

*Marine Geoengineering -
Governance and Practice*
11th June 2009

Chair: Chris Vivian

Rapporteurs: Steve Hall & Richard Lampitt

Governance mechanism

Funding

Scientific requirements

Public outreach

This is a high seas issue

When to take action

Environmental degradation focuses minds but probably too late by then.

IPCC have decided that there should be a chapter on geoengineering in the next assessment. Not just a paragraph.

How to take action?

Financial pain is perhaps the only mechanism.

Governance of research

London Convention and Protocol:

Fewer members than CDB

Is it worth amending the protocol just for scientific research?

Binding resolutions come into force straight away.

Research - how to fund it?

Mix of Government, foundations and private sector

Example of Census of Marine Life: Sloan Foundation provides 10% of funds.

Different public perception (Meddling with the environment is "bad")

Some national funding organisations unwilling due to public opposition.

Research - how to fund it?

Industry are unlikely to invest until

1: Regulatory framework has been clarified
(LC/LP and CBD etc)

2: Scientific questions have been addressed.

Research - how to fund it?

Several examples where research has been adversely affected by poor outreach

e.g.

Brent Spar

LOHAFEX

Research - how to fund it?

Can commercial activities ever claim to be legitimate scientific research?

Any other commercial benefits that might justify ocean fertilisation?

e.g. biomass increase

Outreach and Public perceptions

long lead-time required;
20 years for the media to take climate change seriously.

multiple approaches; real-life examples and role models needed.

No-one believes scientists who say that research is needed 'they would say that wouldn't they?'

Outreach and Public perceptions

Public support needed for research, before considering industrial scale geoengineering.

Can scientists drive the agenda and make a significant impact on public perception?

The NGOs and media are key. Scientists must work with them to spread the message.

Outreach and Public perceptions

How real is the risk that marine geo-engineering will be seen as an excuse not to reduce CO₂ emissions?

Consensus that it's helpful to have a Plan B..
The public might not like it but they need to be informed what it's all about. Educating the public will help.
It's a harder sell than renewable energy.

Outreach and Public perceptions

Solutions:

Smaller meeting maybe 20 people from different sectors to address 'Is London Convention the right place to discuss issues related to ocean fertilisation?'

Similar to UN informal meetings.

This can be done on a National basis too.

Outreach and Public perceptions

Solutions:

There are several flavours of NGO but some of them pay people to lobby.

Well before the next CBD meeting the scientific community must become organised

Outreach and Public perceptions

Solutions:

Strong feeling that input from discussion worth publishing in final form.

Lots of suggestions about places to publish -
Nature, New Scientist, Marine Policy etc.
Wikipedia, UTube important too.

Southern Ocean was, during the last glaciation, up to three times as productive as today without anoxia. Suggests that the system is capable of coping with geoengineering.

Lack of efficacy of geoengineering is still the problem. How much iron do you need to mine?