



FORUM for
CLIMATE ENGINEERING
ASSESSMENT

Academic Working Group on Climate Engineering Governance

Meeting Five

Pocantico Center of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Tarrytown, NY

February 22–24, 2018

Meeting Report

Executive Summary

The Academic Working Group (AWG) gathered for the last time to finalize the main components of their report. Having drafted most of the report between the previous meeting and this one, the group devoted most of this meeting to discussing the objectives of SRM governance and the details of their recommendations for near-term governance. They settled on four objectives and a list of fifteen recommendations, and they finalized the structure of the report.

Main Themes of Discussion

Objectives of SRM Governance

During their previous meeting, the AWG had identified five objectives of SRM governance. The fifth meeting began with renewed debate about the exact phrasing and ordering of these objectives, trying to balance concerns about encouraging SRM with concerns about hampering research. This debate continued throughout the fifth meeting, until the initial list of five objectives was ultimately replaced with a similar list of four objectives.

- I. Keep mitigation and adaptation first
- II. Thoroughly evaluate the risks, burdens, and benefits
- III. Enable responsible knowledge creation
- IV. Ensure robust governance prior to any consideration of deployment

Debating a Moratorium

The AWG resumed a debate began at the previous meeting about the possible purpose(s) and design criteria of a moratorium on various kinds of SRM-related activities. The group did not come to consensus on the necessity of or best design choices for a moratorium.

Review of Report Body

On the second day of the meeting, the AWG reviewed the existing draft of the report body and reaffirmed their decision that the report should remain agnostic about the ultimate wisdom of deploying SRM.

Recommendations for Near-Term Governance

The AWG devoted most of their second day to reviewing the twenty concrete recommendations they had drafted up until this point. Extensive discussions helped refine the content of the recommendations, with the group assigning various members to draft or revise text to capture the group's decisions with respect to each recommendation, as necessary.

On the final day of the meeting, the group analyzed the relationship between the recommendations and their new list of objectives, seeking to ensure that the recommendations furthered those objectives. During this process, they combined several recommendations, reducing the number of recommendations from twenty to fifteen.

Next Steps

The AWG assigned various members of the Forum for Climate Engineering Assessment staff to draft new text and revise existing text as necessary to prepare a complete draft of the final report, which would then be sent to external reviewers. After that review, the report was to be revised and recirculated to the AWG for comments and final revisions.

Attendees

Academic Working Group

1. Netra Chhetri
2. Dan Chong
3. Richard Falk
4. Alexander Gillespie
5. Aarti Gupta
6. Sikina Jinnah
7. Prakash Kashwan
8. Myanna Lahsen
9. Andrew Light
10. Catriona McKinnon
11. Leslie Paul Thiele
12. Walter Valdivia
13. Paul Wapner

Forum for Climate Engineering Assessment

1. Simon Nicholson
2. Michael Thompson
3. David Morrow
4. Carolyn Turkaly