Systemic Investing and Resilient Ecosystems: A Framework for Sustainable Growth and Impact

Farhad Reyazat – PhD in Risk Management

Citation: Reyazat, F. (2025, September 2). *Systemic Investing and Resilient Ecosystems: a framework for sustainable growth and impact*. www.reyazat.com. https://www.reyazat.com/2025/09/02/systemic-investing-and-resilient-ecosystems-a-framework-for-sustainable-growth-and-impact/

Abstract

Risk management has long been perceived as a defensive function—an exercise in compliance, control, and the prevention of failure. However, in the aftermath of the 2008 global financial crisis, regulators and scholars alike recognized that resilience could not be built in silos. New frameworks, such as Basel III, have redefined risk management as the cornerstone of systemic stability, emphasizing the importance of liquidity buffers, stress testing, and the management of interconnected risks. A similar paradigm shift is urgently needed in entrepreneurship.

Startups and small- to medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) remain highly vulnerable to market volatility, resource scarcity, climate shocks, and geopolitical disruptions. When entrepreneurship is defined narrowly in terms of profitability and growth, ventures risk fragility and unsustainability. Growth-only models fail to account for ecological limits and systemic interdependencies. To remain viable, entrepreneurial ecosystems must embed resilience into governance, business strategy, and financing.

This article proposes systemic investing as a framework for embedding resilience into entrepreneurship. Rather than funding ventures in isolation, systemic investing designs multi-layered capital structures and ecosystems that channel resources toward purpose-driven entrepreneurs. By reframing systemic risks as systemic opportunities, such as aging populations driving longevity innovation or climate challenges catalyzing circular economies, entrepreneurs and investors can co-create sustainable pathways for growth.

The contribution of this article is twofold: it highlights how embedding systemic resilience strengthens the long-term viability of startups and SMEs, and it outlines how academics, investors, and policymakers can support the design of resilient ecosystems for purpose-driven innovation.

Keywords: systemic resilience, systemic investing, entrepreneurship, SMEs, impact investing

Introduction

Risk management has traditionally been understood as a defensive discipline, primarily focused on compliance, control, and error avoidance. Within both finance and entrepreneurship, the dominant view has been that risk management exists to prevent loss, protect institutions, and satisfy regulatory obligations. This compliance-driven perspective treats risk as an afterthought, a box to tick once business models, strategies, and operations have already been designed. However, in recent decades, scholars and practitioners have increasingly recognized that this perspective is insufficient. Risk cannot be reduced to a checklist. Instead, it must be approached as a strategic discipline capable of shaping organizational design, guiding investment decisions, and fostering long-term resilience.

The global financial crisis of 2008 marked a turning point. Regulators and policymakers realized that the health of individual institutions did not guarantee the stability of the financial system as a whole. New regulatory frameworks, such as Basel III, introduced systemic perspectives on liquidity, stress testing, and interconnected risks (Rebeca Anguren, 2024). These measures reframed risk management not as an obstacle to growth but as a foundation for systemic stability. This paradigm shift within finance offers valuable lessons for entrepreneurship today, particularly for startups and small- to medium-sized enterprises (SMEs).

Entrepreneurship is often framed primarily in terms of profitability and growth. Economic theory has long equated higher levels of gross domestic product (GDP) per capita with improved standards of living (Baumol, 1990; Kuznets, 1955). However, growth, when pursued as the sole objective, is inherently fragile and unsustainable. Startups and SMEs operate in volatile environments characterized by resource scarcity, climate shocks, digital disruption, and geopolitical uncertainty. If they adopt a narrow view of risk—limiting it to compliance or operational efficiency—they leave themselves exposed to systemic vulnerabilities. This fragility manifests in high failure rates, difficulties in accessing capital, and an inability to scale sustainably across markets. (Hockerts, K,2010)(Smallbone, D., 2012).

The objective of this article is to demonstrate why systemic resilience must be embedded into both entrepreneurship and investing. Systemic resilience refers to the capacity of ventures, markets, and ecosystems to anticipate, absorb, adapt to, and recover from disruptions while maintaining their core functions (Cynthia A, 2011; Folke, 2010). In entrepreneurship, embedding resilience requires moving beyond short-term growth metrics toward strategies that account for interdependencies, long-term sustainability, and societal impact. Investing involves financing structures that support not just individual firms but the broader ecosystems within which they operate. (Harji, Karim & Jackson, 2012); (Jäger, Johannes & Schmidt, 2020)

The significance of this shift extends across multiple stakeholders. For entrepreneurs, adopting systemic resilience as a guiding principle enables ventures to withstand uncertainty and scale sustainably. For academics, embedding resilience offers a fertile ground for theory-building at the intersection of systems thinking, risk management, and entrepreneurship studies. For policymakers, systemic resilience provides a framework for designing policies and instruments that enable innovation ecosystems to flourish without succumbing to fragility. Importantly, for investors, resilience-oriented frameworks help de-risk portfolios while simultaneously identifying opportunities in emerging markets such as climate adaptation technologies, longevity innovations, and circular economy ventures.

This article advances the thesis that risk is not the opposite of opportunity but its blueprint. By embedding systemic resilience into the DNA of entrepreneurship and investing, we can transform vulnerabilities into opportunities and design ecosystems that are sustainable, regenerative, and capable of global growth. (Reyazat,F , 2025) The financial crisis revealed that resilience is indispensable for systemic stability in banking and capital markets; today, entrepreneurship requires a similar shift in paradigm. Embedding resilience at the entrepreneurial and ecosystem level is no longer optional; it is essential for long-term viability, competitiveness, and impact. (Reyazat,F , 2025)

2. Theoretical Foundations

2.1 Risk Management Evolution

For much of the twentieth century, risk management was treated as a defensive mechanism, a process of monitoring compliance, mitigating losses, and adhering to regulatory standards.

Organizations considered risk management primarily as a control function, one that ensured activities did not deviate from pre-set boundaries. This defensive stance, while helpful in preventing immediate crises, left institutions underprepared for systemic disruptions.

The global financial crisis of 2008 exposed the shortcomings of this approach. Regulators recognized that the collapse of a single institution could ripple across the entire system, posing a threat to global economic stability. In response, new frameworks such as Basel III emphasized the importance of systemic safeguards, including liquidity buffers, leverage ratios, and rigorous stress testing. The logic shifted: resilience could no longer be secured through siloed compliance measures; it required recognition of interconnections across markets, institutions, and geographies.

This evolution reframed risk management as a strategic enabler rather than a barrier to growth. By embedding resilience into their core structures, organizations could not only withstand shocks but also seize opportunities that arise from them. The same lesson now applies to entrepreneurship, where startups and SMEs face similarly complex and interconnected risks.

2.2 Limitations of Growth-Only Models

Entrepreneurship has often been defined through the lens of growth and expansion. Higher revenues, market expansion, and GDP contributions are frequently taken as proxies for success. However, equating growth with well-being has proven to be a flawed assumption (Shane S, 2009). GDP per capita may rise, yet measures of ecological sustainability, social cohesion, and quality of life can simultaneously decline.

Ecological economics highlights the limits of growth. The concept of planetary boundaries suggests that humanity cannot exceed certain thresholds such as carbon emissions, biodiversity loss, and freshwater use without triggering irreversible damage (Rockström et al., 2009); (Steffen et al., 2015). A striking example illustrates this point: if every individual on Earth consumed resources at the same rate as the average resident of the United Arab Emirates, more than four planets' worth of resources would be required to sustain that lifestyle (Reyazat, F, February 2024). Such realities demonstrate that growth-only models are fundamentally unsustainable.

Startups and SMEs are particularly vulnerable under these conditions. Unlike large corporations with diversified operations and significant political influence, smaller ventures often lack the buffers necessary to withstand external shocks. They are more exposed to supply chain disruptions, climate-related costs, and market volatility. Pursuing growth without embedding resilience leaves them fragile, jeopardizing their ability to scale and attract long-term investment.

2.3 Conceptual Bridge: Systemic Risk to Systemic Investing

The recognition of systemic risk in finance offers a conceptual bridge for rethinking entrepreneurship and investing. As Reyazat (2025) argues, systemic investing moves beyond the funding of isolated ventures to the financing of interconnected ecosystems. The logic is that risks are rarely confined to a single organization; they often ripple across networks of suppliers, consumers, institutions, and natural systems. Similarly, opportunities emerge not in isolation but in the shared spaces between actors.

Systemic investing, therefore, designs layered capital structures that enable resilience at the ecosystem level. This may include combining venture finance, trade finance, blended funds, and even tokenized assets to ensure that entire systems—not just individual firms—are robust against disruption. By embedding resilience into financing architectures, systemic investing transforms risks into opportunities. For example, demographic shifts in Japan, often perceived as liabilities, become

opportunities for longevity innovation; climate risks become drivers of circular economies and regenerative technologies.

In this way, systemic investing provides a practical framework for embedding resilience into entrepreneurship. It aligns the design of business models with the realities of interconnected risks, creating ecosystems that are both sustainable and investable.

3. Embedding Systemic Resilience in Entrepreneurship

3.1 SMEs and Startups in Complex Systems

Small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) and startups represent the backbone of global economies, yet they operate in environments increasingly characterized by complexity and volatility. Unlike large corporations that possess diversified revenue streams, political influence, and access to substantial liquidity reserves, smaller ventures often lack buffers to withstand systemic disruptions. Climate shocks, such as floods, droughts, and wildfires, can have a direct impact on supply chains, production costs, and consumer demand. Geopolitical uncertainties, including trade wars, sanctions, and regional instability, further expose SMEs to risks that are difficult to anticipate or hedge against. Market volatility—whether driven by global financial fluctuations, commodity price swings, or technological disruption adds a layer of vulnerability.

Governance gaps compound these systemic pressures. Early-stage ventures often prioritize growth, innovation, and market entry over robust governance structures. Boards may lack independent oversight, risk management expertise, or sustainability frameworks (Gabrielsson & Huse, 2005). Without these capacities, startups and SMEs are ill-prepared to adapt to external shocks. This fragility underscores the necessity of embedding resilience not as a reactive measure but as a foundational principle of entrepreneurial design.

3.2 Risk as Strategy

Embedding resilience requires a paradigm shift: risk must be reframed from a defensive posture to a strategic asset. This approach entails integrating risk awareness into business models, operations, and investment decisions from the outset. Three practical methods illustrate this shift.

Adaptive business models. Ventures can design flexibility into their value propositions and revenue streams. Subscription-based services, for example, can provide predictable cash flows during downturns, while modular product lines enable rapid adaptation to changing consumer preferences (Teece, 2010; McGrath, 2010). Adaptive models ensure that businesses are not locked into brittle growth trajectories.

Diversified supply chains. Overreliance on a single supplier, geography, or logistics route increases the risk of disruption. By cultivating multiple sourcing channels, leveraging local and global partnerships, and integrating digital tracking tools, SMEs can reduce vulnerabilities. This principle has been underscored by recent events, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, which revealed the fragility of concentrated global supply chains (Ivanov & Dolgui, 2020; Gereffi, 2020).

Scenario planning and stress testing. Borrowed from the financial sector, stress testing allows ventures to simulate adverse conditions—such as sudden demand collapse, regulatory shifts, or climate events—and assess their capacity to adapt. By embedding scenario planning into strategic decision-making, startups can anticipate a wider range of futures, identify weaknesses in their models, and invest proactively in resilience-building measures.

Short global cases illustrate the power of this mindset. In Japan, startups operating in the longevity and health-tech sectors have leveraged demographic risks—specifically an aging population—to create opportunities for innovation in eldercare, robotics, and healthcare services. Rather than viewing demographic decline as purely negative, entrepreneurs have embedded resilience into their business models by addressing systemic social needs (Kohlbacher & Herstatt, 2011). In the United Arab Emirates, dependency on fossil fuels has historically been a risk factor. However, entrepreneurs, supported by national investment strategies, are transforming this vulnerability into an opportunity through ventures in clean energy, green hydrogen, and sustainable infrastructure. These cases highlight how systemic risks, when strategically integrated, can catalyze new markets and entrepreneurial opportunities.

3.3 Purpose-Driven & Impact Ventures

For impact-driven and purpose-driven entrepreneurs, the scope of risks extends far beyond traditional financial or operational domains. Climate change, demographic transitions, social trust, and digital sovereignty represent systemic challenges that directly influence business viability. These entrepreneurs must therefore embed resilience not only to survive but also to align with their mission of serving people and the planet.

Resilience, in this context, functions as a reputational, financial, and societal advantage. Reputationally, ventures that demonstrate foresight in addressing systemic risks build credibility with stakeholders, customers, and investors. Financially, resilient ventures are more attractive to capital providers, who increasingly prioritize environmental, social, and governance (ESG) criteria (Eccles et al., 2014; Friede et al., 2015). Societally, resilient ventures contribute to broader ecosystem stability, generating trust and legitimacy in the communities they serve.

By adopting this broader horizon, purpose-driven ventures embody the thesis that risk is not the opposite of opportunity but its blueprint. Climate risk can drive innovations in regenerative agriculture; digital sovereignty concerns can stimulate the development of localized, trusted data infrastructures; declining social trust can inspire ventures in transparency, accountability, and civic engagement. The embedding of systemic resilience ensures that such ventures are not only aligned with their mission but also positioned for long-term sustainability in uncertain global contexts.

4. Systemic Investing and Ecosystem Design

4.1 Financing Ecosystems vs. Single Ventures

Traditional venture finance typically focuses on identifying and funding individual firms with high growth potential. While this approach can yield outsized returns for investors, it overlooks the systemic vulnerabilities inherent in entrepreneurial ecosystems. A startup may succeed in isolation, but if the surrounding supply chains, markets, and regulatory frameworks collapse, its sustainability is compromised. Systemic investing seeks to move beyond this narrow focus by financing entire ecosystems rather than individual ventures (Stam, 2015).

Financing ecosystems requires layered capital structures designed to accommodate different stages of growth, risk profiles, and resilience objectives. Venture equity capital remains crucial for early-stage innovation, but must be complemented by trade finance to support SMEs engaged in global supply chains. Blended finance, which combines public, philanthropic, and private capital, can de-risk investments in underserved sectors such as climate adaptation or social infrastructure (*Author, Year*). Tokenisation of assets and digital securities adds a further layer, enabling fractional ownership, liquidity, and cross-border participation.

Institutional investors play a pivotal role in this model. Pension funds, sovereign wealth funds, and insurance companies manage trillions of dollars in capital and are increasingly facing pressure to align their portfolios with environmental, social, and governance (ESG) imperatives. By channeling institutional money into systemic investment vehicles, these actors can provide both scale and stability, while entrepreneurs benefit from patient capital aligned with resilience objectives. In this sense, systemic investing represents not just a financial innovation but also a governance mechanism for aligning capital with long-term societal needs.

4.2 Transforming Risks into Opportunities

The essence of systemic investing lies in its capacity to transform systemic risks into opportunities for innovation and resilience. Rather than treating risks as external threats to be mitigated, systemic investing reframes them as drivers of entrepreneurial creativity and ecosystem renewal.

In Japan, demographic shifts are a prime example. The nation's aging society, often framed as a liability, has catalyzed a wave of innovations in health technology, eldercare robotics, and longevity-focused business models. By addressing the systemic challenges of declining birth rates and rising healthcare costs, entrepreneurs are building resilient markets that serve both societal needs and attract international capital (Muramatsu & Akiyama, 2011).

In the United Arab Emirates, dependency on hydrocarbons has historically represented a structural risk, exposing the economy to fluctuations in global oil prices. However, this risk has been strategically leveraged as a catalyst for diversification into renewable energy, green hydrogen, and sustainable infrastructure. Entrepreneurial ventures in these sectors are supported not only by national policy but also by global investors seeking exposure to the energy transition. What was once a vulnerability is now being reframed as a platform for systemic resilience and opportunity.

Climate risk provides perhaps the most urgent and globally relevant example. Rising temperatures, extreme weather events, and biodiversity loss threaten entire industries, from agriculture to real estate. However, systemic investing identifies opportunities in regenerative cities, sustainable food systems, and circular economies. Entrepreneurs are pioneering solutions such as vertical farming, zero-waste supply chains, and resilient urban infrastructures. Investors who recognize these dynamics can channel capital toward ventures that both mitigate climate risk and generate competitive returns.

4.3 Building Entrepreneurial Ecosystems

To realize the potential of systemic investing, ecosystems must be intentionally designed and developed. Entrepreneurial ecosystems are not merely collections of startups; they are networks of entrepreneurs, investors, institutions, and policies that co-evolve to create shared value (Autio et al., 2018; Stam & van de Ven, 2021; Reyazat F, August 2025).

Cross-border collaboration is a defining feature of resilient ecosystems. Japan, with its strengths in deep technology and academic entrepreneurship, can serve as a source of knowledge, research, and innovation. The United Arab Emirates, with its global capital hubs and scaling infrastructure, offers the financial and logistical platforms to commercialize and internationalize these innovations. Together, these complementary strengths can form systemic investment architectures that link innovation with scale, risk management with opportunity, and local resilience with global reach.

Incubators, accelerators, and systemic funds play critical roles as bridging institutions. Incubators nurture early-stage ideas, accelerators provide scaling support, and systemic funds align capital with

long-term resilience goals. Unlike conventional venture capital, which often seeks rapid exits, systemic funds are structured to prioritize the health and sustainability of the ecosystem.

Ultimately, the design of entrepreneurial ecosystems must adhere to principles derived from systems thinking, including interconnectedness, adaptability, and redundancy. Interconnectedness ensures that ventures, institutions, and investors collaborate rather than operate in silos. Adaptability enables ecosystems to evolve in response to shifting risks and opportunities. Redundancy, often overlooked in efficiency-driven models, provides crucial buffers that enhance resilience in the face of shocks. Together, these design principles create ecosystems that are not only innovative but also robust in the face of uncertainty.

5. Practical Framework for Entrepreneurs & Investors

Embedding systemic resilience into entrepreneurship and investing requires translating high-level principles into actionable practices. The following framework outlines practical steps for entrepreneurs, investors, academics, and policymakers to co-create resilient and regenerative ecosystems.

5.1 Entrepreneurs

For entrepreneurs, embedding resilience begins with governance. Startups and SMEs often overlook the importance of governance structures in their early stages, but boards and advisory networks can serve as critical sources of resilience. By including advisors with expertise in sustainability, risk management, and systems thinking, entrepreneurs can integrate resilience into strategic decision-making rather than treating it as a peripheral concern (Huse, 2007; Zahra & Pearce, 1989).

Measuring resilience alongside profit is another key step. Conventional financial metrics, such as revenues, margins, and growth rates, tell only part of the story. Entrepreneurs should also track resilience indicators such as supply chain diversity, stakeholder trust, or adaptability to regulatory change. These metrics, while less standardized, provide investors and partners with signals that a venture is prepared for systemic uncertainty.

Finally, aligning with environmental, social, and governance (ESG) criteria and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) enables ventures to demonstrate both accountability and relevance in global markets. Purpose-driven ventures that can demonstrate their contributions to climate action, social inclusion, or sustainable infrastructure are better positioned to attract patient capital and scale internationally (Kotsantonis et al., 2016; United Nations, 2015).

5.2 Investors

For investors, a shift in mindset is required: due diligence should move beyond assessing growth potential to include what might be called “resilience potential.” This entails evaluating whether a venture can survive and adapt to systemic shocks. For example, does the startup have alternative supply chains? Does it align with long-term sustainability trends? Does it maintain governance structures capable of managing crises? Such questions move investment analysis beyond short-term returns toward long-term viability.

Incorporating systemic risk into valuation frameworks represents another critical step. Traditional valuation methods—such as discounted cash flows, comparables, or internal rate of return—rarely capture exposure to systemic risks, including climate change, geopolitical shifts, or technological disruptions. By integrating resilience assessments into valuation models, investors can better account

for downside risks while identifying opportunities in sectors aligned with systemic transitions (Krueger et al., 2020; Battiston et al., 2017).

Investors can also co-create ecosystem financing structures rather than simply funding isolated ventures. By pooling resources into systemic funds, blended finance vehicles, or regional innovation ecosystems, investors can strengthen entire networks of SMEs. This approach not only diversifies risk but also ensures that the failure of a single firm does not destabilize the entire ecosystem. In effect, investors become stewards of resilience, shaping the architecture of entrepreneurial ecosystems.

5.3 Academics and Policymakers

Academics and policymakers also play indispensable roles in embedding systemic resilience. For academia, a clear research agenda is emerging around systemic entrepreneurship. This includes studying how resilience metrics can be standardized, how ecosystem-level financing structures function, and how ventures can be designed to thrive in uncertain environments. Interdisciplinary collaboration drawing on systems science, finance, sustainability studies, and organizational theory is essential for advancing this agenda (George et al., 2016).

Policymakers, meanwhile, must design enabling environments that make resilience not just desirable but viable. Policies that encourage blended finance can reduce risks for private investors entering socially or environmentally critical sectors. Regulations that mandate climate disclosures or ESG reporting can incentivize ventures to embed resilience into their strategies. Support structures, such as incubators, accelerators, and public–private partnerships, can bridge the gap between early-stage innovation and systemic scaling.

Together, these interventions align entrepreneurial ecosystems with long-term resilience and sustainability. Entrepreneurs provide the innovation, investors provide the capital, academics provide the frameworks, and policymakers provide the enabling infrastructure. When coordinated, these actors can transform systemic risks into systemic opportunities, laying the foundation for resilient and regenerative economies.

6. Discussion

Traditional models of entrepreneurship have long emphasized efficiency, rapid growth, and competitive advantage as key indicators of success. These models typically frame risk in narrow operational or financial terms, measuring performance almost exclusively through profitability and scale (Alvarez & Barney, 2007). While such approaches can generate short-term gains, they often leave ventures exposed to systemic disruptions—whether in the form of supply chain shocks, ecological crises, or shifting regulatory regimes. By contrast, embedding systemic resilience reframes entrepreneurship as the design of ventures and ecosystems that can endure and adapt within complex and uncertain environments.

It is important to distinguish systemic resilience from conventional environmental, social, and governance (ESG) or corporate social responsibility (CSR) frameworks. ESG and CSR often serve as external reporting mechanisms or reputational strategies that are layered onto existing business models. While valuable, they are frequently reactive, compliance-oriented, and limited in scope. Systemic resilience, in contrast, is embedded in the DNA of strategy, governance, and financing. It moves beyond reporting to reconfiguring the very architecture of ventures and ecosystems, anticipating and adapting to systemic risks. In this sense, resilience represents a more profound and structural paradigm shift than traditional ESG or CSR initiatives (Eccles & Klimenko, 2019; Bansal & Song, 2017).

Nonetheless, the pursuit of systemic resilience presents challenges. One key issue is the measurement of resilience. Unlike profitability, which can be quantified in financial statements, resilience is multi-dimensional and context-dependent. Efforts to develop standardized indicators are ongoing but remain fragmented. A second challenge is the risk of "resilience-washing," where firms claim to embed resilience without implementing meaningful changes, echoing critiques of greenwashing in sustainability discourse. Ultimately, ecosystem-level investing necessitates coordination among diverse stakeholders, including entrepreneurs, investors, policymakers, and institutions. The transaction costs of such coordination can be significant, potentially slowing decision-making and diluting accountability.

Despite these critiques, systemic resilience offers a compelling alternative to growth-only models. While imperfect in its implementation, it equips entrepreneurs and investors with a framework better suited to navigating twenty-first-century risks. The challenge ahead lies in refining measurement tools, establishing accountability mechanisms, and designing governance structures that enable ecosystem-level coordination to be both feasible and effective.

7. Conclusion

This article argues that systemic resilience must be embedded in the core of entrepreneurship and investing if ventures and ecosystems are to remain viable in an increasingly uncertain world. Traditional models that prioritize rapid growth and efficiency, while effective in specific contexts, fail to account for the systemic risks that define the twenty-first century. Startups and SMEs, as key drivers of innovation and employment, are particularly vulnerable to climate shocks, geopolitical volatility, and market disruptions. Without embedding resilience into their strategies, governance, and financing models, they risk fragility and unsustainability.

The evolution of risk management in the post-2008 financial system offers a valuable analogy. Just as Basel III shifted attention from individual institutions to systemic stability, entrepreneurs and investors must move beyond firm-level metrics to ecosystem-level resilience. Systemic investing provides a framework for achieving this by financing interconnected networks rather than isolated ventures. It reframes risks as blueprints for opportunity—aging societies as drivers of longevity innovation, energy dependency as a catalyst for renewable transitions, and climate risks as engines of regenerative solutions.

The thesis advanced here is that risk is not the opposite of opportunity but its foundation. Embedding systemic resilience transforms vulnerabilities into drivers of creativity and long-term value creation. For entrepreneurs, this means integrating resilience into governance, strategy, and impact measurement. For investors, it requires shifting due diligence toward resilience potential and co-creating ecosystem financing structures. For academics and policymakers, it calls for research and policies that enable systemic entrepreneurship and blended finance models.

Ultimately, building resilient entrepreneurial ecosystems is not merely a defensive exercise. It is a generative act—one that allows societies to innovate, adapt, and thrive in ways that are sustainable, equitable, and aligned with the challenges and opportunities of our shared future.

References:

1. Rebeca Anguren, Gabriel Jiménez, José-Luis Peydró, Bank capital requirements and risk-taking: Evidence from Basel III, Journal of Financial Stability, Volume 74, 2024, 101292, ISSN 1572-3089, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfs.2024.101292.

2. Baumol, W. J. (1990). Entrepreneurship: Productive, unproductive, and destructive. *Journal of Political Economy, 98*(5, Part 1), 893–921. https://doi.org/10.1086/261712
3. Kuznets, S. (1955). Economic growth and income inequality. *The American Economic Review, 45*(1), 1–28. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1811581
4. Hockerts, K., & Wüstenhagen, R. (2010). Greening Goliaths versus emerging Davids: Theorizing about the role of incumbents and new entrants in sustainable entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing, 25*(5), 481–492. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2009.07.005
5. Smallbone, D., & Welter, F. (2012). Entrepreneurship and Institutional Change in Transition Economies: A Comparison of the Commonwealth of Independent States, Central and Eastern Europe, and China. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development, 24*(3–4), 215–233. https://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2012.670914
6. Cynthia A. Lengnick-Hall, Tammy E. Beck, Mark L. Lengnick-Hall, Developing a capacity for organizational resilience through strategic human resource management, Human Resource Management Review, Volume 21, Issue 3, 2011, Pages 243-255, ISSN 1053-4822, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.07.001.
7. Folke, C., Carpenter, S. R., Walker, B., Scheffer, M., Chapin, T., & Rockström, J. (2010). Resilience thinking: Integrating resilience, adaptability, and transformability. *Ecology and Society, 15*(4), Article 20. https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-03610-150420
8. Harji, Karim & Jackson, Edward. (2012). Accelerating Impact Achievements, Challenges, and What is Next in Building the Impact Investing Industry. 10.13140/RG.2.2.26485.78565.
9. c, Lukas. (2020). The Global Political Economy of Green Finance: A Regulationist Perspective. Journal für Entwicklungspolitik. 36. 31-50. 10.20446/JEP-2414-3197-36-4-31.
10. Reyazat, F. (2025, August 20). London Institute of Banking and Finance, The conceptual bridge: from systemic risk to systemic investing in the pursuit of resilience. https://www.reyazat.com/2025/08/20/the-conceptual-bridge-from-systemic-risk-to-systemic-investing-in-the-pursuit-of-resilience/
11. Shane, S. (2009). Why encouraging more people to become entrepreneurs is bad public policy. *Small Business Economics, 33*(2), 141–149. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-009-9215-5

12. Rockström, J., Steffen, W., Noone, K., Persson, Å., Chapin, F. S., Lambin, E., Lenton, T. M., Scheffer, M., Folke, C., Schellnhuber, H. J., Nykvist, B., de Wit, C. A., Hughes, T., van der Leeuw, S., Rodhe, H., Sörlin, S., Snyder, P. K., Costanza, R., Svedin, U., … Foley, J. A. (2009). A safe operating space for humanity. *Nature, 461*(7263), 472–475. https://doi.org/10.1038/461472a
13. Steffen, W., Richardson, K., Rockström, J., Cornell, S. E., Fetzer, I., Bennett, E. M., Biggs, R., Carpenter, S. R., de Vries, W., de Wit, C. A., Folke, C., Gerten, D., Heinke, J., Mace, G. M., Persson, L. M., Ramanathan, V., Reyers, B., & Sörlin, S. (2015). Planetary boundaries: Guiding human development on a changing planet. *Science, 347*(6223), 1259855. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1259855
14. Reyazat, F. (2024, February 4). London School of Banking and Finance, Earth in Overdraft: The non-negotiable need for systemic change. https://www.reyazat.com/2024/02/03/earth-in-overdraft-the-non-negotiable-need-for-systemic-change/
15. Gabrielsson, J., & Huse, M. (2005). Outside directors in SME boards: A call for theoretical reflections. *Corporate Board: Role, Duties & Composition, 1*(1), 28–37. https://doi.org/10.22495/cbv1i1art3

16. Teece, D. J. (2010). Business models, business strategy, and innovation. *Long Range Planning, 43*(2–3), 172–194. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2009.07.003
17. McGrath, R. G. (2010). Business models: A discovery-driven approach. *Long Range Planning, 43*(2–3), 247–261. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2009.07.005
18. Ivanov, D., & Dolgui, A. (2020). Viability of Intertwined Supply Networks: Extending Supply Chain Resilience Angles towards Survivability. *International Journal of Production Research, 58*(10), 2904–2915. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2020.1750727
19. Gereffi, G. (2020). What does the COVID-19 pandemic teach us about global value chains? The case of medical supplies. *Journal of International Business Policy, 3*(3), 287–301. https://doi.org/10.1057/s42214-020-00062-w
20. Kohlbacher, F., & Herstatt, C. (2011). *The silver market phenomenon: Marketing and innovation in the aging society* (2nd ed.). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-14338-0

21. Eccles, R. G., Ioannou, I., & Serafeim, G. (2014). The impact of corporate sustainability on organizational processes and performance. *Management Science, 60*(11), 2835–2857. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2014.1984
22. Friede, G., Busch, T., & Bassen, A. (2015). ESG and financial performance: Aggregated evidence from more than 2000 empirical studies. *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment, 5*(4), 210–233. https://doi.org/10.1080/20430795.2015.1118917
23. Stam, E. (2015). Entrepreneurial ecosystems and regional policy: A sympathetic critique. *European Planning Studies, 23*(9), 1759–1769. https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2015.1061484
24. Muramatsu, N., & Akiyama, H. (2011). Japan: A super-aging society prepares for the future. *The Gerontologist, 51*(4), 425–432. https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/gnr067

25. Autio, E., Nambisan, S., Thomas, L. D. W., & Wright, M. (2018). Digital affordances, spatial affordances, and the genesis of entrepreneurial ecosystems. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal, 12*(1), 72–95. https://doi.org/10.1002/sej.1266

26. Stam, E., & van de Ven, A. (2021). Entrepreneurial ecosystem elements. *Small Business Economics, 56*(2), 809–832. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-019-00270-6
27. Huse, M. (2007). *Boards, governance, and value creation: The human side of corporate governance*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511611070
28. Zahra, S. A., & Pearce, J. A. (1989). Boards of directors and corporate financial performance: A review and integrative model. *Journal of Management, 15*(2), 291–334. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920638901500208
29. Kotsantonis, S., Pinney, C., & Serafeim, G. (2016). ESG integration in investment management: Myths and realities. *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance, 28*(2), 10–16. https://doi.org/10.1111/jacf.12169
30. United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. United Nations. https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda
31. Krueger, P., Sautner, Z., & Starks, L. T. (2020). The Importance of Climate Risks for Institutional Investors. *The Review of Financial Studies, 33*(3), 1067–1111. https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhz137
32. Battiston, S., Mandel, A., Monasterolo, I., Schütze, F., & Visentin, G. (2017). A climate stress-test of the financial system. *Nature Climate Change, 7*(4), 283–288. https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate3255
33. George, G., Howard-Grenville, J., Joshi, A., & Tihanyi, L. (2016). Understanding and tackling societal grand challenges through management research. *Academy of Management Journal, 59*(6), 1880–1895. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2016.4007
34. Alvarez, S. A., & Barney, J. B. (2007). Discovery and creation: Alternative theories of entrepreneurial action. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal, 1*(1-2), 11–26. https://doi.org/10.1002/sej.4
35. Eccles, R. G., & Klimenko, S. (2019). The investor revolution: Shareholders lead on sustainability. *Harvard Business Review, 97*(3), 106–116. https://hbr.org/2019/05/the-investor-revolution
36. Bansal, P., & Song, H. C. (2017). Similar but not the same: Differentiating corporate sustainability from corporate responsibility. *Academy of Management Annals, 11*(1), 105–149. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2015.0095