FCEA Board of Advisors Meeting, NYC, February 16, 2017

Detailed Notes

Nicholson: [Introduction covering the origin story of FCEA, the staff and board of advisors, and major work streams: engagements with policy and NGO community in DC; education and outreach; umbrella for various academic activities; and the Academic Working Group.]upon which Jinnah and Light elaborated, explaining the current structure of the AWG's report].

[Jinnah and Light elaborated on the AWG, explaining the current structure of the report and providing a few details about some of the accountability-related proposals that Jinnah, Light and McKinnonhad drafted. A ~10-minute discussion of the AWG followed, in which Long pressed for details about the kinds of recommendations being considered and how it differed from, e.g., Anna-Maria Hubert's Code of Conduct. Nicholson noted that the AWG report would be more comprehensive in scope. MacMartin asked about international representation of the AWG. Jinnah raised the issue of peer review, which Nicholson noted would include review by the Board members.]

Nicholson: Next steps for FCEA: We want to continue to open the conversation about CE, including bridging the gap between academia and policy circles. We want to shape what's on the agenda, though not what conclusions people reach about CE. Collaborating with C2G2 on international governance pathways. We considered but are unsure about continuing with a project on US federal oversight of CE. We want to work on human rights and CE. We want to create a space for postdocs, members of civil society, and visiting academics (esp. from the rest of the world) to come to DC and work on CE, as well as improving educational opportunities. We have just launched a new Working Paper series. Exploring communications tools for meaningful public engagement.

On the relationship between FCEA and C2G2: FCEA does more of the academic work, while C2G2 does more applied policy work.

Long: This is a big problem in academia generally, not just in CE. We need to move from a peer-reviewed-paper-driven approach to a problem-solving approach. The model for doing this is Arizona State.

Citro: While I understand that it's difficult to overcome this problem, the lack of representation from the global South is potentially a huge problem that could undermine FCEA's process. It might mean looking for people who don't have long academic CVs.

Pasztor: Brian is right. C2G2 is trying to address this, too, though it's difficult. C2G2 is partnering with SRMGI, but everyone needs to do much more, which will require much more in terms of engagement, capacity-building, and resources. Developing countries have a great deal at stake and need to be involved.

Educational outreach is very important. Education is connected to governance because it will enable participation in the future.

It is important to get a good piece of academic, policy-relevant work on CE governance [like the AWG report].

MacMartin: We need some integration between social science and physical science and governance/policy people. Climate science is almost always curiosity-driven, not policy-demand-driven. One avenue for overcoming this limitation would be to have policy types tell climate scientists what questions they need answered, but that doesn't sit easily with a stance of neutrality because it amounts to calling for research.

Suarez: We have always known that it is important but difficult to engage with academics and policymakers in the global South. We should consider their incentive structures and what *they* get out of attending these meetings.

Long: We also need to be clear about what we want them to do. We can't just invite them to show up without giving them meaningful ways to participate.

Suarez: Artists would be way more effective at outreach than any of us. I collaborated with a local hip-hop artist to rewrite the abstract for my paper in *Earth's Future* and it was fantastic.

Citro: We could use the global public health community as a model for bringing in marginalized and vulnerable voices.

Jinnah: Ways to expand diversity: postdoc positions are incredibly difficult to secure and could be used to attract international scholars to the discussion;

faculty fellow affiliations could be useful, too, either in-residence or not; and FCEA should include women and/or people of color higher up in the organizational structure.

Buck: it would be important to know about policymaker demand for information about CE. FCEA might play a role in gathering information about that demand.

Are there opportunities to reach other countries by bringing in developing-country teachers or educators rather than policymakers?

Pasztor: Re: Doug's point about policy-driven climate science. There *are* calls for specific science (e.g., related to the 1.5ºC target).

Nicholson: Should FCEA coordinate efforts at international outreach with, e.g., Harvard and C2G2?

Craik: Pretty much every big CE meeting includes discussion of the way in which IAMs influence the way that CDR is perceived. The same may someday be true of SRM. Can IAM assumptions be opened up to social scientists? Could FCEA's convening power be useful in that process?

Re: international governance pathways. Could CE discussions be linked to discussions about, e.g., the SDGs or other existing international projects/governance regimes?

Waterloo has been doing some work on case studies as a form of pedagogy. Maybe look at producing those and/or a MOOC.

Try to ensure that reliable sites outrank unreliable sites on Google. [There was some discussion of the appropriateness of this method, but the general consensus was that it was an appropriate way of ensuring that good information reaches people who want it.]

Flegal: Maybe instead of developing a research agenda, develop a set of best practices for academics for, e.g., communicating uncertainty.

Suarez: We should rethink our engagements with each other and the public so that they start with a decision-making conundrum, such as Pablo's dice games or his aerodynamic cone game.

Morton: If none of us are *advocating* CE, doesn't that kill the conversation? "Who wants to do this? No one. Then why are we talking about it?"

Thompson: People advocate for *exploring* CE.

MacMartin: Both pro and con attitudes toward CE itself are misinformed at this point. The correct position is to be an advocate for research.

Suarez: We need to plan for "deployment of engagement" before deployment of CE.

MacMartin: Are any *organizations* advocating for research?

Pasztor: C2G2 is an advocacy organization of sorts: it is an advocate for dialogue. That may amount to an implicit call for research because dialogue needs research in order to move forward.

Long: BPC called for research. EDF has a pro-research statement, as does UCS. [The significance of UCS's statement was later disputed.]

Long: This isn't the time for public deliberation.

Morton: Deliberation or engagement?

Long: What's the difference?

MacMartin: Deliberation is about deciding something. There's nothing to deliberate about at this point. Everything's still imaginary.

Long: We can't keep talking about SRM on its own.

Nicholson: We absolutely agree.

Citro: Is all research on a par? Can we differentiate kinds of research that require different kinds or levels of governance?

Long: There were two workshops, one at Harvard and one in San Francisco, about the next stage of research [beyond computer modeling].

Nicholson: Those workshops were totally unstrategic—they were about individual projects rather than a research program.

MacMartin: Yes, that was my frustration with those processes.

Long: But in the SF meeting, participants from government said that [sometimes?] this is how these processes start.

Craik: We had a related workshop in Ottawa in which various funders and research agencies were asked to consider what would happen if a proposal for one of these experiments landed on their desk. The result was that governance was less problematic and gappy than might be expected. We need to avoid a research agenda that is a *fait accomplit* that is then presented to the public.

Long: We [BPC?] emphasized the importance of having an independent advisory board associated with any experiment that address a wide range of governance questions.

Board members present were:

- Neil Craik, University of Waterloo
- Sikina Jinnah, UC Santa Cruz
- Andrew Light [by Skype], World Resources Institute/George Mason
- Jane Long, "Retired"
- Doug MacMartin, CalTech/Cornell
- Janos Pasztor, C2G2
- Pablo Suarez, Red Cross Red Crescent Climate Centre

Board members not present

- Tom Ackerman, University of Washington
- Clive Hamilton, Somewhere in Australia
- Mark Lawrence, IASS
- Lynn Russell, Scripps
- David Winickoff, UC Berkeley

Note: this meeting included some participants in the earlier meeting who were neither Board Members nor staff of FCEA.

- Holly Buck, FCEA/Cornell
- Jane Flegal, UC Berkeley
- Tracy Hester, University of Houston Law Center

- Josh Horton, Harvard Kennedy School
- Drew Jones, Climate Interactive
- David Morrow, FCEA/American
- Oliver Morton, *The Economist*
- Kai-Uwe Schmidt, C2G2