

Rehdanz, Katrin; Rickels, Wilfried

**Book Part — Published Version**

## Ocean iron fertilization: Can we afford to postpone exploring this option?

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

Kiel Institute for the World Economy – Leibniz Center for Research on Global Economic Challenges

*Suggested Citation:* Rehdanz, Katrin; Rickels, Wilfried (2011) : Ocean iron fertilization: Can we afford to postpone exploring this option?, In: Natalia Trofimenko (Ed.): Climate Change: Current Issues, Kiel Institute for the World Economy, Kiel, pp. 14-15

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/60987>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*

## OCEAN IRON FERTILIZATION: CAN WE AFFORD TO POSTPONE EXPLORING THIS OPTION?

*„Give me half a tankerful of iron and I'll give you an Ice Age,“ boasted John Martin in 1988. Whether or not ocean iron fertilization effectively removes CO<sub>2</sub>, retains carbon in the ocean for an adequate amount of time, and has predictable and acceptable environmental disturbances still remains to be seen, decades after Martin's statement. Given the distinct possibility that we may exhaust the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions budget by 2024, can we afford to wait any further before clarifying the uncertainties that surround the process of ocean iron fertilization? Which scientific, economic, and legal issues need to be examined in order to make an informed decision as to whether to include ocean iron fertilization into the Kyoto Protocol as a viable option to offset anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions?*



Katrin Rehdanz



Wilfred Rickels

By some estimates, roughly half of the carbon dioxide that humans put into the atmosphere each year is absorbed by carbon sinks – reservoirs that accumulate and store some carbon-containing chemical component – on land and in the oceans. A combination of increasing temperatures (for example, warmer autumns and resulting soil decomposition) and economic activities (such as agriculture) reduced the rate of terrestrial and oceanic carbon uptake, which necessitates human intervention aimed at enhancing or substituting these natural carbon sinks.

The greatest terrestrial carbon sinks occur in young, growing forests and can be enhanced by means of forestation. The oceanic sinks may, in some regions, be enhanced by means of fertilization, for example by artificially enhanced upwelling of macronutrients or by purposeful addition of the micronutrient iron. Whether or not climate change can be mitigated through these measures remains debatable, primarily because of continued uncertainty about three factors: uncertainty about the magnitude of the gains – in terms of reduced emissions – resulting from engaging in such measures; uncertainty about the potential for shifting emissions to other locations, and regarding the degree to which the emissions are reduced permanently as opposed to being simply shifted to a different period. In any case, the terrestrial vegetation sinks have entered the Kyoto Protocol as offsets for

anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions. By contrast, the oceanic sinks have not.

The uncertainty about undesired adverse effects of purposeful iron fertilization on marine ecosystems and biogeochemistry has led to attempts to ban commercial and, to some extent, scientific experiments. Such a ban is what significantly slows down the exploration of this option and may preclude it from consideration altogether. In fact, demands have already been made that research, and in particular large-scale experiments on ocean iron fertilization, should not be further pursued. We challenge this view and argue that further research about the climate-engineering potential of ocean iron fertilization is not only desirable but necessary.

First of all, even if emissions were to be cut significantly, it is possible that the current levels of atmospheric carbon concentration are already sufficiently high to result in irreversible climate change. Ocean iron fertilization directly decreases atmospheric carbon concentration and thus, in principle, could facilitate the removal of past emissions. As the risks of a truly catastrophic climate change cannot be dismissed as negligible in a compelling fashion, large-scale carbon removal projects may become an option of last resort and we simply cannot afford to postpone research that would help us understand the workings

of ocean iron fertilization. In particular, we need to know more about the intended and unintended consequences of ocean iron fertilization. It has been documented, for example, that there are some significant perturbations of marine biogeochemistry and ecology. In fact, some alteration of the functioning of oceanic ecosystems is the very objective of carbon sequestration. As of today, we know little about the dangers of such disturbances. We know even less about how these negative effects compare to the damages resulting from leaving CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere.

Secondly, the potential of ocean iron fertilization is far from negligible in relation to other abatement options from an economic perspective. Estimates of the costs associated with ocean iron fertilization are in the same order of magnitude as the estimates of the costs associated with forestation projects. Ocean iron fertilization can also generate more carbon credits, even if we take into account the possibility that emissions shift to other regions or that the reductions are not permanent.

As for the legitimacy of ocean iron fertilization, as viewed by the public international law, the pertinent agreements dealing with the protection of the marine environment indicate that ocean iron fertilization is to be considered lawful to the extent to which it represents authentic scientific research. As scientific experiments are carried out within a limited marine area and the associated detrimental effects are acceptable relative to the potential gains, further scientific research must be permitted to explore the carbon sequestration potential of the ocean in order to make an informed decision on whether to reject ocean iron fertilization or to integrate it into the flexible mechanisms contained in the Kyoto Protocol.


#### BACKGROUND FACTS

- Today, most countries have accepted a 2°C temperature increase above pre-industrial levels as the maximum tolerable limit for global warming.
- Given the current global CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, the corresponding emission budget will only last until

2024.

- Oceans absorb more than a quarter of the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.
- Iron fertilization is relatively inexpensive and can theoretically sequester for less than €5/ton CO<sub>2</sub>.

HOW TO COOL THE PLANET: GEOENGINEERING AND THE AUDACIOUS QUEST TO FIX EARTH' CLIMATE  
By Jeff Goodell



How are scientists trying to lower the temperature of the entire planet?

Do the ideas, once “fringe”, seem sane and even inspired in the face of the economic crisis and global political realities?

Who is to blame if something goes terribly wrong?

Unable to predict even next week’s weather, can we tinker with the planet’s thermostat?

What are the unintended consequences?

Is the alternative worse than the risks?

May climate engineering be our last best hope, our Plan B?

Who should control the process?

What R&D needs to be done in order to support climate engineering?

What are the ethical, moral and religious reasons for favoring or opposing various techniques?

Can one or more methods be used for military, political or even terrorist purpose?

of ocean iron fertilization. In particular, we need to know more about the intended and unintended consequences of ocean iron fertilization. It has been documented, for example, that there are some significant perturbations of marine biogeochemistry and ecology. In fact, some alteration of the functioning of oceanic ecosystems is the very objective of carbon sequestration. As of today, we know little about the dangers of such disturbances. We know even less about how these negative effects compare to the damages resulting from leaving CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere.

Secondly, the potential of ocean iron fertilization is far from negligible in relation to other abatement options from an economic perspective. Estimates of the costs associated with ocean iron fertilization are in the same order of magnitude as the estimates of the costs associated with forestation projects. Ocean iron fertilization can also generate more carbon credits, even if we take into account the possibility that emissions shift to other regions or that the reductions are not permanent.

As for the legitimacy of ocean iron fertilization, as viewed by the public international law, the pertinent agreements dealing with the protection of the marine environment indicate that ocean iron fertilization is to be considered lawful to the extent to which it represents authentic scientific research. As scientific experiments are carried out within a limited marine area and the associated detrimental effects are acceptable relative to the potential gains, further scientific research must be permitted to explore the carbon sequestration potential of the ocean in order to make an informed decision on whether to reject ocean iron fertilization or to integrate it into the flexible mechanisms contained in the Kyoto Protocol.


#### BACKGROUND FACTS

- Today, most countries have accepted a 2°C temperature increase above pre-industrial levels as the maximum tolerable limit for global warming.
- Given the current global CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, the corresponding emission budget will only last until

2024.

- Oceans absorb more than a quarter of the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.
- Iron fertilization is relatively inexpensive and can theoretically sequester for less than €5/ton CO<sub>2</sub>.

HOW TO COOL THE PLANET: GEOENGINEERING AND THE AUDACIOUS QUEST TO FIX EARTH' CLIMATE  
By  
Jeff Goodell



How are scientists trying to lower the temperature of the entire planet?

Do the ideas, once “fringe”, seem sane and even inspired in the face of the economic crisis and global political realities?

Who is to blame if something goes terribly wrong?

Unable to predict even next week’s weather, can we tinker with the planet’s thermostat?

What are the unintended consequences?

Is the alternative worse than the risks?

May climate engineering be our last best hope, our Plan B?

Who should control the process?

What R&D needs to be done in order to support climate engineering?

What are the ethical, moral and religious reasons for favoring or opposing various techniques?

Can one or more methods be used for military, political or even terrorist purpose?