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Australian wildfires from the ISS (12 February 2020)
• *Climate intervention*, also known as *geoengineering* refers to cooling the Earth by human means to offset the warming and other impacts due to greenhouse gas accumulation.

• Principal climate intervention methods are *stratospheric aerosol injection* (SAI) and *marine cloud brightening* (MCB)

• “Should it ever become important for society to cool Earth rapidly, albedo modification approaches (in particular stratospheric aerosol injection and possibly marine cloud brightening) are the only ways that have been suggested by which humans could potentially cool Earth within years after deployment.”

Importance of an international scientific assessment for decision making and governance

https://nap.nationalacademies.org/catalog/18988/climate-intervention-reflecting-sunlight-to-cool-earth
What other ways have been proposed to cool Earth?

- There are many proposed methods to cool the Earth.

- **Climate dioxide removal (CDR)** is cooling the Earth by permanently removing CO₂ from the atmosphere.

- CDR (and emissions reductions) is **required** for cooling the Earth in the long term.

- No effective and feasible CDR methods have been demonstrated at the required scale.

- Climate intervention is the **only way** we could ‘buy time’ to develop and achieve suitable CDR implementation.

---

UNEP/WMO 2022 Ozone Assessment Box 6-1
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Chapter 6 – Stratospheric Aerosol Injection and Its Potential Effect on the Stratospheric Ozone Layer
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Cooling the Earth with stratospheric aerosol injection (SAI) is expected to have unintended outcomes of changing stratospheric ozone chemistry and stratospheric heating which potentially alters the global ozone distribution.

The Montreal Protocol asks for an assessment of information and research related to solar radiation management and its potential effect on the stratospheric ozone layer.

The scientific assessment is:
- Based on Terms of Reference from delegates
- Based on peer-reviewed literature
- Open, transparent and accessible
- Quadrennial cycle
- Geographically inclusive
- Equitable
- Peer reviewed

Note: I am a Co-Chair of the Scientific Assessment Panel of the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Destroy the Ozone Layer.
Why are scenarios important for climate intervention?

- Developing scenarios of future climate change with and without climate interventions is an essential framework to discuss the potential role of climate intervention.
Formal Statements about Climate Intervention Research and Governance

- UNEP One Atmosphere Report  February 2023
- US White House SRM Research Plan  July 2023
- 2024 NOAA Research Plan

p24 An important aspect of an SRM research program would be developing a suite of SRM scenarios. Collectively, the scenarios would span the climate intervention scenarios that the international community might choose to analyze in the future. Key aspects of an SRM research program would be assessment of both the climatic and environmental impacts, as well as feasibility of implementation strategies, of specific SRM scenarios. The development of SRM scenarios would provide a process for the physical, biological, environmental, socioeconomic, ethical, and geopolitical aspects of SRM implementation to be considered within a holistic framework. The exploration of a set of scenarios would serve to coordinate and integrate activities across all aspects of SRM research, while ensuring that the knowledge gained improves the assessment of the most relevant intervention scenarios.

p40 Cooperation on SRM could usefully involve an international assessment of scenarios and strategies and their associated consequences. For example, it might document and expand the scientific foundation for SRM scenarios and implementation strategies and provide a comprehensive analysis of their intended and unintended consequences for climate and the physical environment broadly. Such an assessment would support future research activities by identifying where knowledge and understanding seem sufficient and where significant gaps remain.
p.25: The panel anticipates that periodic scientific assessments, including both the natural and social sciences, would be valuable for guiding future research and for defining the foundation for decision processes associated with an international discussion about SRM issues such as governance of small-scale outdoor experiments, technology development, financing, deployment options and governance of large-scale operational deployment. Therefore, this panel suggests the establishment of a globally inclusive, transparent and equitable scientific review process for SRM.
There is a growing risk that the global response to climate change will be inadequate to avoid an unsafe global climate. There is corresponding interest in exploring the potential need for, and feasibility of, rapid responses to avoid dangerous climate change – such as solar climate intervention (SCI). At the same time, there is concern that such intervention, if any, be implemented as safely as possible. This paper posits a scenario in which a group of countries seeks a cooperative, science-based approach to decision-making regarding the potential use of SCI, in the context of increasingly dangerous climate conditions, taking into account “two safeties:” the safety of the global climate, and the safety of SCI, if any, in response. The paper surveys the existing institutional landscape to identify the extent to which one or more international forums would be in a position: (1) to produce a high-quality, scientific/technological assessment that would enable informed, objective decisions to be taken on the two safeties; and (2) to take such decisions (pro or con). It concludes that several forums could potentially perform one or more aspects of the scientific/technological assessment function and that the UN Security Council is uniquely placed to take authoritative decisions in a climate emergency situation, but that there is no single international forum (at least as currently configured) that could effectively serve as “one-stop shopping” for both the assessment and decision-making functions.
There is a growing risk that the global response to climate change will be inadequate to avoid an unsafe global climate. There is corresponding interest in exploring the potential need for, and feasibility of, rapid responses to avoid dangerous climate change – such as solar climate intervention (SCI). At the same time, there is concern that such intervention, if any, be implemented as safely as possible. This paper posits a climate emergency situation, but that there is no single international forum (at least as currently configured) that could effectively serve as “one-stop shopping” for both the assessment and decision-making functions.
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