



Risk management perspective for climate service development – Results from a study on Finnish organizations

Riina Haavisto (1), Atte Harjanne (1,2), Heikki Tuomenvirta (1), and Hilppa Gregow (1)

(1) Finnish Meteorological Institute, Helsinki, Finland, (2) Aalto University School of Business, Helsinki, Finland

Climate change can cause significant risks to businesses and public administration. However, it can also offer opportunities. The key is in the provision of information, how it is communicated, how tailored and how it meets the needs of the users. To better understand how climate risks and opportunities are reflected in different organizational processes and related information needs we conducted a study on weather and climate risk perceptions, management and information use in Finnish organizations. In addition we collected feedback on how the existing climate information tools should be developed.

Data on climate risk management was collected in an online survey and in one full-day workshop. The survey was aimed to Finnish public and private weather and climate data user organizations and altogether 151 responses was collected. The workshop consisted of two parts: weather and climate risk management processes in general and development of the current information tools further to address user needs.

We found that climate risk management in organizations is very de-centralized and diverse and that external experts are considered the most useful sources of related information. These result in users emphasizing the need for networks of expertise and sector specific information tools that require input and information sharing from the users as well. Better temporal and spatial accuracy is naturally asked for, but users also emphasized the need for transparency when it comes to communicating uncertainties, availability and up-to-datedness of information. There is also a great need to understand the need of resources: human, temporal and budget. One needs 1) proper adaptation strategy, 2) clear implementation plan, 3) clarified roles of responsibilities and 4) justified analysis of the costs and benefits of adaptation measure.

Our results illustrate that any holistic evaluation of climate services should take into account the context of organizational risk management processes.