

Minutes and actions

Solar Radiation Management: Public Dialogue Oversight Group Meeting 02

Monday 30 September 2024, 13:00-15:00 BST, by zoom videoconference.

Members:

Jack Stilgoe (Chair): University College London
 Jim Haywood: University of Exeter
 Joanna Haigh: Imperial College London
 Duncan McLaren: University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) School of Law
 Doug Parr: Greenpeace
 Nick Pidgeon: Cardiff University
 Alexander Hall: McMaster University
 Savio Moniz: Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ)
 Tracey Dale: Economic and Social Research Council UKRI (ESRC)
 Jim Fleming: Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council UKRI (EPSRC)
 Emma Bessent: Arts and Humanities Research Council UKRI (AHRC)

Other attendees:

Lizzie Garratt, Simon Howe, Catriona Till: Natural Environment Research Council UKRI (NERC)
 Diane Beddoes, Steve Robinson: Sciencewise
 Clio Heslop: British Science Association (BSA)

Apologies:

Daisy Thomson, Elizabeth Cunningham: Sciencewise

Oversight Group 01 Meeting Actions: All actions closed.

Oversight Group 02 Meeting Actions:

No.	Action	Responsible	Timing	Action
2.1	Draft ITT to be updated to include comments from the OG 02 meeting.	NERC	4 October 2024	CLOSED
2.2	Updated draft ITT to be shared with all OG members.	NERC	4 October 2024	CLOSED
2.3	All OG members to make comments directly onto the draft ITT working document.	OG members	Before 11 October 2024	
2.4	NERC to be notified (srm@nerc.ukri.org) if OG members would like to take part in the contractor bid panel assessment process.	OG members	31 October 2024	

2.5	OG members to contact NERC if they would like to be noted in the ToR as representing the views of their organisation.	OG members	Before the OG 03 meeting	
2.6	ToR working document to be re-shared with OG members.	NERC	4 October 2024	CLOSED
2.7	Comments on the OG ToR to be tracked directly onto the ToR working document.	OG members	Ongoing	
2.8	Professor Okereke and OG Chair JS to be put in contact.	NERC	3 October 2024	CLOSED
2.9	OG members to send critical success factors that they feel should be included in the Public Dialogue Evaluation to NERC.	OG members	31 October 2024	
2.10	Updated BSA Social Intelligence Report to be circulated to all OG members.	NERC	4 October 2024	CLOSED
2.11	OG members to notify NERC if they have any final comments on the BSA Social Intelligence Report.	OG members	11 October 2024	
2.12	Doodle Poll to be sent to OG members to find the most appropriate date for OG 03 meeting.	NERC	11 October 2024	

Minutes:

1. *Review of agenda – Chair*
The meeting agenda was accepted by all OG members. OG members agreed to compress the meeting schedule to be completed by 14:30 BST to allow key agenda items to be covered before several members were required to leave the meeting.
2. *Welcome and introduction – Chair*
The group noted absences and welcomed all members.
3. *Discussion of Public Dialogue Invitation to Tender (ITT) – NERC*
 - 3.1 NERC shared slides and provided an overview of the timeline for the ITT. It was noted that the [Modelling environmental responses to solar radiation management](#) research call, which has been live since 8 July, will close on 8 October 2024. NERC highlighted that the ITT is due to be launched by the 31 October and will close on 6 December. OG members were invited to contact NERC if they would like to volunteer to take part in the public dialogue contractor bid assessment process, which is due to be held in January 2025 (~2-3 OG members required).

3.2 The content and wording of the draft ITT was discussed by OG members:

- It was suggested that the objective 'To define if, how, and whether SRM could or should be deployed and under what conditions' could be too far reaching and may need rewording.
- The use of the word modification versus management was discussed. NERC confirmed that it was too late to change the wording on the SRM research call, however both modification and management could be included in the ITT.
- The use of the word legal when referring to SRM was also discussed.
- It was noted that the nationality of the public referred to in the ITT varied between different sections of the ITT and it was agreed that this would be changed to improve consistency. One OG member said that it would also be important to consider the balance of the different UK nations involved in the public dialogue process.
- OG members noted that the contractor delivering the public dialogue would need to provide a plan explaining how they would approach SRM conspiracy theories. Some OG members felt that it was important to use the public dialogue to understand how many people believe SMR conspiracy theories (e.g. chemtrails), how many people are making a connection between SRM and chemtrails and what the motivations behind these beliefs might be.
- Some OG members suggested that information on SRM could be shared with participants prior to the public dialogue workshop. However, it was noted that the use of the word 'educating' in the ITT, may not reflect the dialogue process and 'information provision' could be an appropriate alternative wording.
- In response to a query from an OG member, NERC/Sciencewise clarified that the aim of the dialogue would not be for participants to reach one single consensus. Instead, the dialogue would aim to understand the diversity of perspectives on SRM and the values/principles that underlie these perspectives.
- OG members suggested there is a need for clarity around how the research teams will work alongside the public dialogue process, and NERC noted that this detail could be added to the ITT. NERC highlighted that the research programme coordination function will work with the research projects to help them consider the ethical and governance implications of their research.
- One OG member noted that it would be important that public dialogue participants are clearly briefed on the extent of their role and its potential future impacts.
- Another OG member suggested that there is a need for mapping risk-risk into the public dialogue questions, e.g., by asking participants what they feel the risk of not deploying or not researching SRM would be.
- Some OG members felt that the tone of the ITT implied that SRM technologies are ready to be used. OG members suggested that the ITT wording could be altered to highlight that these are only possible technologies and have associated risks.
- The importance of consulting with other similar SRM research programmes to prevent overlap was raised. It was confirmed that NERC are in regular communication with ARIA. The OG Chair noted that he is sitting on ARIA's Oversight Committee and would be happy to answer any questions from OG members relating to ARIA. It was agreed that the ITT would be amended to include greater detail regarding this programme's relationship with ARIA.

- OG members asked for greater clarity on who would have access to the public dialogue report and what its intended use would be. Other comments were noted directly onto the draft ITT working document.

Action 2.1: NERC update the draft ITT to include comments from the OG 02 meeting.

Action 2.2: NERC to share the updated draft ITT with all OG members.

Action 2.3: All OG members to make final comments on the ITT draft by 11 October 2024.

Action 2.4: OG members to contact NERC if they would like to volunteer to take part in the public dialogue contractor bid panel assessment process.

4. *Discussion of the OG Terms of Reference (ToR) – LG (The ToR was updated following the OG 01 meeting. Prior to the OG 02 meeting this revised ToR was shared with OG members for comments.)*

4.1 OG members agreed to the changes made to the ToR. No further amendments to the ToR were suggested. NERC highlighted that any further comments should be made directly onto the shared ToR.

4.2 It was suggested that OG members would represent their own views while sitting on the OG, not the views of their organisation. OG members agreed to contact NERC if they would like to be recorded as representing the views of their organisation.

4.3 During the meeting members discussed the diversity of the OG. NERC noted that, following discussion in the OG 01 meeting, Professor Chukwumerije Okereke had been invited to become a member of the OG. NERC and the OG Chair will meet the new member in October to discuss the role in more detail.

Action 2.5: OG members to contact NERC (srm@nerc.ukri.org) if they feel they should be recorded as representing the views of their organisation.

Action 2.6: NERC to re-share ToR link.

Action 2.7: OG members to note any further comments directly onto the shared ToR working document.

Action 2.8: NERC will put Professor Okereke and JS in contact via email with a view of meeting in October 2024.

5. *Public Dialogue Evaluation – Sciencewise*

Sciencewise explained to the OG that the public dialogue would have an independent evaluation completed by an external organisation. It was noted that the public dialogue evaluation will be

formative and summative. The evaluator will be appointed at the same time as the dialogue contractor and will attend the project meetings/inception meetings. The evaluator will complete (1) a baseline report outlining the critical success factors and how these will be assessed (2) an interim report (3) a final report, published 6-8 months after the public dialogue report. The evaluation would be looking at all parts of the public dialogue process.

OG members were asked to consider what they felt the critical success factors for this public dialogue would be. OG members suggested the following as possible critical success factors (1) deep discussions (2) breadth of discussions (3) full participation and co-creation by all participants (4) participants having a clear understanding of what the outcome/impact of the public dialogue will be. It was also suggested that the evaluation assessed how the public dialogue addressed conspiracy theories and if there was value in sharing information on SRM with participants.

An OG member suggested that the evaluator should produce a Logic Model/Theory of Change document, DB agreed that this could be included in the evaluator's ITT.

Action 2.9: OG members to consider what critical success factors they feel should be included in the public dialogue evaluation.

6. *AOB: BSA Social Intelligence Report update*

OG members were thanked for their off-line comments (shared via email and during the OG 01 meeting) on the BSA Social Intelligence Report. BSA confirmed that the report was updated in response to these comments received and that the new version will be re-shared with the OG. Final comments are invited by 11 October with any final comments.

Action 2.10: NERC to re-circulate updated BSA Social Intelligence Report.

Action 2.11: OG members to BSA directly by the 11 October if they have any final comments on the BSA Social Intelligence Report.

7. *OG 03 meeting*

All OG members agreed to the next OG meeting being held in January/ February 2025. NERC noted that the assessment of the public dialogue contractor bids will take place in mid-January, with the aim that the contractor will start in February 2025. It was agreed that once in post, the public dialogue contractor will attend future OG meetings.

Action 2.12: NERC to find a date for the OG 03 2025 meeting.

8. *Meeting close*