

Global warming is a huge problem currently happening today. Global warming is the increase in the earth's surface temperature. This topic is important because over the years global warming has gotten worse and it's starting to have a negative effect on the environment and animals living here and ~~as~~ it's about to effect us too. This topic is controversial because there is a debate of whether or not solar geoengineering should be used to reduce global warming. Solar geoengineering should not be used to reduce global warming because it can cause negative effects (text 2, line 34), and ~~as~~ the use of Solar geoengineering would only be a temporary fix (text 4, line 1). But others believe that Solar geoengineering should be used because it would cool the surface of the earth, reducing the effects of global warming (Text 1, line 41), But the fact of the matter is Solar engineering should not be used.

Solar geoengineering shouldn't be used because it can cause severe and permanent effects that could negatively affect us. One reason for this is "To the Harvard University atmospheric chemist, schemes such as spraying millions of tons of sulfate particles into the sky to reflect the sun's rays and cool the planet seemed perilous. Not only might the strategies disrupt the atmosphere in unexpected ways, but they might

also dramatically alter the weather and harm the lives of Earth's inhabitants." This quote shows how scientists, experts, in this field, are warning not to do this and it's why solar geoengineering can't be used. Another reason is "Counteracting greenhouse warming by reducing sunlight would likely make the planet drier - Models predict a 1 percent reduction in rainfall for every degree Celsius of warming counteracted." This quote shows how trying to fix one problem would just create another problem, we prevent global warming but decrease our water supply. This is why solar geoengineering shouldn't be used.

Another reason why ~~solar~~ solar geoengineering shouldn't be used is because ~~solar~~ solar geoengineering would only be a temporary fix for the problem. One reason is, "the idea that instead of dealing with the cause behind climate change directly, by cutting back on the use of fossile fuels, humans would fall back on solar engineering to merely starve off its symptoms." This quote shows how people, when in danger, they'd make the most riskiest decisions just to feel safe but ignore the consequences. Another reason is, "Because solar geoengineering addresses only the symptoms and not the cause of climate change - greenhouse gases - stopping treatment could lead

Anchor Paper – Part 2 – Level 3 – A

to devastating consequences." (Text 3, lines 48-50) This quote shows how Solar geoengineering would only be a temporary fix. This shows why Solar geoengineering shouldn't be used.

Anchor Level 3–A

CONTENT AND ANALYSIS:

- The essay introduces a reasonable claim as directed by the task (*Solar geoengineering should not be used ... because it can cause negative effects ... and the use of Solar geoengineering would only be a temporary fix*).
- The essay demonstrates some analysis of the texts (*Solar geoengineering ... can cause severe and permanent effects that could negatively effect us and people, when in danger, they'd make the most riskiest decisions just to feel safe but ignore the consequences*), but insufficiently distinguishes the claim from alternate or opposing claims (*others believe that solar geoengineering should be used because it would cool the surface of the earth, reducing the effects of global warming ... But the fact of the Matter is solar engineering should not be used*).

COMMAND OF EVIDENCE:

- The essay presents ideas briefly, making use of some specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (“*To the Harvard University atmospheric chemist ... Not only might the strategies disrupt the atmosphere in unexpected ways, but they might also dramatically alter the weather ... This quote shows how scientists ... are warning not to do this*” and “*Because Solar geoengineering addresses only the symptoms and not the cause of climate change — greenhouse gases — stopping treatment could lead to devastating consequences.*” ... *This quote Shows how Solar geoengineering would only be a temporary fix*).
- The essay demonstrates inconsistent citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material, identifying in the introductory paragraph which texts will be used while only including the initial line numbers of the evidence being cited [*negative effects (text 2, line 24)* and *reducing the effects of global warming (text 1, line 41)*] except in one instance where the direct quote is correctly cited as (*Text 3, lines 48–50*).

COHERENCE, ORGANIZATION, AND STYLE:

- The essay exhibits some organization of ideas and information to create a mostly coherent essay that introduces the topic of solar geoengineering as being *controversial* because *global warming is a huge problem*, then states the opinion that *solar geoengineering should not be used to reduce global warming*, then provides two body paragraphs that support the claim, leaving the counterclaim undeveloped and concluding with the repetitive statement *Solar geoengineering should not be used*.
- The essay establishes but fails to maintain a formal style, using primarily basic language and structure (*huge problem, has gotten wores, effect* for “affect”, *starve* for “stave”, *this quote shows how people ... they'd, most riskiest*).

CONTROL OF CONVENTIONS:

- The essay demonstrates partial control of conventions, exhibiting occasional errors that do not hinder comprehension (*its; enviroment; earth; line 41*), *But; is solar; is* “*To; reflex; fossile; consequences.*” (*Text 3, line 47*) *This*).

Should solar geoengineering be used to reduce global warming. no I don't think geoengineering should be used to reduce global warming

one piece of evidence can be found in text 4 line (38-40) This state, "By 2090 according to the team's calculation there should need to annually a amount of SO_2 equivalent to up to half the total volume that burn fossil fuels release globally each year." This mean that if each year we keep inject chemical to the earth to try to stop global warming we could damage the earth and their some side effect that would come with it.

A different point of view can be seen in text 1. This counterclaim states tha "Scientist agree that cutting global greenhouse emission as soon as possible will be key to tackling global warming. However what make them think it the only way global warming could happen, and that how we could stop it.

Finally, the best reason to prove that geoengineering shouldn't be use to reduce global warming, can be found in text 4. Here when David W. Keith said "Solar geoengineering

may temporarily reduce such climate risk, but no matter how well it works it cannot eliminate all the risk ~~as~~ arising from the growing burden on long-lived greenhouse gases'. This explained that even if we try this the geoengineering it may not be a long term thing and what if it work for a while, but and then it make Global warming ~~worst~~ ~~worst~~ worst.

This are the reason why i think Geoengineering solar shouldn't be used to reduce Global warming

Anchor Level 3–B

CONTENT AND ANALYSIS:

- The essay introduces a reasonable claim (*No I don't think geoengineering should be used to reduce global warming*).
- The essay demonstrates some analysis of the texts (*This mean that if each year we keep inject camicoil to the earth to try to stop global warming we could damage the earth and their some side effect that would come with it and This explained that even if we try the geoengineering it may not be a long term thing*), but insufficiently distinguishes the claim from alternate or opposing claims by simply stating a quote (*This counterclaim states tha “scientist agree that cutting global greenhouse emission ... will be key to tackling. global warming*) with no substantive analysis, rebuttal, or follow-up.

COMMAND OF EVIDENCE:

- The essay presents ideas briefly, making use of some specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (*This state, “By 2090 according to the team’s calculation we should need to annually a amount of SO₂ equivalent to up to half the total volume that burn fossil fluels realese globally each year” and the best reason ... can be found ... when David W. Keith said “solar geoengineering may temporarily reduce such climate risk, but no matter how well it workes it cannot eliminate all the risk arising from ... greenhouse gases”*).
- The essay demonstrates inconsistent citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material, misidentifying the first quote which comes from Text 3 as being from Text 4 and not including line numbers for quotes taken from *Text 1* and *Text 4*. Some parts of quoted material are also miscopied.

COHERENCE, ORGANIZATION, AND STYLE:

- The essay exhibits some organization of ideas and information to create a mostly coherent essay, first introducing the claim, then moving on to a supportive paragraph about the *damage geoengineering could cause*, followed by a third body paragraph that presents a counterclaim and a fourth which focuses on *the best reason to prove that geoengineering shouldn’t be use*, concluding with a sentence that restates the claim.
- The essay establishes but fails to maintain a formal style, using primarily basic language and structure (*one piece of evidence and a long term thing*) that is sometimes inexact (*and their some side effect, Here when David W. Keith said, wild for “while”*).

CONTROL OF CONVENTIONS:

- The essay demonstrates a lack of control, exhibiting frequent errors that make comprehension difficult (*fuels; realese; This mean; camicoil; earth; However what make them it the only way ... how we could stop it.; workes; worst; This are the reason*).

Scientists believe that cutting global green house emission is the key to tackling global warming. also I believe that trees by cutting down things and burn things will be the key that causing the global warming.

In text 3 state that "sure the unknowns of opening what amounts to a chemical sunshade over our heads are worrisome." that's sound dangerous these chemical definitely can cause global warming and make our life really in danger.

In text 4 state that "climate risks such as warming extreme storms and rising seas increase with cumulative emissions of carbon dioxide" also that show are dangerous ~~that~~ these chemical for us. they are really bad for our environment.

In the text 2 State that "still putting a million tons of sulfur into the stratosphere each year would probably" contribute to the tens of air pollution deaths a year, these pollutions causing deaths the air been polluted people are dying that shouldn't be taking place that's really bad for our community.

Anchor Level 2–A

CONTENT AND ANALYSIS:

- The essay introduces a claim (*Scientists believe that cutting global green-house emission is the key to tackling global warming. also I believe that true by cutting down things and burn things Will be the key that causing the global warming*).
- The essay demonstrates confused analysis of the texts (*these chemical definitely can cause global warming and make our life really in danger and these pollutions causing deaths*), failing to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims.

COMMAND OF EVIDENCE:

- The essay presents ideas briefly, making use of some specific and relevant evidence to support analysis (“*sure the unknowns of opening what amounts to a chemical sunshade over our heads are worrisom*” and “*putting a million tons of sulfur into the stratosphere each year would probabllly contribute to thousands of air pollution deaths a year*”).
- The essay demonstrates inconsistent citation of sources to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material by omitting line numbers for all three citations (*text 3, text 4, text 2*).

COHERENCE, ORGANIZATION, AND STYLE:

- The essay exhibits inconsistent organization of ideas and information, failing to create a coherent essay, with an introduction that presents a claim that focuses on global warming instead of solar geoengineering, misinterpreting the evidence it is responding to, followed by three paragraphs that offer evidence that move away from the claim while stressing the dangers of chemicals, including some faulty analysis, and concluding with a generalized comment about pollution (*the air been polluted people are dying that shouldn't be taking place that's really bad for our comunity*).
- The essay lacks a formal style, using some language that is imprecise (*by cutting down things and burn things Will be the key, In text 4 state, these pollutions causing deaths*).

CONTROL OF CONVENTIONS:

- The essay demonstrates a lack of control of conventions, exhibiting frequent errors (*warming. also I; that true; state that “sure the; worrisom; that’s sound; these chemical; definitely; dioxide” also that; enviromental; probabllly; a year,” these; comunity*) that make comprehension difficult.

Global warming they are talking about it in all of the articles.

And saying now it's good and bad at the same time.

Global warming could be good and bad at the same time. But personally I think global warming is good because It helps with not making the lakes and water over flow so there is not a lot of flooding. More animals survive. Also they talk about how global warming could be hiding sun ray and that's bad for the earth. In the article they talk about SRM and how it's growing and growing bigger and bigger every single day. And how they just want to dominate the conversation they don't want to talk about it it's so bad for the earth and they can't fix it. it's so harmful. they can't do nothing to help it at all. Also solar geoengineering and how it don't effect carbon dioxide in the air it's more effective on the ground.

I think the world not be

Ready for solar geoengineering because this is a big thing to deal with. They call it a "moral hazard" they are still researching solar geoengineering its such a huge subject to start to talk about that you should know every thing about it. and it effects us more like us and how we live global warming and just the earth in general and more than that like animals plants mainly those ones. theres just that people don't know about this except a little bit more facts about global warming is that yes it could be really bad for us and the earth, how you ask. I think because global warming could take so much water from the earth and it can become dry lands no water to be seen and we don't even think because first mean some of the animals will die from not drinking water and we can't have food and us we won't have nothing to drink either then we will not

be here to like, so it's some reasons why global warming could be bad.

global warming though is not always bad it helps us up in space with arc rays and stuff like that but in all the ways its good and bad for our earth we can't change global warming it just happened.

in conclusion all the articles were thinking about good and bad I think its good for the earth it raises risks but its good to fix them

Anchor Level 2-B

CONTENT AND ANALYSIS:

- The essay introduces a claim that focuses on global warming as opposed to solar geoengineering (*I think global warming is good because It helps with not making the lakes and water over flow so ther is not alot of Flooding*).
- The essay demonstrates a confused and unclear analysis (*they Dont want to talk about it its so bad for the earth and they cant fix it and we wont have nothing to drink eather then we will not be here to live*).

COMMAND OF EVIDENCE:

- The essay presents ideas inaccurately (*Also solar geoengineering and how it dont effect carbin dioxide in the air it's more effective on the grouned*), making use of some evidence that is irrelevant (*its such a huge supject to start to talk about and theres alot that people dont now about this supject*).
- The essay demonstrates little use of citations, inserting arbitrary sections of text with only brief and generalized references to the texts (*Global warming they are talking about it in all of the articles and In the article*) with no individual text identification or line numbers.

COHERENCE, ORGANIZATION, AND STYLE:

- The essay exhibits little organization of ideas and information, first stating a claim about global warming being good rather than focusing on solar geoengineering, then continuing in an attempt to support the claim with a discussion that interweaves evidence and analysis that alternates between comments about good and bad qualities of global warming and the bad qualities of solar geoengineering (*Also they talk about how global warming could be hiding Sun Ray and thats bad for the earth and I think the world not be Ready for solar geoengineering*), most of which goes against the initial claim, concluding with a return to the positive claim (*I think its good for the earth it takes Risks but its good to tak them*).
- The essay uses language that is predominately incoherent (*they talk about SRM and how it's growing ... And how they Just want to dominate the conversation they Dont want to talk about it, it helps us up in space with are Rays and stuff like that, now for “know”, effects for “affects”, are for “our”*).

CONTROL OF CONVENTIONS:

- The essay demonstrates a lack of control of conventions, exhibiting frequent errors (*Time But persinally, servive, hiding Sun Ray, bigger, about it its so, it dont, carbin, Reserching, live global, supject, conclution, all the article’s*) that make comprehension difficult.

Anchor Paper – Part 2 – Level 1 – A

The over heating of the world by a lot on reasons like houses color. The chemical like plastic bottle chemicals make the Earth over heat. Plastic cause a lot and when that Energy is on the plastic, the plastic bottle causing to overheat and melt this can damage the atmosphere. Also the color of houses can cause Earth to over heat, when there is a darker more over heating will happen, the lighter the color is the less over heating would happen.

Anchor Level 1-A

CONTENT AND ANALYSIS:

- The essay does not introduce a claim.
- The essay does not demonstrate analysis of the texts.

COMMAND OF EVIDENCE:

- The essay presents no evidence from the texts.
- The essay does not make use of citations.

COHERENCE, ORGANIZATION, AND STYLE:

- The essay exhibits inconsistent organization of ideas and information in a single paragraph that opens with an off-task statement (*The over heating of the world by a lot on reasons like houses color*), followed by a brief series of unrelated ideas that move from how *plastic bottles* can *melt* and *damage the atmosphere* back to the idea of how the *color of houses* affect the overheating, failing to create a coherent essay.
- The essay uses language that is predominately incoherent (*the plastic bottle causing to overheat and melt, their for “there”, when there is a darker more over heatin*).

CONTROL OF CONVENTIONS:

- The essay demonstrates a lack of control of conventions, exhibiting frequent errors that make comprehension difficult (*a lot on reasons; The chemical like plastic bottle chemical make; plastic absque; melt this; over heat, when*). Holistically, this is a Level 1 response because, although it has some Level 2 qualities, it is a personal response as it makes no reference to the task or texts and can be scored no higher than a 1.

Anchor Paper – Part 2 – Level 1 – B

all this tex is about the solar geoengineering the Solar is all about the world the air pollution that then more time is more pollution in the ocean in the land the solar is when the climate is change.

Anchor Level 1-B

CONTENT AND ANALYSIS:

- The essay does not introduce a claim that is related to the task.
- The essay does not demonstrate analysis of the texts.

COMMAND OF EVIDENCE:

- The essay presents no evidence from the text.
- The essay does not make use of citations.

COHERENCE, ORGANIZATION, AND STYLE:

- The essay exhibits little organization of ideas and information in a single paragraph that opens with *all this tex is about the solar geoengineering*, followed by a series of loosely related comments about pollution (*more time is more pollution*).
- The essay uses language that is predominately incoherent (*in the land the solar is when the climate is change*).

CONTROL OF CONVENTIONS:

- The essay is minimal, making assessment of conventions unreliable.

Earth is the only home for humanity and it's their job to protect it. However, centuries of misuse and poor protective protocols has allowed this planet to be stuffed full of pollution, such as greenhouse gases. These help boost global warming; a possible remedy has been proposed to correct this issue: solar geoengineering. Solar geoengineering could cut down global temperatures, but it's unhealthy side-effects, ~~and~~ potential for more harm, and potential for more problems calls for humanity to not use this method.

The most commonly proposed method of solar geoengineering is to spray an aerosol into the atmosphere to reflect sunlight out. While this seems very plausible, there are too many health risks to use this method. "Putting a million tons of sulfur into the stratosphere each year would probably 'contribute to thousands of air pollution deaths a year'" (Text 2, lines 34-35) – a health risk too large to be dismissed. Although in the grand scheme of things covering the Earth in an aerosol layer may work, the amount of deaths resulting from it outweighs the necessity. Either a different method must be developed, or a way to combat the air pollution must be found.

Furthermore, solar geoengineering holds ~~on~~ the ~~paper~~ potential for great danger. Using any method could cause a cascade of problems from either its start, or a sudden stop. As addressed in Text 3, "Because

Part 2 – Practice Paper – A

solar geoengineering addresses only the symptoms and not the cause of climate change—greenhouse gases—“Stopping treatment could lead to devastating consequences...” (Lines 48–50), or in other words, the root of the problem is neither fixed nor reversed in any way, and more issues arise. This form of climate control is too risky to be administered on our already harmed planet.

Ultimately, solar geoengineering creates problems in its wake and doesn’t solve the greater cause. Its purpose is to clear up our atmosphere by blocking out sunlight. While this does lower global temperatures, it doesn’t solve the foundational issue at hand: greenhouse gas emissions. So although some may argue for its benefits, solar geoengineering comes, “...with its own set of environmental and societal challenges, which they say could be comparable to—or even worse than—climate change” (Text 1, Lines 24–26). Therefore, the bad outweighs the good. The present health and safety of our planet and ~~and~~ its inhabitants should not ~~be~~ be put in harm’s way over a system that covers up problems instead of fixing them.

Solar geoengineering has its good parts; some aspects of it are quite beneficial. However, the current ideas for it are far too dangerous towards the health of humanity without actually clearing up the atmosphere. What needs to happen to correct global warming isn’t solar geoengineering (at least in this way) but rather a correction of humanity’s over-emitted

Part 2 – Practice Paper – A

greenhouse gases. If this pollution can be cleaned up, instead of covered up, then the Earth will be better off. Solar geoengineering, due to its negative effect, should not be used to solve global warming.

Solar geoengineering can be used to help out the Earth and fight global warming. It is worth a try as it has been studied by scientists to see if it's effective enough to reflect sunlight away from the surface of the Earth to counteract temperature rise (Text 1, 5-7). Solar geoengineering should be used because it can help assure the survival of our planet and the human race.

There has been many concerns that people have about climate change and what to do about it. Though some may fear that geoengineering can have side effects, like "termination shock" if suddenly stopped, which could be deadly to wildlife (Text 1, lines 44-49). Some feel not enough is known about it to put the process into action. Daisy Dunne, author of Text 1, assures that "[Researchers] have looked at changes to climate extremes, such as heatwaves, extreme precipitation events, cold nights. They've found that solar geoengineering over land regions could be very effective at reducing these extremes." (Text 1 lines 40-42) ~~Knowing that these climate extremes, and the damage they are already starting to cause, is already happening it seems we should trust the experts. It only makes sense that if we can~~

find a way to cool the Earth, that this would save life on Earth, not destroy it like global warming is presently doing.

Harvard physicist, David Keith, projects that "a world that would have warmed 2 degrees C [Celsius] by century's end would instead warm 1 degree C." if geoengineering is put into effect at a cost of about \$ 700 million annually" (Text 2, lines 10-15).

This sounds like a lot of money but is actually "less than 1 percent of what is currently spent on clean energy development" (Text 2, line 15). Cooling the Earth to save the life of all its inhabitants is worth doing at any expense. The added bonus in using geoengineering is that it is cost-effective as well.

Therefore, in conclusion solar geoengineering should be used to reduce global warming. It can help reduce global warming and climate change and save the future of our world.

In life people are faced with several problems which they must learn to solve. Solutions to problems aren't always easy however, because ^{with} each ~~solve~~ obstacle one tackles, one has created another problem. There are costs and benefits for all our choices and actions, and in psychology this is known as multiple approach avoidance, or when a situation has both ~~desireable~~ desirable and undesirable effects. Such is the problem of global warming. While possible solutions have been proposed, they simply contain the problem, all the while creating new issues. Solar geoengineering is one method devised to combat global warming, and it is comprised of hypothetical technologies made to undo the global temperature increase by reflecting sunlight away from the Earth's surface. However, with ~~them~~ these technologies come a new problems such as a resurgence of global temperatures if ~~the~~ the treatments were stopped, air pollution, ~~or~~ less rainfall, and the destruction of the ozone layer. The costs outweigh the temporary benefits. Therefore solar geoengineering should not be used to reduce global warming.

Solar geoengineering features a technique known as stratospheric aerosol injection. This method involves spraying sulfate into the stratosphere, which produces a cooling effect similar to that of a volcanic eruption, during which the ash reflects sunlight, decreasing temperatures (text, lines 28-32). However, with this

Solution come problems. According to David Keith, a Harvard scientist, "a fleet of ten Gulfstream jets could be used to annually inject 25,000 tons of sulfur... into the lower stratosphere." (text 2, lines 4-5). The plan is to inject sulfur into the stratosphere to facilitate cooling of Earth because the sulfur would reflect sunlight. However, using sulfur may result in "termination shock", so sulfur must be continually administered or else global temperatures will bounce back up (text 1, lines 43-48). It's like shaving — once you start you can't stop, or else the hair will grow back. Thus, eventually millions of tons of sulfate will need to be injected into the stratosphere, which can result in air pollution. Sulfate is not meant to be present in such high concentrations in the stratosphere. Therefore, adding it in will lead to air pollution, which can cause many people to die yearly (text 2, lines 34-35). Other concerns include the decreased rainfall. As the global temperature drops in response to the aerosol treatment, greenhouse warming is counteracted by decreasing sunlight (text 2, lines 44-45). Furthermore, "models predict a 1 percent reduction in rainfall for every degree Celsius of warming the planet." In such a manner, our planet would become drier and inhospitable to animals, because organisms have adaptations suited to the climate and environment they live in. That will be changed by aerosol use that causes drier climates, which would have disastrous and devastating effects.

on many species, especially those that depend on rain. Even so, a huge concern is that aerosols harm the ozone layer. The ozone is destroyed by the use of sulfate which speeds up a reaction that turns halogen molecules into halogen radicals (text 3, lines 44-45). Earth's ozone layer is like a blanket that ~~shields~~ shields us from ^{harmful} UV rays. UV rays are found in ~~the~~ sunlight, and they cause mutations in ~~at~~ our cells that can lead to cancers. With the breakdown of the ozone layer, more UV rays would ~~make it~~ pass through Earth's atmosphere and cause mutations in DNA and skin cells, eventually leading to an increase in the occurrences of cancers such as melanoma (skin cancer). Due to the "termination shock", possible air pollution, likely ~~be~~ drastic effects on species, ~~as~~ as a result of decreased rainfall, and increased ~~presence of~~ harmful UV rays, solar geoengineering methods should not be used to combat global warming.

Some people believe that solar geoengineering will help lower temperatures and solve our global warming concerns. David Keith proposed the idea of injecting sulfate into the stratosphere, starting with 25,000 tons and gradually increasing the amount (text 2, lines 2-5-~~xx~~). ~~If his idea was employed, "a world that would have warmed 2 degrees Celsius by century's end would instead warm 1 degree C."~~ (text 2, lines 10-11). While this offers hope to some people that global warming can be "fixed", it's only a temporary solution to a

long lasting problem. Using aerosols simply contains the problem and keeps it from getting worse, rather than solving it all together. Therefore, any such method is not worth the efforts when it produces minimal and fleeting benefits. Additionally, solar geoengineering methods, ^{may} provide a false sense of security to some individuals. Knowing that the techniques have solved of the problem, they may continue using fossil fuels, which only worsens the problem: the very thing that ~~is~~ we are trying to fix! As described, some may consider the technology as a “technofix!” and may decide that “[they] can buy a big truck and ignore the environmental extremists.” (text 4, lines 43–44). This false sense of safety ~~in~~ promotes the ^{very} actions (emission of fossil fuels) that led to global warming. So while some people believe that solar geoengineering is beneficial and should be used, it provides temporary gains and can create a laid back attitude towards global warming, which conversely effects ~~to~~ the Earth.

Solar geoengineering should not be used because the costs outweigh its benefits. So, until a method or solution that can be used with minimal costs and that provides a true solution to global warming is developed, ~~solar geoengineering~~ the world ~~is~~ is not quite ready for solar geoengineering.

Should Solar geoengineering be used to Reduce global warming? No Solar geoengineering should not be used to Reduce ~~the~~ global warming because If we Stop Sunlight that come to the Earth, ~~reproduce~~ we will cause to other thing to not reproduce. ~~reproduce~~ geoengineering Solar is term that is used to describe a group of hypothetical technologies that could, In theory The away to stop over warming or sunlight enter to the Earth. In fact Solar geoengineering is away to stop plant to growing and not produce thing that human to survive.

Leting Solar geoengineering be used it will caused to the planet to get cold. According to Text 2 "Studies have shown that Solar radiation management could be accomplished and that would cold the planet." In Other words This mean that If we Stop the raditione of the Sun It will cause the Earth to get colder and Plant to reproduce or growthe. In concultion Solar geoengineering it noto a good way to stop global warming over highte.

In recent years scientists have been trying to develop alternative ways to reduce global warming. One idea that science came up with is solar geoengineering. This new technology when put in place will be a positive because it will reduce the global temperature.

One way ~~solar~~ solar geoengineering would be a benefit is if it would cool the planet enough over time to stop extreme weather events. Text 1 talks about how stratospheric aerosol injections can help lower the temperature of the planet by putting a cloud of aerosol into the stratosphere, while also lowering the risks of extreme weather. It is stated that "[Researchers] have looked at changes to climate extremes such as heat-waves ... They've found that solar geoengineering over land regions could be very effective at reducing these extremes" (Text 1 Lines 40-42). This would be a positive because the weather would not be as drastic as it is and it would have a more average temperature. Another example is in text 2 which talks about how injecting sulfuric acid

into the stratosphere would cool the planet. This article states "If you cool the planet enough to keep that ice, says Calderia, then this dominates the climate response" (Text 1 lines 31-33). This would be a positive because with polar ice, the water would stay cool and it will no longer melt increasing the water levels.

Solar geoengineering also has another positive aspect to it being the earth's overall temperature is reduced. One example of this is in Text 1 where it talks about how putting sulfuric acid into the atmosphere would be similar to the ash of a volcano. The article reads "This technique, which is known as, "stratospheric aerosol injection", could cool the planet in a similar way to a large volcanic eruption." (Text 1 lines 28-29).

This would be beneficial because the ash from a volcanic eruption covers the sky, not allowing sunlight through cooling the area where the eruption took place. This is similar to a text example where injecting sulfuric acid into the sky would be beneficial because it would cool the earth by 1 degree. "Under Keith's projections, a world that would

have warmed 2 degrees C, [Celsius] by centuries and would instead warm 1 degree C." (Text 2 lines 10-11). This would be beneficial because with the cooling of earth by 1 less degree may make it more comfortable to live on.

While solar geoengineering has its positive aspects there are also major negative ones. Text 3 is all about the negatives and how geoengineering would cause more problems than it would solve. One example is the "monst hazard" because people would fall not be solving the problem just finding a scapegoat.

One example is how this sulfuric acid will destroy the ozone layer and thus leading to our doom. It says

"Arguably, the most serious side effect is that sulfates could lead to the destruction of the ozone" (Text 3 lines 43-44). This would be very bad because without the ozone humans and animals could not survive. But this is only a possibility which means it could happen but is not bound to happen because scientists can come up with a solution to this problem.

Solar Geoengineering has become

a major part of recent history because it could be the solution to the major problem of global warming. This is why the major aspects of it ~~is~~ would be a necessity to have so the human race can live on.

Practice Paper A – Score Level 5

Holistically, this essay best fits the criteria for Level 5. The essay introduces a precise and thoughtful claim and demonstrates thorough analysis of the texts to support the claim and to distinguish the claim from an opposing claim. Ideas are presented clearly and accurately using specific, often paraphrased, evidence from the texts. Citation format is proper. The style is formal, using language that is fluent and precise with sound structure. The essay demonstrates control of the conventions, exhibiting occasional errors only when using sophisticated language.

Practice Paper B – Score Level 3

Holistically, this essay best fits the criteria for Level 3. Although this is holistically a Level 4 essay that introduces a precise claim and demonstrates appropriate and accurate analysis of the texts to support the claim, distinguishes the claim from an opposing claim with sufficient evidence, proper citations and acceptable organization with a formal style and a partial control of conventions, the essay addresses fewer texts than required by the task and can be scored no higher than a 3.

Practice Paper C – Score Level 6

Holistically, this essay best fits the criteria for Level 6. The essay introduces a precise and insightful claim supported by an in-depth and insightful analysis which includes distinguishing the claim from the opposing claim. Ideas are presented and supported fully and thoughtfully, employing a wide range of specific and relevant evidence that is properly cited. The essay exhibits skillful organization of ideas and information in a cohesive and coherent manner while maintaining a formal style that uses sophisticated language and structure. The essay demonstrates control of conventions with essentially no errors.

Practice Paper D – Score Level 2

Holistically, this essay best fits the criteria for Level 2. The essay introduces a claim opposing solar geoengineering but demonstrates confused and unclear analysis of the texts, failing to distinguish the claim from alternate or opposing claims. The essay presents ideas inaccurately, making some use of evidence that may be irrelevant. The essay demonstrates little use of citations to avoid plagiarism when dealing with direct quotes and paraphrased material. The essay exhibits inconsistent organization of ideas and information, failing to create a coherent essay. The essay lacks a formal style, using some language that is imprecise. The essay demonstrates a lack of control of conventions, exhibiting frequent errors that make comprehension difficult.

Practice Paper E – Score Level 4

Holistically, this essay best fits the criteria for Level 4. The essay introduces a precise claim with appropriate and accurate analysis and distinguishes the claim from an opposing claim. The essay presents ideas sufficiently with proper citations and exhibits acceptable organization with a formal style and appropriate structure, demonstrating partial control of conventions.