

Minutes and actions

Solar Radiation Management: Public Dialogue Oversight Group (OG)

Meeting 07

Thursday 29 January 2026, 13:00, by videoconference.

Members:

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

Attendees:

Lizzie Garratt, Simon Howe: Natural Environment Research Council (NERC)
 Steve Robinson, Trupti Patel: Sciencewise
 Henrietta Hopkins, Hally Ingram: Hopkins Van Mil (HVM)
 Anna MacGillivray, Hilary Livesey: URSUS Consulting Ltd

Apologies:

Alexander Hall: McMaster University
 Chuks Okereke: University of Bristol
 Kate Fuber: Hopkins Van Mil (HVM)
 Mark Swaine: Natural Environment Research Council (NERC)
 Kate Scott: Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ)
 Jim Fleming: Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council UKRI (EPSRC)
 Emma Bessent: Arts and Humanities Research Council UKRI (AHRC)

Oversight Group 07 Actions:

No.	Action	Responsible	Timing	Note
7.1	Liaise with ARIA's Exploring Climate Cooling programme team to discuss a briefing on the dialogue outcomes	NERC, Sciencewise, HVM	February-March 2026 (pre dialogue report launch)	Briefing for ARIA's Exploring Climate Cooling Oversight Committee scheduled in February 2026
7.2	Schedule final OG meeting (OG #08) for mid-summer 2026	NERC	March 2026	Expectation that this will be in July, with the opportunity to cancel should the OG deem it not necessary.

Minutes:1. *Welcome – Chair*

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted apologies.

2. *Meeting overview – Chair*

2.1 The Chair set out the structure and purpose of this meeting by detailing that the focus will be on the public dialogue report and subsequent stakeholder engagement plans.

2.2 The OG discussed the minutes and actions from the previous meeting. It was confirmed that action 4.1 was now completed as meeting minutes from OG #01-04 have now been published on the Sciencewise website: [Solar Radiation Management | Sciencewise](#). The minutes from meeting #05-06 will be published shortly, with those from meeting #07 following the OG's sign-off. **POST-METTING NOTE:** Minutes for meetings 01-06 have now been published.

There was a correction for action 3.1 to clarify that the final version of the SRM research project's coordination plan would be submitted to NERC by February 2026. All other actions were noted as completed.

3. *Public Dialogue report – HVM*

3.1 HVM presented a summary of the public dialogue report. The report is structured into two parts: *Part one: About the Dialogue*, which contains the introduction, explanation of the methodology and participant journey; *Part two: The Findings*, which focusses on the participants' responses to SRM.

The OG were thanked for their review of and comments on the draft report (circulated in December 2025), summarising the additions and changes made as a result.

HVM described key moments within the dialogue process which highlighted changes in participant's minds or views; i) Hearing about the seriousness of the climate crisis and understanding how far we are from achieving net zero ambitions; ii) further discovery of SRM research and approaches; iii) consideration of geopolitical and ethical dimensions of SRM.

HVM then described that through the in-person workshops, participants proposed and developed a group of principles for SRM research and potential deployment. The presentation also discussed the overarching themes identified through the dialogue process. These focus upon a desire to tackle climate change, global governance and collaboration, impacts and unintended consequences, and public trust and engagement. These areas are further detailed within the report.

Further to the key themes, HVM identified that the dialogue, which built on previous deliberation and public perceptions work, may be used to springboard for four specific areas for further potential deliberations. These were: revisiting the principles to test the details; deliberation on diverging views on private sector involvement in SRM; further exploration on outdoor experiments (type & scale); integration of SRM deliberations into existing global citizen's involvement mechanisms on climate change.

Within the final report there is a summary of key messages for the key audiences: researcher, policy and governance, and funding bodies, as well as the public engagement sector.

- 3.2 The OG gave their initial responses to the report. This included discussion of the suitability of quantifying or defining the number/percentages of participants in statements made citing 'most participants' or 'some'. The OG and HVM discussed the merits of this being a qualitative report, using social scientific practice taking the standard approach to these quantifiers. The report will reflect and clarify the 'most' refers to the participants of the dialogue, not a wider societal group, and therefore extrapolation to a greater public perception.
- 3.3 Further discussion centred on the messaging that climate change action and continued emphasis on climate mitigation was seen as a clear priority for participants, which SRM research should not hinder.
- 3.4 Additionally, the OG deliberated on the messaging that SRM should not incur further harm through unintended consequences, coupled with the concept of SRM utilised in the short term as 'buying time'. The notion was discussed relating to offsetting and undertaking CO2 reduction immediately, as the impacts continue to grow while mitigation approaches, such as SRM, are further explored.
- 3.5 The group concurred that the report accurately reflects the deliberations of participants throughout the process. It was also recognised that often place-based geographical deployment of new technologies (i.e. SRM in this instance) often elicits strong participant views and roll-out implications.
- 3.6 The group emphasised the desire for the report to have real impact once published. In addition it was noted that questions around risk analysis, prioritisation and moral hazard, for example, should be considered further opportunities for reflection by report audiences within the policy, funding and research spheres.

4. *Evaluation – URSUS*

- 4.1 URSUS Consulting presented a summary of interim evaluation findings as an immediate reflection prior to the evaluation report is being finalised. Discussion focused upon lessons and highlights for a dialogue exercise of similar scope and design. There is strong recognition of receiving a geographically diverse UK wide representation bringing different climate experiences, rather than running workshops centrally. Within smaller groups, personal accounts and sense of place allowed

for meaningful discussions and considerations by participants. This enhanced the global and national climate context framing within workshops.

It was also noted that the oversight group was formed and convened earlier than in other dialogue processes. The strong benefit of which was having a key early role in drafting the dialogue specification, maintaining input throughout to shape the project, with a continued desire to remain engaged through the outcome and impact phase.

URSUS also explained that they will produce an impact report. This will factor in the outcomes of the engagement activities and report publication to capture the impact of dissemination and how findings will be integrated across government with the context of the NERC funded research projects and wider SRM work. URSUS will also engage with individual OG members about dissemination and impacts.

- 4.2 The OG recognised the importance of the evaluation being framed within the context of the whole process, not just the dialogue workshops.

5. *Stakeholder and comms plans – NERC*

- 5.1 NERC discussed the public engagement plan for the SRM public dialogue. The purpose of which is to share the findings, engage stakeholders with tailored messaging, inform policy, research and public engagement sectors, and to create a pathway for further impact.

Core publications via UKRI/Sciencewise channels have been identified. Alongside the final report being launched in March-April 2026, these include film and social media snippets, URKI news article, two-page summaries tailored to different audiences, a slide deck of key findings for use during meetings and presentations.

Further plans will include cascading to cross-UKRI research communities, presentations to relevant UKRI and ARIA boards (on an operational level as well as for a research governance and integrity perspective). In addition, a governmental cross-departmental teach-in, a workshop with the NERC funded projects, as well as engagement with other key stakeholders within the SRM landscape, with the opportunity to input to public attitude to science roundtables related to broader topics of contentious research discussions.

There will also be a strategic approach to targeting youth/early career/future generation engagement and a drive to engage with diverse audiences using relevant conferences, existing partnerships and networks.

- 5.2 It was confirmed that the final public dialogue report will feature a forward from NERC as a recognition of and response to the findings. The OG recognised that it is also important that NERC and other funders of research have a role in responding to the dialogue outcomes to reflect upon future process (related to research integrity), topics and priorities for research.
- 5.3 The OG discussed the opportunity for an academic publication where the principles identified within the report are compared to principles and messages from other processes led by other

groups, separate from that of the public. It was clarified that this approach would not include an in-depth the methodological examination of the public dialogue process. The OG further discussed the complex landscape of SRM whereby researchers may not be a supporter of SRM deployment but advocate for further research to understand implications should deployment be enacted, and/or to advise on implications for policy.

- 5.4 The OG further reflected on the report's message of SRM being of a lower priority than further climate mitigation action. The group recognised that proportionately and financially this is and should continue to be the case. The OG continued by noting that the report outcomes, while useful for researchers, will primarily be useful for policy makers to aid informing the debate further. The URKI Parliamentary affairs team is a key partner within the stakeholder plan, with the objective to advise on and lead appropriate engagement with policy and parliamentary routes.
- 5.5 Further discussion centred on how public support and reflection on research topics can inform the future of prioritisation and spend in an area.
- 5.4 NERC confirmed they will liaise with ARIA to brief on the dialogue, prior to publication. **POST-MEETING NOTE:** Meeting arranged for February 2026 to present to ARIA's Exploring Climate Cooling Oversight Committee.

ACTION 7.1: Liaise with ARIA's Exploring Climate Cooling programme team to discuss a briefing on the dialogue outcomes (NERC, Sciencewise, HVM)

6. *Future meeting – Chair*

- 6.1 The OG was further encouraged to continue to look for opportunities to engage with the dialogue launch and events. Note was given to the scheduled cross-department teach-in, where outcomes of the report will be discussed, to gain further traction and interest from a policy perspective.
- 6.2 The OG recognised that their substantive role was now fulfilled. Discussion then centred on the value of re-convening for a further meeting once the report has been launched to discuss the outreach and impacts of the work. There was agreement to schedule a final OG meeting for mid-summer 2026.

ACTION 7.2: Schedule final OG meeting (OG #08) for mid-summer 2026. (NERC)

7. *AOB – all*

- 7.1 The OG discussed ARIA's Cooling the Climate programme, specifically in relation to the topic of engagement with local communities where projects engage with groups in advance of tests

taking place in polar regions. Further to this how ARIA's Climate Tipping Points programme has developed a useful model for how to collaborate on research in the Arctic with local communities. The OG reflected that discussions on SRM are taking place globally, with specific noting of The Alliance for Just Deliberation on Solar Geoengineering.

8. *Meeting end*

8.1 The chair thanked the Oversight Group for their continued efforts and engagement, as well as thanking Hopkins Van Mil and URSUS for the public dialogue and evaluation work.

8.2 Meeting close.