

**Summary of Topical Lunch on  
“Governance of Solar Radiation Management?”,  
March 15, 2018**

**Organizers:** Jennifer Haverkamp, Natalie Mahowald, and Douglas MacMartin

**Participants:** Toby Ault (EAS), Diana Bernstein (EAS), Dave Dietrich (Atkinson), Charlotte Levy, David Lodge (Atkinson), Chris Miller (Atkinson), Jonathan Ochshorn (Arch), Gerald Torres (Law), and Zellman Warhaft (MAE),

The motivation for the lunch was to explore governance of solar radiation management (SRM). After a brief introduction to the science (D. MacMartin), Ambassador Jennifer Haverkamp, currently a Visiting Professor of the Practice and Distinguished Practitioner in Residence at Cornell’s Law School and Executive in Residence at the Atkinson Center, presented some of the legal aspects of governance in the area of solar radiation management.

Broad observations from Jennifer include

- That governance of research is already behind. For research, some perceive that even talking about geoengineering leads to less mitigation; others suggest that talking about it is a wake-up call. Better to ensure a communications component to avoid having opponents frame the issue.
- No legal regime; closest are the UN CBD (to which the US is not a party) which recommends no deployment without adequate research on impact on biological diversity, and the London Convention which is relevant only (?) to ocean iron fertilization
- Ongoing efforts in governance include SRMGI (the Solar Radiation Management Governance Initiative; UK Royal Society, The World Academy of Sciences, and EDF), C2G2 (Carnegie Climate Geoengineering Governance; Carnegie council, funded by Rasmussen foundation), the University of Calgary (more legal focused) and FCEA (Forum for Climate Engineering Assessment, at American University).
- Basically, there is no willpower or capacity for governance right now.

A few key observations made during discussion include

- Some comments on carbon dioxide removal (CDR) which has historically been labeled as “geoengineering” though has little to do with SRM Natalie pointed out that IPCC is officially considering this as part of mitigation, so no need to consider it further in this context.
- Verification is hard. Zellman pointed out the example from Israel, with 30 years of cloud seeding, and still disagreement as to whether it works. Is there enough certainty in attribution possible to underpin any compensation regime?
- Or is “compensation” more appropriately just in the general category of providing assistance to those who need it; Gerald noted the possibility of building in an adaptation fund that is not explicitly compensation (which implies a causal link); more in the form of insurance, e.g., if X happens then...
- Potential negative regional impacts include influence on ozone, air pollution, agriculture, etc.
- Question was raised as to whether institutions like Cornell should follow to the Oxford principles on geoengineering practices for all research activities. (Yes!)
- Question on what we can learn from previous technologies? What past cases are useful?