent experience of food-price inflation demonstrates the importance of these economic transmission channels. The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2025 emphasizes that elevated food-price inflation has undermined purchasing power and access to healthy diets, particularly among low-income populations. Food-security analysis must therefore connect climate risk with inflation, wages, market structure, energy costs, exchange rates and social protection rather than treating climate and economics as separate policy fields.

The main objective of this article is to analyse the relationship between climate change, economic risks and global food security and to identify policy measures capable of strengthening food-system resilience. The research object is the global food-security system under conditions of environmental and economic uncertainty. The research subject is the set of direct and indirect relationships through which climate change affects food availability, access, utilization and stability through production, prices, income, trade, infrastructure and nutrition.

The study pursues five interrelated tasks: to clarify the theoretical evolution of food security; to identify the principal climate-related risks to food systems; to examine economic transmission mechanisms; to assess compound and cascading risks; and to formulate recommendations for

REGIONAL ECONOMY

adaptation and resilience. Methodologically, the article applies descriptive, comparative and systemic analysis and synthesizes scientific and institutional literature. The central proposition is that climate change affects food security both directly through biological and physical impacts on food production and indirectly through economic mechanisms that determine affordability and access.

Theoretical and Conceptual Framework of Food Security

Food security developed as an international policy concept during a period in which global concern focused on shortages and instability in basic food commodities. Early formulations consequently emphasized national and global supplies. This supply-side approach was understandable in the context of the 1970s, but subsequent research demonstrated that famine and hunger could occur even where aggregate food availability was not exceptionally low. The decisive analytical insight was that access and entitlement matter: people can become food insecure when they lose the means to command food through income, production, exchange or transfers.

The 1990s consolidated a broader, multidisciplinary interpretation. The 1992 International Conference on Nutrition strengthened the link between agriculture, nutrition and health, while the 1996 World Food Summit became a major milestone in the international definition of food security. The definition adopted at the Summit emphasized that food security exists when people have physical and economic access, at all times, to sufficient, safe and nutritious food meeting dietary needs and preferences. This formulation established a foundation for the four-pillar framework widely used in research and policy.

Availability concerns the physical presence of food and is determined by domestic production, stocks, imports and exports. It depends on agricultural productivity, land, water, technology, energy, infrastructure and functioning markets. Availability is therefore not equivalent to domestic self-sufficiency. International trade can improve availability by allowing food-deficit areas to draw on production from food-surplus regions, although excessive concentration of suppliers can create new vulnerabilities.

Access refers to the capacity of individuals and households to obtain available food. Economic access depends on income, employment, asset ownership, prices and social transfers, while physical access depends on transport,

REGIONAL ECONOMY

markets and geographical conditions. The distinction is essential because national food abundance can coexist with household hunger. Inflation is especially important because food expenditures account for a larger share of the budgets of poorer households, making them more exposed to price increases.

Utilization links food consumption to nutrition, health and the body's ability to benefit from food. Dietary diversity, food safety, clean water, sanitation and health care affect nutritional outcomes. Sufficient calories do not necessarily imply adequate nutrition. Deficiencies in protein, iron, zinc and other micronutrients can coexist with caloric sufficiency, which is why food security must be connected to diet quality rather than measured only through quantities of staple foods.

Stability adds a temporal dimension. Food availability and access must be reliable rather than temporary. Households can move rapidly from security to insecurity after crop failure, unemployment, conflict, sudden inflation or natural disaster. Stability therefore connects food security with vulnerability, risk management and resilience. A system that performs well under normal conditions but collapses when exposed to shocks cannot be regarded as sustainably food secure.

Recent food-security thinking also gives greater attention to agency and sustainability. Agency concerns the capacity of people to participate meaningfully in decisions shaping food systems and their own food choices. Sustainability concerns the ability of food systems to meet present needs without undermining ecological, economic and social foundations for future generations. These dimensions are especially relevant under climate change because adaptation measures may redistribute costs and benefits among producers, consumers, regions and generations.

No single indicator captures all dimensions of food security. Production statistics may reveal availability but say little about affordability. Income indicators may approximate economic access but do not measure diet quality. Nutrition outcomes are influenced by health and sanitation as well as food consumption. Effective assessment therefore requires a dashboard combining production, market, household, nutrition, climate and vulnerability indicators. This multidimensionality is a methodological challenge but also a necessary reflection of the phenomenon itself.

Proceedings of the 14th International Scientific and Practical Conference «Global and Regional Aspects of Sustainable Development»

(September 16-18, 2026). Copenhagen, Denmark

No 309

REGIONAL ECONOMY

Climate Change as a Systemic Risk to Food Security

Climate change influences food systems through multiple climatic impact drivers. Heat, drought, floods, changing rainfall, storms, sea-level rise, ocean warming and acidification affect terrestrial and aquatic food production. The magnitude of these effects varies by region, production system and adaptive capacity. Rain-fed agriculture, pastoral systems, small islands, drylands and low-income regions are particularly exposed because livelihoods are closely tied to climate-sensitive natural resources.

Crop production is affected through temperature stress, altered growing seasons, water scarcity, soil degradation, pests and diseases. Moderate warming can have heterogeneous effects, but higher levels of warming increase the probability of simultaneous losses in major producing regions. Extreme heat during sensitive crop-development stages can sharply reduce yields, while drought can limit both rain-fed production and irrigation where reservoirs and groundwater are stressed.

Livestock systems face heat stress, reduced feed availability, water scarcity and changing disease patterns. Heat can reduce animal fertility, weight gain and milk production. Pastoral systems are vulnerable when drought lowers pasture productivity over large areas. These impacts have economic consequences for rural households because livestock often serves simultaneously as a source of food, income, savings and insurance.

Fisheries and aquaculture are also exposed. Ocean warming changes species distribution and productivity, while marine heat waves and acidification can damage ecosystems on which fisheries depend. Coastal communities may face a double exposure when climate change reduces aquatic resources while storms and sea-level rise damage ports, storage, processing facilities and settlements.

Climate hazards can disrupt infrastructure even when primary production is not severely affected. Floods and storms can damage roads, railways, ports, warehouses, cold chains and energy systems. A food system therefore may experience shortages or price spikes because food cannot be stored or transported efficiently. This illustrates why resilience must be analysed across the entire value chain rather than only at the level of agricultural output.

Climate change also affects nutritional quality. Higher atmospheric carbon dioxide can alter concentrations of

REGIONAL ECONOMY

protein and micronutrients in some crops. Climate-related changes in fruit, vegetable, fish and livestock availability can reduce dietary diversity. These effects are important because the food-security challenge is not merely to supply calories but to ensure access to nutritionally adequate diets.

The severity of climate-related food risk depends on exposure, vulnerability and capacity to respond. Wealthier producers may invest in irrigation, insurance, improved seeds, storage and information systems, while poorer producers often have fewer options. The same drought can therefore generate manageable losses in one region and a humanitarian emergency in another. Climate risk is socially differentiated rather than purely biophysical.

A further concern is the possibility of concurrent shocks. Global food markets can normally compensate for a localized production failure by reallocating supplies through trade. When several major producing regions experience adverse conditions at the same time, however, the capacity for substitution declines. This can amplify commodity-price volatility and transmit local climate shocks internationally.

Economic Dimensions of Food Security

The economic dimension of food security begins with affordability. Households require sufficient purchasing power to acquire an adequate diet. Real income, employment, wages, food prices, housing and energy costs, debt obligations and social transfers jointly determine this capacity. Food insecurity can therefore rise even when national food supplies are stable if prices increase faster than incomes.

Food-price inflation has strongly distributional consequences. Low-income households generally spend a higher share of their resources on food and possess smaller financial buffers. They are therefore more likely to respond to price increases by reducing dietary diversity, purchasing lower-quality food, skipping meals or cutting expenditure on health, education and other necessities. These coping strategies can create long-term human-capital costs.

Recent international evidence reinforces this relationship. SOFI 2025 reports that food-price inflation outpaced headline inflation during the post-pandemic surge and that elevated food prices undermined purchasing power, especially in low-income economies. The report links higher food prices with increased moderate-to-severe food insecurity and highlights the disproportionate burden on vulnerable

REGIONAL ECONOMY

populations. This evidence shows why price stability and income protection are central components of food-security policy.

Agricultural prices, however, have different effects on producers and consumers. Higher farm-gate prices may benefit net sellers, but many small farmers are also net purchasers of food and may face higher fertilizer, fuel, seed and credit costs. The welfare effect therefore depends on the structure of household production and consumption. Policy responses should avoid simplistic assumptions that higher food prices automatically benefit rural populations.

Exchange rates and international prices are particularly important for import-dependent economies. Currency depreciation raises the domestic cost of imported food and agricultural inputs. Energy-price increases affect fertilizer production, machinery, irrigation, processing, refrigeration and transport. Consequently, an external energy or currency shock can become a food-security shock even without a domestic harvest failure.

Trade improves food security by allowing countries to diversify sources of supply and smooth regional production variability. Yet trade dependence can also transmit shocks. Export restrictions, conflict, port disruption or concentrated sourcing may suddenly reduce access to key commodities. Resilient trade policy should therefore distinguish between openness and dependence: diversified international integration can strengthen resilience, whereas reliance on a narrow set of suppliers or routes can increase systemic risk.

Food security and economic growth interact in both directions. Higher productivity and income can improve household access and expand public resources for infrastructure, health, education and social protection. Conversely, adequate nutrition supports cognitive development, health and labour productivity. Persistent malnutrition can reduce human capital and reinforce poverty traps. Food security should thus be viewed as both an outcome and an input of development.

Public finances are another transmission channel. Governments often respond to food crises through subsidies, transfers, tax reductions, public stocks or emergency imports. These measures can protect consumers but may become fiscally expensive, particularly when shocks persist. Countries with limited fiscal space face difficult trade-offs

REGIONAL ECONOMY

between immediate relief and long-term investment. Building resilience before crises occur is therefore economically preferable to relying exclusively on emergency intervention.

Compound, Cascading and Geopolitical Risks

Food-security shocks rarely occur in isolation. Climate hazards interact with conflict, poverty, energy markets, disease outbreaks, water scarcity and macroeconomic instability. These interactions can produce compound risks, in which several stresses occur simultaneously, and cascading risks, in which an initial disruption triggers additional failures across connected systems.

A drought, for example, may reduce crop output and farm income. Lower output raises local prices; higher prices reduce consumer purchasing power; farmers facing income losses may postpone investment; governments may increase subsidies; and import demand may rise. If the national currency is simultaneously depreciating or global commodity prices are high, the cost of imports increases further. What begins as a climatic event can therefore become an agricultural, inflationary, fiscal and social crisis.

Conflict magnifies these dynamics by damaging infrastructure, restricting mobility, reducing investment and disrupting production and trade. Food insecurity can also contribute to social instability when households experience severe and persistent losses of purchasing power, although the relationship is context-dependent and should not be reduced to a deterministic causal claim. The policy implication is that peace, institutional capacity and food-system resilience are mutually reinforcing.

The COVID-19 pandemic illustrated how non-climatic shocks can expose weaknesses in food systems. Restrictions, labour shortages and logistical disruptions interacted with changes in demand and later with energy and commodity-market pressures. Subsequent geopolitical conflict added further stress to grain, fertilizer and energy markets. Climate extremes occurring within such an environment can have larger consequences than they would under stable economic conditions.

Water security is another important connection. Agriculture competes with households, industry and ecosystems for limited water resources. Drought and higher temperatures can increase irrigation demand precisely when water availability declines. Poorly designed adaptation may transfer risk rather than reduce it—for example, excessive

REGIONAL ECONOMY

groundwater extraction can support short-term production while undermining long-term sustainability.

The concept of systemic risk is therefore useful for food-security analysis. Food systems are networks of producers, input suppliers, processors, transporters, retailers, financial institutions, governments and consumers. Disturbances can propagate through these networks. Resilience requires redundancy, diversity, information and adaptive capacity so that the failure of one component does not cause disproportionate system-wide damage.

Food Security, Hunger and Nutrition

The relationship between climate change and nutrition extends beyond the quantity of calories available. Healthy diets require diversity, affordability, food safety and access to nutrient-rich foods. Climate shocks can reduce supplies of fruits, vegetables, animal-source foods and fish, while price increases may encourage households to substitute cheaper energy-dense staples. The result can be simultaneous exposure to undernutrition, micronutrient deficiency and diet-related disease.

Children are particularly vulnerable because nutritional deprivation during early life can produce lasting effects on physical growth, cognitive development and future productivity. Maternal nutrition also influences birth outcomes and intergenerational health. Food-price shocks therefore have consequences that may persist long after markets stabilize.

Food safety can also be affected by climate conditions. Higher temperature and humidity can influence pathogens, pests and mycotoxins. Flooding can contaminate water and food-storage systems. Ocean warming can alter harmful algal blooms and marine pathogens. These pathways reinforce the need to integrate food safety and public health into climate adaptation.

Nutrition-sensitive food-security policy should therefore protect not only minimum caloric intake but also access to diverse and healthy diets. School feeding, maternal and child nutrition programmes, targeted transfers and support for local production of nutrient-rich foods can complement broader agricultural and market policies. The quality of diets should be a central indicator of resilience rather than an afterthought.

Adaptation and Resilience of Food Systems

Adaptation involves reducing exposure and vulnerability while increasing the capacity of food systems to cope with

REGIONAL ECONOMY

changing climatic conditions. Effective adaptation is not a single technology or programme. It is a continuous process of learning, investment, institutional adjustment and risk management across farms, markets, infrastructure and households.

At farm level, adaptation options include changes in crop varieties and planting dates, improved irrigation efficiency, soil-moisture conservation, agroforestry, crop diversification, integrated pest management and climate-informed decision-making. Livestock adaptation can involve heat-tolerant breeds, shade, water management, altered feeding practices and disease surveillance. Fisheries and aquaculture require ecosystem-based management, flexible quotas, monitoring and adaptation to shifting species distributions.

Diversification is a recurring resilience principle. Farms dependent on one crop, households dependent on one income source and countries dependent on one import supplier are more exposed to shocks. Diversification cannot eliminate risk, but it can reduce the probability that a single disruption causes catastrophic loss. Policies should encourage economically viable diversification rather than impose uniform production models.

Climate information and early-warning systems can improve decisions before shocks occur. Seasonal forecasts, drought monitoring, market-price information and pest alerts allow producers and governments to respond earlier. The value of information depends on accessibility and trust; data must be translated into actionable guidance for farmers, traders and local authorities.

Infrastructure investment is equally important. Storage reduces post-harvest losses and creates buffers. Cold chains protect perishable foods. Roads, railways and ports facilitate redistribution when local shortages emerge. Reliable electricity and digital connectivity support processing, logistics and information systems. Resilience therefore requires coordination between agricultural policy and broader infrastructure planning.

Financial instruments can help households and firms absorb shocks. Agricultural insurance, emergency credit, savings mechanisms and risk-sharing arrangements can support recovery. However, poorly designed insurance may be inaccessible to small producers or may fail when systemic shocks affect entire regions. Public-private arrangements and

REGIONAL ECONOMY

index-based products can be useful, but they require reliable data and careful consumer protection.

Social protection is indispensable because adaptation capacity is unevenly distributed. Cash transfers, food assistance, unemployment protection and school meals can preserve access during shocks. Adaptive social-protection systems should be scalable so that coverage and benefit levels can increase when climate or price indicators signal a crisis. Targeting should be accurate enough to reach vulnerable households without creating excessive administrative delay.

Supply-chain resilience requires diversification of suppliers and routes, strategic storage where economically justified, improved logistics and stronger regional markets. Shorter supply chains can be useful for some products and communities, but localization is not universally superior. International trade remains essential for balancing geographically uneven production. The objective should be a robust combination of local, regional and global sourcing.

Demand-side measures also matter. Reducing food loss and waste can increase effective availability without requiring proportional increases in production. Dietary patterns influence land, water and emissions, and healthier diets can sometimes generate environmental co-benefits. Such transitions, however, should respect affordability, cultural preferences and nutritional requirements.

Adaptation also faces limits and trade-offs. Irrigation can reduce drought exposure but increase pressure on scarce water. Protective trade measures can support domestic producers but raise consumer prices. Bioenergy policies can compete with food production for land. Adaptation must therefore be evaluated across multiple objectives and time horizons to avoid maladaptation—actions that reduce one risk while increasing another.

Governance, International Cooperation and Sustainable Development

Food security is a global concern but implementation remains strongly rooted in national institutions. Governments determine agricultural policy, social protection, infrastructure investment and many market regulations. At the same time, climate change, commodity markets and trade are transboundary. Effective governance therefore requires coordination across local, national, regional and international levels.

REGIONAL ECONOMY

The Committee on World Food Security has become an important forum for inclusive global dialogue, bringing governments together with international organizations, civil society and other stakeholders. The evolution of food-security governance reflects recognition that technical knowledge and practical experience are distributed across many institutions rather than concentrated in a single agency. Inclusive governance can improve legitimacy and reveal vulnerabilities that aggregate national indicators overlook.

International cooperation is particularly important for research, climate finance, early warning, humanitarian response and market transparency. Low-income countries often face the greatest exposure while possessing the least fiscal and technological capacity to adapt. International finance should therefore support long-term resilience rather than only emergency relief after crises occur.

The Sustainable Development Goals provide a broad policy framework linking Zero Hunger with poverty reduction, health, water, climate action, ecosystems and inequality. These goals should not be treated as separate silos. Progress on food security depends on advances across multiple goals, and poorly coordinated policies can create trade-offs. Integrated planning is consequently essential.

Private-sector actors also shape resilience through investment, procurement, processing, logistics, retail and innovation. Public policy should create incentives for sustainable investment while maintaining competition and preventing excessive market concentration. Transparency in food markets and supply chains can improve both efficiency and accountability.

Civil society and producer organizations can strengthen local adaptation by representing communities, sharing knowledge and coordinating collective action. Bottom-up participation is particularly important because vulnerability is context-specific. National strategies are more likely to succeed when local actors participate in identifying risks and designing interventions rather than merely implementing externally defined solutions.

Discussion

The analysis confirms that the contemporary food-security challenge cannot be reduced to a global production gap. Production remains fundamental, but access, nutrition, stability, agency and sustainability determine whether food systems actually deliver human well-being. This distinction

changes the policy question from 'How can more food be produced?' to 'How can food systems reliably provide adequate, healthy and affordable diets under increasing uncertainty?'

Climate change intensifies this challenge because it affects several components simultaneously. It can lower yields, increase production costs, disrupt infrastructure, alter trade patterns and reduce nutritional quality. These effects interact with pre-existing inequality and economic vulnerability. Climate change therefore acts as a risk multiplier rather than an isolated environmental variable.

Economic policy is consequently part of climate adaptation. Inflation management, social protection, competition policy, exchange-rate stability, access to finance and infrastructure investment influence how climate shocks are transmitted to households. Conversely, agricultural and climate policy can contribute to macroeconomic stability by reducing the frequency and magnitude of food-supply shocks.

The evidence also suggests that resilience should not be equated with self-sufficiency. Complete national self-sufficiency can be costly and, in countries with limited land or water, physically unrealistic. Trade can diversify climate risk because production conditions differ across regions. The more relevant objective is strategic diversification: avoiding excessive dependence on individual crops, suppliers, routes, technologies or income sources.

Equity is central to adaptation. Vulnerable households often have the least capacity to invest before shocks and the fewest resources to recover afterwards. Without deliberate social policy, climate adaptation may reinforce existing inequalities. Measures that improve aggregate resilience should therefore be evaluated for distributional effects.

Finally, adaptation must be dynamic. Climate conditions, technology, markets and demographics are changing. Fixed plans based on historical climate patterns are unlikely to be sufficient. Governments and firms need monitoring systems, scenario planning and institutions capable of revising strategies as new information emerges.

Policy Transmission Channels and an Integrated Analytical Framework

A useful way to synthesize the preceding analysis is to distinguish between primary climate impacts and secondary economic transmission. Primary impacts occur when temperature, precipitation, water availability or extreme

REGIONAL ECONOMY

events directly alter biological production and physical infrastructure. Secondary impacts emerge when those losses are translated through markets and institutions into changes in prices, wages, profits, trade balances, fiscal expenditure and household welfare. This distinction helps explain why similar physical shocks can generate very different social outcomes. The economic transmission mechanism is shaped by market integration, storage capacity, competition, import dependence, exchange rates, fiscal space and the responsiveness of social-protection systems.

The first transmission channel is agricultural productivity. Lower yields reduce marketable output and may increase average production costs. Farmers can respond by changing inputs, switching crops, drawing down savings or reducing investment. Where adaptation options are limited, repeated shocks can erode productive assets and create a cycle in which lower income today reduces the capacity to invest in resilience tomorrow. The long-run effect can therefore exceed the immediate value of a lost harvest.

The second channel is price formation. A production shock does not translate mechanically into an identical price change. The response depends on inventories, import capacity, market concentration, transportation costs and expectations. Well-integrated markets and adequate stocks can smooth temporary shortages, whereas fragmented markets and damaged infrastructure can magnify them. Expectations may also matter: traders and consumers anticipating future scarcity may alter purchasing and storage behaviour, increasing short-term volatility.

The third channel is household income. Climate shocks affect not only consumers but also workers and producers. Agricultural labour demand may fall after crop losses, tourism and other climate-sensitive activities can weaken, and informal employment may become less reliable. A household can therefore face higher food prices and lower income simultaneously. This double exposure is especially dangerous for households without savings, insurance or access to formal credit.

The fourth channel is the external sector. Food-importing countries are exposed to world prices, freight costs and exchange-rate movements. A domestic currency depreciation can amplify an international commodity-price increase, while a stronger currency can partially cushion it. Countries that export agricultural commodities may benefit from higher

REGIONAL ECONOMY

international prices in aggregate, but domestic consumers can still experience affordability problems. Trade balances and food security can therefore move in different directions.

The fifth channel concerns public budgets. Governments may respond to food-price shocks through subsidies, tax reductions, public procurement, strategic reserves, transfers or emergency imports. These instruments can stabilize access, but they have different fiscal and distributional effects. Generalized price subsidies are politically visible but often expensive and may benefit higher-income consumers in absolute terms. Targeted transfers can be more efficient but require administrative capacity, reliable registries and payment systems.

An integrated analytical framework should therefore monitor at least five groups of indicators: climatic hazards and water conditions; agricultural production and input costs; food prices and trade; household income and dietary outcomes; and institutional response capacity. Combining these indicators can improve early warning because deterioration in one domain may be manageable, while simultaneous deterioration across several domains signals a much more serious systemic risk.

Scenario analysis is particularly useful under deep uncertainty. Rather than relying on a single forecast, policymakers can examine combinations of warming, commodity prices, exchange rates, trade disruptions and income growth. Stress tests can identify thresholds at which existing storage, social protection or import capacity becomes insufficient. Such exercises can support contingency planning and clarify which investments provide value across multiple plausible futures.

The framework also highlights the importance of timing. Immediate crisis measures and long-term structural reforms serve different purposes. Emergency transfers can prevent hunger during a price spike, but they do not substitute for irrigation, research, storage or diversified energy systems. Conversely, long-term investments cannot protect a household that lacks food today. Effective policy therefore requires layered instruments operating over different time horizons.

Measurement should also distinguish between national averages and distributional outcomes. Aggregate food availability can improve while vulnerable groups deteriorate. Average inflation can fall while prices of nutrient-rich foods remain unaffordable. National adaptation spending can rise

REGIONAL ECONOMY

while remote rural areas receive little support. Disaggregated data by income, location, gender, age and livelihood are therefore important for evaluating whether resilience is inclusive.

A further analytical priority is the interaction between mitigation and adaptation. Food systems contribute to greenhouse-gas emissions, while simultaneously being highly exposed to climate impacts. Policies that reduce emissions can generate adaptation co-benefits when they improve soil health, energy efficiency or reduce food loss. However, mitigation measures can also create trade-offs if they increase land competition or food prices. Policy assessment should therefore consider food security explicitly when designing climate interventions.

Finally, resilience should be evaluated not only by the speed of recovery after a shock but by whether recovery reduces future vulnerability. Rebuilding damaged infrastructure to the same standard may restore activity quickly while reproducing exposure. Transformational adaptation seeks to alter the underlying structure of risk through new technologies, institutions, livelihood opportunities or spatial planning. This approach is more demanding but may become increasingly necessary where incremental adaptation approaches physical or economic limits.

The European context deserves particular attention because it illustrates both the advantages and vulnerabilities of highly integrated food markets. The European Union combines substantial agricultural production with dense cross-border trade, common regulatory frameworks and extensive transport infrastructure. Integration can absorb localized production losses, yet simultaneous heat, drought or flood events can affect several member states and create pressure on prices, water resources and farm incomes. Adaptation therefore requires coordination across national borders, river basins, agricultural markets and infrastructure networks.

For Bulgaria and other countries in South-Eastern Europe, climate resilience in agriculture is closely connected to water management, soil protection, modernization of irrigation, farm structure and access to investment. Greater climatic variability can increase the value of risk-management instruments and agricultural advisory services. At the same time, regional integration provides opportunities to diversify supply and share information. National food-

REGIONAL ECONOMY

security strategies should therefore combine domestic productive capacity with the advantages of European and international markets rather than treating these objectives as alternatives.

Research and policy evaluation should increasingly focus on the cost-effectiveness of adaptation. Resources are limited, and not every technically feasible intervention produces the same reduction in risk. Economic appraisal should account for avoided losses, distributional benefits, environmental effects and option value under uncertainty. Investments that perform reasonably well across a wide range of climate scenarios may be preferable to solutions optimized for a single forecast. This is particularly relevant for infrastructure with long lifetimes.

The role of knowledge institutions is also important. Universities, research organizations and agricultural extension services can connect global climate science with local production decisions. Interdisciplinary research is necessary because food-security outcomes emerge from biological, economic and social processes. Stronger cooperation between climate scientists, agronomists, economists, nutrition specialists and public-policy researchers can improve both diagnosis and the design of practical interventions.

Recommendations

Based on the analysis, a coherent policy package should combine prevention, preparedness, protection and transformation. The following recommendations are proposed.

First, food security should be embedded in national climate-adaptation and economic-resilience strategies. Agricultural ministries cannot manage systemic food risk alone. Coordination is required with finance, environment, health, transport, energy, trade and social-policy institutions.

Second, public and private investment should prioritize climate-resilient agriculture. Research and extension systems should support heat- and drought-tolerant varieties, soil health, water efficiency, diversified production and context-appropriate digital technologies. Innovation policies should explicitly address the needs of small and medium-sized producers.

Third, governments should strengthen integrated early-warning systems combining climate forecasts, crop conditions, food prices, household vulnerability and nutrition indicators. Trigger-based contingency plans can enable action before a shock becomes a humanitarian crisis.

REGIONAL ECONOMY

Fourth, adaptive social protection should protect purchasing power during food-price and climate shocks. Targeted cash transfers, school feeding and nutrition programmes should be designed for rapid scale-up. Assistance should preserve access to healthy diets rather than merely minimum calories.

Fifth, supply chains should be diversified and critical infrastructure strengthened. Investment in storage, cold chains, transport, ports, energy and digital systems can reduce losses and improve the ability to redirect supplies during disruptions. Regional trade corridors deserve particular attention.

Sixth, trade policy should support resilience without encouraging unnecessary protectionism. Countries should diversify suppliers and maintain transparent, predictable trade rules. Emergency export restrictions should be carefully assessed because simultaneous restrictions by several exporters can amplify global price spikes.

Seventh, agricultural finance and insurance should become more accessible. Blended finance, guarantees, weather-index insurance and emergency credit can support adaptation, but products must be transparent and affordable. Financial instruments should complement, not replace, investments that reduce underlying risk.

Eighth, food loss and waste should be reduced throughout the value chain. Better harvesting, storage, processing, packaging, retail management and consumer awareness can increase effective food availability and reduce unnecessary pressure on land, water and energy.

Ninth, nutrition should be integrated into agricultural and economic policy. Support should encourage diversified, nutrient-rich production and improve affordability of healthy diets. Public procurement, school meals and targeted nutrition programmes can create demand for nutritious foods while protecting vulnerable groups.

Tenth, adaptation policies should be screened for maladaptation and distributional impacts. Measures that overexploit water, displace vulnerable groups or transfer costs to future generations may reduce short-term exposure while increasing long-term risk.

Eleventh, international climate and development finance should place greater emphasis on food-system resilience in vulnerable economies. Financing should support infrastructure, research, institutional capacity and local

REGIONAL ECONOMY

adaptation rather than focusing only on post-disaster response.

Twelfth, governance should be participatory. Farmers, consumers, local authorities, scientists, civil society and businesses should be involved in risk assessment and policy design. Participation improves the relevance of interventions and supports agency within food systems.

Conclusion

Food security is one of the defining development challenges of the twenty-first century because it lies at the intersection of economic welfare, human health, environmental sustainability and political stability. The evolution of the concept from a narrow concern with aggregate supply to a multidimensional framework of availability, access, utilization and stability has made it possible to understand why hunger can persist even when food exists in aggregate.

Climate change deepens the challenge by introducing greater variability and uncertainty into food production and distribution. Heat, drought, floods, changing ecosystems and extreme events affect crops, livestock, fisheries, infrastructure and livelihoods. Their consequences are transmitted through prices, income, trade, public budgets and nutrition. Climate change should therefore be treated as a systemic economic risk to food security.

The analysis also demonstrates that vulnerability is not evenly distributed. Low-income households, small producers and countries with limited fiscal and institutional capacity face greater difficulties in absorbing shocks. Food-price inflation can rapidly convert a production or market disturbance into a crisis of access. Protecting purchasing power is consequently as important as protecting physical supply.

Resilience requires a portfolio of measures rather than a single solution. Climate-resilient production, diversified supply chains, effective trade, infrastructure, early warning, social protection, finance and nutrition-sensitive policy are mutually reinforcing. Their effectiveness depends on institutions capable of coordinating across sectors and adapting strategies over time.

The central policy implication is that food security should be approached as a system. Interventions focused only on production risk overlooking affordability; interventions focused only on prices risk neglecting ecological limits; and interventions focused only on emergency relief risk perpetuating vulnerability. Sustainable food security

REGIONAL ECONOMY

requires prevention, adaptation and structural transformation.

Future research should further quantify the economic transmission of climate shocks across different food-system components and examine how adaptation measures affect inequality, prices and nutrition. Greater integration of climate, market and household-level data would improve early warning and allow more precise evaluation of policy effectiveness. The ultimate objective is not simply to maximize food output, but to build food systems capable of delivering sufficient, safe, nutritious and affordable food under changing environmental and economic conditions.

References:

[1] Bezner Kerr, R., Hasegawa, T., Lasco, R., et al. (2022). Food, Fibre and Other Ecosystem Products. In: Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Cambridge University Press.

[2] FAO (1996). Rome Declaration on World Food Security and World Food Summit Plan of Action. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

[3] FAO (2003). Trade Reforms and Food Security: Conceptualizing the Linkages. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

[4] FAO (2016). The State of Food and Agriculture 2016: Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security. Rome: FAO.

[5] FAO, IFAD, UNICEF, WFP and WHO (2025). The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2025: Addressing High Food Price Inflation for Food Security and Nutrition. Rome: FAO.

[6] HLPE (2020). Food Security and Nutrition: Building a Global Narrative towards 2030. Rome: High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition.

[7] IPCC (2019). Climate Change and Land: An IPCC Special Report on Climate Change, Desertification, Land Degradation, Sustainable Land Management, Food Security, and Greenhouse Gas Fluxes in Terrestrial Ecosystems.

[8] IPCC (2022). Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Sixth Assessment Report. Cambridge University Press.

[9] Malthus, T. R. (1798). An Essay on the Principle of Population. London.

[10] Sen, A. (1981). Poverty and Famines: An Essay on Entitlement and Deprivation. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

[11] United Nations (2015). Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. New York: United Nations.

[12] World Food Programme (2009). World Hunger Series: Hunger and Markets. Rome: WFP.

[13] World Bank (1986). Poverty and Hunger: Issues and Options for Food Security in Developing Countries. Washington, DC: World Bank.