

**WebTable 1. Interdisciplinary comparison of climate engineering strategies and comparative ratings (1 = poor strategy; 5 = effective strategy) are shown, with ratings in bold**

Strategy <sup>a</sup>	Technical potential for GT C sequestered (years to achieve) (1 = low; 5 = high) (Field et al. 1998; Lal 2004; Pacala and Socolow 2004; Friedlingstein et al. 2006)	Cooling potential (W m <sup>-2</sup> ) (Morgan et al. 2006; Vaughan and Lenton 2011)	Lifetime of effect (yrs) (Vaughan and Lenton 2011)	Ecological risks (1 = high; 5 = low) (Betts 2000; McNeill 2000; Rosner 2004; Czimczik and Masiello 2007; Jackson et al. 2008; Shepherd et al. 2009; NRC 2013)	Cost effectiveness <sup>b</sup> (1 = low; 5 = high) (Murphy and Jaccard 2011)	Public acceptance <sup>c</sup> (1 = low; 5 = high)	Institutional feasibility <sup>d</sup> (1 = low; 5 = high) (Ostrom et al. 1999; Dietz et al. 2003; Dietz and Stern 2009; Morrow et al. 2009; Ostrom 2010; Biermann et al. 2012)	Scope of ethical concerns (1 = extreme; 5 = minimal) (Morrow et al. 2009; Elliott 2010; Gardiner 2011; Hale and Dilling 2011; Preston 2011)
Do nothing	Diminished background seq to 0 by 2100 <b>5</b>			Rapid increase in atmospheric CO <sub>2</sub> , global warming, ocean acidification <b>1</b>	<b>5</b> (short term)	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	Extreme <b>1</b>
Abatement	<b>5</b>	As much as desired	N/A	None, if biomass fuels are grown on marginal, unforested lands where soils have previously been disturbed <b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	Minimal <b>5</b>
Reforestation/ afforestation	25 (50 yrs) <b>5</b>	0.37	10–100s	Decreased albedo in temperate/boreal forests, increased surface roughness and evaporation <b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	Moderate <b>4</b>
Plantations (conversion to forest cover)	14 (50 yrs) <b>5</b>	2.5	10s	Stream acidification, reduced stream flow, soil salinization, land-use change, energy requirement <b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	Moderate <b>4</b>
Soil management for C sequestration	14–25 (50 yrs) <b>5</b>	unknown	10–1000	Potential for improved agricultural productivity <b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	Moderate <b>4</b>
Biochar	Unknown <b>3</b>	0.4	0–1000	Fuel requirement, energy requirement, CO <sub>2</sub> byproduct <b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	Moderate <b>4</b>
Ocean iron fertilization	70–227 (100 yrs) <b>2</b>	0.2	10–100s	Change in marine food webs, algal toxin production, oxygen depletion <b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	Vast <b>2</b>
Geological CCS	25 (50 yrs) <b>4</b>		100–10 000s	Infrastructure/energy requirement to develop <b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	Significant <b>3</b>
Ocean CCS	Unknown <b>3</b>	0.025	100–10 000s	CO <sub>2</sub> leakage, ocean acidification, infrastructure/energy requirement to develop <b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	Vast <b>2</b>
Stratospheric aerosols	No carbon sequestered <b>4</b>	3–3.7	~3	Tropospheric pollution, changing weather patterns, does not decrease ocean acidification <b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	Extreme <b>1</b>

**Notes:** Ratings are based on information obtained from a literature review and involved a collaborative consensus among the authors, who provided expertise in the disciplines represented. Ratings are presented without weighting criteria or summing scores. Broader surveys of expert opinion for rankings, as well as inclusion of policy makers and the public, would be useful avenues for further research in this area (Morgan and Keith 1995; Rowe and Wright 2011; Rosa et al. 2012). For this multi-attribute trade-off analysis we do not sum or weight the scores, but present six scores for each strategy. Applying decision analysis methods that weight criteria differently, based on public or expert value systems, is a key direction for future prioritization of climate engineering strategies (Arvai et al. 2001). <sup>a</sup>Citations are in the main text, with additional citations for each criterion shown. <sup>b</sup>Explanation of cost effectiveness ratings provided in WebTable 3. <sup>c</sup>Explanation of public acceptance ratings provided in WebTable 2. <sup>d</sup>Institutional feasibility was calculated by evaluating the climate engineering options on five criteria: (1) low number of decision makers required to implement (1 point), high number of decision makers necessary to implement (0 points); (2) risks and benefits are aligned (1 point), risks and benefits are not aligned (0 points); (3) low level of uncertainty of harms and/or benefits (1 point), high level of uncertainty of harms/and or benefits (0 points); (4) high level of permanence of climate benefits of action (1 point), low level of permanence in climate benefits of action (0 points); and (5) high level of visibility and ease to monitor option (1 point), difficult to monitor option (0 points).

**WebTable 2. Public acceptance rating explanation**

	<i>Perceived cost</i>	<i>Perceived risk</i>	<i>Trust (in technology and actors)</i>	<i>Fairness (process and distribution of benefits)</i>	<i>Perception of "naturalness"</i>	<i>Likely reaction<sup>a</sup></i>	<i>Source(s)</i>
Abatement	High (economic)	Low	High	High	High	Support/tolerance	
Forest management	Unclear	Low	High	High	High	Support	(NERC 2010)
Soil management	Unclear	Low	Moderate	Moderate	High	Tolerance	
Biochar	Unclear	Low	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Tolerance	
Ocean fertilization	Moderate to low	High	Low	Low – oceans are international	Low	Resistance	(NERC 2010)
Geological CCS	High	Moderate – risk of leakage	Moderate	Moderate – national, but greater risk for stakeholders near sites	Low	Tolerance/connivance	(Perrings and Hannon 2001; Midden and Huijts 2009; Sharp <i>et al.</i> 2009; Wallquist <i>et al.</i> 2010)
Ocean CCS	Unknown	High – risk of leakage, marine impacts	Moderate to Low	Low – oceans are international	Low	Tolerance/connivance	(Kamishiro and Sato 2009; Amikawa <i>et al.</i> 2011)
Stratospheric aerosols	Low	High	Low – use of known "pollutants"	Low – distributive fairness	Low	Resistance	(NERC 2010; Mercer <i>et al.</i> 2011)

**Notes:** <sup>a</sup>Categorizing potential citizen reactions (Huijts *et al.* 2012) based on support, toleration, connivance, and resistance.

**WebTable 3. Cost effectiveness rating explanation**

	<i>Uncertainty of cost</i>	<i>Explanation and source(s)</i>
Abatement	Low to moderate	Moderate to high; ~\$27 (Stern 2007) or \$20–80 (Morris <i>et al.</i> 2012) per ton CO <sub>2</sub>
Forest management	Moderate	"Low" cost (see Shepherd <i>et al.</i> 2009); \$17–21 per ton CO <sub>2</sub> for global 50% reduction of deforestation by 2030 (Kindermann <i>et al.</i> 2008)
Soil management	Moderate	"Moderate" cost (see Shepherd <i>et al.</i> 2009)
Biochar	Moderate	"Moderate" cost (see Shepherd <i>et al.</i> 2009)
Ocean fertilization	High	"Low" cost (see Shepherd <i>et al.</i> 2009); \$22–120 (Rickels <i>et al.</i> 2012) or \$8–80 (Boyd 2008; Bertram 2010) per ton CO <sub>2</sub>
Geological CCS	Moderate to high	Moderate cost; ~\$30–60 per ton CO <sub>2</sub> (Hamilton <i>et al.</i> 2009)
Ocean CCS	High	Similar to Geological CCS
Stratospheric aerosols	Very high (Blackstock 2012)	Very low cost (Shepherd <i>et al.</i> 2009)

## ■ WebReferences

- Amikawa K, Hirabayashi S, and Sato T. 2011. Public acceptance of subsea underground carbon storage. *Energy Procedia* **4**: 6345–52.
- Arvai JL, Gregory R, and McDaniels TL. 2001. Testing a structured decision approach: value-focused thinking for deliberative risk communication. *Risk Anal* **21**: 1065–76.
- Bertram C. 2010. Ocean iron fertilization in the context of the Kyoto Protocol and the post-Kyoto process. *Energy Policy* **38**: 1130–39.
- Betts RA. 2000. Offset of the potential carbon sink from boreal forestation by decreases in surface albedo. *Nature* **408**: 187–90.
- Biermann F, Abbott K, Andresen S, *et al.* 2012. Navigating the Anthropocene: improving Earth system governance. *Science* **335**: 1306–07.
- Blackstock J. 2012. Researchers can't regulate climate engineering alone. *Nature* **486**: 159.
- Boyd P. 2008. Implications of large-scale iron fertilization of the oceans. *Mar Ecol-Prog Ser* **364**: 213–18.
- Czimczik CI and Masiello CA. 2007. Controls on black carbon storage in soils. *Glob Biogeochem Cy* **21**: GB3005.
- Dietz T, Ostrom E, and Stern P. 2003. The struggle to govern the commons. *Science* **302**: 1907–12.
- Dietz T and Stern P (Eds). 2009. Public participation in environmental assessment and decision making. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Elliott K. 2010. Geoengineering and the precautionary principle. *Int J Appl Philos* **24**: 237–53.
- Field C, Behrenfeld M, Randerson J, and Falkowski P. 1998. Primary production of the biosphere: integrating terrestrial and oceanic components. *Science* **281**: 237–40.
- Friedlingstein P, Cox P, Betts R, *et al.* 2006. Climate–carbon cycle feedback analysis: results from the (CMIP)-M-4 model inter-comparison. *J Climate* **19**: 3337–53.
- Gardiner SM. 2011. A perfect moral storm: the ethical tragedy of climate change. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Hale B and Dilling L. 2011. Ocean fertilization, and the problem of permissible pollution. *Sci Technol Hum Val* **36**: 190–212.
- Hamilton MR, Herzog HJ, and Parsons JE. 2009. Cost and US public policy for new coal power plants with carbon capture and sequestration. *Energy Procedia* **1**: 4487–94.
- Huijts NMA, Molin E, and Steg L. 2012. Psychological factors influencing sustainable energy technology acceptance: a review-based comprehensive framework. *Renew Sust Energ Rev* **16**: 525–31.
- Jackson RB, Randerson JT, Canadell JG, *et al.* 2008. Protecting climate with forests. *Environ Res Lett* **3**: 044006.
- Kamishiro N and Sato T. 2009. Public acceptance of the oceanic carbon sequestration. *Mar Policy* **33**: 466–71.
- Kindermann G, Obersteiner M, Sohngen B, *et al.* 2008. Global cost estimates of reducing carbon emissions through avoided deforestation. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* **105**: 10302–07.
- Lal R. 2004. Carbon emission from farm operations. *Environ Int* **30**: 981–90.
- McNeill J. 2000. Something new under the sun: an environmental history of the twentieth-century world. New York, NY: WW Norton & Company.
- Mercer A, Keith DW, and Sharp JD. 2011. Public understanding of solar radiation management. *Environ Res Lett* **6**: 044006.
- Midden CJH and Huijts NMA. 2009. The role of trust in the affective evaluation of novel risks: the case of CO<sub>2</sub> storage. *Risk Anal* **29**: 743–51.
- Morgan MG, Adams PJ, and Keith DW. 2006. Elicitation of expert judgments of aerosol forcing. *Climatic Change* **75**: 195–214.
- Morgan MG and Keith DW. 1995. Climate change – subjective judgements by climate experts. *Environ Sci Technol* **29**: A468–76.
- Morris J, Paltsev S, and Reilly J. 2012. Marginal abatement costs and marginal welfare costs for greenhouse gas emissions reductions: results from the EPPA model. *Environ Model Assess* **17**: 325–36.
- Morrow DR, Kopp RE, and Oppenheimer M. 2009. Toward ethical norms and institutions for climate engineering research. *Environ Res Lett* **4**: 045106.
- Murphy R and Jaccard M. 2011. Energy efficiency and the cost of GHG abatement: a comparison of bottom-up and hybrid models for the US. *Energy Policy* **39**: 7146–55.
- NERC (Natural Environment Research Council). 2010. Experiment Earth? Report on a public dialogue on geoengineering. Swindon, UK: NERC.
- NRC (National Research Council). 2013. Induced seismicity potential in energy technologies. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Ostrom E. 2010. Beyond markets and states: polycentric governance of complex economic systems. *Am Econ Rev* **100**: 641–72.
- Ostrom E, Burger J, Field C, *et al.* 1999. Revisiting the commons: local lessons, global challenges. *Science* **284**: 278–82.
- Pacala S and Socolow R. 2004. Stabilization wedges: solving the climate problem for the next 50 years with current technologies. *Science* **305**: 968–72.
- Perrings C and Hannon B. 2001. An introduction to spatial discounting. *J Regional Sci* **41**: 23–38.
- Preston CJ. 2011. Re-thinking the unthinkable: environmental ethics and the presumptive argument against geoengineering. *Environ Value* **20**: 457–79.
- Rickels W, Rehdanz K, and Oschlies A. 2012. Economic prospects of ocean iron fertilization in an international carbon market. *Resour Energ Econ* **34**: 129–50.
- Rosa E, Dietz T, Moss R, *et al.* 2012. Managing the risks of climate change and terrorism. *Solutions* **3**: 59–65.
- Rosner L (Ed). 2004. The technological fix: how people use technology to create and solve problems. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Rowe G and Wright G. 2011. The Delphi technique: past, present, and future prospects. *Technol Forecast Soc* **78**: 1487–90.
- Sharp JD, Jaccard MK, and Keith DW. 2009. Anticipating public attitudes toward underground CO<sub>2</sub> storage. *Int J Greenh Gas Con* **3**: 641–51.
- Shepherd J, Caldeira K, Cox P, *et al.* 2009. Geoengineering the climate: science, governance and uncertainty. London, UK: The Royal Society.
- Stern N. 2007. The economics of climate change: the Stern review. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Vaughan N and Lenton T. 2011. A review of climate geoengineering proposals. *Climatic Change* **109**: 745–90.
- Wallquist L, Visschers V, and Siegrist M. 2010. Impact of knowledge and misconceptions on benefit and risk perception of CCS. *Environ Sci Technol* **44**: 6557–62.