

**Minutes and actions**

**Solar Radiation Management: Public Dialogue Oversight Group (OG)  
Meeting 06**

Monday 3 November 2025, 13:00, by Microsoft Teams videoconference.

**Members:**

Jack Stilgoe (Chair): University College London  
 Alexander Hall: McMaster University  
 Duncan McLaren: University of California, Los Angeles  
 Joanna Haigh: Imperial College London  
 Jim Haywood: University of Exeter  
 Hugh Hunt: University of Cambridge  
 Nick Pidgeon: Cardiff University  
 Savio Moniz, Kate Scott: Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ)  
 Tracey Dale: Economic and Social Research Council UKRI (ESRC)

**Other attendees:**

Lizzie Garratt, Simon Howe, Mark Swaine: Natural Environment Research Council (NERC)  
 Steve Robinson: Sciencewise  
 Henrietta Hopkins, Kate Furber, Hally Ingram, Mattie Carter: Hopkins Van Mil (HVM)  
 Anna MacGillivray, Hilary Livesey: URSUS Consulting Ltd

**Apologies:**

Chuks Okereke: University of Bristol  
 Doug Parr: Greenpeace  
 Trupti Patel: Sciencewise  
 Jim Fleming: Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council UKRI (EPSRC)  
 Emma Bessent: Arts and Humanities Research Council UKRI (AHRC)

**Oversight Group Action log:**

| No. | Action   | Responsible | Timing        | Note  |
|-----|--|-------------|---------------|---|
| 3.1 | NERC team to initiate discussion with funded research projects to formalise public dialogue feedback and response process. | NERC        | December 2025 | Closed: The first iteration of the research project’s coordination plan submitted to NERC in November 2025, with the final version due in February 2026. The Plan includes written response to the dialogue report in addition to a meeting to further discuss outcomes and research project responses in summer 2026. Format and date TBC. |

|     |  |      |               |   |
|-----|--|------|---------------|---|
| 6.1 | Circulate draft Dialogue report to OG. Comments requested by 20 January. | NERC | December 2025 | Complete: Sent 23 December              |
| 6.2 | Seek date for future OG meeting (OG 07) in February 2026                 | NERC | December 2025 | Complete: Date of 29 January finalised. |

## Minutes:

### 1. *Welcome – Chair*

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. Apologies were noted and introductions were given for those who were attending an Oversight Group (OG) meeting for the first time.

### 2. *Meeting overview – Chair*

The Chair set out the structure and purpose of this meeting. Specifically, that the meeting will focus on discussion of the recently completed public dialogue workshops, as well as initial evaluation findings. The OG will input into the structure of the dialogue report.

2.1 The OG discussed the minutes and actions from the previous meeting. The lead action from the previous meeting (action 5.1) related to final input from the OG to dialogue materials and resources. This was marked as closed due to all dialogue workshops having taken place.

2.2 Ongoing actions related to publishing OG meeting minutes on the Sciencewise website (action 4.1). The process for publication was agreed between NERC and Sciencewise, with final sign-off from URKI comms due imminently for immediate publication thereafter. **Post meeting note:** Meeting minutes from OG 01-04 were published on 5 November: [Solar Radiation Management | Sciencewise](#).

2.3 Related to action 3.1 regarding feedback process and expected response from the funded research projects to the Public Dialogue, it was confirmed that coordination focussed discussions have been held with the research projects with the plan to produce an initial coordination plan by the end of 2025. This will include resource and an outline for feedback to the dialogue report. It was proposed by the OG that projects could report back to the OG in approx. Summer 2026 allowing the projects to formulate a considered response and make necessary plans.

In parallel, ARIA funded SRM project have been advised of the report timing during a public engagement centric workshop. Engagement with the report findings, while not mandatory as funded stakeholder, will be advised given the shared and timely nature of the subject.

### 3. *Feedback from the public dialogue workshops – HVM / URSUS*

3.1 HVM provided a verbal update recounting to the OG the process for the public dialogue workshops. This included dialogue participants, dialogue process overview, role of specialist

input and the participants' journey. The OG were reminded of the 52 dialogue participants who attended each of the four workshops, one of which was in person in either Glasgow, Chester, Exeter or Peterborough. Participants were recruited to be broadly reflective of the UK population with regards to age, ethnicity, socio-economic status, religion and attitude towards climate change. Within the participant group 35 had either not heard about SRM or were unsure if they had heard about in before participating.

- 3.2 URSUS Consulting, as Evaluators for the public dialogue process, continued the discussion focussed on feedback to the dialogue process. This included highlighting the efforts to balanced framing of SRM research as a tool in the kit to address climate change, with a mix of science, ethics, pro/anti as well as UK/global perspectives. Additionally, the diverse participants remained engaged throughout and were supported in both a technical and emotional capacity. Information formats were provided in mixed media, and available after sessions, to meet learning styles, as well as a mixture of group and individual sessions. Participants views were captured through note taking, session recordings and direct comments through plenary sessions and online.

Other key factors contributing to success of process so far were recognised as being the recommendations and principles developed across the in-person locations being synthesised and tested in the final online workshop where all participated. The role of the OG was also recognised as being instrumental in the design and success of the progress thus far. Having been convened earlier than in other Sciencewise projects, drafting the dialogue specification and ensuring a balance of perspectives while contributing to content has been beneficial.

URSUS continued to add a brief summation of what participants most values about the process, as garnered through feedback forms. These included appreciating the exposure to diverse perspectives to broaden their base understanding on the subject, enjoyment of the group dynamics and collective experience, feeling heard and having opinions valued in addition to learning and gaining knowledge on SRM to enable them to form opinions and to make useful contributions as part of a process which will aid decision making processes.

- 3.3 Reflecting on the dialogue process, the OG questioned that participants were given a delineation between modelling research and fieldwork and deployment. It was confirmed by that both these elements of SRM were discussed as part of the full spectrum of SRM. It was also confirmed that participants were very keen to discuss and better understand SRM in an international context, with the complexity of global collaboration on governance coming through strongly in each workshop. Further to this, the OG discussed weighting of climate scepticism as indicative of population. Additionally, the importance of analysis and interpretation of comments associated with SRM as an additional mechanism to tackle the impacts of climate change, not as a single remedy.

#### 4. *Public Dialogue report – HVM*

- 4.1 HVM introduced the OG to an initial concept of the dialogue report themes, including some draft research principles derived from the dialogue participants. In addition, HVM lead discussion on the key points which arose during workshop 3 (in person workshop), which incorporated global collaboration & governance, ethically responsible governance and continuing SRM research, but not at the cost of enduring work on reducing GHG emissions. Participants also focussed on public knowledge and engagement, both UK and globally, consideration for future generations, being mindful of unintended consequences, additionally noting the need for transparency and trust to be vital, as well as fairness and accountability.

The summary continued with key messages from dialogue participants to researchers and decision makers, which were categorised around exercising care and caution, while supporting the continuation, in principle, of the research. With underlying principles being global cooperation, with transparency, communication and clarity. These messages, and others, will be further analysed with the detailed nuance extracted during the report analysis work by HVM to produce the draft report in the next months.

Further to the summaries, HVM presented a draft dialogue report structure to the OG. This was divided into three parts: 1) Summary of dialogue process, 2) research principles, 3) participant responses to ERM from research to deployment.

- 4.2 The OG provided some initial responses to the HVM led presentations. The OG commended the work undertaken, remarking that the public's grasp of the potentially complex landscape was well thought through and knowledgeable, with the initial messaging signalling support, with caveats around continued understanding for unintended consequences, for further research to be undertaken. It was recognised that this signals trust in scientists and researchers, with the governance caveat desires notes, as well as in which targeted areas research was more endorsed. The endorsement therefore for policy and governance implications to continue to be developed in parallel and in advance of research.

The OG continued to discuss the participants understanding of governance differences and challenges between modelling research and outdoor experimentation. The OG also raised the conception and discussion of moral hazard during workshops. It was confirmed that emphasis was mainly on distinction of SRM drawing political and societal attention from underlying GHG emission reduction and broader Net Zero targets.

Discussion also focussed on ensuring the analysis of data from workshops kept fidelity to conversations and discussions at the workshops. HVM discussed their approach to data analysis focussing on the qualitative process.

5. *Date of next meeting– Chair*

- 5.1 The OG agreed to a future meeting in ~February 2026 at which the OG can reflect on the dialogue report with a forward look at findings and sharing approaches. The OG agreed to provide views on the draft report, which will be available in mid-late December 2025. It was acknowledged that the OG do not have sign-off authority for the report, they will be invited to comment and contribute feedback on points of clarity and fact.

**ACTION 6.1: Circulate draft report to OG. Comments requested by 20 January (NERC)**

**ACTION 6.2: Find suitable date for next OG meeting in approx. February 2026 (NERC)**

6. *AOB – all*

- 6.1 The OG reflected on the role of evaluation outside of the dialogue work, expanding also to consider the impacts on research funding decision making. It's confirmed that the final Evaluation report will complete in summer 2026 with the foresight to capture the impact of the dialogue report for research funders and policy makers.
- 6.2 Discussing the possibility of including an analysis of how public perception may have changed on SRM, and geoengineering more broadly, it was confirmed that there was no big emphasis on analysing shifts since the 2011 geoengineering public dialogue. However, that information is considered in the background and as the baseline for this new report.
- 6.3 The OG further reflected upon and commended the HVM for their management and facilitation of conspiracy theories and misinformation within the dialogue process.

7. *Meeting end*