ECOSYSTEM IMPACTS OF GEOENGINEERING:
A Review for Developing a Science Plan

Authors (Biographies and Affiliations on previous page)
Lynn M. Russell, Philip J. Rasch, Georgina Mace, Robert B. Jackson, John Shepherd, Peter Liss, Margaret Leinen, David Schimel, Naomi E. Vaughan, Anthony C. Janetos, Philip Boyd, Richard J. Norby, Ken Caldeira, Joonas Merikanto, Paulo Artaxo, Jerry Melillo, and M. Granger Morgan

Word Count
7415 (max. 9000), excluding abstract (150), notes (489), references, and 4 tables (no figures)

Abstract (max. 150 words)
Geoengineering methods are intended to reduce the magnitude of climate change, which is already having demonstrable effects on ecosystem structure and functioning. Two different types of activities have been proposed: solar radiation management (SRM), or sunlight reflection methods, which involves reflecting a small percentage of solar light back into space to offset the warming due to greenhouse gases, and carbon dioxide removal (CDR), which includes a range of engineered and biological processes to remove carbon dioxide (CO_2) from the atmosphere. This report evaluates some of the possible impacts of CDR and SRM on the physical climate and their subsequent influence on ecosystems, which include the risks and uncertainties associated with new kinds of purposeful perturbations to the Earth. *Therefore, the question considered in this review is whether CDR and SRM methods would exacerbate or alleviate the deleterious impacts on ecosystems associated with climate changes that might occur in the foreseeable future.*

Keywords
Geoengineering, Ecosystems, Climate Change, Carbon Dioxide Removal, Solar Radiation Management.

Submitted to *Ambio* (http://www.springer.com/environment/journal/13280) 20 June 2011.
Draft for comment (http://aerosol.ucsd.edu/IGBPworkshop); send comments to lmrussell@ucsd.edu.

ECOSYSTEM IMPACTS OF GEOENGINEERING:

A Review for Developing a Science Plan

INTRODUCTION

As anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases rise and their levels in the atmosphere continue to increase, there is a growing discussion of the possibility of implementing methods for "geoengineering" that could reduce the greenhouse effects on climate and the environment (Shepherd et al. 2009). Geoengineering can be defined as the deliberate manipulation of features of the Earth system to reduce the magnitude and rate of changes in the physical climate system that are generally attributed to this accumulation of greenhouse gases. While there has now been much general discussion of the different means by which geoengineering may be accomplished and some speculation about the research strategies by which their effectiveness could be determined, there has been relatively little discussion of research needed to understand their potential for affecting ecosystems. Yet many of these activities could have significant impacts on both natural and managed ecosystems and their functions. This is important because ecosystems, including those within forests, oceans, grasslands, and wetlands, provide both innate value and our life support systems, including numerous essential goods and services (MEA 2005).

In this report we follow the Royal Society (Shepherd et al. 2009) in referring to two different sets of activities: solar radiation management (SRM), or sunlight reflection, methods that involve reflecting a small percentage of solar light and heat back into space to offset the warming due to greenhouse gases, and carbon dioxide removal (CDR) methods that include a range of engineered and biological processes to remove carbon dioxide (CO_2) from the atmosphere. One fundamental difference between CDR and SRM techniques is the timescales over which these interventions would operate (Lenton and Vaughan 2009, Shepherd et al. 2009). The The scale-up of a CDR deployment to the point where it would have significant climate effects would likely be slow, but its effects would be long lasting. In contrast, SRM could provide rapid cooling but would need to be continually renewed. Of these two types of methods, only CDR would address the CO_2 concentrations that cause both climate change and ocean acidification.

The Climate System.

The temperature and climate of the Earth is fundamentally controlled by its energy balance, which drives and maintains the climate system. This is the balance between incoming energy from the sun (mainly ultra violet and visible light) that acts to heat the Earth, and out-going heat (thermal infrared) radiation that acts to cool it. These energy streams do not reach or leave the Earth's surface unimpeded. About one third of the incoming sunlight radiation on average is reflected by clouds, and by ice caps and bright surfaces. This reflectivity of the earth is referred to as its *albedo*. Most of the incoming energy passes through the atmosphere to reach the Earth's surface, where some is also reflected but most is absorbed, so warming the surface. Some of the outgoing thermal energy then emitted by the Earth's warm surface is absorbed by the greenhouse gases in the atmosphere (mainly by natural water vapor and CO_2) and also by clouds, thus reducing the amount of heat radiation escaping to space and warming the atmosphere and the Earth's surface. This is known as the greenhouse effect. Only about 60% of the thermal energy emitted by the surface eventually leaves the atmosphere, on average, after repeated absorption and re-emission within the atmosphere. The increase in CO_2 is responsible not only for temperature changes, but also other consequences to the Earth system. The additional absorption of CO_2 by the ocean has a measurable effect on ocean acidity, with consequent impacts on ocean biogeochemistry and biodiversity.

Carbon Dioxide Removal

Carbon dioxide removal (CDR) methods are designed to remove carbon dioxide (CO_2) from the atmosphere and transfer it to long-lived carbon reservoirs. They include:

- Land use management to protect or enhance land carbon sinks;
- The use of biomass for carbon sequestration as well as (or instead of) a carbon neutral energy source;
- Acceleration of the natural geological processes that remove CO_2 from the atmosphere ("enhanced weathering");d
- Direct engineered capture of CO_2 from ambient air;
- The enhancement of oceanic uptake of CO_2 by, for example, fertilization of the oceans with naturally scarce nutrients or increasing upwelling processes.

These would address the root cause of the problem, would help with ocean acidification, and would return the climate to something similar to a former, pre-industrial state. Because they reduce atmospheric CO_2 they would be preferred, but they act slowly and are likely to be costly.

Solar Radiation Management

Solar radiation management (SRM) methods, also called sunlight reflection methods, aim to reflect up to a few per cent of the incident sunlight away from the Earth. They would take less than a few years to have an effect on climate once they had been deployed, and so some argue they might be useful if a rapid response is needed, for example to avoid reaching a climate threshold. Suggested methods include:

- Increasing the surface reflectivity of the planet, by brightening human structures (e.g. by painting them white), planting of crops with a high reflectivity, or covering deserts with reflective material;
- Enhancing marine cloud brightness (reflectivity) by increasing the number of particles acting as cloud condensation nuclei over the oceans;
- Injecting aerosol particles (e.g. sulfates) into the lower stratosphere to mimic the effects of volcanic eruptions;
- Placing shields or deflectors in space to reduce the amount of solar energy reaching the Earth.

Model simulations (and some natural analogs like volcanic eruptions that change the planetary albedo) indicate that SRM methods would act quickly. In addition, some initial estimates suggest they would likely be relatively cheap. Nonetheless, SRM methods would only create an artificial, approximate, and potentially delicate balance between two opposing anthropogenic forcings. They would also have to be maintained as long as excess greenhouse gases remain in the atmosphere, for perhaps centuries unless CDR techniques were employed. In the event that SRM were ended while CO_2 concentrations remained high, the planet would warm very rapidly, producing a “termination problem” (see below). They also do nothing to remediate ocean acidification (the “other CO_2 problem”).

Ecosystems.

The world's terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems are critically important for humanity's well-being and economic prosperity. They drive the production of food and energy, regulate water supplies and climate, provide resilience to disease, and recycle waste products. We also value them for non-utilitarian reasons. Natural areas and wild species are valued for recreational, inspirational, spiritual, and cultural purposes at the local level, as well as more broadly. Many ecosystem functions that support these services are also dependent on biodiversity – on the existence of a rich variety of species representing the full breadth of life on Earth, including specific evolutionary adaptations that lead to distinctive local biota. Ecosystems are dynamic complexes of plant, animal, and micro-organism communities with their non-living environment interacting as a functional unit (MEA 2005). Changes to the physical and biological components of ecosystems will affect the nature and rate of ecosystem processes and therefore also the ecosystem services on which people depend. It is already widely recognized that climate change will have a dramatic range of consequences on ecosystems and their capacity to provide goods and services to society (MEA 2005, Mooney et al. 2009).[i] We focus here on the ecosystem impacts of CDR and SRM methods,[ii] but we acknowledge that geoengineering involves risks and uncertainties associated with novel perturbations to the imperfectly understood Earth system. In particular, the interconnectedness of many ecosystem processes across a wide range of spatial and temporal scales leads to complex systems, that have behaviors that are difficult to predict as the systems move outside any previously observed states.

Ecosystems play a variety of pivotal roles for Earth, but it is worth noting some specific aspects that are being altered by the changing climate (Mooney et al. 2009). Specific effects include altered ocean productivity, altered food web dynamics, reduced abundance of habitat-forming species, shifting species distributions, and possible greater incidence of some kinds of disease (Hoegh-Guldberg and Bruno 2010), as well as some decreases in biodiversity (Pereira et al. 2010). Since ecosystems are being affected, ecosystem services are also altered. For example, natural and managed ecosystems are important components of the global carbon budget; one key ecosystem service that is affected by these climate effects is the ~100 Pg (turnover) of biologically produced carbon each year (Field et al. 1998; Field et al. 2007). Other vital services sustain human nutrition and air quality and provide fuel, clean water, climate regulation, and spiritual and aesthetic fulfillment (MEA 2005). Ecosystems also maintain the world's biodiversity.

While both SRM and CDR methods have been proposed as a way to reduce climate change, scientists are still actively debating the strategies under which these methods might be used effectively. For example, some have focused primarily on addressing global temperature and its associated impacts on precipitation (Crutzen 2006, Keith et al. 2006, Trenberth and Dai 2007). Others have focused on targeting geoengineering methods to address specific climate impacts of increased CO_2, like hurricane intensity and landfalls, persistence of summer sea ice, and precipitation regimes (MacCracken 2009). And still others have focused on addressing the impacts of ocean acidification.[iii]

An important open question is: How would such CDR and SRM methods influence the many roles of ecosystems on the Earth system? However, it is widely recognized that climate change, and mankind more generally, are already having demonstrable effects on ecosystem structure and functions. It is very likely that climate change (and ocean acidification) will have increasing consequences in a world with continuing unabated CO_2 emissions, or even in a world with the levels of emissions reduction currently under negotiation by governments. Thus, a second important open question is: Would the impacts of CDR and SRM methods be less or more acceptable than the ecosystem impacts of the climate change likely under politically reasonable scenarios of emissions reduction or unabated emissions reduction? Because we know very little about how different CDR and SRM methods might each modify ecosystems and their services, it is difficult to compare their combined consequences (Boyd 2009) to the alternative, which would be a future in which greenhouse gases were largely unmitigated. In addition, it is worth noting that some methods probably will involve additional risks and uncertainties associated with new kinds of perturbations to the imperfectly understood Earth system.

Geoengineering methods have several important characteristics from the standpoint of understanding their ecological consequences as well as their potential physical effects on the Earth system. Depending on the objective of the geoengineering, they might need to operate on very large spatial scales and might require long-term commitments. This could result in purposeful alteration of biological processes, such as productivity and carbon sequestration, or the transfer of the Sun's energy, on scales that have never before been observed, let alone attempted deliberately.

Governance of CDR and SRM Research

Although there are a growing number of publications on geoengineering methods (Shepherd et al. 2009 and references therein), to date there has been little discussion of formal governance arrangements for either research or potential implementation by international governing bodies. The UK Royal Society report outlines the need to build governance structures if research into a wide range of geoengineering methods is to take place (Shepherd et al. 2009). In 2010, the UN Convention on Biological Diversity has issued two statements on climate engineering techniques, which are discussed elsewhere in this report. Recently a group of nongovernmental organizations has joined with the UK Royal Society to assess these issues for SRM technologies in the SRM Governance Initiative.[iv] These efforts provide suggestions to governments, but do not identify mechanisms other than individual national governance to carry out recommendations. In contrast, the London Convention/London Protocol (LC/LP)[v] has assumed the responsibility for establishing a governance framework for all planned research into ocean fertilization as a climate modification method. Following consultation with the research community, the Scientific Group of the LC/LP has completed an assessment framework for research on ocean fertilization. This framework if approved by the Legal Group of the LC/LP would be considered for adoption. This would be the first international governance mechanism for any climate engineering technology.

A group of researchers from Oxford University proposed a set of five principles of governance[vi] that were later elaborated by the large Asilomar International Conference on principles for governance[vii]. The principles emphasize the need for research to promote the collective benefit of humankind and the environment and the need to establish responsibility and liability, open and cooperative research, iterative evaluation and assessment, and public involvement and consent. Most members of the research community have articulated the belief that governance is necessary for potentially risky CDR and SRM field tests.[viii]

PART 1: POSSIBLE IMPACTS OF GEOENGINEERING ON ECOSYSTEMS

The rates and impacts of the various proposed CDR and SRM methods on climate, ocean acidification, ecosystems, and human activities will vary (Boyd 2008). To compare the direct and indirect effects of these CDR and SRM methods on ecosystems, we consider two scenarios for each proposed method, one with geoengineering and the other without geoengineering. In each case, both scenarios have the same level emissions reduction (*i.e.* CO_2 mitigation). By definition, each of the geoengineered scenarios will have a lower global mean temperature as compared to the scenarios without geoengineering. However, this temperature reduction varies in quantity and speed (*e.g.* CDR techniques would have a much slower temperature response than SRM). In addition, each SRM or CDR method varies in its impacts on other climate characteristics (such as precipitation). For these reasons, the ecosystem impacts of different SRM and CDR methods will be different and should be considered individually.

As there have been only a few limited field tests of some CDR methods (*e.g.* afforestation) and essentially no field tests of any SRM methods, little is known regarding the beneficial and detrimental effects of these methods on ecosystems. There has been some exploration of both the purposeful and inadvertent impacts of different CDR and SRM methods (Boyd 2008; Shepherd et al. 2009) that exploits information from analogs in the natural world (*e.g.* volcanic eruptions, Hamme et al. 2010) or from other research on the ocean's role in modulating climate (de Baar et al. 2005). Together they reveal that the impacts of both CDR and SRM methods can have both beneficial and detrimental effects. For example, the purposeful enhancement of net primary production by ocean fertilization can potentially add more carbon to the base of food webs (de Baar et al. 2005), which could be considered a positive outcome or an unwanted ecosystem disturbance. Inadvertent effects of this method could include the stimulation of populations in tropical, subarctic, and Southern Ocean waters of phytoplankton species that have capability to release toxins (Trick et al. 2010; Silver et al. 2010). Based on prior inter-comparisons of the different CDR and SRM methods (Boyd 2008, Lenton and Vaughan 2009), it is possible to put forward preliminary criteria that could be used to rank which method will be least detrimental to ecosystems. For example, a method that would best retain ecosystem health would be one that offsets the effects of climate change without directly targeting and perturbing the land, the oceans, or their biota (and also have virtually no side effects). In contrast, a method that does not reduce CO_2 and for which both the purposeful and inadvertent side-effects on ecosystems outweighed any benefit of mitigating climate change would be considered most detrimental.

No general assessment of all of the types of impacts on ecosystems that might result from all of the CDR and SRM methods is possible. The inability to generalize is partly because of the preliminary state of research, but mostly because of the disparate nature of the dozens of individual geoengineering methods that have been proposed and the vastly different impacts that they have on the Earth system. We have not tried to assess all possible impacts on ecosystems from all proposed methods but have limited this report to a few exemplary case studies, followed by a discussion of the research necessary to extend an assessment beyond these examples. We have considered separately SRM and CDR techniques, as well as land-based and ocean-based techniques. The case studies are not intended to be comprehensive but rather to be illustrative of the expected range of effects, both positive and negative, on ecosystems.

The analysis of each of these case studies is divided into two parts. First, we identify the physical and chemical perturbations that the SRM or CDR method is meant to induce (Table 1). Second, we identify how each of the individual perturbations and their collective impacts might affect ecosystems and the services that they provide for humanity (Tables 2 and 3). We apply this two-part assessment framework to the methods noted above (SRM-ocean, SRM-land, CDR-ocean, CDR-land), with one example for each and a fifth example for CDR that would be located underground. For each method, we assume that it works approximately as designed in terms of its climate impact, its temporal and spatial scales of deployment, and its potential side-effects (*e.g.* CDR-mediated reductions in CO_2 and decreased fertilization of terrestrial crops or enhanced photosynthesis in plant canopies by SRM-elevated diffuse light). We also take into account the likelihood that the methods will not work as envisioned, although this assessment is extremely uncertain due to the very limited amount of available information.

“Control” Scenario (without CDR or SRM)

Since there is no need to implement CDR or SRM in pre-industrial conditions, the choice of whether or not to implement CDR or SRM needs to be evaluated by comparison to a likely future that differs from the geoengineered future only in its lack of geoengineering. Current and expected climate changes have had and will have significant impacts on ecosystems and their services (IPCC 2007a, IPCC 2007b, MEA 2005), whether or not CDR or SRM is implemented, and these changes need to be considered in our assessment of the risks and benefits of CDR and SRM. We assume a mid-range mitigation scenario as our "control" scenario, which implies an approximate doubling of pre-industrial atmospheric CO_2 concentration (560 ppm).[ix] Given a mid-range climate sensitivity this would equate to an increase above pre-industrial global temperatures of 3°C (IPCC 2007a). It is likely that these changes will increase the magnitude of currently observed impacts on ecosystem and ecosystem service (IPCC 2007b).

Carbon Dioxide Removal

Removal of CO_2 from the atmosphere requires identifying a means for storing the captured carbon as a stable chemical, in a location that will provide long-term storage. While several possible solutions exist, there is concern that many may not provide permanent sequestration.

Afforestation. Afforestation of areas of 'abandoned' land is suggested as a CDR geoengineering strategy that would remove carbon from the atmosphere and store it in either the vegetation itself or in organic matter (decayed vegetation) in soils.[x] In order to have a notable impact on atmospheric CO_2 concentration, this activity would have to be conducted on a very large scale and over a long term (*e.g.* Lenton 2010, Jackson and Salzman 2010). Tropical forests would likely give the fastest carbon accumulation given their long growing seasons (Sabine et al. 2004). Ecosystem and ecosystem services impacts will be dependent upon the plant species involved, the degree to which monocultures are used, the amount of fertilizer and water that would be needed to accelerate carbon capture, the storage necessary to meet targets, the previous use of the afforested land, and the latitude of the plantation (*e.g.* surface albedo impacts of boreal forests, Betts 2000). Afforestation is likely to cause changes in local and regional energy balance and hydrology, soil chemistry and acidity, together with impacts on soil carbon storage (*e.g.* Jackson et al. 2005, Rotenberg and Yakir 2010). New forests will also emit volatile organic compounds (VOCs), which increase cloud condensation nuclei concentrations and affect cloud formation (Spracklen et al. 2008). The combined effects of afforestation on the hydrological balance, the surface albedo, and cloud properties can influence regional precipitation patterns and climatology, an area for which considerable new research is needed. Furthermore, nominally 'abandoned' land may be providing some services; afforestation could result in the demand for these services being displaced onto other land, resulting in "knock-on" effects on that land. These socio-economic dimensions could be important and should be taken into account. Finally, the permanence of carbon removal by afforestation is dependent on continued management of afforested land to maintain the sequestration. Without a commitment to continued management, afforestation is effective as CDR only for a limited duration (~100 yr).

Engineered Carbon Capture and Storage. An engineered method for capture of carbon with subsequent geological storage could involve the use of chemical sorbent materials to capture CO_2 from the atmosphere (Lackner 2003) or reaction of CO_2 with strong bases (Keith et al. 2006). The captured CO_2 must be recovered, transported and placed in a site for underground geological storage (Elliott et al. 2001; Lackner 2003; Keith et al. 2006). The geological storage is envisaged to be similar to that used for Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) (IPCC 2005). The process has substantial energy and water requirements that vary with technique and exact design specifications (Socolow et al. 2011). In general, the direct impacts of this method on ecosystem resources (*e.g.* water) would appear to be relatively small and likely to be highly localized to the site of the capture facility and the underground site of the storage facility, unless there were a major requirement for minerals, water, or materials.

Ocean Fertilization. Two proposed methods of CDR for stimulating ocean biological removal of CO_2 by fertilization have received the most attention. One relies upon iron fertilization to alleviate the iron limitation of phytoplankton growth. The approach uses large inventories of unused nutrients in those ocean regions that have High Nutrients but paradoxically Low Chlorophyll (termed HNLC, Martin et al. 1990), and therefore to stimulate phytoplankton growth that will take up CO_2. The underlying principle behind the second approach is to provide nutrients, such as nitrate or phosphate, whose supply is otherwise limiting to surface waters to increase biological productivity in order to increase carbon export to deeper waters. The regions where these methods could be deployed are large (basin scale) HNLC regions that are limited by iron availability, such as the Southern Ocean, and oligotrophic areas that are limited by nitrate or phosphate availability (Boyd et al. 2007). The addition of the nutrients could be accomplished by surface addition (Matear and Elliott 2004) or upwelling of deeper, more nutrient rich waters over large swathes of the remaining (Low Nutrients Low Chlorophyll) ocean (Karl and Letelier 2008; Shepherd et al. 2009). By altering the relative biomass of phytoplankton, these interventions will necessarily alter food web structure and hence many other ecosystem functions.

Solar Radiation Management

Because SRM methods do not address increased atmospheric CO_2 concentrations, they will not reduce ocean acidification. Nor do they address the effects of high CO_2 concentrations on terrestrial ecosystems (*e.g.* favoring woody over grassy plants). However, their potentially rapid reduction of warming may provide sufficient benefits in and of themselves to merit consideration under some conceivable circumstances. Two SRM methods, commonly thought to be among the more feasible of SRM methods, are considered here, stratospheric aerosol injection and cloud albedo enhancement.

Stratospheric aerosol injection. The injection into the lower stratosphere of sulfate (or other) aerosols would induce a cooling, similar to that observed in response to the eruption of Mt. Pinatubo in June 1991 (Crutzen 2006, Soden et al. 2002, Stenchikov et al. 1998; Rasch et al. 2008). This cooling is because the aerosols reflect sunlight away from the planet. However, the particles from volcanic eruptions do not represent a direct analog for geoengineered aerosol particles, particularly due to differences in the aerosol sizes produced and in the different background aerosol concentrations of natural and geoengineered stratospheres. Geoengineered aerosols would have a lifetime of a few years in the stratosphere -- similar to volcanic aerosols. But maintaining the concentrations necessary to continuously reduce temperatures would require regular aerosol or precursor gas injections.

This type of sulfate-aerosol geoengineering could lead to unwanted side effects such as changes in precipitation and ozone depletion in heterogeneous chemical reactions (Robock et al. 2008; Rasch et al. 2008, Tilmes et al. 2008, Trenberth and Dai 2007). The increased acidification from the sulfur additions appears to have a relatively minor impact on acid rain because the quantities of sulfur would likely be $<10\%$ of global deposition and possibly $<1\%$ (Kravitz et al. 2009). However, changes in precipitation are possible but highly uncertain, and a large increase in total stratospheric sulfate can lead to significantly enhanced ozone depletion. The impact of this ozone depletion on the amount of UV-B light reaching the surface (with a consequent effect on ecosystem function) is as yet unknown because stratospheric aerosols also attenuate light in this part of the energy spectrum (Rasch et al. 2008). The ozone depletion problem might be avoided by using particles made of chemicals other than sulfate.

The efficiency of carbon fixation by the forest canopy is increased when the light is distributed more uniformly throughout the canopy, as occurs with diffuse light. Diffuse light penetrates the upper canopy more effectively than direct-beam radiation, because direct light saturates upper sunlit leaves but shades lower leaves. The primary effect of injection of sulfate aerosols into the stratosphere is to scatter light, and this will increase the fraction of light reaching the Earth's surface that is diffuse. Hence, it has been suggested that the (small) reduction in total photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) would reduce terrestrial productivity less than the increase due to increased efficiency resulting from the increase in diffuse radiation. Such may have been the case following the Mt. Pinatubo eruption (Gu et al. 2003) and during the "global dimming period" (1950-1980) (Mercado et al. 2009). A sensitivity analysis carried out for the broadleaf forest shows that simulated gross primary productivity reaches a maximum at a diffuse fraction of 0.4, after which it decreases due to a reduction in the total PAR. In the absence of deliberate aerosol injection associated with SRM, a decline in aerosols before atmospheric CO_2 is stabilized will mean the effect of diffuse radiation on photosynthesis will decline rapidly to near zero by the end of the 21st century (Mercado et al. 2009). Analyses of oceanic photosynthesis effects of SRM have not been made, but oceanic photosynthesis depends on downward directed or 'downwelling' PAR, which could be decreased by diffusive effects. At the same time, cooling will slow the rate of soil organic matter decomposition and thus reduce the availability of soil nutrients to plants. Persistent nutrient limitations may complicate the plant responses to diffuse light.

Cloud albedo enhancement. The principle of this geoengineering intervention is to increase the reflectivity of low level maritime clouds by generation of cloud condensation nuclei (CCN) (Latham 1990; Latham 2002), for example by spraying sea salt into the marine boundary layer using specifically designed vessels (Salter et al. 2008). Three remote marine areas are identified as having suitable atmospheric conditions: North East Pacific, South East Pacific, and South East Atlantic Oceans (Latham et al. 2008). There is currently little to no research on the potential impact of this surface cooling and reduction in light on marine ecosystems. In order to achieve a sufficient reduction in global annual mean temperature, this strategy requires significant localized cooling in these regions. This strong regional cooling has been shown in some modeling studies to perturb mesoscale atmospheric-oceanic systems, such as the West African Monsoon and the El Nino Southern Oscillation, although the results are inconsistent across the different studies (Jones et al. 2009, Latham et al. 2008, Rasch et al. 2009). The biological effects have not yet been estimated but could presumably be significant. These atmospheric and oceanic perturbations may in turn have significant terrestrial ecosystem impacts, especially through changes to regional precipitation regimes.

Additional Considerations

SRM novel environment. Given the evidence now available from climate modeling simulations, the Earth with SRM would involve a smaller change from today's world in terms of temperature and precipitation than a world in which emissions of greenhouse gasses (GHGs) continued unchecked. If these simulations are accurate (Ricke et al. 2010) and if SRM is undertaken and sustained for decades at a level chosen to roughly offset growing GHG forcing, the ecosystem impacts of SRM might be more modest than the impacts arising from climate change without SRM. However, the combinations of changes in an SRM-altered world – more diffuse light, unpredictably altered precipitation patterns, very high CO_2 concentrations – are unlike any known combination that today's species and ecosystems have ever faced and to which they have become adapted. We have low confidence in our ability to predict the ecological consequences to such an unknown combination of climatic variables and in our ability to predict surprises arising from the deployment of SRM, especially given the rather short transition times that may be involved with both initiation and termination.

SRM termination problem. SRM will provide cooling only as long as it is continually renewed. If SRM is undertaken for many decades with its forcing increasing to offset rising GHG levels, then cessation of SRM will result in very rapid warming (Matthews and Caldeira 2007), and large and rapid changes in circulatory patterns and precipitation would likely occur. Such rapid changes would almost certainly have very large negative impacts on ecosystems.

Ecosystem responses to such rapid warming would be expected to be much more severe than the response of the biota to the more gradual warming that has resulted and will result in future from the ongoing gradual increase in GHG concentrations. Without any opportunity for species and communities to adapt, many microbial organisms, plants, animals, and their interactions could be affected, altering community structure, affecting biogeochemical cycles, carbon and nutrient losses from soil, and fire risk. Very rapid warming could cause accelerated thawing of permafrost. An example of sudden warming is provided by the extraordinarily hot summer in Europe in 2003, resulting in 40,000 extra deaths in the region during that summer. July temperature was 6°C above the long-term average, and annual precipitation was 50% below average. The resulting drought-induced reduction of gross primary productivity by 30% produced a strong anomalous net source of CO_2 to the atmosphere, reversing 4 years of ecosystem-driven net carbon sequestration (Ciais et al. 2005). It should also be noted that significant crop failures occurred; much larger anomalies could result from a sudden cessation of SRM.[xi]

Ocean acidification. The ongoing acidification of the oceans is a result of rising atmospheric levels of carbon dioxide (Shepherd et al. 2009) and would be affected very differently by the large-scale adoption of either SRM or CDR strategies. If the world, or some major emitting states, were to adopt SRM as a primary strategy for addressing climate change, the rise in the atmospheric levels of CO_2 could be more likely to continue unchecked. In this event, the ongoing acidification of the oceans, and the large impacts that this is likely to produce on ocean ecosystems (Fabry et al. 2008), would also be unchecked. In contrast, any CDR strategy that slows or reverses the rise in the atmospheric levels of CO_2 would help to slow or even reverse the process of ocean acidification.

Until a few years ago, the ecological consequences of ocean acidification had received very little research attention (Doney et al. 2009). If significant levels of SRM were undertaken that were not accompanied by a comparably major effort to limit ocean acidification, the impacts on the ocean would be substantial. Research on the ecological impacts of SRM unaccompanied by CDR should be embedded in any research program on the ecological consequences of geoengineering.

While it is not the focus of this study, in principle it would be possible to engage in a form of geoengineering designed to regulate the pH of the oceans (*e.g.* alkalinity addition methods by oceanic "enhanced weathering" or "liming the oceans")[xii] (Rau and Caldeira 2002, Rau 2011). The amount (mass) of minerals that would have to be moved to do this makes it expensive and therefore unlikely to be attractive as a global strategy in the near future. But some local "preservation" of unique or valuable ecosystems, such as specific coral reefs or aquaculture sites, might be feasible.

PART 2: UNCERTAINTIES IN DETECTION AND ATTRIBUTION

Climate variability and anthropogenic climate change are already altering both ocean and terrestrial ecosystem dynamics at a global scale (Boyd and Doney 2002, Parmesan and Yohe 2003). But detecting and attributing the relative contributions of natural climate variability and climate change to altering ecosystem dynamics is challenging (Doney 2010). Likewise, detecting and quantifying the impact of individual (or multiple) geoengineering activities on ecology would be difficult, whether these are research experiments or potential future deployments of CDR and SRM (Boyd 2009). Scholars and international groups are already beginning to discuss questions of governance (*e.g.* Blackstock and Long 2010) and the potential for liability associated with loss of ecosystem services or alterations to ecosystem structure after an experiment or future deployment. Such questions would also require distinguishing the relative role of natural (climate variability) and anthropogenic (climate change, CDR, SRM) alterations to ecosystem structure (Boyd 2009; Blackstock and Long 2010). Research into such detection and attribution will need to be an important part of an overall research strategy to understand the ecological impacts of geoengineering.

PART 3: PRELIMINARY RESEARCH PLAN

Given the clear need to better assess the potential impacts of proposed geoengineering schemes on ecosystems, we discuss here the salient features of a research plan on this topic.

Framing the Question

A research strategy to assess the ecosystem impacts of CDR and SRM needs to focus on close coordination between the design of the perturbation itself (the emulation of the CDR or SRM method) and the design of the research on its impacts on the ecosystem. It is important to carefully design the locations and durations of CDR and SRM studies to ensure that the responses of the ecosystems and their time scales of response are captured, including both the intentional perturbation as well as any associated side effects (whether anticipated or unanticipated). This is also true if natural perturbations are to be studied (such as volcanic eruptions), since the responses may occur over longer times than the observed disturbance. Particular attention needs to be paid to the large uncertainties associated with the desired effects, as well as the side effects associated with the proposed techniques. There is also the problematic issue of selecting a baseline reference set of observations with which to compare the outcomes of the perturbation. Also, many geoengineering concepts couple effects in marine, terrestrial, and atmospheric systems, thus requiring that these domains be studied together.

Scientists and funding agencies should be prepared to be cautious and judicious in designing geoengineering experiments, as we do not have a strong *a priori* basis for knowing all the potential consequences of geoengineering experiments or even of predicting whether they will yield results that can be easily interpreted. The potential for unanticipated environmental or ecological responses (*e.g.* toxic phytoplankton blooms, Trick et al. 2010) from such experiments, in addition to the risk of failure, must be acknowledged.

Observational Records and Process Studies

Many CDR and SRM methods are intrinsically very large-scale or global in their application and impacts and so cannot be studied without a clear baseline observational record before the intervention is begun (Law 2008). Baselines and coordinated process studies are also critical to be able to explicitly attribute the changes detected to specific causes. However, given the longevity (decades) or spatial extent (ocean basin scale or large part of the stratosphere) of some CDR and SRM methods, defining a baseline is difficult, as ideally it would include a long-term, spatially resolved record of the Earth's ecosystems (Keller et al. 2008).

Numerical Models and Experiments

Ecologists need to define the key processes, space and time scales, and state variables required to study the impacts of CDR and SRM methods. Specifically, distinguishing sensitivity and adaptability to rates and to types of environmental change will increase the utility of analyses (Dawson et al. 2011). Specifically, the types of ecological models that need to be used have to be clearly defined, as well as the models and model experiments (*e.g.* simulated CDR and SRM impacts) used in the design of observing systems and experiments. It is likely that data assimilation approaches will also be required (Raupach et al. 2005, Watson 2008).

Experiments: Analog and Field

Analog exercises (*e.g.* laboratory-scale experiments that capture key features of proposed geoengineering approaches) can be extremely valuable, especially when key features of the system and its feedbacks and interactions can be modeled, while greatly compressing the time and spatial scales required. Such experiments (*e.g.* the effects of elevated CO_2 or increased temperature on plant growth), while idealized, can lead to development of hypotheses for further exploration using full-scale experiments, numerical simulations, and observations. Analog experiments can provide evidence of sensitivity to rates of change. Further they can be used in experiments that examine *unnatural* worlds, *i.e.* worlds with combinations of variables that do not (yet) exist on Earth.

Field experiments, using either direct manipulation or taking advantage of natural perturbations (such as volcanic eruptions (Hamme et al. 2010), or large-scale dust deposition to the oceans) are critical for exploring the geoengineering impacts on ecosystems. To fully exploit such experiments, coupled physical, chemical, optical, and biological measurements need to be made, with careful design by experts in each area working in close cooperation (Watson 2008).   A large suite of skills (and possibly international funding sources) will be required to design effective CDR and SRM experiments. However, not all experiments need to be large to be useful. For example, relatively small (but sustained) field experiments could be designed to study the effects of an increase in diffuse sunlight (such as might occur with some SRM schemes) on various terrestrial ecosystems.

Due to their inherent complexity, geoengineering experiments should be modeled as an integral part of the design process, to optimize their location, spatial scale, duration, and sampling strategy. During and after the experiment, comparisons should be made between models and observations for mid-course correction to forecasts (Watson 2008) and to identify model errors diagnostic of unknown or uncertain processes. In addition, comparison of measurements and model outputs are vital for the extrapolation of the results in space and time.

The scale and potential policy importance of CDR and SRM requires an international approach to field studies, and leadership by international science organizations to design experiments that can be executed at large scales, and whose results will be credible to the many nations involved. Indeed, CDR and SRM experiments may be so large and may have sufficient trans-boundary environmental impact (Boyd 2009) that international governance may be required sooner rather than later.

Integration

An integrated approach to experimental design and execution, observations and modeling is needed to study the impacts of CDR and SRM methods. Experiments are needed to provide insight into how organisms and ecosystems respond to perturbations of current environmental conditions. Observations are needed to detect consequences of CDR and SRM and determine whether anticipated or unanticipated effects occur. Models are needed to integrate observations, and to explore consequences at time and space scales that cannot be addressed with experiments.

We have outlined some but likely not all of the components and strategies that would be important for a research agenda on geoengineering. Workshops dedicated to addressing important questions may be needed to elucidate specific goals, including:

1) To design experiments that examine the ecological consequences of an engineered planet, *e.g.* cool, but with high CO_2;
2) To define the baseline observations necessary to interpret the results of CDR and SRM experiments;

3) To define the types of model that are necessary to address ecological impacts of CDR and SRM (in particular, ecologists need to define the key processes, scales, state variables and sensitivity to rates of change for modeling ecological impacts); and

4) To define the models and analyses that would be necessary to compare geoengineered and non-geoengineered worlds.

PART 4: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on this synthesis of current knowledge on the ecosystem impacts of proposed CDR and SRM methods, we provide the following conclusions and recommendations.

Conclusions.

While relatively little is currently known about the effects of geongineering on ecosystems, it is clear that different geoengineering strategies will have different ecological impacts. In this context, it is important to recognize that whether geoengineering methods are targeted at a particular ecosystem (*e.g.* ocean iron fertilization) or designed to affect climate directly (*e.g.* SRM), there are likely to be inadvertent effects on the targeted ecosystem as well as on ones that are not specifically targeted. Further, geoengineering strategies designed to address local to regional impacts of climate change might well have more global consequences.

In addition, we note that:

- Research on the possible ecological impacts of SRM and CDR will be important, since geoengineering may produce new environments that differ from those existing in the present or that occur in a non-geoengineered future. This research could be complementary to that needed and already underway on the ecosystem impacts of climate change as well as to other aspects of mainstream ecological research.
- The effects of CDR and SRM methods undertaken to moderate climate change are uncertain for ecosystems and their biodiversity. These effects may be smaller or less severe than the effects of unmitigated climate change in some cases but need the initiation of targeted research to identify the most promising approaches and locations and to reduce uncertainties.

- Some methods of CDR and SRM may alter key features of the climate system such as the location of the inter-tropical convergence zone or oceanic upwelling systems with consequent effects on ecosystems and biodiversity, but these multi-link chains of coupled physical-biological impacts are highly uncertain but can be extremely influential (Wang and Schimel 2003).
- If SRM were undertaken without concomitant attention to increases in atmospheric CO_2, then ocean acidification (and the effects of CO_2 on terrestrial ecosystems) would remain a concern. If SRM were pursued, and then ended abruptly, the impacts on all ecosystems of large and rapid changes in temperature and other climate variables are likely to be more severe than current (slower) warming scenarios.

Recommendations (for Research)

Given the current large uncertainties, research on ecosystem impacts is needed to provide the knowledge on which to base informed decisions on CDR and SRM. Current knowledge of existing biodiversity and ecosystem structure and function is inadequate and must be improved by undertaking major coordinated programs of laboratory, field, and modeling research in conditions representative of the changing climate with and without CDR and SRM, if they are to provide an improved baseline and basis for evaluating possible future impacts. International cooperation in the design and execution of research programs on the ecological impact of CDR and SRM would be highly desirable and should be promoted.

In addition, we recommend specifically that

1. Research into the impacts of CDR and SRM on ecosystems and ecosystem services, would benefit from multi- and inter-disciplinary research incorporating physical, biological and social disciplines, to ensure that all relevant aspects of each SRM or CDR technique and its ecological impacts are studied in detail.
2. Geoengineering-related ecological research should
    a. be integrated with mainstream and climate change related research programs wherever possible and
    b. include efforts to study novel environments that may be created as a result of possible geoengineering interventions, which may include careful perturbation experiments.

3. Careful thought needs to be given to research, especially to field experiments. Although caution needs to be exercised for some geoengineering-related research, a broad moratorium on small-scale experiments is not recommended as it would impede the advancement of knowledge. A system of governance is needed for experiments that could have substantial or trans-boundary ecological or other impacts that would be likely to have impacts exceeding those of ongoing commercial and agricultural activities. Any such regulatory system needs to take account of appropriate expert guidance that allows for relevant experiments.[xiii]

Acknowledgements

The authors gratefully acknowledge financial support from the U.S. National Science Foundation grant AGS1111205 and the U.K. Natural Environment Research Council, as well as seed funding and outreach support from the International Geosphere-Biosphere Program. We also gratefully acknowledge workshop participation from Richard Norris, Richard Somerville, Susan Hassol, Kathy Barbeau, Ken Caldeira, Luis Gylvan, Phil Ineson, Ninad Bondre, Ben Kravitz, Spencer Hill, Lili Xia, Robin Stevens, and Anita Johnson.

References

Betts, R. A. 2000. Offset of the potential carbon sink from boreal forestation by decreases in surface albedo. Nature 408: 187-190.

Blackstock, J. J. and J. C. S. Long. 2010. The politics of geoengineering. Science 327: 527-527.

Bopp, L., C. Le Quere, M. Heimann, A. C. Manning and P. Monfray. 2002. Climate-induced oceanic oxygen fluxes: Implications for the contemporary carbon budget. Global Biogeochemical Cycles 16: 10.1029/2001gb001445

Boyd, P. W. and S. C. Doney. 2002. Modelling regional responses by marine pelagic ecosystems to global climate change. Geophysical Research Letters 29: 53-51-53-54. 10.1029/2001gl014130

Boyd, P. W., C. S. Law, C. S. Wong, Y. Nojiri, A. Tsuda, M. Levasseur, S. Takeda, R. Rivkin, et al. 2004. The decline and fate of an iron-induced subarctic phytoplankton bloom. Nature 428: 549-553. 10.1038/nature02437

Boyd, P. W., T. Jickells, C. S. Law, S. Blain, E. A. Boyle, K. O. Buesseler, K. H. Coale, J. J. Cullen, et al. 2007. Mesoscale iron enrichment experiments 1993-2005: Synthesis and future directions. Science 315: 612-617. 10.1126/science.1131669

Boyd, P. W. 2008. Ranking geo-engineering schemes. Nature Geoscience 1: 722-724. 10.1038/ngeo348

Boyd, P. W. 2009. Geopolitics of geoengineering. Nature Geoscience 2: 812-812. 10.1038/ngeo710

Boyd, P. W. and M. J. Ellwood. 2010. The biogeochemical cycle of iron in the ocean. Nature Geoscience 3: 675-682. 10.1038/ngeo964

Boyd, P. W., D. S. Mackie and K. A. Hunter. 2010. Aerosol iron deposition to the surface ocean - modes of iron supply and biological responses. Marine Chemistry 120: 128-143. :10.1016/j.marchem.2009.01.008

Cao, L. and K. Caldeira. 2010. Can ocean iron fertilization mitigate ocean acidification? Climatic Change 99: 303-311. 10.1007/s10584-010-9799-4

Chan, F., J. A. Barth, J. Lubchenco, A. Kirincich, H. Weeks, W. T. Peterson and B. A. Menge. 2008. Emergence of anoxia in the california current large marine ecosystem. Science 319: 920-920. 10.1126/science.1149016

Ciais, P., M. Reichstein, N. Viovy, A. Granier, J. Ogee, V. Allard, M. Aubinet, N. Buchmann, et al. 2005. Europe-wide reduction in primary productivity caused by the heat and drought in 2003. Nature 437: 529-533. 10.1038/nature03972

Crutzen, P. J. 2006. Albedo enhancement by stratospheric sulfur injections: A contribution to resolve a policy dilemma? Climatic Change 77: 211-219. 10.1007/s10584-006-9101-y

Cunningham, S. A., T. Kanzow, D. Rayner, M. O. Baringer, W. E. Johns, J. Marotzke, H. R. Longworth, E. M. Grant, et al. 2007. Temporal variability of the atlantic meridional overturning circulation at 26.5 degrees n. Science 317: 935-938. 10.1126/science.1141304

Dawson, T. P., S. T. Jackson, J. I. House, I. C. Prentice and G. M. Mace. 2011. Beyond predictions: Biodiversity conservation in a changing climate. Science 332: 53-58.

de Baar, H. J. W., P. W. Boyd, K. H. Coale, M. R. Landry, A. Tsuda, P. Assmy, D. C. E. Bakker, Y. Bozec, et al. 2005. Synthesis of iron fertilization experiments: From the iron age in the age of enlightenment. Journal of Geophysical Research-Oceans 110: 1-24. 10.1029/2004jc002601

Doney, S. C. 1996. A synoptic atmospheric surface forcing data set and physical upper ocean model for the us jgofs bermuda atlantic time-series study site Journal of Geophysical Research-Oceans 101: 25615-25634
Doney, S. C. 2006. Oceanography - plankton in a warmer world. Nature 444: 695-696. 10.1038/444695a
Doney, S. C., V. J. Fabry, R. A. Feely and J. A. Kleypas. 2009. Ocean acidification: The other co2 problem. Annual Review of Marine Science 1: 169-192. 10.1146/annurev.marine.010908.163834
Doney, S. C. 2010. The growing human footprint on coastal and open-ocean biogeochemistry. Science 328: 1512-1516. 10.1126/science.1185198
Dooley, J. J. and K. V. Calvin. 2011. Temporal and spatial deployment of carbon dioxide capture and storage technologies across the representative concentration pathways. Energy Procedia 4: 5845-5852.
Duce, R. A., J. LaRoche, K. Altieri, K. R. Arrigo, A. R. Baker, D. G. Capone, S. Cornell, F. Dentener, et al. 2008. Impacts of atmospheric anthropogenic nitrogen on the open ocean. Science 320: 893-897. 10.1126/science.1150369
Durner. 2009. Predicting 21st-century polar bear habitat distribution from global climate models (vol 79, pg 25, 2009). Ecological Monographs 79: 522.
Elliott, S., K. S. Lackner, H. J. Ziock, M. K. Dubey, H. P. Hanson, S. Barr, N. A. Ciszkowski and D. R. Blake. 2001. Compensation of atmospheric co2 buildup through engineered chemical sinkage. Geophysical Research Letters 28: 1235-1238.
Fabry, V. J., B. A. Seibel, R. A. Feely and J. C. Orr. 2008. Impacts of ocean acidification on marine fauna and ecosystem processes. Ices Journal of Marine Science 65: 414-432. 10.1093/icesjms/fsn048
Field, C. B., M. J. Behrenfeld, J. T. Randerson and P. Falkowski. 1998. Primary production of the biosphere: Integrating terrestrial and oceanic components. Science 281: 237-240.
Field, C. B., D. B. Lobell, H. A. Peters and N. R. Chiariello. 2007. Feedbacks of terrestrial ecosystems to climate change. Annual Review of Environment and Resources 32: 1-29. 10.1146/annurev.energy.32.053006.141119
Gnanadesikan, A., J. L. Sarmiento and R. D. Slater. 2003. Effects of patchy ocean fertilization on atmospheric carbon dioxide and biological production. Global Biogeochemical Cycles 17: 10.1029/2002gb001940
Gnanadesikan, A. and I. Marinov. 2008. Export is not enough: Nutrient cycling and carbon sequestration. Marine Ecology-Progress Series 364: 289-294. 10.3354/meps07550
Gnanadesikan, A., K. Emanuel, G. A. Vecchi, W. G. Anderson and R. Hallberg. 2010. How ocean color can steer pacific tropical cyclones. Geophysical Research Letters 37: 10.1029/2010gl044514
Gu, L. H., D. D. Baldocchi, S. C. Wofsy, J. W. Munger, J. J. Michalsky, S. P. Urbanski and T. A. Boden. 2003. Response of a deciduous forest to the mount pinatubo eruption: Enhanced photosynthesis. Science 299: 2035-2038.
Hamme, R. C., P. W. Webley, W. R. Crawford, F. A. Whitney, M. D. DeGrandpre, S. R. Emerson, C. C. Eriksen, K. E. Giesbrecht, et al. 2010. Volcanic ash fuels anomalous plankton bloom in subarctic northeast pacific. Geophysical Research Letters 37: 1-5. 10.1029/2010gl044629
Hoegh-Guldberg, O. and J. F. Bruno. 2010. The impact of climate change on the world's marine ecosystems. Science 328: 1523-1528. 10.1126/science.1189930

IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change). 2005. Special report on carbon dioxide capture and storage. Prepared by working group iii. Eds. B. Metz, O. D., H. C. De Coninck, M. Loos, and L. A. Meyer. Cambridge Universtiy Press, Cambridge, UK. 442 pp.
IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change). 2007a. Climate change 2007: The physical science basis. Contribution of working group i to the fourth assessment report Eds. S. Solomon, D. Q., M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K.B. Avery, M. Tignor, and H.L. Miller. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK. 996 pp.
IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change). 2007b. Climate change 2007: Impacts, adaptation and vulnerability. Contribution of working group ii to the fourth assessment report. M.L. Parry, O. F. C., J.P. Palutikof, P.J. Van Der Linden and C.E. Hanson. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK. 976 pp.
Jackson, R. B., E. G. Jobbagy, R. Avissar, S. B. Roy, D. J. Barrett, C. W. Cook, K. A. Farley, D. C. le Maitre, et al. 2005. Trading water for carbon with biological sequestration. Science 310: 1944-1947. 10.1126/science.1119282
Jackson, R. B. and J. Salzman. 2010. Pursuing geoengineering for atmospheric restoration. Issues in Science and Technology 26: 67-76.
Jin, X., N. Gruber, H. Frenzel, S. C. Doney and J. C. McWilliams. 2008. The impact on atmospheric co2 of iron fertilization induced changes in the ocean's biological pump. Biogeosciences 5: 385-406.
Jones, A., J. Haywood and O. Boucher. 2009. Climate impacts of geoengineering marine stratocumulus clouds. Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres 114: 1-9. 10.1029/2008jd011450
Karl, D. and R. Letelier. 2008. Nitrogen fixation-enhanced carbon sequestration in low nitrate, low chlorophyll seascapes. Marine Ecology-Progress Series 364: 257-268
Karl, D. M. and R. M. Letelier. 2008. Nitrogen fixation-enhanced carbon sequestration in low nitrate, low chlorophyll seascapes. Marine Ecology-Progress Series 364: 257-268. 10.3354/meps07547
Keith, D. W., M. Ha-Duong and J. K. Stolaroff. 2006. Climate strategy with co2 capture from the air. Climatic Change 74: 17-45. 10.1007/s10584-005-9026-x
Keller, M., D. S. Schimel, W. W. Hargrove and F. M. Hoffman. 2008. A continental strategy for the national ecological observatory network. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment 6: 282–284.
Kravitz, B., A. Robock, L. Oman, G. Stenchikov and A. B. Marquardt. 2009. Sulfuric acid deposition from stratospheric geoengineering with sulfate aerosols. Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres 114: 10.1029/2009jd011918
Lackner, K. S. 2003. A guide to co2 sequestration. Science 300: 1677-1678.
Latham, J. 1990. Control of global warming. Nature 347: 339-340.
Latham, J. 2002. Amelioration of global warming by controlled enhancement of the albedo and longevity of low-level maritime clouds. Atmospheric Science Letters 3: 52-58. 10.1006/ASLE.2002.0048
Latham, J., P. Rasch, C. C. Chen, L. Kettles, A. Gadian, A. Gettelman, H. Morrison, K. Bower, et al. 2008. Global temperature stabilization via controlled albedo enhancement of low-level maritime clouds. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society a-Mathematical Physical and Engineering Sciences 366: 3969-3987. 10.1098/rsta.2008.0137

Law, C. S. 2008. Predicting and monitoring the effects of large-scale ocean iron fertilization on marine trace gas emissions. Marine Ecology-Progress Series 364: 283-288. 10.3354/meps07549

Lenton, T. M. and N. E. Vaughan. 2009. The radiative forcing potential of different climate geoengineering options. Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics 9: 5539-5561.

Lenton, T. M. 2010. The potential for land-based biological co2 removal to lower future atmospheric co2 concentration. Carbon Management 1: 145-160.

MacCracken, M. C. 2009. On the possible use of geoengineering to moderate specific climate change impacts. Environmental Research Letters 045107 (045114 pp.). 10.1088/1748-9326/4/4/045107

Manizza, M., M. J. Follows, S. Dutkiewicz, J. W. McClelland, D. Menemenlis, C. N. Hill, A. Townsend-Small and B. J. Peterson. 2009. Modeling transport and fate of riverine dissolved organic carbon in the arctic ocean. Global Biogeochemical Cycles 23: 10.1029/2008gb003396

Martin, J. H., R. M. Gordon and S. E. Fitzwater. 1990. Iron in antarctic waters. Nature 345: 156-158.

Matear, R. J. and B. Elliott. 2004. Enhancement of oceanic uptake of anthropogenic co2 by macronutrient fertilization. Journal of Geophysical Research-Oceans 109: 10.1029/2000jc000321

Matthews, H. D. and K. Caldeira. 2007. Transient climate-carbon simulations of planetary geoengineering. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 104: 9949-9954.

MEA (Millenium Ecosystem Assessment). 2005. Ecosystems and human well-being: Synthesis. Island Press, Washington, DC. 155 pp.

Melillo, J. M., P. A. Steudler, J. D. Aber, K. Newkirk, H. Lux, F. P. Bowles, C. Catricala, A. Magill, et al. 2002. Soil warming and carbon-cycle feedbacks to the climate system. Science 298: 2173-2176.

Mercado, L. M., N. Bellouin, S. Sitch, O. Boucher, C. Huntingford, M. Wild and P. M. Cox. 2009. Impact of changes in diffuse radiation on the global land carbon sink. Nature 458: 1014-1017. 10.1038/nature07949

Mooney, H., A. Larigauderie, M. Cesario, T. Elmquist, O. Hoegh-Guldberg, S. Lavorel, G. M. Mace, M. Palmer, et al. 2009. Biodiversity, climate change, and ecosystem services. Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability 1: 46-54. 10.1016/j.cosust.2009.07.006

Moore, J. C., S. Jevrejeva and A. Grinsted. 2010. Efficacy of geoengineering to limit 21st century sea-level rise. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 107: 15699-15703. 10.1073/pnas.1008153107

Norby, R. J., J. M. Warren, C. M. Iversen, B. E. Medlyn and R. E. McMurtrie. 2010. Co2 enhancement of forest productivity constrained by limited nitrogen availability. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 107: 19368-19373. 10.1073/pnas.1006463107

Parmesan, C. and G. Yohe. 2003. A globally coherent fingerprint of climate change impacts across natural systems. Nature 421: 37-42. 10.1038/nature01286

Pereira, H. M., P. W. Leadley, V. Proenca, R. Alkemade, J. P. W. Scharlemann, J. F. Fernandez-Manjarres, M. B. Araujo, P. Balvanera, et al. 2010. Scenarios for global biodiversity in the 21st century. Science 330: 1496-1501. 10.1126/science.1196624

Pielke, R. A., G. Marland, R. A. Betts, T. N. Chase, J. L. Eastman, J. O. Niles, D. D. S. Niyogi and S. W. Running. 2002. The influence of land-use change and landscape dynamics on the climate system: Relevance to climate-change policy beyond the radiative effect of greenhouse gases. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London Series a-Mathematical Physical and Engineering Sciences 360: 1705-1719. 10.1098/rsta.2002.1027

Rasch, P. J., S. Tilmes, R. P. Turco, A. Robock, L. Oman, C. C. Chen, G. L. Stenchikov and R. R. Garcia. 2008. An overview of geoengineering of climate using stratospheric sulphate aerosols. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society a-Mathematical Physical and Engineering Sciences 366: 4007-4037. 10.1098/rsta.2008.0131

Rasch, P. J., J. Latham and C. C. Chen. 2009. Geoengineering by cloud seeding: Influence on sea ice and climate system. Environmental Research Letters 4: 045112-045119. 10.1088/1748-9326/4/4/045112

Rau, G. H. and K. Caldeira. 2002. Minimizing effects of co2 storage in oceans. Science 295: 275-276.

Rau, G. H. 2011. Co2 mitigation via capture and chemical conversion in seawater. Environmental Science & Technology 45: 1088-1092. 10.1021/es102671x

Raupach, M. R., P. J. Rayner, D. J. Barrett, R. S. DeFries, M. Heimann, D. S. Ojima, S. Quegan and C. C. Schmullius. 2005. Model–data synthesis in terrestrial carbon observation: Methods, data requirements and data uncertainty specifications. Global Change Biology 11: 378–397. 10.1111/j.1365-2486.2005.00917.x

Richardson, A. J. and D. S. Schoeman. 2004. Climate impact on plankton ecosystems in the northeast atlantic. Science 305: 1609-1612.

Ricke, K., G. Morgan and M. Allen. 2010. Regional climate response to solar-radiation management. Nature Geoscience 3: 537-541. 10.10.38/NGEO915

Robock, A., L. Oman and G. L. Stenchikov. 2008. Regional climate responses to geoengineering with tropical and arctic so2 injections. Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres 113: D16101-D16115. 10.1029/2008jd010050

Rotenberg, E. and D. Yakir. 2010. Contribution of semi-arid forests to the climate system Science 327: 451-454. 10.1126/science.1179998

Saba, V. S., M. A. M. Friedrichs, M. E. Carr, D. Antoine, R. A. Armstrong, I. Asanuma, O. Aumont, N. R. Bates, et al. 2010. Challenges of modeling depth-integrated marine primary productivity over multiple decades: A case study at bats and hot. Global Biogeochemical Cycles 24: 10.1029/2009gb003655

Sabine, C. L., M. Heimann and P. Artaxo. 2004. Current status and past trends of the global carbon cycle. Island Press, Washington, DC. 17-44 pp.

Salter, S., G. Sortino and J. Latham. 2008. Sea-going hardware for the cloud albedo method of reversing global warming. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society a-Mathematical Physical and Engineering Sciences 366: 3989-4006. 10.1098/rsta.2008.0136

Sarmiento, J., R. Slater, J. Dunne, A. Gnanadesikan and M. Hiscock. 2010. Efficiency of small scale carbon mitigation by patch iron fertilization. Biogeosciences 7: 3593-3624. 10.5194/bg-7-3593-2010

Shepherd, J., K. Caldeira, P. Cox, J. Haigh, D. Keith, B. Launder, G. Mace, G. MacKerron, et al. 2009. Geoengineering the climate. The Royal Society

Silver, M. W., S. Bargu, S. L. Coale, C. R. Benitez-Nelson, A. C. Garcia, K. J. Roberts, E. Sekula-Wood, K. W. Bruland, et al. 2010. Toxic diatoms and domoic acid in natural and iron

enriched waters of the oceanic pacific. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 107: 20762-20767. 10.1073/pnas.1006968107
Socolow, R., M. Desmond, R. Aines, J. Blackstock, O. Bolland, T. Kaarsberg, N. Lewis, M. Mazzotti, et al. 2011. Direct air capture of co2 with chemicals, a technology assessment for the aps panel on public affairs. 91 pp. http://www.aps.org/policy/reports/assessments/loader.cfm?csModule=security/getfile&PageID=244407
Soden, B. J., R. T. Wetherald, G. L. Stenchikov and A. Robock. 2002. Global cooling after the eruption of mount pinatubo: A test of climate feedback by water vapor. Science 296: 727-730.
Spracklen, D. V., B. Bonn and K. S. Carslaw. 2008. Boreal forests, aerosols and the impacts on clouds and climate. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society a-Mathematical Physical and Engineering Sciences 366: 4613-4626. 10.1098/rsta.2008.0201
Stenchikov, G. L., I. Kirchner, A. Robock, H. F. Graf, J. C. Antuna, R. G. Grainger, A. Lambert and L. Thomason. 1998. Radiative forcing from the 1991 mount pinatubo volcanic eruption. Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres 103: 13837-13857.
Tilmes, S., R. Muller and R. Salawitch. 2008. The sensitivity of polar ozone depletion to proposed geoengineering schemes. Science 320: 1201-1204. 10.1126/science.1153966
Trenberth, K. E. and A. Dai. 2007. Effects of mount pinatubo volcanic eruption on the hydrological cycle as an analog of geoengineering. Geophysical Research Letters 34: 5. L15702 10.1029/2007gl030524
Trick, C. G., B. D. Bill, W. P. Cochlan, M. L. Wells, V. L. Trainer and L. D. Pickell. 2010. Iron enrichment stimulates toxic diatom production in high-nitrate, low-chlorophyll areas. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 107: 5887-5892. 10.1073/pnas.0910579107
Wang, G. L. and D. S. Schimel. 2003. Climate change, climate modes, and climate impacts Annual Review of Environment and Resources 28: 1-28.
Watson, R. T. 2008. Environment: Challenges and opportunities. Journal of Environmental Monitoring 10: 288-290. 10.1039/b800856f
Zeebe, R. E. and D. Archer. 2005. Feasibility of ocean fertilization and its impact on future atmospheric co2 levels. Geophysical Research Letters 32: 10.1029/2005gl022449

Notes

[i] By 2100 climate change is likely to have altered most ecosystems in their structure, function and biodiversity, and most of these alterations could compromise the services those ecosystems provide to society. Terrestrial ecosystems currently are highly important in carbon sequestration, but the terrestrial biosphere can also act as a net source of carbon to the atmosphere. There is an increasingly high risk of plant and animal species extinctions across terrestrial, fresh water, and marine biota as global mean temperatures exceed a warming of 2-3°C above preindustrial levels. These impacts on biodiversity are in many cases practically irreversible. The structure and functioning of terrestrial ecosystems are likely to change; some of these impacts may be positive and others negative. The structure and functioning of marine ecosystems also are likely to be impacted regionally by climate change with models projecting elevated productivity at high latitudes and reduced productivity at low latitudes (Doney, S. C. 1996. A synoptic atmospheric surface forcing data set and physical upper ocean model for the us jgofs bermuda atlantic time-series study site *Journal of Geophysical Research-Oceans* 101: 25615-25634). The most vulnerable ecosystems and species are thought to be coral reefs, the sea-ice biome, other high-latitude ecosystems, mountain ecosystems, and Mediterranean-climate ecosystems.

[ii] There is a fundamental problem in estimating the ecosystem (and other) effects of geoengineering, namely the choice of alternative (reference) scenario against which they are assessed. Throughout this document we compare with a reasonably likely scenario as our "control," *i.e.* one in the mid-range of SRES scenarios (IPCC 2007a), midway between the extremes of Business-as-Usual and very rapid reduction of emissions. This assumes some "moderate" rate of fossil carbon and other greenhouse gases (GHG) into the atmosphere from energy use and land use changes. The expected responses of ecosystems to the atmospheric and climatic changes resulting from increasing GHG concentrations were reviewed and summarized (IPCC 2007b). We assume that this would correspond to a leveling off of CO_2 concentrations and temperatures at approximately doubled CO_2 (560 ppm).

[iii] See http://www.oxfordgeoengineering.org/about.php. Accessed 7 June 2011.

[iv] See http://www.srmgi.org/.

[v] A description of the London Convention (or London Protocol) is available at http://www.imo.org/OurWork/Environment/SpecialProgramsAndInitiatives/Pages/London-Convention-and-Protocol.aspx.

[vi] The proposed five principles are available at http://www.sbs.ox.ac.uk/centres/insis/news/Pages/regulation-geoengineering.aspx.

[vii] Articles on this topic are available in the special issue of *Stanford Journal of Law, Science and Policy* at http://www.stanford.edu/group/sjlsp/cgi-bin/articles/index.php?CatID=1013.

[viii] See note (vii).

[ix] See note (ii).

[x] It should be noted that we consider afforestation here as a CDR method, even though in some circumstances it is also considered a mitigation method, *e.g.* avoided deforestation.

[xi] CDR methods do not have this so-called "termination problem", since any reduction of GHG concentrations is necessarily gradual and essentially permanent, and this can be regarded as a major advantage of this class of methods.

[xii] See note (iii).

[xiii] The efforts already being made through the Solar Radiation Management Governance Initiative (of the Royal Society, TWAS and EDF) and through the London Convention for ocean fertilization will contribute to the development of necessary systems and norms.

Table 1: Impacts of Control, SRM and CDR Scenarios on the Physical Climate System

	Control	CDR Examples			SRM Examples	
	Doubled Atmospheric CO_2	Afforestation (Land)	Engineered Carbon Capture and Storage (Underground)	Ocean Fertilization (Ocean)	Stratospheric Aerosol Injection (Land/Ocean)	Cloud Albedo Enhancement (Ocean)
Mechanism for offsetting CO_2-based warming.	N/A.	CDR provides a nearly direct offset of CO_2 emissions by removing the CO_2. Other climate impacts from CDR are indirect: surface albedo may be changed through changes in vegetation required for some CDR strategies (*e.g.* afforestation); soil moisture, river runoff, nutrient cycles etc may be changed to support some kinds of CDR (*e.g.* biochar).			SRM techniques increase planetary albedo to offset the warming associated with CO_2 increases. These albedo changes may not be uniform in space or time.	
Spatial distribution.	Man-made CO_2 emissions (*e.g.* fossil fuel burning) occur primarily over land. CO_2 is a long-lived greenhouse gas, making it well mixed in the atmosphere and insensitive to the spatial distribution of its sources and sinks. This long lifetime produces warming which is nearly uniform globally and other indirect consequences regionally.	Increased vegetation on land (likely targeting temperate or tropical regions), but the CO_2 response will be global.	Minimal expected changes to land or ocean regions as this method could remove CO_2 quickly, countering a lot of CO_2 emissions, with relatively little impact on local resources.	Imposed biogeochemical changes in ocean regions by fertilizing with nutrients. In the Southern Ocean, direct iron addition capitalizes on large inventories of unused plant nutrients such as nitrogen and phosphate (Sarmiento et al. 2010). In low-latitude waters, indirect ocean fertilization by pumping up nutrients in ocean pipes (Karl and Letelier 2008).	Most studies to date have considered sulfate aerosols. Their long lifetime in the stratosphere means that they will spread extensively (at least hemispherically), producing relatively small albedo change locally.	Marine stratocumulus clouds seem optimal for albedo change (Latham et al. 2008). These clouds exist in the eastern side of subtropical ocean basins.
Atmospheric CO_2 reduction per year.	N/A.	0.4-0.8 Pg C/yr removal of CO_2 (Shepherd et al. 2009).	1.7-1700 Pg C/yr, removal of CO_2, with the expected value limited by technology and cost (Dooley and Calvin 2011).	10-30 Tg C after 100 years (Gnanadesikan et al. 2003) or 32 Pg C over 100 years (Zeebe and Archer 2005); 3.4 Pg C air-sea flux over 10 years (Jin et al. 2008).	~0 Tg C/yr, except for a small enhancement from increased light into plant canopy, possible small reduction in atmospheric CO_2 due to lower temperature.	~0 Tg C/yr, with possible effect on atmospheric CO_2 concentration through ocean cooling providing a marginal enhancement of solubility pump.
Major physical attributes of CDR or SRM method.	N/A.	Significant changes to albedo and latent and sensible heat fluxes over land (Pielke et al. 2002) and possible increases in cooling from biogenic aerosol.	No expected effects other than reduced atmospheric and oceanic CO_2.	Projected changes in ocean heat budgets with potential for episodic and extreme meteorological effects in low latitude ocean (Gnanadesikan et al. 2010).	Relatively uniform albedo change, expected reduction in stratospheric ozone, small diurnal cycle suppression, and possible seasonal suppression (Robock et al. 2008).	Significant albedo change in marine stratocumulus regions, potential small effects on local ocean salinity of the surface layer.
Climatological feature changes associated with CO_2 increases that may be ameliorated by CDR or SRM methods.	Surface temperatures increase, polar amplification of temperature increase, sea level increase, sea ice decrease, poleward shift of storm tracks, increase of strength of hydrological cycle (IPCC 2007a); changes in ocean circulation (Cunningham et al. 2007) and stratification (Doney 2006); projected increase in permafrost thawing and methane release.	All changes for the "Control" case would be mitigated to some extent if the CO_2 decrease is large enough. Combinations of CDR might be required; afforestation by itself would not be enough to mitigate loss of sea ice or sea level (Moore et al. 2010).			Modeling studies suggest that many of the large scale climate changes produced in the "Control" case could be mitigated by SRM. However, it will be difficult to simultaneously compensate for temperature changes and hydrologic cycle changes. If SRM is applied to the level that global temperature is similar to present day, then tropics will be somewhat cooler that present, polar regions somewhat warmer, and the global hydrologic cycle somewhat weaker. Many other subtle changes are possible (too numerous to list here).	
Unique features of particular geoengineering strategies.	N/A.	Signicant demands on water and land use; possible impacts on nitrogen cycle.	There are likely to be minor impacts on land use but the impacts on water use are less certain.	Biologically-mediated heating effects in vicinity of fertilized surface waters (Manizza et al. 2009).	Aerosol scattering decreases the ratio of direct-to-diffuse light, with a small reduction in net phototrophic light reaching the surface; changes in ozone and additional aerosols may impact surface UVB light (Rasch et al. 2008); potential global reduction in precipitation, possible shifts in precipitation and temperature; impacts on summer monsoon.	Reduction in sunlight of up to 50W m^{-2} at surface in stratocumulus regions, surface temperature cooling larger over ocean than land; other changes similar to stratospheric aerosol injection. Local cloud albedo increases, resulting in possible changes in circulation, sea surface temperature gradients, nutrient upwelling, and La Nina patterns.

Table 2: Impacts of Control, SRM and CDR Scenarios on Ecosystem Cycling and Chemical Environment

	Control	CDR Examples			SRM Examples	
	Doubled Atmospheric CO_2	Afforestation (Land)	Engineered Carbon Capture and Storage (Underground)	Ocean Fertilization (Ocean)	Stratospheric Aerosol Injection (Land/Ocean)	Cloud Albedo Enhancement (Ocean)
Effects on nutrient cycling (including nutrient supply to ecosystems).	Elevated CO_2: accelerated development of nutrient limitation (Norby et al. 2010); warming: accelerated nutrient cycling, transfer of nutrients from soil to vegetation, accelerated nutrient loss (Melillo et al. 2002); increased nitrogen deposition with fossil fuel use; projected increase in ocean stratification will reduce vertical nutrient supply (Doney 2006).	Increased demand for fertilizer.	Slow reversal of baseline conditions, but no effect on nitrogen deposition.	Possible nutrient robbing (Gnanadesikan and Marinov, 2008); substantial macronutrient depletion, possibly limited by silicate availability (Boyd et al. 2004); O_2 loss in midwater and deep ocean resulting in possible increased hypoxia; reduced surface-ocean and increased deep-ocean acidification (Cao and Caldeira 2010).	Changes caused by warming for the "Control" case would be mitigated to some extent; changes caused by elevated CO_2 would not be affected.	
Chemical environment for ecosystems.	Potential enhancement of anoxia on continental shelves (Chan et al. 2008).	Increased N_2O emissions.	Changes for the "Control" case would be mitigated to some extent.	O_2 loss in deep oceans, acidification in deep oceans (Cao and Caldeira 2010) N_2O production (Law 2008).	Some deposition of dilute sulfuric acid but small relative to natural and anthropogenic sources (Kravitz et al. 2009).	Possible increased transport and deposition of sea spray to land.

Table 3: Impacts of Control, SRM and CDR Scenarios on Ecosystem Components

	Control	CDR Examples			SRM Examples	
	Doubled Atmospheric CO_2	Afforestation (Land)	Engineered Carbon Capture and Storage (Underground)	Ocean Fertilization (Ocean)	Stratospheric Aerosol Injection (Land/Ocean)	Cloud Albedo Enhancement (Ocean)
Community structure and taxonomic diversity.	Changes in biome distributions in land (tundra, Amazon, boreal, desertification) and ocean (Boyd and Doney 2002, Boyd and Ellwood 2010, Boyd et al. 2010) ecosystems; increased weediness; reduced biodiversity; reduced sea ice causing polar bear extinction (Durner 2009); ocean acidification; large effects on community structure in coral reefs; uncertain effects on calcifying plankton; effects will be different for different species (Fabry et al. 2008).	Reduced changes in biome distribution, more forests retained; reallocation of land use (*e.g.* from grassland to forest).	Changes for the “Control” case would be mitigated to some extent: reduced changes in biomes, extinctions.	Purposeful redistribution of phytoplankton species (Boyd et al. 2007). Short-term (multi-week) changes in phytoplankton, heterotrophic bacteria and higher trophic levels during bloom (permanent changes are possible, with increased toxic diatoms in some regions (Trick et al. 2010; Silver et al. 2010).	Changes for the “Control” case would be mitigated to some extent: reduced changes in biomes, extinctions. Change in seasonality will impact phenology, especially for near-freezing ecosystems.	Changes for the “Control” case would be mitigated to some extent: more biodiversity than base case; unknown effects on surface-ocean species distributions (*e.g.* reduced light could favor phytoplankton that are adapted to lower light), but likely smaller than the “Control” case.
Biomass and productivity	Benefits from warming: increased biological productivity because of CO_2 fertilization and water efficiency, including increases in oceanic net primary productivity (Saba et al. 2010); losses from warming: sensitivity to drought, possible transition of Amazon to tundra, decreased productivity from coastal changes in hydrology, increased vulnerability to wild fires.	Increased forest biomass and productivity.	Changes for the “Control” case would be mitigated to some extent, but localized changes in land use are likely in deserts.	Purposeful increase in net primary productivity and phytoplankton biomass in surface waters (Boyd et al. 2004; Boyd et al. 2007); increases could be either sustained or transient, depending on region and amount of unused nutrients; changes on land for “Control” case would be mitigated.	Biomass and productivity will be stimulated by increased diffuse radiation and synergy with high CO_2 (reduction in PAR will limit this effect); in some places, productivity could be reduced by different or exacerbated regional drought.	May be more biomass than base case if global temperature is reduced, but intense cooling over small ocean regions could change ocean productivity and circulation (*e.g.* El Nino and monsoon cycles), which could have detrimental effects on land; changes in stratification, nutrient supply, sunlight.
Biogeochemical cycling	Increased nitrogen deposition from continued fossil fuel combustion (*e.g.* in Arctic); changing nutrient loads in coastal and to some extent open oceans due to eutrophication and atmospheric deposition (Duce et al. 2008); overall decreased particulate export flux in open ocean (Bopp et al. 2002).	Increased nitrogen deposition.	Changes for the “Control” case would be mitigated to some extent, including possible restoration of nutrient imbalances.	Increased biogeochemical cycling in surface layers (including CO_2 uptake and trace gases, DMS, N_2O); unknown extent of CO_2 drawdown; expected acceleration and enhanced re-mineralization of sinking particles (Boyd et al. 2004).	Cooler soil temperatures could reduce nutrient turnover in soils; reduced carbon loss; small change in sulfur deposition in rain; changes in atmospheric circulation and precipitation could have large scale impacts on terrestrial biogeochemical cycling.	Potentially high regional changes in ocean cycling; changes in atmospheric circulation and precipitation could have large scale impacts on terrestrial biogeochemical cycling; possible localized changes in ocean chemical cycling.

Table 4: Impacts of Control, SRM and CDR Scenarios on Ecosystem Services

	Control	CDR Examples			SRM Examples	
	Doubled Atmospheric CO_2	Afforestation (Land)	Engineered Carbon Capture and Storage (Underground)	Ocean Fertilization (Ocean)	Stratospheric Aerosol Injection (Land/Ocean)	Cloud Albedo Enhancement (Ocean)
Supporting (net primary productivity, soil, nutrient cycling).	Mixed effects on ocean and land net primary productivity; indirect effects on soils; positive effects from high CO_2; mixed effects from increased temperature; negative effects from drought; reduced ocean nutrient supply but could be offset in some regions by enhanced atmospheric nitrogen deposition (Duce et al. 2008).	Increased forest causes higher net primary productivity.	Depends on materials needed for specific carbon capture technology.	Ocean nutrient robbing – localized increases in primary production but potential decreases far afield (Gnanadesikan and Marinov 2008).	Changes for the "Control" case would be same for CO_2, and productivity would be enhanced by increased diffuse radiation.	Changes similar to the "Control" case are expected for land net primary productivity; enhanced upwelling and nutrient supply may increase ocean net primary productivity.
Provisioning (fuel, fiber, food).	Food supply is reduced by temperature increase and drought, but partially offset by high CO_2; ocean impacts are unclear but probably negative for fisheries and shellfish (*e.g*. altered distribution of 'fish food' zooplankton in Atlantic,Richardson and Schoeman 2004).	Competition with food for arable land.	Energy cost for capturing and storing CO_2.	Possible enhancement of some fisheries due to increased phytoplankton, but such carbon cycling through food web would reduce carbon sequestration.	Energy will be required for aerosol delivery; otherwise fuel and fiber likely improved relative to "Control" case.	Energy is required; potential changes to fishery production in some regions (*e.g.* Peruvian tuna fishery); possible increased productivity for upwelling-based fisheries.
Regulating (climate regulation, water quality).	Diminished capacity for carbon sequestration; terrestrial biosphere is likely to become net carbon source; tundra source of methane; change in water vapor distribution; freshwater supply redistributed; higher O_3 exposure of plants; warming reduces ocean biological (Bopp et al. 2002) and solubility pumps.	Increased water use and changes to water availability; trace gas emissions reduced.	Water will be required for capturing and storing CO_2.	Possible albedo increases from enhanced DMS emissions; enhanced ocean capacity of CO_2; potential production of N_2O during remineralization (Law 2008); altered water quality (less nutrients, less O_2 and more acid) in mid and deep water as well as column.	Cooler temperatures may increase water availability due to lower temperature and less drought; increased ozone hole formation from aerosol heterogeneous chemistry, causing increased UV radiation damage to land-based biota.	May be better climate regulation than base case if global temperature is reduced, but intense cooling over small ocean regions could change circulation (*e.g.* El Nino and monsoon cycles), which could could impede climate regulation; enhanced ocean upwelling could increase outgassing of CO_2.
Cultural (aesthetics, educational, spiritual).	Changes in biome distributions; loss of biodiversity and ecosystems, especially at high altitudes and latitudes; negative impacts on coral and other ecosystem-related tourism.	Reduced visual diversity.	Factories will be visually unappealing but likely to impact small, unpopulated areas.	Impacts on coastal fishing communities; possible H_2S production due to increased anoxic zones; increased acidification of deep ocean biota (Cao and Caldeira 2010).	No blue sky; impeded astronomical observations.	Increased man-made structures in ocean regions; possible reduced visibility at sea; similar to arguments against offshore wind turbines.

Author Biographies and Affiliations

Lynn M. Russell is Professor of Atmospheric Chemistry at the Scripps Institution of Oceanography at the University of California, San Diego. Her research interests include atmospheric aerosols and their interactions with clouds. Lynn M. Russell, Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California, San Diego, 9500 Gilman Dr. Mail Code 0221, La Jolla, California, 92093-0221, 858-534-4852. lmrussell@ucsd.edu

Philip J. Rasch is Chief Scientist for Climate Science in the Atmospheric Science and Global Change Division of the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. His research interests include understanding the role of clouds and aerosols in influencing climate; climate modeling; and in numerical methods for the solution of differential equations in climate models: Phil Rasch, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, 902 Battelle Boulevard P. O. Box 999, MSIN K9-34, Richland, WA, 99352, Phone (509)372-4464 Philip.Rasch@pnnl.gov

Margaret Leinen is Associate Provost for Marine and Environmental Initiatives at Florida Atlantic University and Executive Director of Harbor Branch Oceanographic Institute. His research interests are paleoceanography and paleoclimate, biogeochemical cycling, and governance of geoengineering. Margaret Leinen, Harbor Branch Oceanographic Institute, 5600 US Rt 1 North, Fort Pierce, FL 34946, mleinen@hboi.fau.edu

Robert B. Jackson is Nicholas Professor of Global Environmental Change in the Nicholas School of the Environment at Duke University. His research interests include energy and environmental sciences. Robert B. Jackson, Nicholas School of the Environment, Duke University, Durham, NC 27708; 919-660-7408; jackson@duke.edu

Philip Boyd is a Professor of Ocean Biogeochemistry at the National Institute of Water and Atmosphere in Dunedin New Zealand. His research interests include phytoplankton ecology, iron biogeochemistry and the biological pump. Philip Boyd, NIWA Centre of Chemical & Physical Oceanography, Department of Chemistry, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand. 03-479-5249 Pboyd@chemistry.otago.ac.nz

Naomi E. Vaughan is a senior research associate at the Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research, University of East Anglia. Her research interests include societal responses to climate change, geoengineering and global carbon cycle-climate interactions. Naomi E. Vaughan, Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research, School of Environmental Sciences, University of East Anglia, Norwich, NR4 7TJ, United Kingdom. n.vaughan@uea.ac.uk

Peter Liss is a Professorial Fellow in the School of Environmental Sciences at the University of East Anglia in Norwich UK. His research interests are in ocean-atmosphere interaction particularly involving trace gases. Peter S. Liss, School of Environmental Sciences, University of East Anglia, Norwich, NR4 7TJ, United Kingdom. 44 1603 592563. p.liss@uea.ac.uk.

Georgina M. Mace is a Professor of Conservation Science at Imperial College London. Her research focuses on the causes and consequences of biodiversity loss and ecosystem change. Georgina Mace, Centre for Population Biology, Imperial College London, Silwood Park, Ascot, Berks SL5 7PY, UK. g.mace@imperial.ac.uk

John Shepherd is a Professorial Research Fellow in Earth System Science, University of Southampton School of Ocean and Earth Sciences. John Shepherd, Earth System Science, University of Southampton School of Ocean and Earth Sciences. National Oceanography Centre, European Way, Southampton, SO14 3ZH, United Kingdom. Tel: 44 23 8059 6256; j.g.shepherd@noc.soton.ac.uk.

David Schimel is Chief Science Officer and Principal Investigator at the National Ecological Observatory Network. His research interest focus on the global carbon cycle, climate change and the impacts of climate change on ecosystem dynamics. David S. Schimel, NEON Inc, 1685 38th Street, Boulder, CO 80305, USA. dschimel@neoninc.org

Joonas Merikanto is a Postdoctoral research fellow at the Division of Atmospheric Sciences at the University of Helsinki. His research interests include global modeling of atmospheric aerosols and aerosol microphysics. Joonas Merikanto, Division of Atmospheric Sciences, Department of Physics, University of Helsinki, P.O Box 64, 00014 University of Helsinki, Finland. 050-3182235, joonas.merikanto@helsinki.fi

Richard J. Norby is a Corporate Research Fellow at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, USA. His research interests include physiological ecology and terrestrial ecosystem response to atmospheric and climatic change. Richard J. Norby, Environmental Sciences Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory; Bethel Valley Road, Bldg. 2040, MS-6301; Oak Ridge, TN 37831-6301 USA; 865-576-5261; rjn@ornl.gov

Ken Caldeira is a Staff Scientist in the Carnegie Insitution Department of Global Ecology and a Professor (by courtesy) in the Stanford University Department of Environmental Earth System Sciences. His research interests include long-term geochemical controls on climate and ocean chemistry, long-term biogeochemical cycles, climate modeling, energy systems, and economics. Ken Caldeira, Department of Global Ecology, Carnegie Institution, Stanford, CA 94305 USA, Phone (650) 704-7212. kcaldeira@carnegie.stanford.edu

Anthony C. Janetos is Director of the Joint Global Change Research Institute, a creation of the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory and the University of Maryland. His research interests lie in the interactions of human decisions about land use and the land's subsequent interactions with the physical climate system. Anthony C. Janetos, Director Joint Global Change Research Institute Pacific Northwest National Laboratory/University of Maryland 5825 University Research Court, Suite 3500 College Park, MD 20740, 301-314-7843 anthony.janetos@pnnl.gov

Paulo Artaxo is Professor of Environmental Physics at the University of São Paulo, Brazil. His research interests are in the role of aerosol particles in tropical ecosystems, including radiative forcing and aerosol-cloud interactions. Paulo Artaxo, Institute of Physics, University of São Paulo. Rua do Matão, Travessa R, 187. CEP 05508-090, São Paulo, S.P., Brazil. Artaxo@if.usp.br

Jerry Melillo is a Distinguished Scientist at the Marine Biological Laboratory in Woods Hole, Massachusetts, USA. His research focuses on understanding the impacts of human activities on the carbon and nitrogen cycles of land ecosystems using a combination of field studies and simulation modeling. Jerry M. Melillo, The Ecosystems Center, Marine Biological Laboratory, Woods Hole, MA, 02543 USA, 508-289-7494, jmelillo@mbl.edu.

M. Granger Morgan is Professor and Head of the Department of Engineering and Public Policy at Carnegie Mellon University where he is also University and Lord Chair Professor in Engineering. His research addresses problems in science, technology and public policy with a particular focus on energy, environmental systems, climate change and risk analysis. M. Granger Morgan, Department of Engineering and Public Policy, 5000 Forbes Avenue, Pittsburgh, PA 15213, 412-268-1085, granger.morgan@andrew.cmu.edu