

Worldwards Geoengineering Policy

This document is a brief description of Worldward's policy on geoengineering research governance and deployment. This is not a full and detailed presentation of why we believe this, nor does this contain all of our beliefs, but contains the core of our policy on geoengineering.

Worldward's fundamental beliefs on geoengineering are as follows:

- Geoengineering could be an incredibly positive force in combating climate change as part of a holistic solution alongside adaptation measures and emission reductions
- Geoengineering, if unresearched and ungoverned, has a tremendous potential for harm as well as good
- Geoengineering, if properly researched, could help us reverse the current negatives of climate change, as well as stop us reaching tipping points, whilst at the same time, extending the time we have to adapt and mitigate climate change. By extending the time we can do this, geoengineering increases the likelihood of these two pillars to climate change strategy succeeding, as it gives us time to fight political inertia
- Geoengineering, by itself, is wholly inadequate to fighting climate change, and must be combined with adaptation and mitigation measures. However, it has the potential to buy us more time to implement these measures, research permitting. As such, no action today should be made on the assumption geoengineering will provide protection in the future
- All endeavours must be made to avoid the moral hazard of geoengineering, including the stress that this must be implemented alongside radical societal reform

Greenhouse Gas Removal

- Worldward believes it is vital for us to research more economically viable Greenhouse Gas Removal solutions, which do not rely on enhanced oil recovery or other economic uses that increase emissions, for economic viability
- National Greenhouse Gas Removal councils should be created to oversee research into GGR solutions
- These should interact with international councils and agreements into the usage of GGR
- Moreover, there needs to be research into more effective use of sequestered carbon, making it economically productive whilst not releasing extra emissions
- Government policy should not subsidise any form of CCS or negative emissions technology if it is used in EOR or burned
- Any form of subsidy or tax cut of negative emission technology when in practice should consider the
- Genuine negative emission technologies, however, should be subsidized by the government or directly invested in and managed by the government
- International agreements should be further made on the management of GGR technologies, and an intergovernmental council should be made to oversee national policies on this
- Open discussion and research is needed, with the patenting of the technologies discouraged, as they should be used for the public benefit

Solar Radiation Management

- This must be managed by an intergovernmental council immediately
- This council should be established even though there are currently no workable SRM solutions to oversee all research into SRM solutions

- The funding and voting model of this council should allow for smaller countries, and those affected the most by climate change and any potential SRM
- Any SRM research should focus on both the potential benefits but also the risks of any solution
- In any practical field trials, money must be put aside for compensation for any damage incurred
- The proceedings of this council must be open, democratic and fair
- We must endeavor to systemically deny the fossil fuel industry influence over this council and its working
- Furthermore, there should be a legal framework to work out these solutions in, by replacing the existing international laws that interfere with geoengineering, with special provisions to allow research and implementation of geoengineering through this intergovernmental council
- It is vital that we are adequately informed about the risks and benefits of SRM, to protect us and to allow for its usage if research points in that direction