

CRF 2010 PROGRAM STRATEGY

CRF's 2010 Basic Program Strategy should have the following three elements:

1) Continue the work begun at Asilomar to draft and entrain scientific guidelines around geoengineering research.

- a. Not every country's funding and regulatory agencies have to adopt the Asilomar recommendations for us to be successful. But we need to show that Asilomar has had real impact. In order to do that we have to adopt an internal set of priorities for pushing countries/agencies to consider the guidelines and adopt what they can.
- b. This plays to the current donors by providing an opportunity to ensure that their investment is leveraged. **This leveraging is the way that we sell this piece of the agenda.**
- c. My current thinking about the priorities for countries is:
 - i. US (because we're here and there are big funding opportunities)
 - ii. UK (because they're putting the most money into research next year and will be a thought leader on this subject)
 - iii. Asilomar governmental partners –for obvious reasons
 - iv. Key national stakeholders
 - 1. India
 - 2. Brazil
 - 3. China
 - 4. Others

2) Understand and assess the governance options for geoengineering research and deployment

3) Ensuring that CRF is a partner in the most highly visible geoengineering policy activities that will take place this year

- a. The big issue here will be *governance* because with guidelines in hand people will immediately focus on who will enforce them. The UK Royal Society has announced that they will be focusing on governance of geoengineering in partnership with other nonprofit organizations. I have seen a confidential document from the Royal Society and CRF is included as a partner. This puts us in an

excellent position, but we need to set the stage for this with donors. The critical element for CRF is how we establish credibility/immediacy for this effort and distinguish ourselves from others like the Royal Society. This distinction will allow us to raise funds. This has to be through establishing elements/activities that no one else is doing. I think there are two possibilities here:

- i. The first priority is a conference activity. The Royal Society operates through establishing small expert groups who work privately. **I think that CRF can sell donors the idea that we will complement (but actually upstage) Royal Society work by holding an international conference on governance that actually gives governance organizations (treaty organizations like London Convention, ENMOD, Montreal Protocol), and the academic sector that studies these groups, an opportunity to discuss governance in a conference.** Royal Society does not do this. UN will not bring treaty groups together –they have never done this because there is too much internal UN politics involved for them. But the treaty groups are dying to talk to each other. This is a terrific opportunity for CRF and one that I think the organizations –and donors -- will respond to.
- ii. The second opportunity is funding small studies of particular ideas. For example, everyone is talking about whether ENMOD could be used to regulate stratospheric aerosol experiments. But no one has actually done an analysis of this. We could probably fund an academic for a small amount (\$15-20K) that would study this and publish a paper on it.

- b. There are lots of other ideas, but I haven't developed them, given the importance of i) and ii)

4) Understanding public opinion on geoengineering and climate change

- a. One of the biggest obstacles for government funding agencies, nonprofits, and others that accept that research needs to be done is that the public doesn't understand geoengineering. They haven't even heard about it
- b. Therefore, if presented with the ideas, most of the public thinks that it's dangerous –or that it runs counter to the need to reduce emissions. This feeds the fear of funding agencies

- c. In order to deal with public opinion we have to understand why people have the responses that they do and how to construct messages for them. This means that we need to fund one of the groups that has the ability to provide insight. We currently have a proposal in front of us from the Yale/George Mason University group that is the premier pollster of public opinion on climate change (quoted in every article on changing US public opinion on climate change). Because of the lack of information they propose to do focus group studies within the basic climate change opinion groups to understand their understanding and opinion of geoengineering
 - d. This effort provides two benefits: it helps us understand how to shape our own message and it allows us to provide US funding agencies, policymakers, and potential foundation partners with an insight into how to shape the message of their involvement with us and with geoengineering
 - e. **I think that providing the opportunity to actually understand public opinion on geoengineering could be sold to a certain class of donors, but would need the communications people to understand how best to sell this.**
- 5) **A survey and ranking of geoengineering options.**
- a. **Simplistic surveys have been performed, but no thorough framework for the analysis and ranking of geoengineering options has yet been created.**
- 6) **Pilot studies**
- a. Pilot studies remain a high priority –not just because of the opportunity with Climos, but because there is absolutely NO opportunity for US scientists to develop ideas to the point that they could actually be funded for field studies. My discussions yesterday with program officers at NSF showed that they were very open to funding field studies, but that they feel that they will be so large (\$10M) that they will need considerable pre-experiment planning. At present they have no budget to fund such planning
 - b. This is, of course, one of our priorities for large investors. I think that the specific rationale for these investments is going to have to be developed by CRF in collaboration with the two of you and with our communications effort

