12SM

Cross-sectoral Perspectives Supplementary Material

Coordinating Lead Authors:
Mustafa Babiker (Sudan/Saudi Arabia), Göran Berndes (Sweden)

Lead Authors:
Kornelis Blok (the Netherlands), Brett Cohen (Republic of South Africa), Annette Cowie (Australia), Oliver Geden (Germany), Veronika Ginzburg (the Russian Federation), Adrian Leip (Italy/Germany), Pete Smith (United Kingdom), Masahiro Sugiyama (Japan), Francis Yamba (Zambia)

Contributing Authors:
Alaa Al Khourdajie (United Kingdom/Syria), Almut Arneth (Germany), Inês M.L. Azevedo (Portugal/the United States of America), Christopher Bataille (Canada), David Beerling (United Kingdom), Rachel Bezner Kerr (the United States of America), Jessie Bradley (the Netherlands), Holly Jean Buck (the United States of America), Luisa F. Cabeza (Spain), Katherine Calvin (the United States of America), Donovan Campbell (Jamaica), Jofre Carnicer Cols (Spain), Vassilis Daioglou (Greece), Mathijs Harmsen (the Netherlands), Lena Höglund-Isaksson (Sweden), Joanna I. House (United Kingdom), David Keller (Germany/the United States of America), Kiane de Kleijne (the Netherlands), Susanna Kugelberg (Sweden), Igor Makarov (the Russian Federation), Francisco Meza (Chile), Jan Christoph Minx (Germany), Michael Morecroft (United Kingdom), Gert-Jan Nabuurs (the Netherlands), Henry Neufeldt (Denmark/Germany), Aleksandra Novikova (Germany), Sudarmanto Budi Nugroho (Indonesia), Andreas Oschlies (Germany), Camille Parmesan (United Kingdom/the United States of America), Glen P. Peters (Norway/Australia), Joseph Poore (United Kingdom), Joana Portugal-Pereira (Brazil), Julio C. Postigo (the United States of America/Peru), Prajal Pradhan (Germany/Nepal), Phil Renforth (United Kingdom), Marta G. Rivera-Ferre (Spain), Stephanie Roe (the United States of America/the Philippines), Pramod K. Singh (India), Raphael Slade (United Kingdom), Stephen M. Smith (United Kingdom), Maria Cristina Tirado von der Pahlen (the United States of America/Spain), Daniela Toribio Ramirez (Mexico)

Review Editors:
Gilberto Jannuzzi (Brazil), Andy Reisinger (New Zealand)

Chapter Scientists:
Kiane de Kleijne (the Netherlands), Eveline María Vásquez-Arroyo (Peru/Brazil)

This chapter should be cited as:
Babiker, M., G. Berndes, K. Blok, B. Cohen, A. Cowie, O. Geden, V. Ginzburg, A. Leip, P. Smith, M. Sugiyama, F. Yamba, 2022: Cross-sectoral perspectives Supplementary Material. In IPCC, 2022: *Climate Change 2022: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [P.R. Shukla, J. Skea, R. Slade, A. Al Khourdajie, R. van Diemen, D. McCollum, M. Pathak, S. Some, P. Vyas, R. Fradera, M. Belkacemi, A. Hasija, G. Lisboa, S. Luz, J. Malley, (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK and New York, NY, USA. Available from https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg3/.

Table of Contents

12.SM.1 Detailed Explanation of the Data on Costs and Potentials in Section 12.2

12.SM.1.1 Introduction

In this Supplementary Material, background information is provided on the way the data on costs and potentials has been synthesised. Section 12.SM.1.2 provides information on how the extended Table 12.4 on costs and potentials of mitigation options was constructed using the input of the sectoral chapters and other information. Section 12.SM.1.3 provides information on the construction of Figure SPM.7 in the Summary for Policymakers.

12.SM.1.2 Data on Emission Scenarios and Mitigation Potentials (Table 12.4)

Energy sector

For the energy sector, the starting point for determining the mitigation potential was UNEP (2017), which was also published as Blok et al. (2020). This assessment was checked for key updates that substantially influence the ranges as reported in these literature sources.

The reference emissions scenario in the World Energy Outlook 2016 report (IEA 2016) was compared to the preferred reference scenario for this assessment, World Energy Outlook 2019 (IEA 2019b). There is limited change in the overall parameters between the World Energy Outlooks of 2019 and 2016. Total electricity production in 2030 was marginally higher (0.6%) and the average fossil fuel emissions factor 2.4% lower in WEO2019 as compared to WEO2016. A substantially higher contribution of wind and solar energy was seen in the reference scenario (Current Policies), leading to a reduction of the remaining potential by 0.50 and 0.95 gigatonnes of carbon dioxide ($GtCO_2$) for wind and solar respectively. In contrast, the contribution of nuclear energy in the reference scenario has become smaller. For all other low-carbon sources the differences are small.

Estimating the potential deployment of low-carbon electricity sources by 2030 is difficult. The technical potentials are significant, and for all technologies are higher or much higher than the potentials identified by UNEP (2017). In many cases, the technical potential of electricity-generating technologies is even much higher than the anticipated electricity demand projected for 2030, see for example recent assessments for solar energy (Creutzig et al. 2017; Dupont et al. 2020), onshore wind energy (Bosch et al. 2017), offshore wind energy (Bosch et al. 2018) and hydropower (Hoes et al. 2017).

There are few studies that explicitly explore the limits of deployment of technologies by 2030. For solar energy a group of solar energy experts (Haegel et al. 2019) showed the feasibility of achieving 10 terawatt (TW) of installed photovoltaic energy capacity in 2030, which is higher than the highest end of the 8.2 TW estimate in the UNEP (2017) report. Bogdanov et al. (2019) provide a somewhat lower contribution of solar energy in 2030 (installed power 7 TW), but a somewhat higher contribution from wind energy than assumed before, at 3.3 TW. Combined with a substantially higher full-load equivalent hours of wind turbines (3200 hours yr^{-1} versus 2600 hours yr^{-1}), this leads to a higher production and associated avoided emissions compared to UNEP (2017). Combined with the higher reference levels for solar and wind energy, this brings the achievable mitigation potential range for 2030 for solar energy to 2 to 7 $GtCO_2$ (from 3 to 6 $GtCO_2$) and for wind energy to 2.1 to 5.6 $GtCO_2$-eq (from 2.6 to 4.1 $GtCO_2$).

Regarding nuclear energy, IEA (2019a) explores the role of lifetime extensions of nuclear power plants. The report shows that an extra 80 GW can stay online by 2030, which would be equivalent to about 0.4 $GtCO_2$ of avoided emissions. This is well below the potential estimate in UNEP (2017) and could be part of the realisation of that potential, compensating for the fact that the potential for new-built power plants in the timeframe until 2030 will gradually decrease given the long lead times required to get nuclear power plants online (IEA 2019b). Based on these considerations, the potential for nuclear energy is not updated from the figures presented in UNEP (2017).

For other low-carbon electricity sources, no studies were found that led to a downward or upward revision of the potentials identified in UNEP (2017).

The mitigation cost data per electricity generation technology were provided in Chapter 6. The starting point was electricity production cost data for 2019 and 2030 provided by the International Energy Agency (IEA) for four marker regions: Asia (China), Asia (India), Europe, and North America. For these regions, mitigation costs were calculated for two scenarios, the first in which coal-fired power plants are replaced, and the second in which natural-gas fired power plants are replaced, leading to a total of eight cases. Although these cases cannot be used to determine an accurate global distribution of mitigation costs, they are considered sufficiently representative for the *range* of mitigation costs for each technology.

For onshore wind and utility solar energy, the mitigation costs end up in the negative cost bins, if we compare the full levelised cost of electricity (LCOE) of these technologies with the full LCOE of conventional power production. However, if solar and wind energy develop rapidly, they will not necessarily replace existing capacity, but rather just avoid the fuel and other operational costs of existing power plants. Taking that into account, the mitigation costs will become higher. In many cases negative costs still occur, but also costs in the ranges of 0 to 50 USD tCO_2-eq^{-1} (for wind) and 0 to 100 USD tCO_2-eq^{-1} (for solar) occur. This full range of cost bins is used, noting that the majority of the potential will be in the negative cost bin. The latter is also confirmed by the analysis of the historic development of electricity production costs in Chapter 6 (Figure SPM.5). Offshore wind currently is more expensive, but also here negative costs are expected by 2030. For nuclear energy, costs can vary widely, largely region-dependent, the cases end up in the cost bins ranging from negative to over 100 USD tCO_2.eq^{-1}. For bioenergy, carbon capture and storage and bioenergy combined with carbon capture and storage (BECCS), mitigation costs virtually all end up in the range of 50 to 200 USD tCO_2.eq^{-1}. For hydropower and geothermal, energy costs in the range of 0 to 100 USD tCO_2-eq^{-1} are assumed. It should be stressed that costs vary widely depending on

12SM

local and regional conditions (see also Section 6.4.7), but the cost ranges presented here are considered to represent how the various technologies compare in mitigation costs, along with the variability per technology.

Methane emission reductions (excluding AFOLU)

Data for methane (CH_4) emissions reductions from coal, oil and natural gas operations, solid waste and wastewater were provided by three organisations: the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), the Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency PBL and the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). For oil and gas, data from the IEA were also used. In this analysis, as far as possible global warming potentials (GWPs) as established in the Sixth Assessment Report are used: 27 for biogenic methane and 28.9 for fossil methane (Cross-Chapter Box 2 in Chapter 2).

The analysis by IIASA is reported in Höglund-Isaksson et al. (2020). Data were provided by Mrs Lena Höglund-Isaksson (most recent version on 27 October 2021). The data were reported in EUR tCO_2^{-1} and allocated to USD tCO_2^{-1} cost bins using a USD to EUR ratio of 0.86.

The analysis by the Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency PBL is reported in Harmsen et al. (2019a). Data were provided by Mr Mathijs Harmsen in Excel format (1 February 2021), see also Harmsen et al. (2019b). Cumulative relative emissions reduction potentials were provided. The relative emissions reductions were applied to the Shared Socio-economic Pathway 2 (SSP2) baseline provided with the PBL dataset and subsequently organised in cost bins.

The analysis by the United States Environmental Protection Agency is reported in US EPA (2019). Data were downloaded via the Non-CO_2 Greenhouse Gas Data Tool (US EPA 2021), which provides cumulative cost data, and organised in cost bins. The mitigation potentials were corrected for the GWPs used in AR6. However, as EPA originally uses a GWP of 25, there may still be a small mismatch over the cost bins.

Data from the IEA for oil and gas were downloaded from the Methane Tracker Database (IEA 2021). Costs are given in USD per British thermal unit (BTU), these were converted using a conversion factor of 21.5 kg methane per million BTU.

The results are shown in Table 12.SM.1.1. There are notable differences between the sources in mitigation potentials. There is however a fair agreement between the data sources as to whether mitigation potentials typically appear in lower or higher cost ranges. In the table, a 'best estimate' per cost bin is also presented, based on an average of the estimates. For coal, oil and gas, PBL and IIASA are each allocated half of the weight of the other sources, based on the observation that PBL relies heavily on IIASA for these sources. For the 'less than zero' cost bin, data from PBL were not taken into account as these potentials are already included in the baseline.

Table 12.SM.1.1 | Methane mitigation potentials for the year 2030 for coal mining, oil and gas operations, waste and wastewater from four different sources. For comparison, the reference emissions are also given. A 'best estimate' per source is given in italics. Sources: see text.

Sector/ data source	Cost ranges (USD tCO_2-eq^{-1})						Total mitigation potential ($GtCO_2$-eq)	Reference 2030 emissions ($GtCO_2$-eq)
	<0	0–20	20–50	50–100	100–200	>200		
Coal								
IIASA	0.06	0.22	0.05	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.36	1.21
EPA	0.01	0.64	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.68	0.91
PBL		0.15	0.02	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.20	1.28
Best estimate	*0.04*	*0.41*	*0.03*	*0.02*	*0.00*	*0.00*	*0.50*	
Oil and gas								
IIASA	0.56	0.19	0.20	0.05	0.00	0.00	1.01	2.88
EPA	0.12	0.23	0.03	0.01	0.29	0.00	0.67	1.78
PBL		0.41	0.04	0.29	0.00	0.00	0.74	3.28
IEA	0.26	1.30	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.61	2.15
Best estimate	*0.31*	*0.61*	*0.07*	*0.06*	*0.10*	*0.00*	*1.15*	
Solid waste								
IIASA	0.43	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.56	1.49
EPA	0.24	0.15	0.07	0.10	0.12	0.00	0.68	1.19
PBL		0.14	0.08	0.01	0.10	0.15	0.48	1.04
Best estimate	*0.33*	*0.11*	*0.06*	*0.04*	*0.08*	*0.06*	*0.69*[a]	
Wastewater								
IIASA	0.05	0.05	0.07	0.04	0.01	0.00	0.21	0.61
EPA	0.00	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.16	0.00	0.27	0.68
PBL		0.01	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.07	0.14	0.84
Best estimate	*0.02*	*0.03*	*0.04*	*0.03*	*0.07*	*0.02*	*0.22*	

[a] This number is the summation over the cost bins and can be higher than all the values per institute because PBL is not taken into account for the negative bin.

The uncertainty ranges are determined by the lowest and highest value per cost bin. Cumulative uncertainty ranges are based on cumulative values and are in relative terms substantially smaller.

Agriculture, forestry and other land-use (AFOLU) change

The data for agriculture, forestry and land-use change were obtained from Chapter 7 (Table 7.3), where potentials below a certain cost level are provided. These values were converted into cost bins in Table 12.4 by calculating the additional potential when going from one cost level to the next. The uncertainty ranges of the cost bin were scaled down proportionally from the cumulative values.

Buildings

The data for buildings were obtained from Chapter 9. A more extended overview than in Table 12.4, with a breakdown for developing and developed countries, can be found in Tables 9.SM.2 and 9.SM.3.

Transport

For the transport sector, the following assessment was made, partly based on information from Chapter 10.

Data for the technical options for passenger cars were taken from ICCT[1] (2019). The authors explore the potential of rapid further fuel economy technologies (50% reduction in per kilometre CO_2 emissions for new passenger vehicles in 2030 compared to 2005) and fast adoption of electric vehicles (35% of sales in 2030). This share in new vehicle sales is comparable with what is assumed in Chapter 10 (30%) and estimated in BNEF (2021). For heavy duty trucks the reduction in per kilometre CO_2 emissions for new vehicles is 35% in 2035 compared to 2005, and the share of electric vehicles sales is 19% in 2030. The emissions reduction in freight transport is comparable to the potential calculated in IEA (2020b). According to ICCT (2019) the fuel economy measures are cost effective, that is, negative costs per tonne of CO_2 avoided. Electric light duty vehicles currently still are often more expensive over the lifetime than vehicles with internal combustion engines. Costs of batteries are falling rapidly (Section 2.5.3) and it is expected that price parity with conventional vehicles is reached in the late 2020s (BNEF, 2021), meaning that lifecycle benefits will already exceed costs prior to that date. This means that mitigation costs will be highly variable until 2030, so no mitigation costs could be assigned to this technology. The same is valid for electric heavy duty vehicles.

Data for the impact of modal shifts in passenger transport are taken from ITDP and UC Davis[2] (2015). They calculate that costs, both for the shift to public transport and the shift to cycling, are lower than for transport by passenger cars.

For aviation, limited estimates are available. Emissions reduction potentials (excluding biofuels) in the range of 0.12 to 0.32 $GtCO_2$ are reported (ICAO 2019; ICCT 2020; IEA 2020), but underlying assumptions are not very well documented.

For shipping, in Chapter 10 an emissions reduction potential of 39% (range 30 to 56%) compared to business as usual is quoted (Section 10.6.4), which translates to 0.7 $GtCO_2$, using an average business-as-usual emissions of approximately 1.8 $GtCO_2$ (Bouman et al. 2017). It is assumed that one-third of the potential is for biofuels, which are excluded here, as this is a separate category in this overview. The review study by Bouman et al. (2017) quotes earlier studies which found that 'it is possible to improve energy efficiency and reduce emissions in a cost effective manner, either with zero costs or with net cost savings', and so it is assumed that the potential will mostly be in the below-zero cost bin.

IRENA (2016) estimates that 10% of the fuels for the transport sector can be in the form of biofuels in 2030. For the calculation of avoided CO_2 emissions, the approach in UNEP (2017) is used. Mitigation costs for transportation biofuels are uncertain. Transportation biofuels are currently mostly more expensive than regular fuels, but they could move closer to parity with regular fuels, especially if next generation biofuels are applied (Junqueira et al. 2017; IEA Bioenergy 2020). Given this uncertainty, it can be expected that costs will end up in the range of 0 to 100 USD $tCO_2\text{-eq}^{-1}$, although the distribution over the cost bins is uncertain.

Industry

The data for industry were obtained from Chapter 11 (Sections 11.4.1 and 11.4.2, and Figure 11.13). The reference shows an increase in CO_2 emissions from 2017 to 2030 of 28%. For comparison, industrial final energy use increases by 24% in the Current Policies scenario of the World Energy Outlook 2019 (IEA 2019b) (no data on CO_2 emissions are available for the World Energy Outlook scenario). This suggests that the Chapter 11 reference emissions are slightly higher than in the World Energy Outlook (assuming no major fuel shifts in the Current Policies scenario).

Fluorinated gases

Data for fluorinated gas emissions reductions were taken from three sources. Data from IIASA are taken directly from Purohit and Höglund-Isaksson (2017). The analysis by the United States Environmental Protection Agency is reported in US EPA (2019). Data were downloaded via the Non-CO_2 Greenhouse Gas Data Tool (US EPA 2021), which provides cumulative cost data, and were subsequently organised in cost bins. The analysis by the Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency PBL is reported in Harmsen et al. (2019a), Data were provided by Mr Mathijs Harmsen in Excel format (1 February 2021), see also Harmsen et al. (2019b). Cumulative relative emissions reductions were provided. The emissions reduction potentials for the various gases were summed together and subsequently organised in cost bins.

The results are presented in Table 12.SM.1.2. There are notable differences between the sources in mitigation potentials. There is, however, a fair agreement that most of the potential appears in

[1] Data were kindly provided by Zifei Yang, International Council on Clean Transportation, Washington DC, USA.

[2] Data were kindly provided by Taylor Reich, Institute for Transportation and Development Policy, New York, USA.

Table 12.SM.1.2 | Methane mitigation potentials for fluorinated gases for 2030 from three different sources. For comparison, the reference emissions are also given. A 'best estimate' per source is given in italics. Sources: see text.

Data source	Cost ranges (USD tCO_2-eq^{-1})						Total emissions reduction potential ($GtCO_2$-eq)
	<0	0–20	20–50	50–100	100–200	>200	
IIASA	0.50	0.90	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.50
EPA	0.01	0.55	0.01	0.07	0.05	0.00	0.70
PBL		0.58	0.42	0.20	0.05	0.00	1.25
Best estimate	*0.26*	*0.68*	*0.18*	*0.09*	*0.03*	*0.00*	*1.24*

the lower cost ranges. In the table, a 'best estimate' per cost bin is also presented, using an average value per cost bin. For the 'less than zero' cost bin, data from PBL were not taken into account as these potentials are already included in the baseline. The uncertainty ranges are determined by the lowest and highest value per cost bin. Cumulative uncertainty ranges are based on cumulative values and are, in relative terms, substantially smaller.

Carbon dioxide removal options not treated previously in this Supplementary Material

The information for direct air carbon capture and storage and enhanced weathering is that reported in Section 12.3.

12.SM.1.3 Construction of Figure SPM.7 for the Summary for Policymakers

Figure SPM.7 is directly derived from Table 12.4, considering the following:

- The mid-range numbers were used. If no mid-range was provided, the average of the low and high extremes was selected.
- For the demand-side options in AFOLU the so-called feasible potential was used.
- Options for which no potential was estimated were excluded from Figure SPM.7, to avoid the impression that the potential is zero.
- For options stretching over more than one cost range, without an indication of the share of each cost range, a smooth transition between the colours was applied (this was done for the energy sector and the buildings sector, and for the option biofuels in transportation).
- For solar energy and wind energy, the notion that 'the majority of the potential is in the negative cost bin' is translated in the picture by putting 60% of the potential in that cost bin. The rest is evenly distributed over the other cost bins. As raised in the previous point, the transition between the cost bins was smoothed to avoid the impression of high precision over the cost bins.
- Uncertainty ranges were indicated with error bars. The error bars represent the uncertainty in the total potential per option. In most cases, the uncertainty range can be derived directly from Table 12.4. For AFOLU, the ranges presented in Table 7.3 for the options with costs less than 100 USD tCO_2-eq^{-1} were used. For the emissions reduction of methane (excluding in AFOLU) and fluorinated gases, the lowest and highest potential cumulative potential found for the various estimates were used as the lowest and highest bound of the error bars presented.

12.SM.2 Feasibility Assessment of DACCS, Enhanced Weathering, Ocean Fertilisation and 'Blue Carbon' As Presented in Section 12.3.1.4

The following tables include the line of sight on which the feasibility assessment of the carbon dioxide removal methods (direct air carbon capture and storage (DACCS), enhanced weathering (EW), ocean fertilisation and 'blue carbon') was based, presented in Section 12.3.1.4, Figure 12.4. The identification of barriers and enablers of the deployment of these carbon dioxide removal methods is organised according to six dimensions of feasibility, each comprised of a number of indicators (Annex II.12): geophysical feasibility (Table 12.SM.2.1), environmental-ecological feasibility (Table 12.SM.2.2), technological feasibility (Table 12.SM.2.3), economic feasibility (Table 12.SM.2.4), socio-cultural feasibility (Table 12.SM.2.5) and institutional feasibility (Table 12.SM.2.6). The tables also provide an overview of the factors affecting the feasibility of DACCS, EW, ocean fertilisation and 'blue carbon' and how they differ across context (e.g., region), time (e.g., 2030 versus 2050), and scale (e.g., small versus large). See Section 6.4, Annex II.11 and Annex II.12 for the full methodology adopted for assessing the feasibility of mitigation response options, including the descriptions of the indicators. For ease of reference note that the level of evidence is denoted as LE to mean "Limited Evidence", NE to mean "No Evidence", and NA to mean "Not Applicable".

Table 12.SM.2.1 | Line of sight and role of context for indicators in the geophysical feasibility dimension for the assessment of direct air carbon capture and storage (DACCS), enhanced weathering (EW), ocean fertilisation and 'blue carbon'.

	Geophysical feasibility dimension					
	Indicator: Physical potential		Indicator: Geophysical resources		Indicator: Land use	
	Line of sight	Role of context	Line of sight	Role of context	Line of sight	Role of context
DACCS	Fuss et al. (2018); Breyer et al. (2020)	Depends on where DAC is employed; Locational flexibility of DACCS can help identify a suitable region	Dooley (2013); Kearns et al. (2017)	Depends on where DAC is employed; Locational flexibility of DACCS can help identify a suitable region	Socolow et al. (2011); Smith et al. (2016); Fuss et al. (2018)	
EW	Lackner et al. (1995); Renforth (2012); Taylor et al. (2016); Kelemen et al. (2019); Renforth (2019); Beerling et al. (2020)		Hartmann et al. (2013); Beerling et al. (2018); Strefler et al. (2018); Renforth (2019); Amann et al. (2020); Beerling et al. (2020)	Silicate rock formations, silicate rock dust stockpiles, construction and demolition waste	Beerling et al. (2020), LE	Existing croplands, co-deployable with afforestation/ reforestation/ BECCS/biochar
Ocean fertilisation	Bopp et al. (2013); Siegel et al. (2014); Trull et al. (2015); Boyd et al. (2019); GESAMP (2019)	Potential is high but 90% of removed carbon is released back into the atmosphere within a year	Bopp et al. (2013); Siegel et al. (2014); Trull et al. (2015); Boyd et al. (2019); GESAMP (2019)		NA	
Blue carbon	Sondak et al. (2017); Wilcox et al. (2017); NASEM (2019); Gattuso et al. (2021)	Depends on ecosystem type and areas covered	NA		Gattuso et al. (2021)	(–) Coastal area is used, could be applicable for other purposes; (+) could be alternative for land-based CDR

Table 12.SM.2.2 | Line of sight and role of context for indicators in the environmental-ecological feasibility dimension for the assessment of direct air carbon capture and storage (DACCS), enhanced weathering (EW), ocean fertilisation and 'blue carbon'.

	Environmental-ecological feasibility dimension							
	Indicator: Air pollution		Indicator: Toxic waste, ecotoxicity and eutrophication		Indicator: Water quantity and quality		Indicator: Biodiversity	
	Line of sight	Role of context	Line of sight	Role of context	Line of sight	Role of context	Line of sight	Role of context
DACCS	Jacobson (2019); Deutz and Bardow (2021); Terlouw et al. (2021)		Deutz and Bardow (2021); Terlouw et al. (2021)		Smith et al. (2016); Fasihi et al. (2019); Fuhrman et al. (2020)	Depends on the technology; some technologies consume water while others generate it	NE	
EW	LE	Air-blown rock dust, reduction in NOx emissions	NE		NE		NE	
Ocean fertilisation	NA		Fuhrman and Capone (1991); DFO (2010); Oschlies et al. (2010); Silver et al. (2010); Trick et al. (2010); Williamson et al. (2012)		Fuhrman and Capone (1991); DFO (2010); Oschlies et al. (2010); Williamson et al. (2012); Minx et al. (2018)		Fuhrman and Capone (1991); DFO (2010); Oschlies et al. (2010); Williamson et al. (2012); Minx et al. (2018)	
Blue carbon	Howard et al. (2017); Hamilton and Friess (2018)		N'Yeurt et al. (2012); Howard et al. (2017); Hamilton and Friess (2018)		NE		Sondak et al. (2017); NASEM (2019); Gattuso et al. (2021)	

Table 12.SM.2.3 | Line of sight and role of context for indicators in the technological feasibility dimension for the assessment of direct air carbon capture and storage (DACCS), enhanced weathering (EW), ocean fertilisation and 'blue carbon'.

	Technological feasibility dimension					
	Indicator: Simplicity		Indicator: Technological scalability		Indicator: Maturity and technology readiness	
	Line of sight	Role of context	Line of sight	Role of context	Line of sight	Role of context
DACCS	Nemet (2019)		Fasihi et al. (2019); Nemet (2019); Realmonte et al. (2019)		Royal Society and Royal Academy of Engineering (2018); Larsen et al. (2019); NASEM (2019); IEA (2020)	
EW	Renforth (2012); Strefler et al. (2018)	Straightforward, utilises existing technology	Beerling et al. (2020)	Upscaling is potentially straightforward, infrastructure (e.g., road, rail) already in place for handling harvests of equivalent mass	Royal Society and Royal Academy of Engineering (2018)	Components of technology are mature, including the application of minerals to land, however commercially operating supply chains for CO_2 removal are immature, longitudinal field-scale demonstrations are required
Ocean fertilisation	Blain et al. (2008); Williamson et al. (2012); Trull et al. (2015); GESAMP (2019)		Blain et al. (2008); Williamson et al. (2012); Trull et al. (2015); GESAMP (2019)		Williamson and Bodle (2016); GESAMP (2019)	
Blue carbon	Sondak et al. (2017); NASEM (2019); Gattuso et al. (2021)	Depends on ecosystem type and areas covered	Sondak et al. (2017); NASEM (2019); Gattuso et al. (2021)	Depends on ecosystem type and areas covered	Sondak et al. (2017); NASEM (2019); Gattuso et al. (2021)	Depends on ecosystem type and areas covered

Table 12.SM.2.4 | Line of sight and role of context for indicators in the economic feasibility dimension for the assessment of direct air carbon capture and storage (DACCS), enhanced weathering (EW), ocean fertilisation and 'blue carbon'.

	Economic feasibility dimension			
	Indicator: Costs in 2030 and long term		Indicator: Employment effects and economic growth	
	Line of sight	Role of context	Line of sight	Role of context
DACCS	Sinha et al. (2017); Fuss et al. (2018); Keith et al. (2018); NASEM (2019); McQueen et al. (2021); Shayegh et al. (2021)	Learning could bring down the costs substantially, which depends on the deployment scenario	Larsen et al. (2019)	
EW	Most accurate costs so far from Beerling et al. (2020)	Developed countries: 160–190 USD tCO_2^{-1} removed; developing countries cheaper: 55–120 USD tCO_2^{-1}	NE	Potential to increase employment in mining, transport sectors
Ocean fertilisation	Boyd (2008); Denman (2008); Harrison (2013); Jones (2014); Minx et al. (2018); Gattuso et al. (2021)	Depends on nutrient production and its delivery to the application area, but currently cost is very uncertain and could be expensive	NE	
Blue carbon	Siikamäki et al. (2012); Nelson (2013); Bayraktarov et al. (2016); Narayan et al. (2016); Gattuso et al. (2021)	Climate mitigation cost is very high, but cost effectiveness considering other ecosystem services could be very high	LE	Potential to increase employment

Table 12.SM.2.5 | Line of sight and role of context for indicators in the socio-cultural feasibility dimension for the assessment of direct air carbon capture and storage (DACCS), enhanced weathering (EW), ocean fertilisation and 'blue carbon'.

	Socio-cultural feasibility dimension					
	Indicator: Public acceptance		Indicator: Effects on health and well-being		Indicator: Distributional effects	
	Line of sight	Role of context	Line of sight	Role of context	Line of sight	Role of context
DACCS	Bellamy et al. (2013); Cox et al. (2020)	Very few countries examined	NE		NE	
EW	Pidgeon and Spence (2017); Cox et al. (2020)	US and UK public support for limited trials with careful monitoring, public concern if it involved opening new mines	NE	Respirable dust means caution required during application, not a barrier to implementation	Beerling et al. (2018)	
Ocean fertilisation	Minx et al. (2018); GESAMP (2019)		NA		Blain et al. (2008); Williamson et al. (2012); Trull et al. (2015); GESAMP (2019)	
Blue carbon	Howard et al. (2017); Hamilton and Friess (2018)		Howard et al. (2017); Hamilton and Friess (2018)		Sondak et al. (2017); Bindoff et al. (2019)	Depends on available areas and suitable ecosystems

Table 12.SM.2.6 | Line of sight and role of context for indicators in the institutional feasibility dimension for the assessment of direct air carbon capture and storage (DACCS), enhanced weathering (EW), ocean fertilisation and 'blue carbon'.

	Institutional feasibility dimension					
	Indicator: Political acceptance		Indicator: Institutional capacity and governance, cross-sectoral coordination		Indicator: Legal and administrative feasibility	
	Line of sight	Role of context	Line of sight	Role of context	Line of sight	Role of context
DACCS	Meckling and Biber (2021)		NE		NE	
EW	Cox and Edwards (2019)	On-climate co-benefits may be valuable in terms of the policy 'demand pull' for CDR	LE		NA: All components of the supply chain are already practised commercially	May not be limiting for natural silicate rock given existing protocols for fertiliser, potentially limiting for alkaline wastes/by-products
Ocean fertilisation	Minx et al. (2018); GESAMP (2019)		Minx et al. (2018); GESAMP (2019)		Minx et al. (2018); GESAMP (2019)	
Blue carbon	Kuwae and Hori (2019)		Nelson (2013); Kuwae and Hori (2019)		Nelson (2013); Kuwae and Hori (2019)	

12.SM.3 The Link Between Co-benefits and Adverse Side Effects of Mitigation Actions and the SDGs

The following tables (Tables 12.SM.3.1 and 12.SM.3.2) present examples of the information used in the construction of Figure 12.9. Table 12.SM.3.1 provides examples of mitigation actions that fall into the groups of actions shown in Figure 12.9 in the different sectors. Note that the mapping is intended to be illustrative and is not intended to be exhaustive.

Table 12.SM.3.1 | Examples of mitigation actions in the different sectors.

Types of mitigation actions	Examples of sector application
A. Energy efficiency	**Energy:** Reducing the auxiliary load of fossil and renewable power stations **Transport:** Advances in vehicle technologies to make them more fuel efficient such as vehicle lightweighting, accessory load management, powertrain systems optimisations, and aerodynamics (Kammen and Sunter 2016) **Industry:** Efficient motors and pumps, increased heat integration **Buildings:** Thermal insulation and efficient heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems (Cao et al. 2016; Kammen and Sunter 2016) **Urban systems:** (Amado et al. 2016) **AFOLU:** Increased efficiency in pumping
B. Fuel changes	**Transport:** Shift from liquid fossil fuels to biofuels, synthetic fuels produced from renewables and CO_2 recycling **Industry:** Shift to natural gas and bioenergy as sources of energy in industrial processes (Åhman et al. 2017)
C. Planning	**Transport:** Improved public transport systems **Urban systems:** Including greenhouse gas (GHG) considerations in decisions surrounding urban development intensity (Wang et al. 2015)
D. AFOLU actions	**AFOLU:** Wetland restoration, biochar and BECCCS (Smith et al. 2019)
E. Renewable energy	**Energy:** Shift from fossil fuels to the various renewable alternatives such as wind, solar, geothermal, wave and bioenergy options **Transport:** Electric vehicles, biofuels in land and aviation transport (Mathiesen et al. 2015) **Industry:** Use of bioenergy and other renewable sources for heating and cooling (Fais et al. 2016), producing hydrocarbons in processes based on renewable electricity (e.g., methane from power-to-gas conversion) (Åhman et al. 2017) **Buildings:** Distributed/embedded renewable energy technologies coupled with smart grids (Cao et al. 2016) **Urban systems:** Urban solar thermal energy, for space and domestic water heating (Kammen and Sunter 2016) **AFOLU:** Solar PV for pumping, solar energy in greenhouses (Hassanien et al. 2016)
F. Feedstock change	**Industry:** Replacing fossil feedstock with biomass in the petrochemicals industry (Åhman et al. 2017)
G. Process change	**Industry:** Producing virgin steel without process-related emissions through the introduction of new concepts such as process-integrated CCS and electrification (electrowinning) or bio-methane/hydrogen direct reduction (Åhman et al. 2017)

Table 12.SM.3.2 | Examples of co-benefits and adverse side effects, linked to different mitigation actions. The letters A to G link to the groups of mitigation actions shown in Table 12.SM.3.1.

Types of mitigation action	Examples of co-benefits	Examples of adverse side effects
I. Climate resilience	Improved insulation to reduce building energy demand also provides resilience to increasing temperatures (A). Integrated planning of urban systems and infrastructure to mitigate emissions can incorporate climate resilience (C). Afforestation and reforestation in the AFOLU sector can help biodiversity, reduce erosion and increase land productivity, thereby increasing climate resilience (D). Distributed renewable energy infrastructure is less vulnerable to climate impacts than large centralised infrastructure (E).	
II. Energy security	Energy efficiency results in a lower primary energy demand to achieve the same productive energy and hence increases energy security (A). Renewable energy reduces requirements for fossil inputs which may be in finite supply, imported, and/or vulnerable to policy, legislation and penalties on fossil fuels. This can contribute to greater energy security for a country or region (B).	

Types of mitigation action	Examples of co-benefits	Examples of adverse side effects
III. Investment, growth	More efficient energy use, switching to more efficient and locally sourced fuels and renewable energy options can be linked to greater resource efficiency and lower productive energy costs, and thus can have positive economic growth outcomes (A, B, E).	Depending on the application, switching to alternative fuels, alternative feedstocks and new processes may require significant technology development, high capital inputs and be more expensive, resulting in negative impacts on investment and growth (B, F, G).
IV. Employment	Job opportunities can be created in energy efficiency, AFOLU and renewable energy actions (A, D, E).	Job losses can be experienced during the transition to increased efficiency, alternative fuels and processing routes (A, B, D, E, G). The growing literature on 'just transitions' describes this concern in the energy sector. Reducing deforestation could lead to reduced employment opportunities for those dependent on firewood for sale (D).
V. Biodiversity, ecosystem services, soil	Many alternative fuels, various actions in the AFOLU sector and renewable energy options require lower inputs of primary resources and thus have a lower impact on biodiversity, ecosystem services and soil (B, D, E).	
VI. Water pollution	Alternative fuels, feedstocks and processes, actions in the AFOLU sector and renewable energy options may require lower water inputs and give rise to lower pollutant loads than the options they are replacing (B, E, D, F, G).	Although alternative feedstocks and processes may be less GHG intensive than current options, some could have potential for negative water pollution impacts (F, G).
VII. Air pollution	Alternative fuels, feedstocks and processes, and renewable energy options may give rise to lower air pollutant loads than the options they are replacing, which are often based on fossil fuels (B, E, F, G).	Although alternative feedstocks and processes may be less GHG intensive than current options, there is potential for greater local air pollution impacts. An example here is diesel vehicles which have lower GHGs but higher local air pollutants than petroleum ones (F, G).
VIII. Energy access	Energy efficiency, alternative fuels and renewable options can provide affordable and reliable energy supply to areas that are both currently served and unserved with electricity and other energy carriers (A, B, E). Sustainable harvesting of forestry resources can contribute to energy access in communities reliant on these sources for supply (E).	Reducing deforestation could lead to reduced energy access for those dependent on collecting firewood from forests for use (D).
IX. Poverty alleviation	Energy efficient technologies can contribute to lower costs of energy, thereby increasing access and reducing poverty (A). Afforestation can provide increased access to firewood and protection of diversity which can lead to positive economic outcomes (D) (Smith et al. 2019). Renewable energy can help increased energy access which can contribute to poverty alleviation through access to lighting, pumping for agriculture, and so on (E).	Reducing deforestation could lead to reduced incomes and increased hardship for those dependent on firewood for use and sale (D).
X. Food and water security	Climate mitigation interventions in the AFOLU sector can help increase land productivity, reduce erosion, and protect biodiversity, which can all contribute to enhanced food and water security (D) (Smith et al. 2019). Renewable energy technologies typically require lower water inputs than fossil fuel options, thereby increasing water availability for other uses and hence increasing water security (E).	
XI. Health	Energy efficiency, alternative fuels and renewable energies can result in lower indoor and outdoor air pollution impacts, thereby contributing to positive health outcomes (A, B, E). Agriculture mitigation options can include lower pesticide and fertiliser application rates, thereby reducing negative impacts on the health of surrounding communities (D).	
XII. Noise, congestion etc	Alternative fuel vehicles and integrated urban planning approaches can help reduce noise and congestion (B, C).	
XIII. Political stability, democracy	Integrated planning approaches which include climate mitigation considerations can support political stability and democracy in decision-making (C).	

Sources include: Ürge-Vorsatz et al. (2014); Buonocore et al. (2016); Åhman et al. (2017); Kerr et al. (2017); Cohen et al. (2019); Forouli et al. (2019); Smith et al. (2019); Van de Ven et al. (2019); Karlsson et al. (2020).

References

Åhman, M., L.J. Nilsson, and B. Johansson, 2017: Global climate policy and deep decarbonization of energy-intensive industries. *Clim. Policy*, **17(5)**, 634–649, doi:10.1080/14693062.2016.1167009.

Amado, M., F. Poggi, and A.R. Amado, 2016: Energy efficient city: A model for urban planning. *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, **26**, 476–485, doi:10.1016/j.scs.2016.04.011.

Amann, T. et al., 2020: Enhanced Weathering and related element fluxes – a cropland mesocosm approach. *Biogeosciences*, **17(1)**, 103–119, doi:10.5194/bg-17-103-2020.

Bayraktarov, E. et al., 2016: The cost and feasibility of marine coastal restoration. *Ecol. Appl.*, **26**(4), 1055–1074, doi:10.1890/15-1077.

Beerling, D.J. et al., 2018: Farming with crops and rocks to address global climate, food and soil security. *Nat. Plants*, **4**, 138–147, doi:10.1038/s41477-018-0108-y.

Beerling, D.J. et al., 2020: Potential for large-scale CO_2 removal via enhanced rock weathering with croplands. *Nature*, **583**, 242–248, doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2448-9.

Bellamy, R., J. Chilvers, N.E. Vaughan, and T.M. Lenton, 2013: 'Opening up' geoengineering appraisal: Multi-Criteria Mapping of options for tackling climate change. *Glob. Environ. Chang.*, **23(5)**, 926–937, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.07.011.

Bindoff, N.L., W.W.L. Cheung, J.G. Kairo, J. Arístegui, V.A. Guinder, R. Hallberg, N. Hilmi, N. Jiao, M.S. Karim, L. Levin, S. O'Donoghue, S.R. Purca Cuicapusa, B. Rinkevich, T. Suga, A. Tagliabue, and P. Williamson, 2019: Changing Ocean, Marine Ecosystems, and Dependent Communities. In: IPCC Special Report on the Ocean and Cryosphere in a Changing Climate [Pörtner, H.-O., D.C. Roberts, V. Masson-Delmotte, P. Zhai, M. Tignor, E. Poloczanska, K. Mintenbeck, A. Alegría, M. Nicolai, A. Okem, J. Petzold, B. Rama and N.M. Weyer (eds.)]. In press. pp. 447–587.

Blain, S., B. Quéguiner, and T. Trull, 2008: The natural iron fertilization experiment KEOPS (KErguelen Ocean and Plateau compared Study): An overview. *Deep Sea Res. Part II Top. Stud. Oceanogr.*, **55(5–7)**, 559–565, doi:10.1016/J.DSR2.2008.01.002.

Blok, K. et al., 2020: Assessment of Sectoral Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Potentials for 2030. *Energies*, **13(4)**, 943, doi:10.3390/en13040943.

BNEF, 2021: *Electric Vehicle Outlook 2021*. BloombergNEF, London, UK, https://about.bnef.com/electric-vehicle-outlook/.

Bogdanov, D. et al., 2019: Radical transformation pathway towards sustainable electricity via evolutionary steps. *Nat. Commun.*, **10(1)**, 1077, doi:10.1038/s41467-019-08855-1.

Bopp, L. et al., 2013: Multiple stressors of ocean ecosystems in the 21st century: Projections with CMIP5 models. *Biogeosciences*, **10(10)**, 6225–6245, doi:10.5194/BG-10-6225-2013.

Bosch, J., I. Staffell, and A.D. Hawkes, 2017: Temporally-explicit and spatially-resolved global onshore wind energy potentials. *Energy*, **131**, 207–217, doi:10.1016/j.energy.2017.05.052.

Bosch, J., I. Staffell, and A.D. Hawkes, 2018: Temporally explicit and spatially resolved global offshore wind energy potentials. *Energy*, **163**, 766–781, doi:10.1016/j.energy.2018.08.153.

Bouman, E.A., E. Lindstad, A.I. Rialland, and A.H. Strømman, 2017: State-of-the-art technologies, measures, and potential for reducing GHG emissions from shipping – A review. *Transp. Res. Part D Transp. Environ.*, **52**(Part A), 408–421, doi:10.1016/j.trd.2017.03.022.

Boyd, P.W., 2008: Introduction and synthesis. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.*, **364**, 213–218. doi:10.3354/meps07541.

Boyd, P.W., H. Claustre, M. Levy, D.A. Siegel, and T. Weber, 2019: Multi-faceted particle pumps drive carbon sequestration in the ocean. *Nature*, **568(7752)**, doi:10.1038/s41586-019-1098-2.

Breyer, C., M. Fasihi, and A. Aghahosseini, 2020: Carbon dioxide direct air capture for effective climate change mitigation based on renewable electricity: a new type of energy system sector coupling. *Mitig. Adapt. Strateg. Glob. Chang.*, **25(1)**, 43–65, doi:10.1007/s11027-019-9847-y.

Buonocore, J.J. et al., 2016: Health and climate benefits of different energy-efficiency and renewable energy choices. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **6(1)**, 100–105, doi:10.1038/nclimate2771.

Cao, X., X. Dai, and J. Liu, 2016: Building energy-consumption status worldwide and the state-of-the-art technologies for zero-energy buildings during the past decade. *Energy Build.*, **128**, 198–213, doi:10.1016/j.enbuild.2016.06.089.

Cohen, B. et al., 2019: Multi-criteria decision analysis in policy-making for climate mitigation and development. *Clim. Dev.*, **11(3)**, 212–222, doi:10.1080/17565529.2018.1445612.

Cox, E. and N.R. Edwards, 2019: Beyond carbon pricing: policy levers for negative emissions technologies. *Clim. Policy*, **19(9)**, 1144–1156, doi:10.1080/14693062.2019.1634509.

Cox, E., E. Spence, and N. Pidgeon, 2020: Public perceptions of carbon dioxide removal in the United States and the United Kingdom. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **10(8)**, 744–749, doi:10.1038/s41558-020-0823-z.

Creutzig, F. et al., 2017: The underestimated potential of solar energy to mitigate climate change. *Nat. Energy*, **2(9)**, 17140, doi:10.1038/nenergy.2017.140.

Denman, K.L., 2008: Climate change, ocean processes and ocean iron fertilization. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.*, **364**, 219–225, doi:10.3354/meps07542.

Deutz, S. and A. Bardow, 2021: Life-cycle assessment of an industrial direct air capture process based on temperature–vacuum swing adsorption. *Nat. Energy*, **6(2)**, 203–213, doi:10.1038/s41560-020-00771-9.

DFO, 2010: *Ocean Fertilization: Mitigating environmental impacts of future scientific research*. DFO Canadian Science Advisory Secretarat, Ottawa, Canada, 14 pp.

Dooley, J.J., 2013: Estimating the Supply and Demand for Deep Geologic CO_2 Storage Capacity over the Course of the 21st Century: A Meta-analysis of the Literature. *Energy Procedia*, **37**, 5141–5150, doi:10.1016/j.egypro.2013.06.429.

Dupont, E., R. Koppelaar, and H. Jeanmart, 2020: Global available solar energy under physical and energy return on investment constraints. *Appl. Energy*, **257**, 113968, doi: 10.1016/j.apenergy.2019.113968.

Fais, B., N. Sabio, and N. Strachan, 2016: The critical role of the industrial sector in reaching long-term emission reduction, energy efficiency and renewable targets. *Appl. Energy*, **162**, 699–712, doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2015.10.112.

Fasihi, M., O. Efimova, and C. Breyer, 2019: Techno-economic assessment of CO_2 direct air capture plants. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **224**, 957–980, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.03.086.

Forouli, A., H. Doukas, A. Nikas, J. Sampedro, and D.J. Van de Ven, 2019: Identifying optimal technological portfolios for European power generation towards climate change mitigation: A robust portfolio analysis approach. *Util. Policy*, **57**, 33–42, doi:10.1016/j.jup.2019.01.006.

Fuhrman, J. et al., 2020: Food–energy–water implications of negative emissions technologies in a +1.5°C future. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **10(10)**, 920–927, doi:10.1038/s41558-020-0876-z.

Fuhrman, J.A. and D.G. Capone, 1991: Possible biogeochemical consequences of ocean fertilization. *Limnol. Oceanogr.*, **36(8)**, 1951–1959, doi:10.4319/lo.1991.36.8.1951.

Fuss, S. et al., 2018: Negative emissions - Part 2: Costs, potentials and side effects. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **13(6)**, 063002, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aabf9f.

Gattuso, J.-P., P. Williamson, C.M. Duarte, and A.K. Magnan, 2021: The Potential for Ocean-Based Climate Action: Negative Emissions Technologies and Beyond. *Front. Clim.*, **2**, 37, doi:10.3389/fclim.2020.575716.

GESAMP, 2019: *High level review of a wide range of proposed marine geoengineering techniques*. International Maritime Organization, London, 144 pp.

Haegel, N.M. et al., 2019: Terawatt-scale photovoltaics: Transform global energy. *Science*, **364(6443)**, 836–838, doi:10.1126/science.aaw1845.

Hamilton, S.E. and D.A. Friess, 2018: Global carbon stocks and potential emissions due to mangrove deforestation from 2000 to 2012. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **8(3)**, 240–244, doi:10.1038/s41558-018-0090-4.

Harmsen, J.H.M. et al., 2019a: Long-term marginal abatement cost curves of non-CO_2 greenhouse gases. *Environ. Sci. Policy*, **99** (September), 136–149, doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2019.05.013.

Harmsen, M.J.H. M. et al., 2019b: Data for long-term marginal abatement cost curves of non-CO_2 greenhouse gases. *Data Br.*, **25**, 104334, doi:10.1016/j.dib.2019.104334.

Harrison, D.P., 2013: A method for estimating the cost to sequester carbon dioxide by delivering iron to the ocean. *Int. J. Glob. Warm.*, **5(3)**, 231–254, doi:10.1504/ijgw.2013.055360.

Hartmann, J. et al., 2013: Enhanced chemical weathering as a geoengineering strategy to reduce atmospheric carbon dioxide, supply nutrients, and mitigate ocean acidification. *Rev. Geophys.*, **51(2)**, 113–149, doi:10.1002/rog.20004.

Hassanien, R.H.E., M. Li, and W. Dong Lin, 2016: Advanced applications of solar energy in agricultural greenhouses. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **54**, 989–1001, doi:10.1016/J.RSER.2015.10.095.

Hoes, O.A.C., L.J.J. Meijer, R.J. van der Ent, and N.C. van de Giesen, 2017: Systematic high-resolution assessment of global hydropower potential. *PLoS One*, **12(2)**, e0171844, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0171844.

Höglund-Isaksson, L. et al., 2020: Technical potentials and costs for reducing global anthropogenic methane emissions in the 2050 timeframe – results from the GAINS model. *Environ. Res. Commun.*, **2(2)**, 25004, doi:10.1088/2515-7620/ab7457.

Howard, J. et al., 2017: Clarifying the role of coastal and marine systems in climate mitigation. *Front. Ecol. Environ.*, **15(1)**, 42–50, doi:10.1002/FEE.1451.

ICAO, 2019: Aviation and Environment Outlook. In: *2019 Environmental Report: Aviation and Environment*, International Civil Aviation Organization, Montreal, Canada, pp. 13–38.

ICCT, 2019: *Prospects for fuel efficiency, electrification and fleet decarbonisation*, The International Council on Clean Transportation, London, UK, 31 pp. https://www.globalfueleconomy.org/media/708302/gfei-working-paper-20.pdf.

ICCT, 2020: *Vision 2050: A strategy to decarbonize the global transport sector by mid-century*. The International Council on Clean Transportation, 30 pp. https://theicct.org/sites/default/files/publications/ICCT_Vision2050_sept2020.pdf.

IEA, 2016: *World Energy Outlook 2016*. International Energy Agency, Paris, France, 684 pp.

IEA, 2018: *World Energy Outlook 2018*. International Energy Agency, Paris, France, 661 pp.

IEA, 2019a: *Nuclear Power in a Clean Energy System*. International Energy Agency, Paris, France, 99 pp.

IEA, 2019b: *World Energy Outlook 2019*. International Energy Agency, Paris, France, 810 pp.

IEA, 2020: *Energy Technology Perspectives 2020*. International Energy Agency, Paris, France, 397 pp.

IEA, 2021: Methane Tracker Database. https://www.iea.org/articles/methane-tracker-database (Accessed September 20, 2021).

IEA Bioenergy, 2020: *Advanced Biofuels - Potential for Cost Reduction*. IEA Bioenergy, 88 pp. https://www.ieabioenergy.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/T41_CostReductionBiofuels-11_02_19-final.pdf.

IRENA, 2016: *REmap: Roadmap for A Renewable Energy Future, 2016 edition*. International Renewable Energy Agency, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, 170 pp.

ITDP and UC Davis, 2015: *A Global High Shift Cycling Scenario: The Potential for Dramatically Increasing Bycle and E-bike Use in Cities Around the World, with Estimated Energy, CO_2, and Cost Impacts*. Institute for Transportation and Development Policy and University of California, Davis, 41 pp. https://www.itdp.org/2015/11/12/a-global-high-shift-cycling-scenario/.

Jacobson, M., 2019: The Health and Climate Impacts of Carbon Capture and Direct Air Capture. *Energy Environ. Sci.*, **12**, doi:10.1039/C9EE02709B.

Jones, I.S., 2014: The cost of carbon management using ocean nourishment. *Int. J. Clim. Chang. Strateg. Manag.*, **6(4)**, 391–400, doi:10.1108/IJCCSM-11-2012-0063.

Junqueira, T.L. et al., 2017: Techno-economic analysis and climate change impacts of sugarcane biorefineries considering different time horizons. *Biotechnol. Biofuels*, **10(1)**, 50, doi:10.1186/s13068-017-0722-3.

Kammen, D.M. and D.A. Sunter, 2016: City-integrated renewable energy for urban sustainability. *Science*, **352(6288)**, 922–928, doi:10.1126/science.aad9302.

Karlsson, M., E. Alfredsson, and N. Westling, 2020: Climate policy co-benefits: a review. *Clim. Policy*, **20(3)**, 1–25, doi:10.1080/14693062.2020.1724070.

Kearns, J. et al., 2017: Developing a Consistent Database for Regional Geologic CO_2 Storage Capacity Worldwide. *Energy Procedia*, **114**, 4697–4709, doi: 10.1016/j.egypro.2017.03.1603.

Keith, D.W., G. Holmes, D. St. Angelo, and K. Heidel, 2018: A Process for Capturing CO_2 from the Atmosphere. *Joule*, **2(8)**, 1573–1594, doi:10.1016/j.joule.2018.05.006.

Kelemen, P., S.M. Benson, H. Pilorgé, P. Psarras, and J. Wilcox, 2019: An Overview of the Status and Challenges of CO_2 Storage in Minerals and Geological Formations. *Front. Clim.*, **1**, 9, doi:10.3389/fclim.2019.00009.

Kerr, N., A. Gouldson, and J. Barrett, 2017: The rationale for energy efficiency policy: Assessing the recognition of the multiple benefits of energy efficiency retrofit policy. *Energy Policy*, **106**, 212–221, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2017.03.053.

Kuwae, T. and M. Hori, 2019: The Future of Blue Carbon: Addressing Global Environmental Issues. In: *Blue Carbon in Shallow Coastal Ecosystems* [Kuwae, T. and M. Hori, (eds.)], Springer Singapore, Singapore, pp. 347–373.

Lackner, K.S., C.H. Wendt, D.P. Butt, E.L. Joyce, and D.H. Sharp, 1995: Carbon dioxide disposal in carbonate minerals. *Energy*, **20(11)**, 1153–1170, doi:10.1016/0360-5442(95)00071-N.

Larsen, J., W. Herndon, M. Grant, and P. Marster, 2019: *Capturing Leadership - Policies for the US to Advance Direct Air Capture Technology*. Rhodium Group, New York, 68 pp. https://rhg.com/research/capturing-leadership-policies-for-the-us-to-advance-direct-air-capture-technology/.

Mathiesen, B.V. et al., 2015: Smart Energy Systems for coherent 100% renewable energy and transport solutions. *Appl. Energy*, **145**, 139–154, doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2015.01.075.

McQueen, N. et al., 2021: A review of direct air capture (DAC): scaling up commercial technologies and innovating for the future. *Prog. Energy*, **3(3)**, 032001, doi:10.1088/2516-1083/abf1ce.

Meckling, J. and E. Biber, 2021: A policy roadmap for negative emissions using direct air capture. *Nat. Commun.*, **12(1)**, 2051, doi:10.1038/s41467-021-22347-1.

Minx, J.C. et al., 2018: Negative emissions - Part 1: Research landscape and synthesis. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **13(6)**, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aabf9b.

N'Yeurt, A.D.R., D.P. Chynoweth, M.E. Capron, J.R. Stewart, and M.A. Hasan, 2012: Negative carbon via ocean afforestation. *Process Saf. Environ. Prot.*, **90(6)**, 467–474, doi:10.1016/J.PSEP.2012.10.008.

Narayan, S. et al., 2016: *Coastal Wetlands and Flood Damage Reduction: Using Risk Industry-based Models to Assess Natural Defenses in the Northeastern USA*. Lloyd's Tercentenary Research Foundation, London, 23 pp.

NASEM, 2019: *Negative Emissions Technologies and Reliable Sequestration: A Research Agenda*. National Academy of Sciences Engineering and Medicine, Washington, DC, USA, 510 pp.

Nelson, E., 2013: The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity: Ecological and Economic Foundations, edited by Pushpam Kumar. *J. Nat. Resour. Policy Res.*, **5(1)**, 68–70, doi:10.1080/19390459.2013.763324.

Nemet, G.F., 2019: Applying the model. In: *How Solar Energy Became Cheap*, Routledge. London, UK, pp. 22.

12SM

Oschlies, A., W. Koeve, W. Rickels, and K. Rehdanz, 2010: Side effects and accounting aspects of hypothetical large-scale Southern Ocean iron fertilization. *Biogeosciences*, **7**, 4017–4035, doi:10.5194/bg-7-4017-2010.

Pidgeon, N.F. and E. Spence, 2017: Perceptions of enhanced weathering as a biological negative emissions option. *Biol. Lett.*, **13(4)**, 20170024, doi:10.1098/rsbl.2017.0024.

Purohit, P. and L. Höglund-Isaksson, 2017: Global emissions of fluorinated greenhouse gases 2005–2050 with abatement potentials and costs. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, **17(4)**, 2795–2816, doi:10.5194/acp-17-2795-2017.

Realmonte, G. et al., 2019: An inter-model assessment of the role of direct air capture in deep mitigation pathways. *Nat. Commun.*, **10(1)**, 1–12, doi:10.1038/s41467-019-10842-5.

Renforth, P., 2012: The potential of enhanced weathering in the UK. *Int. J. Greenh. Gas Control*, **10**, 229–243, doi:10.1016/j.ijggc.2012.06.011.

Renforth, P., 2019: The negative emission potential of alkaline materials. *Nat. Commun.*, **10(1)**, 1401, doi:10.1038/s41467-019-09475-5.

Royal Society, and Royal Academy of Engineering, 2018: *Greenhouse Gas Removal*. Royal Society, London, UK, 134 pp.

Shayegh, S., V. Bosetti, and M. Tavoni, 2021: Future Prospects of Direct Air Capture Technologies: Insights From an Expert Elicitation Survey. *Front. Clim.*, **3**, 630893, doi:10.3389/fclim.2021.630893.

Siegel, D.A. et al., 2014: Global assessment of ocean carbon export by combining satellite observations and food-web models. *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*, **28(3)**, 181–196, doi:10.1002/2013GB004743.

Siikamäki, J., J.N. Sanchirico, and S.L. Jardine, 2012: Global economic potential for reducing carbon dioxide emissions from mangrove loss. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **109(36)**, 14369–14374, doi:10.1073/PNAS.1200519109.

Silver, M.W. et al., 2010: Toxic diatoms and domoic acid in natural and iron enriched waters of the oceanic Pacific. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **107(48)**, 20762–20767, doi:10.1073/pnas.1006968107.

Sinha, A., L.A. Darunte, C.W. Jones, M.J. Realff, and Y. Kawajiri, 2017: Systems Design and Economic Analysis of Direct Air Capture of CO_2 through Temperature Vacuum Swing Adsorption Using MIL-101(Cr)-PEI-800 and mmen-Mg $_2$ (dobpdc) MOF Adsorbents. *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, **56(3)**, 750–764, doi:10.1021/acs.iecr.6b03887.

Smith, P. et al., 2016: Biophysical and economic limits to negative CO_2 emissions. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **6(1)**, 42–50, doi:10.1038/nclimate2870.

Smith, P. et al., 2019: Impacts of Land-Based Greenhouse Gas Removal Options on Ecosystem Services and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.*, **44(1)**, 1–32, doi:10.1146/annurev-environ-101718-033129.

Socolow, R. et al., 2011: *Direct Air Capture of CO_2 with Chemicals: A Technology Assessment for the APS Panel on Public Affairs*. American Physical Society, 100 pp. https://infoscience.epfl.ch/record/200555.

Sondak, C.F.A. et al., 2017: Carbon dioxide mitigation potential of seaweed aquaculture beds (SABs). *J. Appl. Phycol.*, **29(5)**, 2363–2373, doi:10.1007/s10811-016-1022-1.

Strefler, J., T. Amann, N. Bauer, E. Kriegler, and J. Hartmann, 2018: Potential and costs of carbon dioxide removal by enhanced weathering of rocks. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **13(3)**, 034010, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aaa9c4.

Taylor, L.L. et al., 2016: Enhanced weathering strategies for stabilizing climate and averting ocean acidification. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*, **6(4)**, 402–406, doi:10.1038/nclimate2882.

Terlouw, T., K. Treyer, C. Bauer, and M. Mazzotti, 2021: Life Cycle Assessment of Direct Air Carbon Capture and Storage with Low-Carbon Energy Sources. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, **55(16)**, 11397–11411, doi:10.1021/acs.est.1c03263.

Trick, C.G. et al., 2010: Iron enrichment stimulates toxic diatom production in high-nitrate, low-chlorophyll areas. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **107(13)**, 5887–5892, doi:10.1073/pnas.0910579107.

Trull, T.W. et al., 2015: Chemometric perspectives on plankton community responses to natural iron fertilisation over and downstream of the Kerguelen Plateau in the Southern Ocean. *Biogeosciences*, **12**, 1029–1056, doi:10.5194/bg-12-1029-2015.

UNEP, 2017: *The Emissions Gap Report 2017*. United Nations Environment Programme, Nairobi, Kenya, 112 pp.

Ürge-Vorsatz, D., S.T. Herrero, N.K. Dubash, and F. Lecocq, 2014: Measuring the Co-Benefits of Climate Change Mitigation. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.*, **39(1)**, 549–582, doi:10.1146/annurev-environ-031312-125456.

US EPA, 2019: *Global Non-CO_2 Greenhouse Gas Emission Projections & Mitigation 2015-2050*. United States Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC, USA, 78 pp.

US EPA, 2021: Non-CO_2 Greenhouse Gas Data Tool. United States Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC, https://cfpub.epa.gov/ghgdata/nonco2/ (Accessed September 20, 2021).

Van de Ven, D.-J. et al., 2019: Integrated policy assessment and optimisation over multiple sustainable development goals in Eastern Africa. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **14(9)**, 094001, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/ab375d.

Wang, S., C. Fang, Y. Wang, Y. Huang, and H. Ma, 2015: Quantifying the relationship between urban development intensity and carbon dioxide emissions using a panel data analysis. *Ecol. Indic.*, **49**, 121–131, doi:10.1016/J.ECOLIND.2014.10.004.

Wilcox, J., P.C. Psarras, and S. Liguori, 2017: Assessment of reasonable opportunities for direct air capture. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **12(6)**, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aa6de5.

Williamson, P. and R. Bodle, 2016: *Update on climate geoengineering in relation to the Convention on Biological Diversity: Potential impacts and regulatory framework. Technical Series No.84*. Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, Montreal, 158 pp.

Williamson, P. et al., 2012: Ocean fertilization for geoengineering: A review of effectiveness, environmental impacts and emerging governance. *Process Saf. Environ. Prot.*, **90(6)**, 475–488, doi:10.1016/J.PSEP.2012.10.007.