Response to reviewer #1

>> The reviewer's comments are in bold. <<
>> Responses are in italics. <<
>> New text is in plain type. <<

Review Keller et al. 'The Carbon Dioxide Removal Model Intercomparison Project (CDR-MIP): Rationale and experimental design'

This manuscript presents a motivation and description of the experimental design of a planned carbon dioxide removal model intercomparison project. The manuscript touches upon a much discussed but so far little investigated area: how will the Earth system react to large scale removal of carbon from the atmosphere by different processes? This is an important initiative that will serve the community well and I find the article worthy of publication in Geoscientific Model Development. The motivation and experimental protocol is outlined well but for clarity I recommend some changes listed below.

#1 Section 1.2 CDR-MIP Scientific Foci[Page 6] The first and second motivation seem to address the same question and could maybe put together.

Thank you for the suggestion. We agree that they are similar and have combined these motivations (Page 6, lines 186-210).

#2 Section 2 Background and motivation[Page 9, lines 270-273] sentence unclear, rephrase

Sorry if this is unclear. We have tried to clarify the sentence (Page 9, lines 290-295 by rephrasing it to be:

" BECCS is thus, constrained by some environmental limitations (e.g., suitable land area), but because the carbon is removed and ultimately stored elsewhere, it may have a higher CDR potential than if the same deployment area were used for a sink-enhancing CDR method like afforestation that stores carbon permanently above ground and reaches a saturation level for a given area."

[Page 10, line 315] Maybe shortly name some examples for other side effects than regional albedo changes.

We have added a few more examples and slightly changed the sentence order so that the order is logical. This section (Page 10, lines 330-343) now reads:

" Some significant side effects are caused by the spatial scale (e.g., millions of km^2) at which many methods would have to be deployed to have a significant impact upon CO_2 and global temperatures (Boysen et al., 2016; Heck et al., 2016; Keller et al., 2014). Side effects can also potentially alter the natural environment by disrupting biogeochemical and hydrological cycles, ecosystems, and biodiversity (Keller et al., 2014). For example, large-scale afforestation could change regional albedo and evapotranspiration and so have a biogeophysical impact on the Earth's energy budget and climate (Betts, 2000; Keller et al., 2014). Additionally, if afforestation were done with non-native plants or monocultures to increase carbon removal rates this could impact local biodiversity."

#3 Section 3.1 Relations to other MIPsI acknowledge the fact that with the variety of existing MIPs it is not easy to set a new MIP into relation to them. This subsection, however, is generally not very clear to the reader and a bit lengthy with repetitions of statements and needs focusing.

We have tried to improve this section (Page 14-16, lines 470-608). Hopefully it is now more clear and concise without repetitive statements. The section now reads:

" We highly recommend that participants in CDR-MIP also conduct experiments from other MIPs. CMIP6 and CMIP5 experiments, analyses, and assessments both provide a valuable baseline and model sensitivities that can be used to better understand CDR-MIP results. Further, to maximize the use of computing resources CDR-MIP uses experiments from other MIPs as a control run for a CDR-MIP experiment or to provide a pathway from which a CDR-MIP experiment branches (Sections 3.2 and 4, Tables 2- 7). Principle among these is the CMIP Diagnostic, Evaluation, and Characterization of Klima (DECK) and historical experiments as detailed in Eyring et al. (2016) for CMIP6, since they provide the basis for many experiments with almost all MIPs leveraging these in some way.

Here, we additionally describe links to ongoing MIPs that are endorsed by CMIP6, noting that earlier versions of many of these MIPs were part of CMIP5 and so provide a similar synergy for any CMIP5 models participating in CDR-MIP.

Given the emphasis on carbon cycle perturbations in CDR-MIP, there is a strong synergy with C4MIP which provides a baseline, standard protocols, and diagnostics for better understanding the relationship between the carbon cycle and the climate in CMIP6 (Jones et al., 2016b). The C4MIP emissions-driven SSP5-8.5 scenario (a high CO_2 emission scenario with a radiative forcing of 8.5 Wm^{-2} in year 2100) simulation, esm-ssp585, is a control run and branching pathway for several CDR-MIP experiments. CDR-MIP experiments may equally be valuable for understanding model responses during related C4MIP experiments. For example, the C4MIP experiment ssp534-over-bgc is a concentration driven "overshoot" scenario simulation that is run in a partially coupled mode. The control run required for analyses of this simulation is a fully coupled CO_2 concentration driven simulation of this scenario, ssp534-over, from the Scenario Model Intercomparison Project (ScenarioMIP). The CDR-MIP experiment, C2_overshoot, which is a fully coupled CO_2 emission driven version of this scenario, will provide additional information that can be used to extend the analyses to better understand climate-carbon cycle feedbacks.

The Land Use Model Intercomparison Project (LUMIP) is designed to better understand the impacts of land-use and land-cover change on the climate (Lawrence et al., 2016). The three main LUMIP foci overlap with some of the CDR-MIP foci, especially in regards to land management as a CDR method (e.g., afforestation/reforestation). To facilitate land-use and land-cover change investigations LUMIP provides standard protocols and diagnostics for the terrestrial components of CMIP6 Earth system models. The inclusion of these diagnostics will be important for all CDR-MIP experiments performed with CMIP6 models. The CDR-MIP experiment on afforestation/reforestation, C3 (esm-ssp585-ssp126Lu-ext), is an extension of the LUMIP esm-ssp585-ssp126Lu simulation beyond 2100 to investigate the long-term consequences of afforestation/reforestation in a high-CO_2 world (Section 4.3).

ScenarioMIP is designed to provide multi-model climate projections for several scenarios of future anthropogenic emissions and land use changes (O’Neill et al., 2016), and provides baselines or branching for many MIP experiments . The ScenarioMIP SSP5-3.4-OS experiments, ssp534-over and ssp534-over-ext, which prescribe atmospheric CO_2 to follow an emission overshoot pathway that is followed by aggressive mitigation to reduce emissions to zero by about 2070, with substantial negative global emissions thereafter, are used as control runs for the CDR-MIP CO_2 emission driven version of this scenario. Along with the partially coupled C4MIP version of this experiment, these experiments will allow for qualitative comparative analyses to better understand climate-carbon cycle feedbacks in an "overshoot" scenario with negative emissions (CDR). If it is found that the carbon cycle effects of CDR are improperly accounted for in the scenarios, then this information can be used to recalibrate older CDR-including IAM scenarios and be used to better constrain CDR when it is included in new scenarios.

The Ocean Model Intercomparison Project (OMIP), which primarily investigates the ocean-related origins and consequences of systematic model biases, will help to provide an understanding of ocean component functioning for models participating in CMIP6 (Griffies et al., 2016). OMIP will also establish standard protocols and output diagnostics for ocean model components. The biogeochemical protocols and diagnostics of OMIP (Orr et al., 2016) are particularly relevant for CMIP6 models participating in CDR-MIP. While the inclusion of these diagnostics will be important for all CDR-MIP experiments, these standards will be particularly important for facilitating the analysis of our marine CDR experiment, C4 (Section 4.4)."

#4 Section 3.5 Model drift - Shortly state acceptable model drift as described by Jones et al. (2016b) (as done on Page 26, lines 832-839).

Done. Text has been added (Page 19, lines 702-705) stating that, " This means that land, ocean and atmosphere carbon stores should each vary by less than 10 GtC per century (long-term average ≤ 0.1 Gt C yr^{-1}). We leave it to individual groups to determine the length of the run required to reach such a state."

#5 Model output frequency subsections in section 4 (4.1.2, 4.2.2, 4.2.4,4.2.6, 4.3.2, 4.4.2) Combine these subsections into one and refer to Table 8 for details to avoid extensive repetition.

Thanks for the suggestion. These sections have been combined and placed into a new Section - 5.4 (Pages 34-36, lines 1670-1760).

#6 Section 4.2 Very lengthy to read. Shorten and focus.

We have deleted two large sections of text that were repetitions of what had been stated in Sections 2 and 3.1. This should shorten and focus the section.

#7 Section 4.2.1[Page 26, lines 832-839] move to section 3.5 and remove here.

Done.

#8 Section 4.3 Same as #6, try to shorten and focus.

We have deleted a large section of text to shorten this section down to two, more focused paragraphs.

#9 Section 7 Code and/or data availability[Page 41] To avoid repetition, combine this section with section 5.4 into one.

We had originally done this, but the journal explicitly requires that we have section on "Code and/or Data Availability", which is why we added this section at the request of the Journal after uploading our original manuscript. However, we do agree that some information is repetitive and have tried to change text in other sections to refer to this one if possible.

Minor comments

[Page 7, lines 206-207 and 222-225] repetition

The sentence that was on lines 206-207 had been deleted to avoid repetition.

[Page 7, lines 223-224] clarify: a good test for what?

We have deleted this sentence since it repeats, in a less clear manner, what was said in the introductory paragraph to this section (Page 6, lines 202-207) where we state that, "CDR-MIP results may also be able to provide information that helps to understand how model resolution and complexity cause systematic model bias. In this instance, CDR-MIP experiments may be especially useful for gaining a better understanding of the similarities and differences between global carbon cycle models because we invite a diverse group of models to participate in CDR-MIP".

[Page 18, line 577] 'not mandatory, nor a prerequisite' replace 'not' with 'neither'.

Corrected (Page 18, line 672).

[Page 19, lines 621-622] In 'limiting the number experiments' add 'of'.

Corrected (Page 19, line 722).

[Pages 20-21, lines 658-661] Remove sentence 'Moreover, since many...'

Done.

[Page 21, lines 668-669] Remove sentence 'Note that piControl...'

Done.

[Page 28, lines 911-912] Remove sentence 'EMICs and box models...' and include this information in subsection about model output frequency (see #5).

Done.

[Page 29, lines 922-924 and 936-937] Remove sentence 'EMICs and box models...'

Done.

[Page 45, line 1437] '2.8° longitude by 1.6° longitude' do you mean '2.8° longitude by 1.6° latitude'?

Yes, this has been corrected (Page 43, line 1973).

Tables

[Tables 2-7] Including a column with the name of the preceding run from which the experiment is to be started will increase clarity.

Thanks for the suggestion. A new column called "Initialized using a restart from" has been added to each of these tables.

Response to reviewer #2

>> The reviewer's comments are in bold. <<
>> Responses are in italics. <<
>> New text is in plain type. <<

Review:
The submitted paper documents the experimental design for the CDRMIP suite of experiments, designed to explore model uncertainties in Earth System response to climate engineering through potential anthropogenic removal of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere. The MIP is well motivated, and the introduction does a good job of framing why such a MIP would be useful.
The paper should certainly be published, and I look forward to seeing the results of the MIP. I have some minor comments only, which I attach for the authors' consideration.

Minor Comments:

1. The details of the experimental design need clarifying in places. For example, a number of the experiments require 'constant forcing' for non-CO2 agents, but the authors do not explicitly state how to implement this. Should aerosol concentrations be held constant, or should emissions be held constant?

Sorry for leaving out these details. We have added a paragraph to Section 4 (Page 20, lines 734-743) to clarify what we mean by constant forcing. This paragraph reads,

" In some of the experiments described below we ask that non-CO_2 forcing (e.g., land use change, radiative forcing from other greenhouse gases, etc.) be held constant, e.g. at that of a specific year, so that only changes in other forcing, like CO_2 emissions, drive the main model response. For some forcing, e.g. aerosol emissions, this may mean that monthly changes in forcing are repeated throughout the rest of the simulation as if it was always one particular year. However, we recognize that models apply forcing in different ways and leave it to individual modelling groups to determine the best way hold forcing constant. We request that the methodology for holding forcing constant be documented for each model."

2. There is almost no consideration of internal climate variability, recommended ensemble size, and what role that might have. How many ensemble members are required for each of the experiments to assess the desired signal? If it is only 1, can the authors demonstrate that a single simulation can produce a sufficiently significant result to differentiate the structural differences between different models in the presence of climate noise?

We do recommend that groups conduct 3 ensemble members (Section 3.3 on page 18) to deal with variability. However, for CDR-MIP, interannual variability is likely to be a larger issue than internal model variability. Pervious studies such as Hewitt et al., (2016) *that looked at this issue with a focus on the carbon cycle, which is especially relevant for CDR-MIP, found that when comparing simulations of CMIP5 scenarios for land-carbon fluxes, the model spread was so big that it was the primary source of uncertainty. While for ocean carbon uptake, the variance attributed to differences between representative concentration pathway scenarios exceeded the variance attributed to differences between climate models. In most models "internal variability" (assuming this means "sensitivity to perturbed initial conditions") was fairly small – especially on decadal scales. Interannual variability of carbon fluxes was high, but tended to even out on >5 year timescales. Based on this knowledge, we recommend that modelling groups perform at least three ensemble members to reduce this uncertainty related to variability, but leave it up to each group to determine how much of an issue this is and whether it requires more or fewer runs. Thus, section 3.3 states that, "* We encourage participants whose models have internal variability to conduct multiple realizations, i.e. ensembles, for all experiments. While these are highly desirable, they are neither mandatory, nor a prerequisite for participation in CDR-MIP. Therefore, the number of ensemble members is at the discretion of each modeling group. However, we strongly encourage groups to submit at least three ensemble members if possible."

3. It isn't clear how a proposed experiment esm-ssp534-over differs from the existing C4MIP ssp534-over-bgc. Could the authors make this more clear?

The reviewer is likely referring to the statement in section 4.2 where we stated that,

" We also highly recommend that groups conduct the ScenarioMIP *ssp534-over* and *ssp534-over-ext* and C4MIP *ssp534-over-bgc* and *ssp534-over-bgcExt* simulations as these runs will be invaluable for qualitative comparisons."

We agree that the relationship between these simulations was not clear from this isolated statement. We have deleted this statement to avoid repetition (as recommended by reviewer #1) and now highlight the relationship between these simulations in Section 3, where more detail is provided. Here (Page 14, lines 530-537) we state that:

*"*The C4MIP experiment *ssp534-over-bgc* is a concentration driven "overshoot" scenario simulation that is run in a partially coupled mode. The simulation required to analyze this experiment is a fully coupled CO_2 concentration driven simulation of this scenario, *ssp534-over,* from the Scenario Model Intercomparison Project (ScenarioMIP). The novel CDR-MIP experiment, *C2_overshoot*, which is a fully coupled CO_2 emission driven version of this scenario, will provide additional information that can be used to extend the analyses to better understand climate-carbon cycle feedbacks."

We also have similar statements in Section 3.2 (Page 17, lines 649-666) that read, "We also highly recommend that groups run these additional C4MIP and ScenarioMIP simulations:

- The ScenarioMIP *ssp534-over* and *ssp534-over-ext* simulations, which prescribe the atmospheric CO_2 concentration to follow an emission overshoot pathway that is followed by aggressive mitigation to reduce emissions to zero by about 2070, with substantial negative global emissions thereafter. These results can be qualitatively compared to CDR-MIP experiment *C2_overshoot,* which is the same scenario, but driven by CO_2 emissions.

- The C4MIP *ssp534-over-bgc* and *ssp534-over-bgcExt* simulations, which are biogeochemically-coupled versions of the *ssp534-over* and *ssp534-over-ext* simulations, i.e., only the carbon cycle components (land and ocean) see the prescribed increase in the atmospheric CO_2 concentration; the model's radiation scheme sees a fixed preindustrial CO_2 concentration. These results can be qualitatively compared to CDR-MIP experiment *C2_overshoot,* which is a fully coupled version of this scenario."

4. Could the authors expand on what processes would result in yr2010co2 differing from esm-hist-yr2010co2-control, given that if compatible emissions are correctly diagnosed, they should be identical? The only case, to my mind, where this would not be true is if internally-generated climate noise was capable of changing the compatible emissions requirements. However, if this is the case, then the experimental design is insufficient - and an ensemble of yr2010co2 simulations would be required in order to assess the central estimate for compatible emissions.

In the test simulations that we have performed with both an ESM and EMIC it appears that climate-carbon cycle feedbacks, which become evident when atmospheric CO_2 is allowed to freely evolve, can result in the diagnosed CO_2 emissions forcing either slightly under- or overestimating the emissions needed to reach 389ppm. We agree that in such cases our original design was insufficient and have added text to clarify the necessary steps to achieve the correct atmospheric CO_2 concentration. This text (Page 26, lines 1141-1145) reads,

" If there are significant differences, e.g., due to climate-carbon cycle feedbacks that become evident when atmospheric CO_2 is allowed to freely evolve, then they must be diagnosed and used to adjust the CO_2 emission forcing. In some cases it may be necessary to perform an ensemble of simulations to diagnose compatible emissions."

5. In esm-hist-yr2010*, what RCP/SSP should be used if 389ppm is not reached during the historical period?

For groups performing the CMIP6 historical simulation achieving 389ppm should not be a problem as this is part of the prescribed historical forcing. However, we agree that it could be an issue for those using a CMIP5 model configuration and forcing. We have therefore recommended that they use the RCP 8.5 simulation to reach 389 ppm and the sentence (Page 25, lines 1091-1094) now reads, " An existing run or setup from CMIP5 or CMIP6 may also be used to reach a CO_2 concentration of 389ppm, e.g., the RCP 8.5 CMIP5 simulation or the CMIP6 *historical* experiment."

Typos/presentational points:

Line 50: comma after climate

Corrected.

Line 118: Do any of the 2 degree scenarios (which have not already diverged from historical emissions) require no CO2 removal? I'm not aware of them. Could they be cited?

*We are not aware of any of limited warming scenarios without CDR either and have changed the text accordingly. In our original statement we had been referring to scenarios that have already diverged from historical emissions, but now realize that it doesn't make sense to refer to them. The text (Page 4, lines 122-125) is now: "*All Integrated Assessment Model (IAM) scenarios of the future state that some form of CDR will be needed to prevent the mean global surface temperature from exceeding 2°C (Bauer et al., 2017; Fuss et al., 2014; Kriegler et al., 2016; Rogelj et al., 2015a)."

Line 126: suggest "are not yet a commercial product"

Change made (Page 4, line 131).

Line 395: This paragraph seems to imply that a GCM can inform policy which differs only in terms of the relative sizes of positive and negative fluxes which make up a net anthropogenic flux. This seems to be true only for a subset of CDR approaches where there are long term consequences of removal for future fluxes (e.g. reforestation), but not really for direct air capture. Perhaps this could be clarified

We have clarified this statement to address the issue raised here. The sentence (Page 13, lines 421-425) now reads, " This relates to the policy relevant question of whether in a regulatory framework, CO_2 removals from the atmosphere should be treated like emissions except for the opposite (negative) sign or if specific methods, which may or may not have long-term consequences (e.g., afforestation/reforestation vs. direct CO_2 air capture with geological carbon storage), should be treated differently."

Line 464: Suggest using a word other than "control" here, which is almost universally interpreted as a constant forcing simulations in other CMIP6 MIPs.

Done. "control" has been replaced with "simulation". Page 15, line 532.

Line 971: Is esm-535-over-ext a typo?

Yes, this is a typo and has been corrected.

Response to reviewer #3

>> The reviewer's comments are in bold. <<
>> Responses are in italics. <<
>> New text is in plain type. <<

Review:

In the manuscript 'The Carbon Dioxide Removal Model Intercomparison Project (CDR- MIP): Rationale and experimental design' the authors document the experimental de- sign for a suite of coordinated experiments, designed to explore potential, risks and uncertainties in Earth System response to carbon dioxide removal (CDR) from the atmosphere. The authors provide a sound and detailed motivation for this suite of coordinated experiments, emphasizing connection with other model intercomparison exercises.
I much appreciate this paper, which is not only highly relevant in the context of UNFCCC COP21 objectives. IT is also relevant for some WCRP grand challenges topics such as reducing uncertainties in climate sensitivity and constraining climate-carbon cycle feedbacks. Therefore, I recommend acceptance of this manuscript after some minor revisions listed below.

General comments:

1) Some sections are really long to read. I would therefore recommend to bring upfront important message.

To address this comment and those by other reviewers we have shortened several sections, e.g., Section 3.1, 4.2, and 4.3, and spent a considerable amount of time reducing repetitions, e.g., by condensing the multiple model output frequency sections into one (the new Section 5.4 on Page 34, lines 1676-1763). Hopefully, these improvements have made the text more readable and brought the important messages to the forefront.

2) Some experiments seem to complement existing MIP coordinated simulation while some other don't. It would be convenient to clearly state why those later are independent (or new) from existing experiments.

As also suggested by another reviewer we have revised the section describing the relationship to other existing MIPs. In doing this we state (Page 14, lines 472-475) up front that, " There are no existing MIPs with experiments focused on climate "reversibility", direct CO_2 air capture (with storage), or ocean alkalinization." *before describing the links that exist between CDR-MIP and other MIPs. This should clarify how CDR-MIP experiments differ from and are complementary to other existing MIP experiments.*

3) There is no documentation or information on how this MIP will address the role of the internal climate variability. As I read the present ms, it

seems that exp produce a sufficient signal-to-noise ratio. However, for some exp, especially those in emission-driven simulations recommendation and sensitivity relative to the ensemble size seems required.

We do recommend that groups conduct 3 ensemble members (Section 3.3 on page 18) to deal with variability. However, for CDR-MIP, interannual variability is likely to be a larger issue than internal model variability. Pervious studies such as Hewitt et al., (2016) *that looked at this issue with a focus on the carbon cycle, which is especially relevant for CDR-MIP, found that when comparing simulations of CMIP5 scenarios for land-carbon fluxes, the model spread was so big that it was the primary source of uncertainty. While for ocean carbon uptake, the variance attributed to differences between representative concentration pathway scenarios exceeded the variance attributed to differences between climate models. In most models "internal variability" (assuming this means "sensitivity to perturbed initial conditions") was fairly small – especially on decadal scales. Interannual variability of carbon fluxes was high, but tended to even out on >5 year timescales. Based on this knowledge, we recommend that modelling groups perform at least three ensemble members to reduce this uncertainty related to variability, but leave it up to each group to determine how much of an issue this is and whether it requires more or fewer runs. Thus, section 3.3 states that, "* We encourage participants whose models have internal variability to conduct multiple realizations, i.e. ensembles, for all experiments. While these are highly desirable, they are neither mandatory, nor a prerequisite for participation in CDR-MIP. Therefore, the number of ensemble members is at the discretion of each modeling group. However, we strongly encourage groups to submit at least three ensemble members if possible."

Specific comments (note that in the pdf of original comments the symbols Âa˘ were present):

L52: It could be nice somewhere to refer to the IPCC definition of mitigation.

We have added the sentence " To do this a massive climate change mitigation effort to reduce the sources or enhance the sinks of greenhouse gases (IPCC, 2014b) must be undertaken." *to the second paragraph (Page 3, lines 96-98) in the introduction.*

L59: impacts= climate impacts?; efficacy refer to technological scalability here? I don't think CDR-MIP address this very specific point.

*Page 2, lines 59-60, "Impacts" has been changed to "climate impacts". No we did not mean efficacy from a technical viewpoint. To clarify what CDR-MIP focuses on we have added text to point out that we are referring to, "*atmospheric CO_2 reduction efficacy".

L81: please indicated what is the reference period used to defined the preindustrial level.

We are referring to the year 1850 and have added this information to the sentence (Page 3, line 84).

L85: rather use "attributed to anthropogenic...".

*We have added the words "*attributed to*" to this sentence (Page 3, line 88).*

L91: limiting warming= limiting anthropogenic warming

Change made, Page 3, line 94.

L116: please indicate that these are all models(=IAMs) results and are hence speculative. . .

*Done, we now state (Page 4, line 122) that "*All future Integrated Assessment Model (IAM) scenarios of the future state that...*".*

L135-141: "help to mitigation" and "potential effectiveness" are redundant. The last point need to be clearer. As I understand the various foci of CDR-MIP, there are: - Effectiveness - Risks and benefits including avoided impacts - Related carbon cycle –climate feedbacks

We have eliminated the redundant bit from point (ii; line 151) by deleting the word "effectiveness". We have also tried to clarify point (iii; lines 153-156) by changing it to read, " To inform how climate and carbon cycle responses to CDR could be included when calculating and accounting for the contribution of CDR in mitigation scenarios, i.e., so that CDR is better constrained when it is included in IAM generated scenarios."

L235: issue of permanence has to be taken with cautious here. Indeed, CDR-MIP is designed for ESM, EMIC and boxmodel. Those models are not designed to address carbon storage leakage (fit for purpose). They can only document the response of the Earth system when a leakage occurs.

Yes, thanks for pointing this out as it is an issue. In some models permanence cannot really be calculated. However, for models with more complex components some questions about permanence can be evaluated. For example, if a forest is planted and takes up carbon (afforestation forcing), and then at some point experiences dieback or carbon loss due to a warmer drier future climate (as internally calculated), some of the sequestered carbon may be released again. Or if we add alkalinity to the ocean and then stop adding it at some point, we can evaluate if any of the carbon that was sequestered is released again. We have added a statement to address this issue. Question 4 (Page 7, lines 254-255) now reads, " For methods that enhance natural carbon uptake, e.g., afforestation or ocean alkalinization, where is the carbon stored (land and ocean) and for how long (i.e. issues of permanence; at least as much as this can be calculated with these models)?"

L273: Please refer to {Smith:2015}

Done.

L386: CMIP5, are you sure?

Yes, at least some of them are.

L654 doubtful = unrealistic

Word substitution made (Page 21, line 765).

L663: Why C1 doesn't rely on abrupt 4xCO2 rather than 1%CO2.

We considered several designs for C1 such as an abrupt 4xCO2 perturbation. However, after much discussion we decided upon a 1%CO2 experiment because it will better capture the slow ocean response to perturbations.

L841: As I read it: there is a removal of 100Gt in one year. Are you expecting a pulse removal (1 model time-step) are a smoothed removal during one year? Besides, do you expect a spatial structure of the CO2 removal?

Thank you for pointing out that we missed these details. This is an instantaneous removal of CO_2. We do not expect a spatial structure for the CO_2 removal and will leave it up to modelling groups where CO_2 is spatially distributed to find the best way to uniformly remove CO_2 from their atmosphere. We have added text so that this section (Page 24, lines 1012-1014) now reads, " with 100 Gt C instantaneously (within 1 time step) removed from the atmosphere in year 10. If models have CO_2 spatially distributed throughout the atmosphere, we suggest removing this amount in a uniform manner."

L1043-1047: Why not relying on a constant afforestation? LUMIP T1 exp is a constant deforestation. It would have been a complementary model experiments here.

We had considered doing such a simulation in our numerous discussions on how to devise an afforestation simulation for CDR-MIP. The main reason that we did not do an afforestation simulation to compliment the LUMIP deforestation simulation is that the deforestation simulation is CO_2 concentration-driven and we wanted to have a CO_2 emission-driven simulation so that we could quantify climate-carbon cycle feedbacks. The esm-ssp585- ssp126Lu *was then our best choice, especially since other groups would be performing emission-driven SSP5-8.5 simulations as part of C4MIP and ScenarioMIP.*

L1437 2.8◦ longitude by 1.6◦ latitude

Typo corrected.

The Carbon Dioxide Removal Model Intercomparison Project (CDR-MIP): Rationale and experimental design

David P. Keller[1,*], Andrew Lenton[2,3], Vivian Scott[4], Naomi E. Vaughan[5], Nico Bauer[6], Duoying Ji[7], Chris D. Jones[8], Ben Kravitz[9], Helene Muri[10], Kirsten Zickfeld[11]

[*]Corresponding author email: dkeller@geomar.de
[1]GEOMAR Helmholtz Centre for Ocean Research Kiel, Germany
[2]CSIRO Oceans and Atmospheres, Hobart, Australia
[3]Antarctic Climate and Ecosystems Cooperative Research Centre, Hobart, Australia
[4]School of GeoSciences, University of Edinburgh
[5]Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research, School of Environmental Sciences, University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK.
[6]Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research, Research Domain Sustainable Solutions, 14473 Potsdam, Germany
[7]College of Global Change and Earth System Science, Beijing Normal University, Beijing, China
[8] Met Office Hadley Centre, Exeter, UK,
[9]Atmospheric Sciences and Global Change Division, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA, USA.
[10]Department of Geosciences, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway.
[11]Department of Geography, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, Canada

Abstract

The recent IPCC reports state that continued anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions are changing the climate, threatening “severe, pervasive and irreversible” impacts. Slow progress in emissions reduction to mitigate climate change is resulting in increased attention on what is called *Geoengineering*, *Climate Engineering*, or *Climate Intervention* – deliberate interventions to counter climate change that seek to either modify the Earth’s radiation budget or remove greenhouse gases such as CO_2 from the atmosphere. When focused on CO_2, the latter of these categories is called Carbon Dioxide Removal (CDR). Future emission scenarios that stay well below 2°C, and all emission scenarios that do not exceed 1.5°C warming by the year 2100, require some form of CDR. At present, there is little consensus on the climate impacts and atmospheric CO_2 reduction efficacy of the different types of proposed CDR. To address this need the Carbon Dioxide Removal Model Intercomparison Project (or CDR-MIP) was initiated. This project brings together models of the Earth system in a common framework to explore the potential, impacts, and challenges of CDR. Here, we describe the first set of CDR-MIP experiments that are designed to address questions concerning CDR-induced climate "reversibility", the response of the Earth system to direct atmospheric CO_2 removal (direct air capture and storage), and the CDR potential and impacts of afforestation/reforestation, as well as ocean alkalinization.

David Keller 24.11.2017 09:43
Deleted: The majority of f

David Keller 24.11.2017 09:43
Deleted: nearly

1. Introduction

The Earth system is sensitive to the concentration of atmospheric greenhouse gases (GHG) because they have a direct impact on the planetary energy balance (Hansen, 2005), and in many cases also on biogeochemical cycling (IPCC, 2013). The concentration of one particularly important GHG, carbon dioxide (CO_2), has increased from approximately 277 ppm in the year 1750 to over 400 ppm today as a result of anthropogenic activities (Dlugokencky and Tans, 2016; Le Quéré et al., 2015). This CO_2 increase, along with other GHG increases and anthropogenic activities (e.g. land use change), has perturbed the Earth's energy balance leading to an observed global mean surface air temperature increase of around 0.8 °C above preindustrial (year 1850) levels in the year 2015 [updated from Morice et al. (2012)]. Biogeochemistry on land and in the ocean has also been affected by the increase in CO_2, with a well-observed decrease in ocean pH being one of the most notable results (Gruber, 2011; Hofmann and Schellnhuber, 2010). Many of the changes attributed to this rapid temperature increase and perturbation of the carbon cycle have been detrimental for natural and human systems (IPCC, 2014a).

David Keller 23.11.2017 09:10
Deleted: caused by

While recent trends suggest that the atmospheric CO_2 concentration is likely to continue to increase (Peters et al., 2013; Riahi et al., 2017), the Paris Agreement of the 21st session of the Conference of Parties (COP21) on climate change (UNFCCC, 2016) has set the goal of limiting anthropogenic warming to well below 2°C (ideally no more than 1.5°C) relative to the global mean preindustrial temperature. To do this a massive climate change mitigation effort to reduce the sources or enhance the sinks of greenhouse gases (IPCC, 2014b) must be undertaken. Even if significant efforts are made to reduce CO_2 emissions, it will likely take decades before net emissions approach zero (Bauer et al., 2017; Riahi et al., 2017; Rogelj et al., 2015a), a level that is likely required to reach and maintain such temperature targets (Rogelj et al., 2015b). Changes in the climate will therefore continue for some time, with future warming strongly dependent on cumulative CO_2 emissions (Allen et al., 2009; IPCC, 2013; Matthews et al., 2009), and there is the possibility that “severe, pervasive and irreversible” impacts will occur if too much CO_2 is emitted (IPCC, 2013, 2014a).

The lack of agreement on how to sufficiently reduce CO_2 emissions in a timely manner, and the magnitude of the task required to transition to a low carbon world has led to increased attention on what is called *Geoengineering*, *Climate Engineering*, or *Climate Intervention*. These terms are all used to define actions that deliberately manipulate of the climate system in an attempt to ameliorate or reduce the impact of climate change by either modifying the Earth's radiation budget (Solar Radiation Management, or SRM), or by removing the primary greenhouse gas, CO_2, from the atmosphere (Carbon Dioxide Removal, or CDR) (National Research Council, 2015). In particular, there is an increasing focus and study on the potential of carbon dioxide removal (CDR) methods to offset emissions and eventually to enable "net negative emissions", whereby more CO_2 is removed via CDR than is emitted by anthropogenic activities, to complement emissions reduction efforts. CDR has also been proposed as a means of "reversing" climate change if too much CO_2 is emitted, i.e., CDR may be able to reduce atmospheric CO_2 to return radiative forcing to some target level.

All Integrated Assessment Model (IAM) scenarios of the future state that some form of CDR will be needed to prevent the mean global surface temperature from exceeding 2°C (Bauer et al., 2017; Fuss et al., 2014; Kriegler et al., 2016; Rogelj et al., 2015a). Most of these limited warming scenarios feature overshoots in radiative forcing around mid-century, which is closely related to the amount of cumulative CDR up until the year 2100 (Kriegler et al., 2013). Despite the prevalence of CDR in these scenarios, and its increasing utilization in political and economic discussions, many of the methods by which this would be achieved at this point rely on immature technologies (National Research Council, 2015; Schäfer et al., 2015). Large scale CDR methods are not yet a commercial product, and hence questions remain about their feasibility, realizable potential and risks (Smith et al., 2015; Vaughan and Gough, 2016).

Overall, knowledge about the potential climatic, biogeochemical, biogeophysical, and other impacts in response to CDR is still quite limited, and large uncertainties remain, making it difficult to comprehensively evaluate the potential and risks of any particular CDR method and make comparisons between methods. This information is urgently needed to allow us to assess:

David Keller 22.11.2017 17:17
Deleted: Almost a

David Keller 24.11.2017 09:47
Deleted: future

David Keller 23.11.2017 16:21
Deleted: indicate

David Keller 24.11.2017 09:50
Deleted: 1.5

David Keller 24.11.2017 09:50
Deleted: (Rogelj et al., 2015a). The majority of scenarios that limit warming to ≤2°C also include CDR

David Keller 6.11.2017 16:33
Deleted: have not been

i. The degree to which CDR could help mitigate or perhaps reverse climate change;

ii. The potential risks/benefits of different CDR proposals; and

iii. To inform how climate and carbon cycle responses to CDR could be included when calculating and accounting for the contribution of CDR in mitigation scenarios, i.e., so that CDR is better constrained when it is included in IAM generated scenarios.

David Keller 23.11.2017 16:05
Deleted: effectiveness and

David Keller 23.11.2017 16:07
Deleted: in

David Keller 23.11.2017 16:07
Deleted: ed

To date, modelling studies of CDR focusing on the carbon cycle and climatic responses have been undertaken with only a few Earth system models (Arora and Boer, 2014; Boucher et al., 2012; Cao and Caldeira, 2010; Gasser et al., 2015; Jones et al., 2016a; Keller et al., 2014; MacDougall, 2013; Mathesius et al., 2015; Tokarska and Zickfeld, 2015; Zickfeld et al., 2016). However, as these studies all use different experimental designs, their results are not directly comparable, consequently building a consensus on responses is challenging. A model intercomparison study with Earth System Models of Intermediate Complexity (EMICS) that addresses climate reversibility, among other things, has recently been published (Zickfeld et al., 2013), but the focus was on the very distant future rather than this century. Moreover, in many of these studies, atmospheric CO_2 concentrations were prescribed rather than being driven by CO_2 emissions and thus, the projected changes were independent of the strength of feedbacks associated with the carbon cycle.

Given that Earth system models are one of the few tools available for making quantifications at these scales, as well as for making projections into the future, CDR assessments must include emissions-driven modeling studies to capture the carbon-cycle feedbacks. However, such an assessment cannot be done with one or two models alone, since this will not address uncertainties due to model structure and internal variability. Below we describe the scientific foci and several experiments (Table 1) that comprise the initial phase of the Carbon Dioxide Removal Model Intercomparison Project (CDR-MIP).

1.2 CDR-MIP Scientific Foci

There are three principal science motivations behind CDR-MIP. First and foremost, CDR-MIP will provide information that can be used to help assess the potential and risks of using CDR to address climate change. A thorough assessment will need to look at both the impacts of CDR upon the Earth system and human society. CDR-MIP will focus primarily on Earth system impacts, with the anticipation that this information will also be useful for understanding potential impacts upon society. The scientific outcomes will lead to more informed decisions about the role CDR may play in climate change mitigation (defined here as a human intervention to reduce the sources or enhance the sinks of greenhouse gases). CDR-MIP experiments will also provide an opportunity to better understand how the Earth system responds to perturbations, which is relevant to many of the Grand Science Challenges posed by the World Climate Research Program (WCRP; https://www.wcrp-climate.org/grand-challenges/grand-challenges-overview). CDR-MIP experiments provide a unique opportunity because the perturbations are often opposite in sign to previous CMIP perturbation experiments (CO_2 is removed instead of added). Second, CDR-MIP results may also be able to provide information that helps to understand how model resolution and complexity cause systematic model bias. In this instance, CDR-MIP experiments may be especially useful for gaining a better understanding of the similarities and differences between global carbon cycle models because we invite a diverse group of models to participate in CDR-MIP. Finally, CDR-MIP results can help to quantify uncertainties in future climate change scenarios, especially those that include CDR. In this case CDR-MIP results may be useful for calibrating CDR inclusion in IAMs during the scenario development process.

The initial foci that are addressed by CDR-MIP include (but are not limited to):

(i) Climate "reversibility": assessing the efficacy of using CDR to return high future atmospheric CO_2 concentrations to lower levels. This topic is highly idealized, as the technical ability of CDR methods to remove such enormous

David Keller 23.11.2017 16:02

Deleted: Integrated Assessment Models (IAMs) quantities of CO_2 on relatively short timescales (i.e., this century) is doubtful. However, the results will provide information on the degree to which a changing and changed climate could be returned to a previous state. This knowledge is especially important since socio-economic scenarios that limit global warming to well below 2° C often feature radiative forcing overshoots that must be "reversed" using CDR. Specific questions on reversibility will address:

1) What components of the Earth's climate system exhibit "reversibility" when CO_2 increases and then decreases? On what timescales do these "reversals" occur? And if reversible, is this complete reversibility or just on average (are there spatial and temporal aspects)?
2) Which, if any, changes are irreversible?
3) What role does hysteresis play in these responses?

(ii) The potential efficacy, feedbacks, and side effects of specific CDR methods. Efficacy is defined here as CO_2 removed from the atmosphere, over a specific time horizon, as a result of a specific unit of CDR action. This topic will help to better constrain the carbon sequestration potential and risks and/or benefits of selected methods. Together, a rigorous analysis of the nature, sign, and timescales of these CDR-related topics will provide important information for the inclusion of CDR in climate mitigation scenarios, and in resulting mitigation and adaptation policy strategies. Specific questions on individual CDR methods will address:

David Keller 22.11.2017 10:53

Deleted: Moreover, such studies will be a good test for the models, and could be used to improve their performance and realism.

1) How much CO_2 would have to be removed to return to a specified concentration level e.g. present day or pre-industrial?
2) What are the short-term carbon cycle feedbacks (e.g. rebound) associated with the method?
3) What are the short- and longer-term physical/chemical/biological impacts and feedbacks, and potential side effects of the method?
4) For methods that enhance natural carbon uptake, e.g., afforestation or ocean alkalinization, where is the carbon stored (land and

ocean) and for how long (i.e. issues of permanence; at least as much as this can be calculated with these models)?

1.3 Structure of this document

Our motivation for preparing this document is to lay out in detail the CDR-MIP experimental protocol, which we request all modelling groups to follow as closely as possible. Firstly, in Section 2, we review the scientific background and motivation for CDR in more detail than covered in this introduction. Section 3 describes some requirements and recommendations for participating in CDR-MIP and describes links to other CMIP6 activities. Section 4 describes each CDR-MIP simulation in detail. Section 5 describes the model output and data policy. Section 6 presents an outlook of potential future CDR-MIP activities and a conclusion. Section 7 describes how to obtain the model code and data used during the production of this document.

2. Background and motivation

At present, there are two main proposed CDR approaches, which we briefly introduce here. The first category encompasses methods that are primarily designed to enhance the Earth's natural carbon sequestration mechanisms. Enhancing natural oceanic and terrestrial carbon sinks is suggested because these sinks have already *each* taken up over a quarter of the carbon emitted as a result of anthropogenic activities (Le Quéré et al., 2016) and have the capacity to store additional carbon, although this is subject to environmental limitations. Some prominent proposed sink enhancement methods include afforestation or reforestation, enhanced terrestrial weathering, biochar, land management to enhance soil carbon storage, ocean fertilization, ocean alkalinization, and coastal management of blue carbon sinks.

The second general CDR category includes methods that rely primarily on technological means to directly remove carbon from the atmosphere, ocean, or land and isolate it from the climate system, e.g., storage in a geological reservoir (Scott et al., 2015). Methods that are primarily technological are suggested because they may not be as limited by environmental constraints. Some prominent proposed technological methods include direct CO_2 air capture with storage and seawater carbon capture (and storage). One other proposed CDR method, bioenergy with carbon capture and storage (BECCS), relies on both natural processes and technology. BECCS is thus, constrained by some environmental limitations (e.g., suitable land area), but because the carbon is removed and ultimately stored elsewhere, it may have a higher CDR potential than if the same deployment area were used for a sink-enhancing CDR method like afforestation that stores carbon permanently above ground and reaches a saturation level for a given area (Smith et al., 2015).

From an Earth system perspective, the potential and impacts of proposed CDR methods have only been investigated in a few individual studies - see recent climate intervention assessments for a broad overview of the state of CDR research (National Research Council, 2015; Rickels et al., 2011; The Royal Society, 2009; Vaughan and Lenton, 2011) and references therein. These studies agree that CDR application at a large scale ($\geq$1Gt CO_2 yr^{-1}) would likely have a substantial impact on the climate, biogeochemistry and the ecosystem services that the Earth provides (i.e., the benefits humans obtain from ecosystems) (Millennium Ecosystem Assesment, 2005). Idealized Earth system model simulations suggest that CDR does appear to be able to limit or even reverse warming and changes in many other key climate variables (Boucher et al., 2012; Tokarska and Zickfeld, 2015; Wu et al., 2014; Zickfeld et al., 2016). However, less idealized studies, e.g., when some environmental limitations are accounted for, suggest that many methods have only a limited individual mitigation potential (Boysen et al., 2016, 2017; Keller et al., 2014; Sonntag et al., 2016).

Studies have also focused on the carbon cycle response to the deliberate redistribution of carbon between dynamic carbon reservoirs or permanent (geological) carbon removal. Understanding and accounting for the feedbacks between these reservoirs in response to CDR is particularly important for understanding the efficacy of any method (Keller et al., 2014). For example, when CO_2 is removed from the atmosphere in simulations, the rate of oceanic CO_2 uptake, which has historically increased in response to increasing emissions, is reduced and might eventually reverse (i.e., net outgassing), because of a reduction in the air-sea flux disequilibrium (Cao and Caldeira, 2010; Jones et al., 2016a; Tokarska and Zickfeld, 2015; Vichi et al., 2013). Equally, the terrestrial carbon sink also weakens in response to atmospheric CO_2 removal, and can also become a source of CO_2 to the atmosphere (Cao and Caldeira, 2010; Jones et al., 2016a; Tokarska and Zickfeld, 2015). This 'rebound' carbon flux response that weakens or reverses carbon uptake by natural carbon sinks would oppose CDR and needs to be accounted for if the goal is to limit or reduce atmospheric CO_2 concentrations to some specified level (IPCC, 2013).

In addition to the climatic and carbon cycle effects of CDR, most methods appear to have side effects (Keller et al., 2014). The impacts of these side effects tend to be method specific and may amplify or reduce the climate change mitigation potential of the method. Some significant side effects are caused by the spatial scale (e.g., millions of km^2) at which many methods would have to be deployed to have a significant impact upon CO_2 and global temperatures (Boysen et al., 2016; Heck et al., 2016; Keller et al., 2014). Side effects can also potentially alter the natural environment by disrupting biogeochemical and hydrological cycles, ecosystems, and biodiversity (Keller et al., 2014). For example, large-scale afforestation could change regional albedo and evapotranspiration and so have a biogeophysical impact on the Earth's energy budget and climate (Betts, 2000; Keller et al., 2014). Additionally, if afforestation were done with non-native plants or monocultures to increase carbon removal rates this could impact local biodiversity. For human societies, this means that CDR-related side effects could potentially impact the ecosystem services provided by the land and ocean (e.g., food production), with the information so far suggesting that there could be both positive and negative impacts on these services. Such effects could change societal responses and strategies for climate change adaptation if large-scale CDR were to be deployed.

CDR deployment scenarios have focused on both preventing climate change and reversing it. While there is some understanding of how the Earth system may respond to CDR, as described above, another dynamic comes into play if CDR were to be applied to "reverse" climate change. This is because if CDR were deployed for this purpose, it would deliberately change the climate, i.e., drive it in another direction, rather than just prevent it from changing by limiting CO_2 emissions. Few studies have investigated how the Earth system may respond if CDR is applied in this manner. The link between cumulative CO_2 emissions and global mean surface air temperature change has been extensively studied (IPCC, 2013). Can this change simply be reversed by removing the CO_2 that has been emitted since the preindustrial era? Little is known about how reversible this relationship is, or whether it applies to other Earth system properties (e.g., net primary productivity, sea level, etc.). Investigations of CDR-induced climate reversibility have suggested that many Earth system properties are "reversible", but often with non-linear responses (Armour et al., 2011; Boucher et al., 2012; MacDougall, 2013; Tokarska and Zickfeld, 2015; Wang et al., 2014; Wu et al., 2014; Zickfeld et al., 2016). However, these analyses were generally limited to global annual mean values, and most models did not include potentially important components such as permafrost or terrestrial ice sheets. Thus, there are many unknowns and much uncertainty about whether it is possible to "reverse" climate change. Obtaining knowledge about climate "reversibility" is especially important as it could be used to direct or change societal responses and strategies for adaptation and mitigation.

David Keller 5.12.2017 13:54
Deleted: The few studies that have investigated

2.1 Why a model intercomparison study on CDR?

Although ideas for controlling atmospheric CO_2 concentrations were proposed in the middle of the last century, it is only recently that CDR methods have received widespread attention as climate intervention strategies (National Research Council, 2015; Schäfer et al., 2015; The Royal Society, 2009; Vaughan and Lenton, 2011). While some proposed CDR methods do build upon substantial knowledge bases (e.g., soil and forest carbon, and ocean biogeochemistry), little research into large scale CDR has been conducted and limited research resources applied (National Research Council, 2015; Oschlies and Klepper, 2017). The small number of existing laboratory studies and small-scale field trials of CDR methods were not designed to evaluate climate or carbon cycle responses to CDR. At the same time it is difficult to conceive how such an investigation could be carried out without scaling a method up to the point where it would essentially be "deployment". The few natural analogues that exist

David Keller 29.11.2017 11:48
Deleted: of

for some methods (e.g., weathering or reforestation) only provide limited insight into the effectiveness of deliberate large scale CDR. As such, beyond syntheses of resource requirements and availabilities, e.g., Smith, (2016), there is a lack of observational constraints that can be applied to the assessment of the effectiveness of CDR methods. Lastly, many proposed CDR methods are pre-mature at this point and technology deployment strategies would be required to overcome this barrier (Schäfer et al., 2015), which means that they can only be studied in an idealized manner, i.e., through model simulations.

David Keller 29.11.2017 11:48
Deleted: (

Understanding the response of the Earth system to CDR is urgently needed because CDR is increasingly being utilized to inform policy and economic discussions. Examples of this include scenarios that are being developed with GHG emission forcing that exceeds (or overshoots) what is required to limit global mean temperatures to 2° C or 1.5 °C, with the assumption that reversibility is possible with the future deployment of CDR. These scenarios are generated using Integrated Assessment Models, which compute the emissions of GHGs, short-lived climate forcers, and land-cover change associated with economic, technological and policy drivers to achieve climate targets. Most integrated assessment models represent BECCS as the only CDR option, with only a few also including afforestation (IPCC, 2014b). During scenario development and calibration the output from the IAMs is fed into climate models of reduced complexity, e.g., MAGICC (Model for the Assessment of Greenhouse-gas Induced Climate Change) (Meinshausen et al., 2011), to calculate the global mean temperature achieved through the scenario choices, e.g., those in the Shared Socioeconomic Pathways (SSPs) (Riahi et al., 2017). These climate models are calibrated to Earth system models or based on modelling intercomparison exercises like the Coupled Model Intercomparison Phase 5 (CMIP5), where much of the climate-carbon cycle information comes from the Coupled Climate-Carbon Cycle Model Intercomparison Project (C4MIP). However, since the carbon cycle feedbacks of large-scale negative CO_2 emissions have not been explicitly analyzed in projects like CMIP5, with the exception of Jones et al. (2016a), many assumptions have been made about the effects of CDR on the carbon cycle and climate. Knowledge of these short-term carbon cycle feedbacks is needed to better constrain the effectiveness of the CDR technologies assumed in the IAM generated scenarios.

This relates to the policy relevant question of whether in a regulatory framework, CO_2 removals from the atmosphere should be treated like emissions except for the opposite (negative) sign or if specific methods, which may or may not have long-term consequences (e.g., afforestation/reforestation vs. direct CO_2 air capture with geological carbon storage), should be treated differently. The lack of this kind of analyses is a knowledge gap in current climate modeling (Jones et al., 2016a) and relevant for IAM models and political decisions. There is an urgent need to close this gap since additional CDR options like the enhanced weathering of rocks on land or direct air capture continue to be included in IAMs, e.g., Chen and Tavoni (2013). For the policy relevant questions it is also important to analyze the carbon cycle effects given realistic policy scenarios rather than idealized perturbations.

David Keller 29.11.2017 09:54

Deleted: impotant

David Keller 23.11.2017 16:10

Deleted: Therefore, there is a need to better evaluate the climate-carbon cycle feedbacks under CDR using Earth system models so that CDR is better constrained when it is included in IAM generated scenarios.

3. Requirements and recommendations for participation in CDR-MIP

The CDR-MIP initiative is designed to bring together a suite of Earth System Models, Earth System Models of Intermediate Complexity (EMICs), and potentially even box models in a common framework. Models of differing complexities are invited to participate because the questions posed above cannot be answered with any single class of models. For example, ESMs are primarily suited for investigations spanning only the next century because of the computational expense, while EMICs and box models are well suited to investigate the long-term questions surrounding CDR, but are often highly parameterized and may not include important processes, e.g., cloud feedbacks. The use of differing models will also provide insight into how model resolution and complexity controls modeled short- and long-term climate and carbon cycle responses to CDR.

All groups that are running models with an interactive carbon cycle are encouraged to participate in CDR-MIP. We desire diversity and encourage groups to use older models, with well-known characteristics, biases and established responses (e.g. previous CMIP model versions), as well as state-of-the-art CMIP6 models. For longer model simulations, we would encourage modellers when possible to include additional carbon reservoirs, such as ocean sediments or permafrost, as these are not always implemented for short simulations. Models that only include atmospheric and oceanic carbon reservoirs are welcome, and will be able to participate in some experiments. All models wishing to participate in CDR-MIP must provide clear documentation that details the model version, components, and key run-time and initialization information (model time stepping, spin-up state at initialization, etc.). Furthermore, all model output must be standardized to facilitate analyses and public distribution (see Sections 4 and 5).

3.1 Relations to other MIPs

There are no existing MIPs with experiments focused on climate "reversibility", direct CO_2 air capture (with storage), or ocean alkalinization. However, this does not mean that there are no links between CDR-MIP and other MIPs. CMIP6 and CMIP5 experiments, analyses, and assessments both provide a valuable baseline and model sensitivities that can be used to better understand CDR-MIP results and we highly recommend that participants in CDR-MIP also conduct other MIP experiments. Further, to maximize the use of computing resources CDR-MIP uses experiments from other MIPs as a control run for a CDR-MIP experiment or to provide a pathway from which a CDR-MIP experiment branches (Sections 3.2 and 4, Tables 2- 7). Principle among these is the CMIP Diagnostic, Evaluation, and Characterization of Klima (DECK) and historical experiments as detailed in Eyring et al. (2016) for CMIP6, since they provide the basis for many experiments with almost all MIPs leveraging these in some way.

Here, we additionally describe links to ongoing MIPs that are endorsed by CMIP6, noting that earlier versions of many of these MIPs were part of CMIP5 and so provide a similar synergy for any CMIP5 models participating in CDR-MIP.

Given the emphasis on carbon cycle perturbations in CDR-MIP, there is a strong synergy with C4MIP which provides a baseline, standard protocols, and diagnostics for better understanding the relationship between the carbon cycle and the climate in CMIP6 (Jones et al., 2016b). For example, the C4MIP

David Keller 24.11.2017 13:51
Formatted: Subscript

David Keller 24.11.2017 13:57
Deleted: We highly recommend that participantste in CDR-MIP also conduct experiments from other MIPs.

David Keller 24.11.2017 14:02
Deleted: .

SCOTT Vivian 20.11.2017 10:34
Deleted: For models participating in CMIP6, and those running models that participated in CMIP5, the experiments, analyses, and assessments done for various MIPs can provide a valuable baseline and model sensitivities that can be used to better understand the response of these models when they conduct CDR-MIP simulations. In some cases these other MIP experiments also act as a control run for a CDR-MIP experiment or provide a pathway from which a CDR-MIP experiment branches (Sections 3.2 and 4, Tables 2- 7). This is especially true for

SCOTT Vivian 20.11.2017 10:35
Deleted: Below we focus on

SCOTT Vivian 20.11.2017 10:35
Deleted: but

SCOTT Vivian 20.11.2017 10:35
Deleted: e

SCOTT Vivian 20.11.2017 10:36
Deleted: , thus,

SCOTT Vivian 20.11.2017 10:35
Deleted: The

SCOTT Vivian 20.11.2017 10:58
Deleted: will

SCOTT Vivian 20.11.2017 10:58
Deleted: Given the emphasis on carbon cycle perturbations in CDR-MIP, there is a strong synergy between C4MIP and CDR-MIP.

David Keller 16.11.2017 16:34
Deleted: Consequently, C4MIP will be invaluable for understanding model responses in CDR-MIP simulations.

SCOTT Vivian 20.11.2017 10:58
Deleted: A key C4MIP experiment,

David Keller 5.12.2017 14:00
Deleted: T

SCOTT Vivian 20.11.2017 10:58
Deleted: t

emissions-driven SSP5-8.5 scenario (a high CO_2 emission scenario with a radiative forcing of 8.5 Wm^{-2} in year 2100) simulation, *esm-ssp585*, is a control run and branching pathway for several CDR-MIP experiments. CDR-MIP experiments may equally be valuable for understanding model responses during related C4MIP experiments. For example, the C4MIP experiment *ssp534-over-bgc* is a concentration driven "overshoot" scenario simulation that is run in a partially coupled mode. The simulation required to analyze this experiment is a fully coupled CO_2 concentration driven simulation of this scenario, *ssp534-over,* from the Scenario Model Intercomparison Project (ScenarioMIP). The novel CDR-MIP experiment, *C2_overshoot*, which is a fully coupled CO_2 emission driven version of this scenario, will provide additional information that can be used to extend the analyses to better understand climate-carbon cycle feedbacks.

The Land Use Model Intercomparison Project (LUMIP) is designed to better understand the impacts of land-use and land-cover change on the climate (Lawrence et al., 2016). The three main LUMIP foci overlap with some of the CDR-MIP foci, especially in regards to land management as a CDR method (e.g., afforestation/reforestation). To facilitate land-use and land-cover change investigations LUMIP provides standard protocols and diagnostics for the terrestrial components of CMIP6 Earth system models. The inclusion of these diagnostics will be important for all CDR-MIP experiments performed with CMIP6 models. The CDR-MIP experiment on afforestation/reforestation, C3 (*esm-ssp585-ssp126Lu-ext)*, is an extension of the LUMIP *esm-ssp585-ssp126Lu* simulation beyond 2100 to investigate the long-term consequences of afforestation/reforestation in a high-CO_2 world (Section 4.3).

ScenarioMIP is designed to provide multi-model climate projections for several scenarios of future anthropogenic emissions and land use changes (O'Neill et al., 2016), and provides baselines or branching for many MIP experiments. The ScenarioMIP SSP5-3.4-OS experiments, *ssp534-over* and *ssp534-over-ext*, which prescribe atmospheric CO_2 to follow an emission overshoot pathway that is followed by aggressive mitigation to reduce emissions to zero by about 2070, with substantial negative global emissions thereafter, are used as control runs for the CDR-MIP CO_2 emission driven version of this scenario. Along with the partially coupled C4MIP version of this experiment,

SCOTT Vivian 20.11.2017 10:37
Deleted: also

SCOTT Vivian 20.11.2017 11:00
Deleted: In addition, several

SCOTT Vivian 20.11.2017 11:01
Deleted: one of

SCOTT Vivian 20.11.2017 11:01
Deleted: s,

SCOTT Vivian 20.11.2017 11:01
Deleted: ,

David Keller 22.11.2017 17:32
Deleted: e control run

David Keller 22.11.2017 17:32
Deleted: for

David Keller 24.11.2017 12:03
Deleted: analyse

David Keller 22.11.2017 17:32
Deleted: s of

David Keller 22.11.2017 17:32
Deleted: simulation

SCOTT Vivian 20.11.2017 11:05
Deleted: A

SCOTT Vivian 20.11.2017 11:08
Deleted: . In this LUMIP experiment the C4MIP *esm-ssp585* scenario (a high CO_2 emission scenario) is simulated, but instead of using the standard SSP5-8.5 land use forcing, the forcing from an afforestation/reforestation scenario (SSP1-2.6) is used instead. In LUMIP this experiment is conducted from the year 2015 to 2100. CDR-MIP will extend the experiment well beyond this point

SCOTT Vivian 20.11.2017 11:08
Deleted: (Section 4.3)

SCOTT Vivian 20.11.2017 11:09
Deleted: Such an extended simulation will also be useful for answering some of the LUMIP scientific questions.

SCOTT Vivian 20.11.2017 11:09
Deleted: .

SCOTT Vivian 20.11.2017 11:10
Deleted: In addition to providing information on how models respond to forcings, they act as

SCOTT Vivian 20.11.2017 11:10
Deleted: scenarios

SCOTT Vivian 20.11.2017 11:10
Deleted: or provide pathways from which MIP experiments branch

SCOTT Vivian 20.11.2017 11:11
Deleted: linked to CDR-MIP because they act

SCOTT Vivian 20.11.2017 11:12
Deleted: our

these experiments will allow for qualitative comparative analyses to better understand climate-carbon cycle feedbacks in an "overshoot" scenario with negative emissions (CDR). If it is found that the carbon cycle effects of CDR are improperly accounted for in the scenarios, then this information can be used to recalibrate older CDR-including IAM scenarios and be used to better constrain CDR when it is included in new scenarios.

The Ocean Model Intercomparison Project (OMIP), which primarily investigates the ocean-related origins and consequences of systematic model biases, will help to provide an understanding of ocean component functioning for models participating in CMIP6 (Griffies et al., 2016). OMIP will also establish standard protocols and output diagnostics for ocean model components. The biogeochemical protocols and diagnostics of OMIP (Orr et al., 2016) are particularly relevant for CMIP6 models participating in CDR-MIP. While the inclusion of these diagnostics will be important for all CDR-MIP experiments, these standards will be particularly important for facilitating the analysis of our marine CDR experiment, *C4* (Section 4.4).

3.2 Prerequisite and recommended CMIP simulations

The following CMIP experiments are considered prerequisites for specified CDR-MIP experiments (Tables 2- 7) and analyses:

- The CMIP prescribed atmospheric CO_2 pre-industrial control simulation, *piControl.* This is required for all CDR-MIP experiments (many control runs and experiment prerequisites branch from this) and is usually done as part of the spin-up process.

- The CMIP6 pre-industrial control simulation with interactively simulated atmospheric CO_2 (i.e., the CO_2 concentration is internally calculated, but emissions are zero), *esm-piControl.* This is required for CDR-MIP experiments *C2_pi-pulse, C2_overshoot, C3*, and *C4*.

- The CMIP 1 % per year increasing CO_2 simulation, *1pctCO₂*, that is initialized from a pre-industrial CO_2 concentration with CO_2 then increasing by 1% per year until the CO_2 concentration has quadrupled (approximately 139 years). This is required for CDR-MIP experiment *C1*.

- The CMIP6 historical simulation, *historical*, where historical atmospheric CO_2 forcing is prescribed along with land use, aerosols, and non-CO_2 greenhouse gases forcing. This is required for CDR-MIP experiment *C2_yr2010-pulse*.

- The CMIP6 emissions driven historical simulation, *esm-hist*, where the atmospheric CO_2 concentration is internally calculated in response to historical anthropogenic CO_2 emissions forcing. Other forcing such as land use, aerosols, and non-CO_2 greenhouse gases are prescribed. This is required for CDR-MIP experiments *C2_overshoot, C3*, and *C4*.

- The LUMIP *esm-ssp585-ssp126Lu* simulation, which simulates afforestation in a high CO_2 emission scenario, is the basis for CDR-MIP experiment *esm-ssp585-ssp126Lu-ext*.

- The C4MIP *esm-ssp585* simulation, which is a high emission scenario and serves as a control run and branching pathway for CDR-MIP *C4* experiment.

We also highly recommend that groups run these additional C4MIP and ScenarioMIP simulations:

- The ScenarioMIP *ssp534-over* and *ssp534-over-ext* simulations, which prescribe the atmospheric CO_2 concentration to follow an emission overshoot pathway that is followed by aggressive mitigation to reduce emissions to zero by about 2070, with substantial negative global emissions thereafter. These results can be qualitatively compared to CDR-

MIP experiment *C2_overshoot*, which is the same scenario, but driven by CO_2 emissions.

- The C4MIP *ssp534-over-bgc* and *ssp534-over-bgcExt* simulations, which are biogeochemically-coupled versions of the *ssp534-over* and *ssp534-over-ext* simulations, i.e., only the carbon cycle components (land and ocean) see the prescribed increase in the atmospheric CO_2 concentration; the model's radiation scheme sees a fixed preindustrial CO_2 concentration. These results can be qualitatively compared to CDR-MIP experiment *C2_overshoot*, which is a fully coupled version of this scenario.

David Keller 22.11.2017 16:09
Deleted: .

David Keller 22.11.2017 16:09
Deleted:

David Keller 22.11.2017 16:18
Formatted: Font:Not Italic

3.3 Simulation ensembles

We encourage participants whose models have internal variability to conduct multiple realizations, i.e. ensembles, for all experiments. While these are highly desirable, they are neither mandatory, nor a prerequisite for participation in CDR-MIP. Therefore, the number of ensemble members is at the discretion of each modeling group. However, we strongly encourage groups to submit at least three ensemble members if possible.

David Keller 22.11.2017 13:47
Deleted: not

3.4 Climate sensitivity calculation

Knowing the climate sensitivity of each model participating in CDR-MIP is important for interpreting the results. For modelling groups that have not already calculated their model's climate sensitivity, the required CMIP *1pctCO2* simulation can be used to calculate both the transient and equilibrium climate sensitivities. The transient climate sensitivity can be calculated as the difference in the global annual mean surface temperature between the start of the experiment and a 20-year period centered on the time of CO_2 doubling. The equilibrium response can be diagnosed following Gregory et al. (2004), Frölicher et al. (2013), or if possible (desirable) by running the model to an equilibrium state at $2\times CO_2$ or $4\times CO_2$.

3.5 Model drift

Model drift (Gupta et al., 2013; Séférian et al., 2015) is a concern for all CDR-MIP experiments because if a model is not at an equilibrium state when the experiment or prerequisite CMIP experiment begins, then the response to any experimental perturbations could be confused by drift. Thus, before beginning any of the experiments a model must be spun-up to eliminate long-term drift in carbon reservoirs or fluxes. Groups participating in CMIP6 should follow the C4MIP protocols described in Jones et al. (2016b), to ensure that drift is acceptably small. This means that land, ocean and atmosphere carbon stores should each vary by less than 10 GtC per century (long-term average ≤ 0.1 Gt C yr^{-1}). We leave it to individual groups to determine the length of the run required to reach such a state. If older model versions, e.g., CMIP5, are used for any experiments, any known drift should be documented.

4. Experimental Design and Protocols

To facilitate multiple model needs, the experiments described below have been designed to be relatively simple to implement. In most cases, they were also designed to have high signal-to-noise ratios to better understand how the simulated Earth system responds to significant CDR perturbations. While there are many ways in which such experiments could be designed to address the questions surrounding climate reversibility and each proposed CDR method, the CDR-MIP like all MIPs, must be limited to a small number of practical experiments. Therefore, after careful consideration, one experiment was chosen specifically to address climate reversibility and several more were chosen to investigate CDR by idealized direct air capture of CO_2 (DAC), afforestation/reforestation, and ocean alkalinization (Table 1). Experiments are prioritized based on a tiered system, although, we encourage modelling groups to complete the full suite of experiments. Unfortunately, limiting the number of experiments means that a number of potentially promising or widely utilized CDR methods or combinations of methods must wait until a later time, i.e., a 2nd phase, to be investigated in a multi-model context. In particular, the exclusion of Biomass Energy with Carbon Capture and Storage (BECCS) is unfortunate, as this is the primary CDR method in the Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP) and Shared Socio-economic Pathways (SSP) scenarios used in CMIP5 and 6, respectively. However, there was no practical way to design a less idealized BECCS experiment as most state-of-the-art models are either incapable of simulating a biomass harvest with permanent removal or would require a substantial amount of reformulating to do so in a manner that allows comparable multi-model analyses.

In some of the experiments described below we ask that non-CO_2 forcing (e.g., land use change, radiative forcing from other greenhouse gases, etc.) be held constant, e.g. at that of a specific year, so that only changes in other forcing, like CO_2 emissions, drive the main model response. For some forcing, e.g. aerosol emissions, this may mean that monthly changes in forcing are repeated throughout the rest of the simulation as if it was always one particular year. However, we recognize that models apply forcing in different ways and leave it to individual modelling groups to determine the best way hold forcing constant. We request that the methodology for holding forcing constant be documented for each model.

4.1. Climate and carbon cycle reversibility experiment (*C1*)

If CO_2 emissions are not reduced quickly enough, and more warming occurs than is desirable or tolerable, then it is important to understand if CDR has the potential to "reverse" climate change. Here we propose an idealized Tier 1 experiment that is designed to investigate CDR-induced climate "reversibility" (Fig. 1, Table 2). This experiment investigates the "reversibility" of the climate system by leveraging the prescribed 1% yr^{-1} CO_2 concentration increase experiment that was done for prior CMIPs, and is a key run for CMIP6 (Eyring et al., 2016; Meehl et al., 2014). The CDR-MIP experiment starts from the 1% yr^{-1} CO_2 concentration increase experiment, *1pctCO2*, and then at the 4×CO_2 concentration level prescribes a -1% yr^{-1} removal of CO_2 from the atmosphere to pre-industrial levels (Fig. 1; this is also similar to experiments in Boucher et al.,

(2012) and Zickfeld et al., (2016)). This approach is analogous to an unspecified CDR application or DAC, where CO_2 is removed to permanent storage to return atmospheric CO_2 to a prescribed level, i.e., a preindustrial concentration. To do this, CDR would have to counter emissions (unless they have ceased) as well as changes in atmospheric CO_2 due to the response of the ocean and terrestrial biosphere. We realize that the technical ability of CDR methods to remove such enormous quantities of CO_2 on such a relatively short timescale (i.e. in a few centuries) is unrealistic. However, branching from the existing CMIP *1pctCO2* experiment provides a relatively straightforward opportunity, with a high signal-to-noise ratio, to explore the effect of large-scale removal of CO_2 from the atmosphere and issues involving reversibility (Fig. 2 shows exemplary *C1* results from two models).

David Keller 6.11.2017 16:46
Deleted: doubtful

David Keller 6.11.2017 16:23
Deleted: Moreover, since many modelling groups will have already conducted the first part of this experiment in preparation for other modelling research, e.g., for CMIP, this should minimize the effort needed to perform the complete experiment.

4.1.1 Protocol for *C1*

Prerequisite simulations: Perform the CMIP *piControl* and the *1pctCO2* experiments. The *1pctCO2* experiment branches from the DECK *piControl* experiment, which should ideally represent a near-equilibrium state of the climate system under imposed year 1850 conditions. Starting from year 1850 conditions (*piControl* global mean atmospheric CO_2 should be 284.7 ppm) the *1pctCO2* simulation prescribes a CO_2 concentration increase at a rate of 1% yr^{-1} (i.e., exponentially). The only externally imposed difference from the *piControl* experiment is the change in CO_2, i.e., all other forcing is kept at that of year 1850. A restart must be generated when atmospheric CO_2 concentrations are four times that of the *piControl* simulation (1138.8 ppm; this should be 140 years into the run). Groups that have already performed the *piControl* and *1pctCO2* simulations for CMIP5 or CMIP6 may provide a link to them if they are already on the Earth System Grid Federation (ESGF) that host CMIP data.

David Keller 6.11.2017 16:23
Deleted: Note that *piControl* also serves as a control run for this CDR-MIP experiment.

1pctCO2-cdr simulation*:* Use the 4×CO_2 restart from *1pctCO2* and prescribe a 1% yr^{-1} removal of CO_2 from the atmosphere (start removal at the beginning of the 140th year: January 1st.) until the CO_2 concentration reaches 284.7 ppm (140 years of removal). As in *1pctCO2* the only externally imposed forcing should be the change in CO$_2$ (all other forcing is kept at that of year 1850). The CO$_2$ concentration should then be held at 284.7 ppm for as long as possible (a minimum of 60 years is required), with no change in other forcing. EMICs and box models are encouraged to extend runs for at least 1000 years (and up to 5000 years) at 284.7 ppm CO$_2$ to investigate long-term climate system and carbon cycle reversibility (see Fig. 2 b and d for examples of why it is important to understand the long-term response).

4.2 Direct CO$_2$ air capture with permanent storage experiments (*C2*)

The idea of directly removing excess CO$_2$ from the atmosphere (i.e., concentrations above pre-industrial levels) and permanently storing it in some reservoir, such as a geological formation, is appealing because such an action would theoretically address the main cause of climate change, anthropogenically emitted CO$_2$ that remains in the atmosphere. Laboratory studies and small-scale pilot plants have demonstrated that atmospheric CO$_2$ can be captured by several different methods that are often collectively referred to as Direct Air Capture (DAC) technology (Holmes and Keith, 2012; Lackner et al., 2012; Sanz-Pérez et al., 2016). Technology has also been developed that can place captured carbon in permanent reservoirs, i.e., Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) methods (Matter et al., 2016; Scott et al., 2013, 2015) . DAC technology is currently prohibitively expensive to deploy at large scales and may be technically difficult to scale up (National Research Council, 2015), but does appear to be a potentially viable CDR option. However, aside from the technical questions involved in developing and deploying such technology, there remain questions about how the Earth system would respond if CO$_2$ were removed from the atmosphere.

Here we propose a set of experiments that are designed to investigate and quantify the response of the Earth system to idealized large-scale DAC. In all experiments, atmospheric CO$_2$ is allowed to freely evolve to investigate carbon cycle and climate feedbacks in response to DAC. The first two idealized experiments described below use an instantaneous (*pulse*) CO$_2$ removal from the atmosphere - approach for this investigation. Instantaneous CO$_2$ removal perturbations were chosen since *pulsed* CO$_2$ addition experiments have already

David Keller 22.11.2017 10:18
Deleted:

David Keller 22.11.2017 10:20
Moved down [1]: 4.1.2 Model output frequency for experiment *C1*

David Keller 22.11.2017 14:53
Deleted: ***1*** ... [1]

David Keller 22.11.2017 10:18
Deleted:

David Keller 24.11.2017 12:32
Deleted: As mentioned in Section 2, the land and ocean components of the carbon cycle will respond to any changes in atmospheric CO$_2$. These reservoirs, which are currently carbon sinks, will oppose any effort to simply remove atmospheric CO$_2$ by either taking up less carbon or by becoming carbon sources to the atmosphere if enough carbon is removed (Jones et al., 2016a; Tokarska and Zickfeld, 2015; Vichi et al., 2013). The carbon cycle is also strongly affected by the climate (Friedlingstein and Prentice, 2010) and thus, its response to DAC will also depend on the past and present state of the climate. These climate-carbon cycle feedbacks make it difficult to determine exactly how much DAC would be needed to reach a specific atmospheric CO$_2$ or temperature target. Only a few modelling studies have investigated how the climate and carbon cycle respond to DAC (Cao and Caldeira, 2010; Jones et al., 2016a; Tokarska and Zickfeld, 2015) and there is much uncertainty that needs to be overcome before quantitative estimates of DAC efficacy can be made.

been proven useful for diagnosing carbon cycle and climate feedbacks in response to CO_2 perturbations. For example, previous positive CO_2 pulse experiments have been used to calculate Global Warming Potential (GWP) and Global Temperature change Potential (GTP) metrics (Joos et al., 2013). The experiments described below build upon the previous positive CO_2 pulse experiments, i.e., the PD100 and PI100 impulse experiments described in Joos et. al. (2013) where 100 Gt C is instantly added to preindustrial and near present day simulated climates. However, our experiments also prescribe a negative CDR pulse as opposed to just adding CO_2 to the atmosphere. Two experiments are desirable because the Earth system response to CO_2 removal will be different when starting from an equilibrium state versus starting from a perturbed state (Zickfeld et al., 2016). One particular goal of these experiments is to estimate a Global Cooling Potential (GCP) metric based on a CDR Impulse Response Function (IRF_{CDR}). Such a metric will be useful for calculating how much CO_2 is removed by DAC and how much DAC is needed to achieve a particular climate target.

The third experiment, which focuses on "negative emissions", is based on the Shared Socio-economic Pathway (SSP) 5-3.4-overshoot scenario and its long-term extension (Kriegler et al., 2016; O'Neill et al., 2016). This scenario is of interest to CDR-MIP because after an initially high level of emissions, which follows the SSP5-8.5 unmitigated baseline scenario until 2040, CO_2 emissions are rapidly reduced with net CO_2 emissions becoming negative after the year 2070 and continuing to be so until the year 2190 when they reach zero. In the original SSP5-3.4-OS scenario, the negative emissions are achieved using BECCS. However, as stated earlier there is currently no practical way to design a good multi-model BECCS experiment. Therefore, in our experiments negative emissions are achieved by simply removing CO_2 from the atmosphere and assuming that it is permanently stored in a geological reservoir. While this may violate the economic assumptions underlying the scenario, it still provides an opportunity to explore the response of the climate and carbon cycle to potentially achievable levels of negative emissions.

According to calculations done with a simple climate model, MAGICC version 6.8.01 BETA (Meinshausen et al., 2011; O'Neill et al., 2016), the SSP5-3.4-

OS scenario considerably overshoots the 3.4 W m^{-2} forcing level, with a peak global mean temperature of about 2.4° C, before returning to 3.4 W m^{-2} at the end of the century. Eventually in the long-term extension of this scenario, the forcing stabilizes just above 2 W m^{-2}, with a global mean temperature that should equilibrate at about 1.25° C above pre-industrial temperatures. Thus, in addition to allowing an investigation into the response of the climate and carbon cycle to negative emissions, this scenario also provides the opportunity to investigate issues of reversibility, albeit on a shorter timescale and with less of an "overshoot" than in experiment *C1*.

David Keller 24.11.2017 12:10
Deleted: ... [2]

4.2.1 Instantaneous CO_2 removal / addition from an unperturbed climate experimental protocol (*C2_pi-pulse*)

This idealized Tier 1 experiment is designed to investigate how the Earth system responds to DAC when perturbed from an equilibrium state (Fig. 3, Table 3). The idea is to provide a baseline system response that can later be compared to the response of a perturbed system, i.e., experiment *C2_yr2010-pulse* (Section 4.2.3). By also performing another simulation where the same amount of CO_2 is added to the system, it will be possible to diagnose if the system responds in an inverse manner when the CO_2 pulse is positive. Many modelling groups will have already conducted the prerequisite simulation for this experiment in preparation for other modelling research, e.g., during model spin-up or for CMIP, which should minimize the effort needed to perform the complete experiment. The protocol is as follows:

Prerequisite simulation - Control simulation under preindustrial conditions with freely evolving CO_2. All boundary conditions (solar forcing, land use, etc.) are expected to remain constant. This is also the CMIP5 *esmControl* simulation (Taylor et al., 2012) and the CMIP6 *esm-piControl* simulation (Eyring et al., 2016). Note that this is exactly the same as PI100 run 4 in Joos et. al. (2013).

David Keller 1.11.2017 16:28
Deleted: For groups that have not participated in CMIP5 or CMIP6, this run essentially represents an equilibrium model state with no significant drift. We realize that it is difficult for ESMs to reach a state with little drift and follow the guidelines provided by Jones et al. (2016b), to define what is an acceptably small level of drift in a properly spun-up model, e.g., land, ocean and atmosphere carbon stores should each vary by less than 10 GtC per century (long-term average ≤ 0.1 Gt C yr^{-1}). We leave it to individual groups to determine the length of the run required to reach such a state and request only that 100 years of output at such an equilibrium be made available.

esm-pi-cdr-pulse simulation - As in *esm-Control* or *esm-piControl*, but with 100 Gt C instantaneously (within 1 time step) removed from the atmosphere in year 10.

If models have CO_2 spatially distributed throughout the atmosphere, we suggest removing this amount in a uniform manner. After the negative pulse ESMs should continue the run for at least 100 years, while EMICs and box models are encouraged to continue the run for at least 1000 years (and up to 5000 years if possible). Figure 4 shows example *esm-pi-cdr-pulse* model responses.

esm-pi-co2pulse simulation - The same as *esm-pi-cdr-pulse*, but add a positive 100 Gt C pulse (within 1 time step) as in Joos et. al. (2013), instead of a negative one. If models have CO_2 spatially distributed throughout the atmosphere, we suggest adding CO_2 in a uniform manner. Note that this would be exactly the same as the PI100 run 5 in Joos et. al. (2013) and can thus, be compared to this earlier study.

4.2.3 Instantaneous CO_2 removal from a perturbed climate experimental protocol (*C2_yr2010-pulse*)

This Tier 3 experiment is designed to investigate how the Earth system responds when CO_2 is removed from an anthropogenically-altered climate not in equilibrium (Fig. 5, Table 4). Many modelling groups will have already conducted part of the first run of this experiment in preparation for other modelling research, e.g., CMIP, and may be able to use a "restart" file to initialize the first run, which should reduce the effort needed to perform the complete experiment.

Prerequisite simulation - Prescribed CO_2 run. Historical atmospheric CO_2 is prescribed until a concentration of 389ppm is reached (~year 2010; Fig. 5 top panel). Other historical forcing, i.e., from CMIP, should also be applied. An existing run or setup from CMIP5 or CMIP6 may also be used to reach a CO_2 concentration of 389ppm, e.g., the RCP 8.5 CMIP5 simulation or the CMIP6 *historical* experiment. During this run, compatible emissions should be frequently diagnosed (at least annually).

yr2010co2 simulation - Atmospheric CO_2 should be held constant at 389 ppm with other forcing, like land use and aerosol emissions, also held constant (Fig. 5 top panel). ESMs should continue the run at 389ppm for at least 105 years, while

David Keller 23.11.2017 17:00
Formatted: Subscript

David Keller 24.11.2017 12:11
Formatted: Subscript

David Keller 24.11.2017 12:12
Deleted: This will be used to investigate if, after positive and negative pulses, carbon cycle and climate feedback responses, which are expected to be opposite in sign, differ in magnitude and temporal scale. The results can also be compared to Joos et. al. (2013).

David Keller 22.11.2017 10:22
Deleted: **4.2.2 Model output frequency for experiment *C2_pi-pulse*** ... [3]

David Keller 5.12.2017 09:47
Deleted: 2

EMICs and box models are encouraged to continue the run for as long as needed for the subsequent simulations (e.g., 1000+ years). During this run, compatible emissions should be frequently diagnosed (at least annually). Note that when combined with the prerequisite simulation described above this is exactly the same as the PD100 run 1 in Joos et. al. (2013).

esm-hist-yr2010co2-control simulation - Diagnosed emissions control run. The model is initialized from the pre-industrial period (i.e., using a restart from either *piControl* or *esm-piControl*) with the emissions diagnosed in the *historical* and *yr2010co2* simulations, i.e., year 1850 to approximately year 2115 for ESMs and longer for EMICs and box models (up to 5000 years). All other forcing should be as in the *historical* and *yr2010co2* simulations. Atmospheric CO_2 must be allowed to freely evolve. The results should be quite close to those in the *historical* and *yr2010co2* simulations. If there are significant differences, e.g., due to climate-carbon cycle feedbacks that become evident when atmospheric CO_2 is allowed to freely evolve, then they must be diagnosed and used to adjust the CO_2 emission forcing. In some cases it may be necessary to perform an ensemble of simulations to diagnose compatible emissions. Note that this is exactly the same as the PD100 run 2 in Joos et. al. (2013). As in Joos et al. (2013), if computational time is an issue and if a group is sure that CO_2 remains at a nearly constant value with the emissions diagnosed in *yr2010co2*, the *esm-hist-yr2010co2-control* simulation may be skipped. This may only apply to ESMs and it is strongly recommended to perform the *esm-hist-yr2010co2-control* simulation to avoid model drift.

esm-yr2010co2-cdr-pulse simulation - CO_2 removal simulation. Setup is initially as in the *esm-hist-yr2010co2-control* simulation. However, a "negative" emissions pulse of 100 GtC is subtracted instantaneously (within 1 time step) from the atmosphere 5 years after the time at which CO_2 was held constant in the *esm-hist-yr2010co2-control* simulation (this should be at the beginning of the year 2015), with the run continuing thereafter for at least 100 years (up to 5000 years, if possible). If models have CO_2 spatially distributed throughout the atmosphere, we suggest removing this amount in a uniform manner. It is crucial

David Keller 22.11.2017 13:51
Deleted: . EMICs and box models are encouraged to extend the runs for at least 1000 years

David Keller 22.11.2017 13:51
Deleted: (and

that the negative pulse be subtracted from a constant background concentration of ~389 ppm. All forcing, including CO_2 emissions, must be exactly as in the *esm-hist-yr2010co2-control* simulation so that the only difference between these runs is that this one has had CO_2 instantaneously removed from the atmosphere.

esm-yr2010co2-noemit - A zero CO_2 emissions control run. Setup is initially as in the *esm-yr2010co2-cdr-pulse* simulation. However, at the time of the "negative" emissions pulse in the *esm-yr2010co2-cdr-pulse* simulation, emissions are set to zero with the run continuing thereafter for at least 100 years. If possible extend the runs for at least 1000 years (and up to 5000 years). All other forcing must be exactly as in the *esm-yr2010co2-control* simulation. This experiment will be used to isolate the Earth system response to the negative emissions pulse in the *esm-yr2010co2-cdr-pulse* simulation, which convolves the response to the negative emissions pulse with the lagged response to the preceding positive CO_2 emissions (diagnosed with the zero emissions simulation). The response to the negative emissions pulse will be calculated as the difference between *esm-yr2010co2-cdr-pulse* and *esm-yr2010co2-noemit* simulations.

David Keller 1.11.2017 16:34
Deleted: EMICs and box models are encouraged to

esm-yr2010co2-co2pulse simulation - CO_2 addition simulation. Setup is initially as in the *esm-yr2010co2-cdr-pulse* simulation. However, a "positive" emissions pulse of 100 GtC is added instantaneously (within 1 time step), with the run continuing thereafter for a minimum of 100 years. If models have CO_2 spatially distributed throughout the atmosphere, we suggest adding CO_2 in a uniform manner. If possible extend the runs for at least 1000 years (and up to 5000 years). It is crucial that the positive pulse be added to a constant background concentration of ~389 ppm. All forcing, including CO_2 emissions, must be exactly as in the *esm-hist-yr2010co2-control* simulation so that the only difference between these runs is that this one has had CO_2 instantaneously added to the atmosphere. Note that this would be exactly the same as PD100 run in Joos et. al. (2013). This will be used to investigate if, after positive and negative pulses, carbon cycle and climate feedback responses, which are expected to be opposite in sign, differ in magnitude and temporal scale. The results can also be compared to Joos et. al. (2013).

David Keller 1.11.2017 16:34
Deleted: EMICs and box models are encouraged to

David Keller 22.11.2017 10:25
Deleted:

4.2.5 Emission driven SSP5-3.4-OS experimental protocol (*C2_overshoot*)

This Tier 2 experiment explores CDR in an "overshoot" climate change scenario, the SSP5-3.4-OS scenario (Fig. 6, Table 5). To start, groups must perform the CMIP6 emission driven historical simulation, *esm-hist*. Then using this as a starting point, conduct an emissions-driven SSP5-3.4-OS scenario simulation, *esm-ssp534-over*, (starting on January 1, 2015) that includes the long-term extension to the year 2300, *esm-ssp534-over-ext*. All non-CO_2 forcing should be identical to that in the ScenarioMIP *ssp534-over* and *ssp534-over-ext* simulations. If computational resources are sufficient, we recommend that the *esm-ssp534-over-ext* simulation be continued for at least another 1000 years with year 2300 forcing. i.e., the forcing is held constant at year 2300 levels as the simulation continues for as long as possible; up to 5000 years, to better understand processes that are slow to equilibrate, e.g., ocean carbon and heat exchange or permafrost dynamics.

4.3 Afforestation/reforestation experiment (*C3*)

Enhancing the terrestrial carbon sink by restoring or extending forest cover, i.e., reforestation and afforestation, has often been suggested as a potential CDR option (National Research Council, 2015; The Royal Society, 2009). Enhancing this sink is appealing because terrestrial ecosystems have cumulatively absorbed over a quarter of all fossil fuel emissions (Le Quéré et al., 2016) and could potentially sequester much more. Most of the key questions concerning land use change are being addressed by LUMIP (Lawrence et al., 2016). These include investigations into the potential and side effects of afforestation/reforestation to mitigate climate change, for which they have designed four experiments (LUMIP Phase 2 experiments). However, three of these experiments are CO_2 concentration driven, and thus are unable to fully investigate the climate-carbon cycle feedbacks that are important for CDR-MIP. The LUMIP experiment where CO_2 emissions force the simulation, *esm-ssp585-ssp126Lu*, will allow for climate-carbon cycle feedbacks to be investigated.

David Keller 22.11.2017 10:25
Moved down [2]: 4.2.4 Model output frequency for experiment *C2_yr2010-pulse*

David Keller 22.11.2017 14:59
Deleted:

David Keller 22.11.2017 14:59
Formatted: Level 1

David Keller 22.11.2017 14:59
Deleted: *e* ... [4]

David Keller 22.11.2017 14:59
Deleted: 1

David Keller 22.11.2017 17:34
Deleted: *5*

David Keller 22.11.2017 16:25
Deleted:

David Keller 22.11.2017 16:25
Deleted: We also highly recommend that groups conduct the ScenarioMIP *ssp534-over* and *ssp534-over-ext* and C4MIP *ssp534-over-bgc* and *ssp534-over-bgcExt* simulations as these runs will be invaluable for qualitative comparisons.

David Keller 22.11.2017 10:26
Deleted:

David Keller 22.11.2017 10:26
Moved down [3]: 4.2.6 Model output frequency for experiment *C2_overshoot*

David Keller 22.11.2017 15:00
Deleted: *t* ... [5]

David Keller 22.11.2017 10:26
Deleted: ... [6]

David Keller 24.11.2017 13:35
Deleted: This follows because while terrestrial ecosystems may be an overall global net carbon sink, anthropogenic land use change, such as deforestation or agricultural use, affects the exchange of carbon with the atmosphere and can locally cause CO_2 to be emitted instead of sequestered (Arneth et al., 2017). Thus, if some of these disturbed lands, which cover one third of the total land area, can be reforested then there is the potential for them to sequester carbon instead of emitting it (Pongratz et al., 2011). Planting and managing new forests (i.e., afforestation) could also potentially increase the strength of the terrestrial carbon sink by allowing more carbon to be sequestered in regions that are currently minor sinks (e.g., deserts). However, afforestation/reforestation as a CDR method to mitigate climate change will have limits and side effects. This is because land use change also affects the climate by altering other climatically important biogeochemical cycles (e.g., the nitrogen cycle) and terrestrial biophysical properties and processes, e.g., hydrological cycli ... [7]

Unfortunately, since this experiment ends in the year 2100 it is too short to answer some of the key CDR-MIP questions (Section 1.2). We have therefore decided to extend this LUMIP experiment within the CDR-MIP framework as a Tier 2 experiment (Table 6) to better investigate the longer-term CDR potential and risks of afforestation/reforestation.

David Keller 24.11.2017 13:36
Deleted: However

David Keller 5.12.2017 09:47
Deleted: 1

The LUMIP experiment, *esm-ssp585-ssp126Lu,* simulates afforestation/reforestation by combining a high SSP CO_2 emission scenario, SSP5-8.5, with a future land use change scenario from an alternative SSP scenario, SSP1-2.6, which has much greater afforestation/reforestation (Kriegler et al., 2016; Lawrence et al., 2016). By comparing this combination to the SSP5-8.5 baseline scenario, it will be possible to determine the CDR potential of this particular afforestation/reforestation scenario in a high CO_2 world. This is similar to the approach of Sonntag et al. (2016) using RCP 8.5 emissions combined with prescribed RCP 4.5 land use.

4.3.1 *C3* Afforestation/reforestation experimental protocol

Prerequisite simulations - Conduct the C4MIP emission-driven *esm-ssp585* simulation, which is a control run, and the LUMIP Phase 2 experiment *esm-ssp585-ssp126Lu* (Lawrence et al., 2016). Generate restart files in the year 2100.

esm-ssp585-ssp126Lu-ext simulation - Using the year 2100 restart from the *esm-ssp585-ssp126Lu* experiment, continue the run with the same LUMIP protocol (i.e., an emission driven SSP5-8.5 simulation with SSP1-2.6 land use instead of SSP5-8.5 land use) until the year 2300 using the SSP5-8.5 and SSP1-2.6 long-term extension data (O'Neill et al., 2016). If computational resources are sufficient, we recommend that the simulation be continued for at least another 1000 years with year 2300 forcing (i.e., forcing is held at year 2300 levels as the simulation continues for as long as possible; up to 5000 years). This is to better understand processes that are slow to equilibrate, e.g., ocean carbon and heat exchange or permafrost dynamics, and the issue of permanence.

esm-ssp585ext simulation - The emission-driven esmSSP5-8.5 simulation must be extended beyond the year 2100 to serve as a control run for the *esm-ssp585-ssp126Lu-ext* simulation. This will require using the ScenarioMIP *ssp585-ext* forcing, but driving the model with CO_2 emissions instead of prescribing the CO_2 concentration. If computational resources are sufficient, the simulation should be extended even further than in the official SSP scenario, which ends in year 2300, by keeping forcing constant after this time (i.e., forcing is held at year 2300 levels as the simulation continues for as long as possible; up to 5000 years).

4.4. Ocean alkalinization experiment (*C4*)

Enhancing the natural process of weathering, which is one of the key negative climate-carbon cycle feedbacks that removes CO_2 from the atmosphere on long time scales (Colbourn et al., 2015; Walker et al., 1981), has been proposed as a potential CDR method (National Research Council, 2015; The Royal Society, 2009). Enhanced weathering ideas have been proposed for both the terrestrial environment (Hartmann et al., 2013) and the ocean (Köhler et al., 2010; Schuiling and Krijgsman, 2006). We focus on the alkalinization of the ocean given its capacity to take up vast quantities of carbon over relatively short time periods and its potential to reduce the rate and impacts of ocean acidification (Kroeker et al., 2013). The idea is to dissolve silicate or carbonate minerals in seawater to increase total alkalinity. Total alkalinity, which can chemically be defined as the excess of proton acceptors over proton donors with respect to a certain zero level of protons, is a measurable quantity that is related to the concentrations of species of the marine carbonate system (Wolf-Gladrow et al., 2007). It plays a key role determining the air-sea gas exchange of CO_2 (Egleston et al., 2010). When total alkalinity is artificially increased in surface waters, it basically allows more CO_2 to dissolve in the seawater and be stored as ions such as bicarbonate or carbonate, i.e., the general methodology increases the carbon storage capacity of seawater.

Theoretical work and idealized modelling studies have suggested that ocean alkalinization may be an effective CDR method that is more limited by

David Keller 22.11.2017 10:37
Deleted:

David Keller 22.11.2017 10:38
Moved down [4]: 4.3.2 Model output frequency for experiment *C3*

The model output frequency is listed in Table 8. If possible, 3-D model output should be written monthly until the year 2300. LUMIP participants may provide a link to the *esm-hist* and *esm-ssp585-ssp126Lu* data on the ESGF for the first portions of this run (until the year 2100). For groups that can perform longer simulations, e.g., thousands of years, at a minimum annual global mean values (non-gridded output) should be generated for every year beyond 2300. EMICs without a seasonal cycle are expected to generate annual global mean output for the duration of the experiment. The data formatting is described below in Section 5.

David Keller 24.11.2017 12:18
Deleted: *3*

David Keller 24.11.2017 12:18
Formatted: Level 1

David Keller 24.11.2017 12:18
Deleted: .

logistic constraints (e.g., mining, transport, and mineral processing) rather than natural ones, such as available ocean area, although chemical constraints and side effects do exist (González and Ilyina, 2016; Ilyina et al., 2013; Keller et al., 2014; Köhler et al., 2010, 2013). One general side effect of ocean alkalinization, is that it increases the buffering capacity and pH of the seawater. While such a side effect could be beneficial or even an intended effect to counter ocean acidification (Feng et al., 2016), high levels of alkalinity may also be detrimental to some organisms (Cripps et al., 2013). Ocean alkalinization likely also has method specific side effects. Many of these side effects are related to the composition of the alkalizing agent, e.g., olivine may contain nutrients or toxic heavy metals, which could affect marine organisms and ecosystems (Hauck et al., 2016; Köhler et al., 2013). Other side effects could be caused by the mining, processing, and transport of the alkalizing agent, which in some cases may offset the CO_2 sequestration potential of specific ocean alkalinization methods (e.g., through CO_2 release by fossil fuel use or during the calcination of $CaCO_3$) (Kheshgi, 1995; Renforth et al., 2013).

Although previous modelling studies have suggested that ocean alkalinization may be a viable CDR method, these studies are not comparable due to different experimental designs. Here we propose an idealized Tier 2 experiment (Table 7) that is designed to investigate the response of the climate system and carbon cycle to ocean alkalinization. The amount of any particular alkalizing agent that could be mined, processed, transported, and delivered to the ocean in a form that would easily dissolve and enhance alkalinity is poorly constrained (Köhler et al., 2013; Renforth et al., 2013). Therefore, the amount of alkalinity that is to be added in our experiment is set (based on exploratory simulations conducted with the CSIRO-Mk3L-COAL model) to have a cumulative effect on atmospheric CO_2 by the year 2100 that is comparable to the amount removed in the CDR-MIP instantaneous DAC simulations, i.e., an atmospheric reduction of ~100 Gt C; experiments *C2_pi-pulse* and *C2_yr2010-pulse*. The idea here is not to test the maximum potential of such a method, which would be difficult given the still relatively coarse resolution of many models and the way in which ocean carbonate chemistry is simulated, but rather to compare the response of models to a significant alkalinity perturbation. We have also

David Keller 5.12.2017 09:46
Deleted: 1

David Keller 6.12.2017 09:52
Deleted: . This

included an additional "termination" simulation that can be used to investigate an abrupt stop in ocean alkalinization deployment.

4.4.1 *C4* Ocean alkalinization experimental protocol

Prerequisite simulation - Conduct the C4MIP emission-driven *esm-ssp585* simulation as described by Jones et al., (2016b). This is the SSP5-8.5 high CO_2 emission scenario, and it serves as the control run and branching point for the ocean alkalinization experiment. A restart must be generated at the end of the year 2019.

esm-ssp585-ocean-alk simulation - Begin an 80 year run using the *esm-ssp585* year 2020 restart (starting on Jan. 1, 2020) and add 0.14 Pmol Total Alkalinity (TA) yr^{-1} to the upper grid boxes of each model's ocean component, i.e., branch from the C4MIP *esm-ssp585* simulation in 2020 until 2100. The alkalinity additions should be limited to mostly ice free, year-round ship accessible waters, which for simplicity should set to be between 70°N and 60°S (note that this ignores the presence of seasonal sea-ice in some small regions). For many models, this will in practice result in an artificial TA flux at the air-sea interface with realized units that might, for example, be something like µmol TA s^{-1} cm^{-2}. Adding 0. 14 Pmol TA yr^{-1} is equivalent to adding 5.19 Pg yr^{-1} of an alkalizing agent like $Ca(OH)_2$ or 4.92 Pg yr^{-1} of forsterite (Mg_2SiO_4), a form of olivine [assuming theoretical net instant dissolution reactions which for every mole of $Ca(OH)_2$ or Mg_2SiO_4 added sequesters 2 or 4 moles, respectively, of CO_2 (Ilyina et al., 2013; Köhler et al., 2013)]. As not all models include marine iron or silicate cycles, the addition of these nutrients, which could occur if some form of olivine were used as the alkalizing agent, is not considered here. All other forcing is as in the *esm-ssp585* control simulation. If the ocean alkalinization termination simulation (below) is to be conducted, generate a restart at the beginning of the year 2070.

Optional (Tier 3) *esm-ssp585-ocean-alk-stop* simulation - Use the year 2070 restart from the *esm-ssp585-ocean-alk* simulation and start a simulation

David Keller 6.12.2017 09:55
Deleted: (

David Keller 6.12.2017 09:55
Deleted:)

(beginning on Jan. 1, 2070) with the SPP5-8.5 forcing, but without adding any additional alkalinity. Continue this run until the year 2100, or beyond, if conducting the *esm-ssp585-ocean-alk-ext* simulation (below).

Optional (Tier 3) ocean alkalinization extension simulations:

esm-ssp585ext simulation - If groups desire to extend the ocean alkalinization experiment beyond the year 2100, an optional simulation may be conducted to extend the control run using forcing data from the ScenarioMIP *ssp585ext* simulation, i.e., conduct a longer emission-driven control run, *esm-ssp585ext.* This extension is also a control run for those conducting the CDR-MIP *C3* afforestation/reforestation simulation (Section 4.3). If computational resources are sufficient, the simulation should be extended even further than in the official SSP scenario, which ends in year 2300, by keeping the forcing constant after this time (i.e., forcing is held at year 2300 levels as the simulation continues for as long as possible; up to 5000 years).

esm-ssp585-ocean-alk-ext simulation - Continue the ocean alkalinization experiment described above (i.e., adding 0.14 Pmol Total Alkalinity (TA) yr^{-1} to the upper grid boxes of each model's ocean component) beyond the year 2100 (up to 5000 years) using forcing from the *esm-ssp585-ext* simulation.

5. Model output, data availability, and data use policy

5.1 Gridded model output

Models capable of generating gridded data must use a NetCDF format. The output (see Appendix A web link for the list of requested variables) follows the CMIP6 output requirements in frequency and structure. This allows groups to use CMOR software (Climate Model Rewriter Software, available at http://cmor.llnl.gov/) to generate the files that will be available for public download (Section 5). CMOR3 tables for CDR-MIP are available at www.kiel-earth-institute.de/files/media/downloads/CDRmon.json (table for monthly

David Keller 5.12.2017 09:41
Deleted: 2

David Keller 22.11.2017 10:38
Deleted:

David Keller 22.11.2017 10:39
Moved down [5]: 4.4.2 Model output frequency for experiment *C4*
The model output frequency is listed in Table 8. If possible, 3-D gridded model output should be written monthly for all simulations. Models without a seasonal cycle are expected to generate annual global mean output for the duration of the experiment.

David Keller 24.11.2017 12:18
Formatted: Level 1

David Keller 24.11.2017 12:18
Deleted:

David Keller 24.11.2017 12:18
Deleted: .

David Keller 22.11.2017 10:19
Deleted: **formatting**

output) and www.kiel-earth-institute.de/files/media/downloads/CDRga.json (table for global annual mean output). The resolution of the data should be as close to native resolution as possible, but on a regular grid. Please note as different models have different formulations, only applicable outputs need be provided. However, groups are encouraged to generate additional output, i.e., whatever their standard output variables are, and can also make this data available (preferably following the CMIP6 CMOR standardized naming structure).

5.2 Conversion factor Gt C to ppm

For experiments where carbon must be converted between GtC (or Pg) and ppm CO_2, please use a conversion factor of 2.12 GtC per ppm CO_2 to be consistent with Global Carbon Budget (Le Quere et al., 2015) conversion factors.

5.3 Box model output

For models that are incapable of producing gridded NetCDF data (i.e., box models), output is expected to be in an ASCII format (Appendix B). All ASCII files are expected to contain tabulated values (at a minimum global mean values), with at least two significant digits for each run. Models must be able to calculate key carbon cycle variables (Appendix C) to participate in CDR-MIP experiments C1 and C2. Please submit these files directly to the corresponding author who will make them available for registered users to download from the CDR-MIP website.

5.4 Model output frequency

The model output frequency is listed in Table 8. In all experiments box models and EMICs without seasonality are expected to generate annual mean output for the duration of the experiment, while models with seasonality are expected to generate higher spatial resolution data, i.e., monthly, for most simulations.

David Keller 22.11.2017 10:20
Moved (insertion) [1]

David Keller 22.11.2017 10:20
Deleted: 4.1.2

David Keller 22.11.2017 10:20
Deleted: for experiment *C1*

David Keller 22.11.2017 10:23
Deleted: B

David Keller 24.11.2017 12:23
Deleted: global

David Keller 24.11.2017 12:21
Deleted: (Table 8)

In experiment C1 for the control run, *piControl*, we request that 100 years of 3-D model output be written monthly (this should be the last 100 years if conducting a 500+ year run for CMIP6). For the *1pctCO2* and *1pctCO2-cdr* simulations 3-D model output should also be written monthly, i.e., as the atmospheric CO_2 concentration is changing. We suggest that groups that have already performed the *piControl* and *1pctCO2* simulations for CMIP5 or CMIP6 with an even higher output resolution (e.g., daily) continue to use this resolution for the *1pctCO2-cdr* simulation, as this will facilitate the analysis. For groups continuing the simulations for up to 5000 years after CO_2 has returned to 284.7 ppm, at a minimum, annual global mean values (non-gridded output) should be generated after the initial minimum 60 years of higher resolution output.

For experiment *C2_pi_pulse* if possible, 3-D model output should be written monthly for 10 years before the negative pulse and for 100 years following the pulse. For groups that can perform longer simulations, e.g., thousands of years, at a minimum, annual global mean values (non-gridded output) should be generated. Data for the control run, i.e., the equilibrium simulation *esm-piControl*, must also be available for analytical purposes. CMIP participants may provide a link to the *esm-Control* or *esm-piControl* data on the ESGF.

For experiment C2_yr2010-pulse the *historical* and *yr2010co2* simulations output is only needed to diagnose annual CO_2 emissions and will not be archived on the ESGF. Gridded 3-D monthly mean output for the *esm-hist-yr2010co2-control* (starting in the year 2010), *esm-yr2010co2-cdr-pulse, esm-yr2010co2-noemit,* and *esm-yr2010co2-co2pulse* simulations should be written for the initial 100 years of the simulation. Thereafter, for groups that can perform longer simulations (up to 5000 years), at a minimum annual global mean values (non-gridded output) should be generated. CMIP participants are requested to provide a link to the *historical* simulation data on the ESGF.

For experiment *C2_overshoot,* if possible, 3-D model output should be written monthly until the year 2300. We suggest that groups that have already performed the ScenarioMIP *ssp534-over* and *ssp534-over-ext* and C4MIP *ssp534-over-bgc* and *ssp534-over-bgcExt* CMIP6 simulations with an even higher output resolution (e.g., daily) continue to use this resolution as this will facilitate

David Keller 24.11.2017 12:21
Deleted: For the control run, *piControl*,

David Keller 24.11.2017 12:19
Deleted: The data formatting is described below in Section 5.

David Keller 24.11.2017 12:19
Deleted:

David Keller 22.11.2017 10:25
Moved (insertion) [2]

David Keller 22.11.2017 10:25
Deleted: 4.2.4 Model output frequency for experiment *C2_yr2010-pulse* ... [8]

David Keller 22.11.2017 10:25
Deleted: .

David Keller 24.11.2017 12:25
Deleted: Box models or EMICs without a seasonal cycle are expected to generate annual global mean output for the *esm-hist-yr2010co2-control* (starting in the year 2010), *esm-yr2010co2-cdr-pulse, esm-yr2010co2-noemit,* and *esm-yr2010co2-co2pulse* simulations.

David Keller 24.11.2017 12:19
Deleted: The data formatting is described below in Section 5.

David Keller 22.11.2017 10:26
Moved (insertion) [3]

David Keller 22.11.2017 10:27
Deleted: 4.2.6 Model output frequency for experiment *C2_overshoot*
4.3.2 Model output frequency for
4.3.2 Model output frequency for
for experiment C3 4.4.2 Model output frequency for
4.4.2 Model output frequency for ... [9]

David Keller 22.11.2017 10:27
Deleted: I

analyses. For groups that can perform longer simulations, e.g., thousands of years, at a minimum annual global mean values (non-gridded output) should be generated for every year beyond 2300. We recommend that CMIP participants provide a link to the *esm-hist* data on the ESGF. For analytical purposes, we also request that ScenarioMIP and C4MIP participants provide links to any completed *ssp534-over, ssp534-over-ext, ssp534-over-bgc* and *ssp534-over-bgcExt* simulation data on the ESGF.

For experiment C3 if possible, 3-D model output should be written monthly until the year 2300. LUMIP participants may provide a link to the *esm-hist* and *esm-ssp585-ssp126Lu* data on the ESGF for the first portions of this run (until the year 2100). For groups that can perform longer simulations, e.g., thousands of years, at a minimum annual global mean values (non-gridded output) should be generated for every year beyond 2300.

For experiment C4 if possible, 3-D gridded model output should be written monthly for all simulations. For groups that can perform longer simulations, e.g., thousands of years, at a minimum annual global mean values (non-gridded output) should be generated for every year beyond 2300

5.5 Data availability and use policy

The model output from the CDR-MIP experiments described in this paper will be publically available. All gridded model output will, to the extent possible, be distributed through the Earth System Grid Federation (ESGF). Box model output will be available via the CDR-MIP website (http://www.kiel-earth-institute.de/cdr-mip-data.html). The CDR-MIP policy for data use is that if you use output from a particular model, you should contact the modeling group and offer them the opportunity to contribute as authors. Modeling groups will possess detailed understanding of their models and the intricacies of performing the CDR-MIP experiments, so their perspectives will undoubtedly be useful. At minimum, if the offer of author contribution is not taken up, CDR-MIP and the model groups should be credited in acknowledgments with for example a statement like: "*We acknowledge the Carbon Dioxide Removal Model Intercomparison Project leaders and steering committee who are responsible for*

David Keller 24.11.2017 12:26
Deleted: Box models are expected to generate annual global mean output for the duration of the experiment.

David Keller 24.11.2017 12:20
Deleted: The data formatting is described below in Section 5.

David Keller 22.11.2017 10:38
Moved (insertion) [4]

David Keller 22.11.2017 10:38
Deleted: 4.3.2 Model output frequency for experiment *C3*
4.4.2 Model output frequency for
4.4.2 Model output frequency for ... [10]

David Keller 22.11.2017 10:38
Deleted: I

David Keller 24.11.2017 12:28
Deleted: EMICs without a seasonal cycle are expected to generate annual global mean output for the duration of the experiment. The data formatting is described below in Section 5.

David Keller 22.11.2017 10:39
Moved (insertion) [5]

David Keller 22.11.2017 10:39
Deleted: 4.4.2 Model output frequency for experiment *C4* ... [11]

David Keller 22.11.2017 10:39
Formatted: Font:Not Bold

David Keller 22.11.2017 10:39
Deleted: I

David Keller 24.11.2017 12:28
Deleted: Models without a seasonal cycle are expected to generate annual global mean output for the duration of the experiment.

David Keller 22.11.2017 10:20
Deleted: 4

CDR-MIP and we thank the climate modelling groups (listed in Table XX of this paper) for producing and making their model output available."

The natural and anthropogenic forcing data that are required for some simulations are described in several papers in the Geoscientific Model Development CMIP6 special issue. These data will be available on the ESGF. Links to all forcing data can also be found on the CMIP6 Panel website (https://www.wcrp-climate.org/wgcm-cmip/wgcm-cmip6). CMIP6 and CMIP5 data should be acknowledged in the standard way.

6. CDR-MIP outlook and conclusion

It is anticipated that this will be the first stage of an ongoing project exploring CDR. CDR-MIP welcomes input on the development of other (future) experiments and scenarios. Potential future experiments could include Biomass Energy with Carbon Capture and Storage (BECCS) or ocean fertilization. Future experiments could also include the removal of non-CO_2 greenhouse gases, e.g., methane, as these in many cases have a much higher global warming potential (de_Richter et al., 2017; Ming et al., 2016). We also envision that it will be necessary to investigate the simultaneous deployment of several CDR or other greenhouse gas removal methods since early studies suggest that there is likely not an individually capable method (Keller et al., 2014). It is also anticipated that scenarios will be developed that might combine Solar Radiation Management (SRM) and CDR in the future, such as a joint GeoMIP (Geoengineering Model Intercomparison Project) CDR-MIP experiment.

In addition to reductions in anthropogenic CO_2 emissions, it is very likely that CDR will be needed to achieve the climate change mitigation goals laid out in the Paris Agreement. The potential and risks of large scale CDR are poorly quantified, raising important questions about the extent to which large scale CDR can be depended upon to meet Paris Agreement goals. This project, CDR-MIP, is designed to help us better understand how the Earth system might respond to CDR. Over the past two years the CDR-MIP team has developed a set of numerical experiments to be performed with Earth system models of varying complexity.

The aim of these experiments is to provide coordinated simulations and analyses that addresses several key CDR uncertainties including:

- The degree to which CDR could help mitigate climate change or even reverse it.

- The potential effectiveness and risks/benefits of different CDR proposals with a focus on direct CO_2 air capture, afforestation/reforestation, and ocean alkalinization.

- To inform how CDR might be appropriately accounted for within an Earth system framework and during scenario development.

We anticipate that there will be numerous forthcoming studies that utilize CDR-MIP data. The model output from the CDR-MIP experiments will be publically available and we welcome and encourage interested parties to download this data and utilize it to further investigate CDR.

7. Code and/or data availability

As described in Section 5.4, the output from models participating in CDR-MIP will be made publically available. This will include data used in exemplary Figs. 2 and 4. All gridded model output will be distributed through the Earth System Grid Federation (ESGF). Box model output will be available via the CDR-MIP website (http://www.kiel-earth-institute.de/cdr-mip-data.html). The code from the models used to generate the exemplary figures in this document (Figs. 2 and 4, Appendix D) will be made available here via a web link when this manuscript is accepted for publication. To obtain code from modelling groups who are participating in CDR-MIP please contact the modelling group using the contact information that accompanies their data.

David Keller 6.12.2017 15:37
Deleted: ... [12]

Acknowledgements. D. P. Keller and N. Bauer acknowledge funding received from the German Research Foundation's Priority Program 1689 "Climate Engineering" (project CDR-MIA; KE 2149/2-1). K. Zickfeld acknowledges support from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) Discovery grant program. The Pacific Northwest National Laboratory is operated for the U.S. Department of Energy by Battelle Memorial Institute under contract DE-AC05-76RL01830. D. Ji acknowledges support from the National Basic Research Program of China under grant number 2015CB953600. CDJ was supported by the Joint UK BEIS/ Defra Met Office Hadley Centre Climate Programme (GA01101) and by the European Union' s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 641816 (CRESCENDO). H. Muri was supported by Norwegian Research Council grant 261862/E10.

Appendix A. Requested model output variables

A spreadsheet of the requested model output variables and their format can be found at: www.kiel-earth-institute.de/files/media/downloads/CDR-MIP_model_output_requirements.pdf. Please note as different models have different formulations, only applicable outputs need be provided. However, groups are encouraged to generate additional output, i.e., whatever their standard output variables are, and can also make this data available.

Appendix B. Box model output formatting

Box model ASCII formatting example:

File name format: RUNNAME_MODELNAME_Modelversion.dat
C1_MYBOXMODEL_V1.0_.dat
Headers and formats:
Example:

- Start each header comment line with a #

- *Line 1:* Indicate run name, e.g., "# *esm-pi-cdr-pulse* "
- *Line 2:* Provide contact address, e.g., "# B. Box, Uni of Box Models, CO2 Str., BoxCity 110110, BoxCountry"
- *Line 3:* Provide a contact email address, e.g., "# bbox@unibox.bx"
- *Line 4:* Indicate model name, version, e.g., "# MyBoxModel Version 2.2"
- *Line 5:* Concisely indicate main components, e.g., "# two ocean boxes (upper and lower), terrestrial biosphere, and one atmospheric box"
- *Line 6:* Indicate climate sensitivity of model, the abbreviation TCS may be used for transient climate sensitivity and ECS for equilibrium climate sensitivity, e.g., "# TCS=3.2 [deg C], ECS=8.1 [deg C]"
- *Line 7:* Description of non-CO_2 forcing applied, e.g., "# Forcing: solar"
- *Line 8:* Indicate the output frequency and averaging, e.g., "# Output: global mean values"
- *Line 9:* List tabulated output column headers with their units in brackets (see table below), e.g., "# year tas[K]"

Complete Header Example:

esm-pi-cdr-pulse
B. Box, Uni. of Box Models, CO2 Str., BoxCity 110110, BoxCountry
bbox@unibox.bx
MyBoxModel Version 2.2
two ocean boxes (upper and lower), terrestrial biosphere, and one atmospheric box
TCS=3.2 deg C, ECS=8.1 deg C
Forcing: solar
Output: global mean values
year tas[K] co2[Gt C] nep[Gt C yr-1] fgco2[Gt C yr-1]

Appendix C. Requested box model output variables

Table of requested box model output (at a minimum as global mean values). To participate in CDR-MIP at a minimum the variables *tas, xco2,* and *fgco2* must be provided.

Long name	Column Header Name*	Units	Comments
Relative year	year	year	
Near-surface Air Temperature	tas	K	
Atmospheric CO_2	xco2	ppm	
Surface Downward CO_2 flux into the ocean	fgco2	kg m^{-2}	This is the net air-to-ocean carbon flux (positive flux is into the ocean)
Total Atmospheric Mass of CO_2	co2mass	kg	
Net Carbon Mass Flux out of Atmosphere due to Net Ecosystem Productivity on Land.	nep	kg m^{-2}	This is the net air-to-land carbon flux (positive flux is into the land)
Total ocean carbon	cOcean	Gt C	If the ocean contains multiple boxes this output can also be provided, e.g., as cOcean_up and cOcean_low for upper and lower ocean boxes
Total land carbon	cLand	Gt C	This is the sum of all C pools
Ocean Potential Temperature	thetao	K	Please report a mean value if there are multiple ocean boxes
Upper ocean pH	pH	1	Negative log of hydrogen ion concentration with the concentration expressed as mol H kg^{-1}.
Carbon Mass Flux out of Atmosphere due to Net Primary Production on Land	npp	kg m^{-2}	This is calculated as gross primary production – autotrophic respiration (gpp-ra)
Carbon Mass Flux into Atmosphere due to Heterotrophic Respiration on Land	rh	kg m^{-2}	
Ocean Net Primary Production by Phytoplankton	intpp	kg m^{-2}	

*Column header names follow the CMIP CMOR notation when possible

Appendix D. Model descriptions

The two models used to develop and test CDR-MIP experimental protocols and provide example results (Figs. 2 and 4) are described below.

The University of Victoria Earth System Climate model (UVic), version 2.9 consists of three dynamically coupled components: a three-dimensional general circulation model of the ocean that includes a dynamic-thermodynamic sea ice model, a terrestrial model, and a simple one-layer atmospheric energy-moisture balance model (Eby et al., 2013). All components have a common horizontal resolution of 3.6° longitude x 1.8° latitude. The oceanic component, which is in the configuration described by Keller et al. (2012), has 19 levels in the vertical with thicknesses ranging from 50 m near the surface to 500 m in the deep ocean. The terrestrial model of vegetation and carbon cycles (Meissner et al., 2003) is based on the Hadley Center model TRIFFID (Top-down Representation of Interactive Foliage and Flora Including Dynamics). The atmospheric energy-moisture balance model interactively calculates heat and water fluxes to the ocean, land, and sea ice. Wind velocities, which are used to calculate the momentum transfer to the ocean and sea ice model, surface heat and water fluxes, and the advection of water vapor in the atmosphere, are determined by adding wind and wind stress anomalies. These are determined from surface pressure anomalies that are calculated from deviations in pre-industrial surface air temperature to prescribed NCAR/NCEP monthly climatological wind data (Weaver et al., 2001). The model has been extensively used in climate change studies and is also well validated under pre-industrial to present day conditions (Eby et al., 2009, 2013; Keller et al., 2012).

The CSIRO-Mk3L-COAL Earth system model consists of a climate model, Mk3L (Phipps et al., 2011), coupled to a biogeochemical model of carbon, nitrogen and phosphorus cycles on land (CASA-CNP) in the Australian community land surface model, CABLE (Mao et al., 2011; Wang et al., 2010), and an ocean biogeochemical cycle model (Duteil et al., 2012; Matear and Hirst, 2003). The atmospheric model has a horizontal resolution of 5.6° longitude by 3.2° latitude, and 18 vertical layers. The land carbon model has the same horizontal resolution as the atmosphere. The ocean model has a resolution of

2.8° longitude by 1.6° latitude, and 21 vertical levels. Mk3L simulates the historical climate well, as compared to the models used for earlier IPCC assessments (Phipps et al., 2011). Furthermore, the simulated response of the land carbon cycle to increasing atmospheric CO_2 and warming are consistent with those from the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 5 (CMIP5) (Zhang et al., 2014). The ocean biogeochemical model was also shown to realistically simulate the global ocean carbon cycle (Duteil et al., 2012; Matear and Lenton, 2014).

David Keller 1.11.2017 16:35
Deleted: longitude

References

Allen, M. R., Frame, D. J., Huntingford, C., Jones, C. D., Lowe, J. A., Meinshausen, M. and Meinshausen, N.: Warming caused by cumulative carbon emissions towards the trillionth tonne, Nature, 458(7242), 1163–1166, doi:10.1038/nature08019, 2009.

Armour, K. C., Eisenman, I., Blanchard-Wrigglesworth, E., McCusker, K. E. and Bitz, C. M.: The reversibility of sea ice loss in a state-of-the-art climate model, Geophys. Res. Lett., 38(16), 1–5, doi:10.1029/2011GL048739, 2011.

Arneth, A., Sitch, S., Pongratz, J., Stocker, B. D., Ciais, P., Poulter, B., Bayer, A., Bondeau, A., Calle, L., Chini, L., Gasser, T., Fader, M., Friedlingstein, P., Kato, E., Li, W., Lindeskog, M., Nabel, J. E. M. S., Pugh, T. A. M., Robertson, E., Viovy, N., Yue, C. and Zaehle, S.: Historical carbon dioxide emissions due to land use changes possibly larger than assumed, Nat. Geosci., (January), doi:10.1038/ngeo2882, 2017.

Arora, V. K. and Boer, G. J.: Terrestrial ecosystems response to future changes in climate and atmospheric CO_2 concentration, Biogeosciences, 11(15), 4157–4171, doi:10.5194/bg-11-4157-2014, 2014.

Bauer, N., Calvin, K., Emmerling, J., Fricko, O., Fujimori, S., Hilaire, J., Eom, J., Krey, V., Kriegler, E., Mouratiadou, I., Sytze de Boer, H., van den Berg, M., Carrara, S., Daioglou, V., Drouet, L., Edmonds, J. E., Gernaat, D., Havlik, P., Johnson, N., Klein, D., Kyle, P., Marangoni, G., Masui, T., Pietzcker, R. C., Strubegger, M., Wise, M., Riahi, K. and van Vuuren, D. P.: Shared Socio-Economic Pathways of the Energy Sector – Quantifying the Narratives, Glob. Environ. Chang., 42, 316–330, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.07.006, 2017.

Betts, R. A.: Offset of the potential carbon sink from boreal forestation by decreases in surface albedo, Nature, 409, 187–190, 2000.

Betts, R. A., Boucher, O., Collins, M., Cox, P. M., Falloon, P. D., Gedney, N., Hemming, D. L., Huntingford, C., Jones, C. D., Sexton, D. M. H. and Webb, M. J.: Projected increase in continental runoff due to plant responses to increasing carbon dioxide, Nature, 448(7157), 1037–1041, doi:http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v448/n7157/suppinfo/nature06045_S1.html, 2007.

Boucher, O., Halloran, P. R., Burke, E. J., Doutriaux-Boucher, M., Jones, C. D., Lowe, J., Ringer, M. a, Robertson, E. and Wu, P.: Reversibility in an Earth System model in response to CO 2 concentration changes, Environ. Res. Lett., 7(2), 24013, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/7/2/024013, 2012.

Boysen, L. R., Lucht, W., Gerten, D. and Heck, V.: Impacts devalue the potential of large-scale terrestrial CO $_2$ removal through biomass plantations, Environ. Res. Lett., 11(9), 95010, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/9/095010, 2016.

Boysen, L. R., Lucht, W., Gerten, D., Heck, V., Lenton, T. M. and Schellnhuber, H. J.: The limits to global-warming mitigation by terrestrial carbon removal, Earth's Futur., 1–12, doi:10.1002/2016EF000469, 2017.

Cao, L. and Caldeira, K.: Atmospheric carbon dioxide removal: long-term consequences and commitment, Environ. Res. Lett., 5(2), 24011, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/5/2/024011, 2010.

Chen, C. and Tavoni, M.: Direct air capture of CO2 and climate stabilization: A model based assessment, Clim. Change, 118(1), 59–72, doi:10.1007/s10584-013-0714-7, 2013.

Claussen, M., Brovkin, V. and Ganopolski, A.: Biogeophysical versus biogeochemical feedbacks of large-scale land cover change, Geophys. Res. Lett., 28(6), 1011–1014, doi:10.1029/2000GL012471, 2001.

Colbourn, G., Ridgwell, A. and Lenton, T. M.: The time scale of the silicate weathering negative feedback on atmospheric CO 2, , 1–14, doi:10.1002/2014GB005054.Received, 2015.

Cripps, G., Widdicombe, S., Spicer, J. I. and Findlay, H. S.: Biological impacts of enhanced alkalinity in Carcinus maenas, Mar. Pollut. Bull., 71(1–2), 190–198, doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2013.03.015, 2013.

de_Richter, R., Ming, T., Davies, P., Liu, W. and Caillol, S.: Removal of non-CO2 greenhouse gases by large-scale atmospheric solar photocatalysis, Prog. Energy Combust. Sci., 60, 68–96, doi:10.1016/j.pecs.2017.01.001, 2017.

Dlugokencky, E. (NOAA/ESRL) and Tans, P. (NOAA/ESRL): NOAA/ESRL, 2016.

Duteil, O., Koeve, W., Oschlies, a., Aumont, O., Bianchi, D., Bopp, L., Galbraith, E., Matear, R., Moore, J. K., Sarmiento, J. L. and Segschneider, J.: Preformed and regenerated phosphate in ocean general circulation models: can right total concentrations be wrong?, Biogeosciences, 9(5), 1797–1807, doi:10.5194/bg-9-

1797-2012, 2012.

Eby, M., Zickfeld, K., Montenegro, a., Archer, D., Meissner, K. J. and Weaver, a. J.: Lifetime of Anthropogenic Climate Change: Millennial Time Scales of Potential CO 2 and Surface Temperature Perturbations, J. Clim., 22(10), 2501–2511, doi:10.1175/2008JCLI2554.1, 2009.

Eby, M., Weaver, a. J., Alexander, K., Zickfeld, K., Abe-Ouchi, A., Cimatoribus, a. a., Crespin, E., Drijfhout, S. S., Edwards, N. R., Eliseev, a. V., Feulner, G., Fichefet, T., Forest, C. E., Goosse, H., Holden, P. B., Joos, F., Kawamiya, M., Kicklighter, D., Kienert, H., Matsumoto, K., Mokhov, I. I., Monier, E., Olsen, S. M., Pedersen, J. O. P., Perrette, M., Philippon-Berthier, G., Ridgwell, A., Schlosser, A., Schneider von Deimling, T., Shaffer, G., Smith, R. S., Spahni, R., Sokolov, a. P., Steinacher, M., Tachiiri, K., Tokos, K., Yoshimori, M., Zeng, N. and Zhao, F.: Historical and idealized climate model experiments: an intercomparison of Earth system models of intermediate complexity, Clim. Past, 9(3), 1111–1140, doi:10.5194/cp-9-1111-2013, 2013.

Egleston, E. S., Sabine, C. L. and Morel, F. M. M.: Revelle revisited: Buffer factors that quantify the response of ocean chemistry to changes in DIC and alkalinity, Global Biogeochem. Cycles, 24(1), n/a-n/a, doi:10.1029/2008GB003407, 2010.

Eyring, V., Bony, S., Meehl, G. A., Senior, C. A., Stevens, B., Stouffer, R. J. and Taylor, K. E.: Overview of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 6 (CMIP6) experimental design and organization, Geosci. Model Dev., 9(5), 1937–1958, doi:10.5194/gmd-9-1937-2016, 2016.

Feng, E. Y., Keller, D. P., Koeve, W. and Oschlies, A.: Could artificial ocean alkalinization protect tropical coral ecosystems from ocean acidification?, Environ. Res. Lett., 11(7), 74008, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/7/074008, 2016.

Friedlingstein, P. and Prentice, I. C.: Carbon-climate feedbacks: a review of model and observation based estimates, Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain., 2, 251–257, 2010.

Frölicher, T. L., Winton, M. and Sarmiento, J. L.: Continued global warming after CO2 emissions stoppage, Nat. Clim. Chang., 4(1), 40–44, doi:10.1038/nclimate2060, 2013.

Fuss, S., Canadell, J. G., Peters, G. P., Tavoni, M., Andrew, R. M., Ciais, P., Jackson, R. B., Jones, C. D., Kraxner, F., Nakicenovic, N., Quéré, C. Le, Raupach, M. R., Sharifi, A., Smith, P. and Yamagata, Y.: Betting on negative emissions, Nat. Publ. Gr., 4(10), 850–853, doi:10.1038/nclimate2392, 2014.

Gasser, T., Guivarch, C., Tachiiri, K., Jones, C. D. and Ciais, P.: Negative emissions physically needed to keep global warming below 2 °C, Nat. Commun., 6, 7958, doi:10.1038/ncomms8958, 2015.

González, M. F. and Ilyina, T.: Impacts of artificial ocean alkalinization on the carbon cycle and climate in Earth system simulations, Geophys. Res. Lett., 43(12), 6493–6502, doi:10.1002/2016GL068576, 2016.

Gregory, J. M.: A new method for diagnosing radiative forcing and climate sensitivity, Geophys. Res. Lett., 31(October 2003), 2–5, doi:10.1029/2003GL018747, 2004.

Griffies, S. M., Danabasoglu, G., Durack, P. J., Adcroft, A. J., Balaji, V., B??ning, C. W., Chassignet, E. P., Curchitser, E., Deshayes, J., Drange, H., Fox-Kemper, B., Gleckler, P. J., Gregory, J. M., Haak, H., Hallberg, R. W., Heimbach, P., Hewitt, H. T., Holland, D. M., Ilyina, T., Jungclaus, J. H., Komuro, Y., Krasting, J. P., Large, W. G., Marsland, S. J., Masina, S., McDougall, T. J., George Nurser, A. J., Orr, J. C., Pirani, A., Qiao, F., Stouffer, R. J., Taylor, K. E., Treguier, A. M., Tsujino, H., Uotila, P., Valdivieso, M., Wang, Q., Winton, M. and Yeager, S. G.: OMIP contribution to CMIP6: Experimental and diagnostic protocol for the physical component of the Ocean Model Intercomparison Project, Geosci. Model Dev., 9(9), 3231–3296, doi:10.5194/gmd-9-3231-2016, 2016.

Gruber, N.: Warming up, turning sour, losing breath: ocean biogeochemistry under global change., Philos. Trans. A. Math. Phys. Eng. Sci., 369(1943), 1980–96, doi:10.1098/rsta.2011.0003, 2011.

Gupta, A. Sen, Jourdain, N. C., Brown, J. N. and Monselesan, D.: Climate Drift in the CMIP5 Models*, J. Clim., 26(21), 8597–8615, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00521.1, 2013.

Hansen, J.: Efficacy of climate forcings, J. Geophys. Res., 110(D18), D18104, doi:10.1029/2005JD005776, 2005.

Hartmann, J., West, J., Renforth, P., Köhler, P., De La Rocha, C. L., Wolf-Gladrow, D., Dürr, H. and Scheffran, J.: Enhanced Chemical Weathering as a Geoengineering Strategy to Reduce Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide, a Nutrient Source and to Mitigate Ocean Acidification, Rev. Geophys., in press, 2013.

Hauck, J., Köhler, P., Wolf-Gladrow, D. and Völker, C.: Iron fertilisation and century-scale effects of open ocean dissolution of olivine in a simulated CO 2 removal experiment, Environ. Res. Lett., 11(2), 24007, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/2/024007, 2016.

Heck, V., Gerten, D., Lucht, W. and Boysen, L. R.: Is extensive terrestrial carbon dioxide removal a "green" form of geoengineering? A global modelling study, Glob. Planet. Change, 137, 123–130, doi:10.1016/j.gloplacha.2015.12.008, 2016.

Hofmann, M. and Schellnhuber, H. J.: Ocean acidification: a millennial challenge, Energy Environ. Sci., 3, 1883–1896, 2010.

Holmes, G. and Keith, D. W.: An air-liquid contactor for large-scale capture of CO2 from air, Philos. Trans. R. Soc. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci., 370(1974), 4380–4403, doi:10.1098/rsta.2012.0137, 2012.

Ilyina, T., Wolf-Gladrow, D., Munhoven, G. and Heinze, C.: Assessing the potential of calcium-based artificial ocean alkalinization to mitigate rising atmospheric CO 2 and ocean acidification, Geophys. Res. Lett., 40(22), 5909–5914, doi:10.1002/2013GL057981, 2013.

IPCC: Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change., 2013.

IPCC: Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Field, C.B., V.R. Barros, D.J. Dokken, K.J., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA., 2014a.

IPCC: Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change, Cambridge University Press., 2014b.

Jones, C. D., Ciais, P., Davis, S. J., Friedlingstein, P., Gasser, T., Peters, G. P., Rogelj, J., van Vuuren, D. P., Canadell, J. G., Cowie, A., Jackson, R. B., Jonas, M., Kriegler, E., Littleton, E., Lowe, J. A., Milne, J., Shrestha, G., Smith, P., Torvanger, A. and Wiltshire, A.: Simulating the Earth system response to negative emissions, Environ. Res. Lett., 11(9), 95012, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/9/095012, 2016a.

Jones, C. D., Arora, V., Friedlingstein, P., Bopp, L., Brovkin, V., Dunne, J., Graven, H., Hoffman, F., Ilyina, T., John, J. G., Jung, M., Kawamiya, M., Koven, C., Pongratz, J., Raddatz, T., Randerson, J. and Zaehle, S.: The C4MIP experimental protocol for

CMIP6, Geosci. Model Dev., (1), 1–52, doi:10.5194/gmd-2016-36, 2016b.

Joos, F., Roth, R., Fuglestvedt, J. S., Peters, G. P., Enting, I. G., von Bloh, W., Brovkin, V., Burke, E. J., Eby, M., Edwards, N. R., Friedrich, T., Frölicher, T. L., Halloran, P. R., Holden, P. B., Jones, C., Kleinen, T., Mackenzie, F. T., Matsumoto, K., Meinshausen, M., Plattner, G.-K., Reisinger, A., Segschneider, J., Shaffer, G., Steinacher, M., Strassmann, K., Tanaka, K., Timmermann, A. and Weaver, A. J.: Carbon dioxide and climate impulse response functions for the computation of greenhouse gas metrics: a multi-model analysis, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 13(5), 2793–2825, doi:10.5194/acp-13-2793-2013, 2013.

Keller, D. P., Oschlies, A. and Eby, M.: A new marine ecosystem model for the University of Victoria Earth System Climate Model, Geosci. Model Dev., 5(5), 1195–1220, doi:10.5194/gmd-5-1195-2012, 2012.

Keller, D. P., Feng, E. Y. and Oschlies, A.: Potential climate engineering effectiveness and side effects during a high carbon dioxide-emission scenario, Nat. Commun., 5, 1–11, doi:10.1038/ncomms4304, 2014.

Kheshgi, H. S.: Sequestering atmospheric carbon dioxide by increasing ocean alkalinity, Energy, 20(9), 915–922, doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0360-5442(95)00035-F, 1995.

Köhler, P., Hartmann, J. and Wolf-Gladrow, D. a: Geoengineering potential of artificially enhanced silicate weathering of olivine., Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A., 107(47), 20228–20233, doi:10.1073/pnas.1000545107, 2010.

Köhler, P., Abrams, J. F., Völker, C., Hauck, J. and Wolf-Gladrow, D. A.: Geoengineering impact of open ocean dissolution of olivine on atmospheric CO2 , surface ocean pH and marine biology, Environ. Res. Lett., 8(1), 14009 [online] Available from: http://stacks.iop.org/1748-9326/8/i=1/a=014009, 2013.

Kriegler, E., Tavoni, M., ABOUMAHBOUB, T., LUDERER, G., CALVIN, K., DEMAERE, G., KREY, V., RIAHI, K., R?SLER, H., SCHAEFFER, M. and VAN VUUREN, D. P.: WHAT DOES THE 2?C TARGET IMPLY FOR A GLOBAL CLIMATE AGREEMENT IN 2020? THE LIMITS STUDY ON DURBAN PLATFORM SCENARIOS, Clim. Chang. Econ., 4(4), 1340008, doi:10.1142/S2010007813400083, 2013.

Kriegler, E., Bauer, N., Popp, A., Humpenöder, F., Leimbach, M., Strefler, J., Baumstark, L., Bodirsky, B. L., Hilaire, J., Klein, D., Mouratiadou, I., Weindl, I., Bertram, C., Dietrich, J.-P., Luderer, G., Pehl, M., Pietzcker, R., Piontek, F., Lotze-

Campen, H., Biewald, A., Bonsch, M., Giannousakis, A., Kreidenweis, U., Müller, C., Rolinski, S., Schultes, A., Schwanitz, J., Stevanovic, M., Calvin, K., Emmerling, J., Fujimori, S. and Edenhofer, O.: Fossil-fueled development (SSP5): An energy and resource intensive scenario for the 21st century, Glob. Environ. Chang., doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.05.015, 2016.

Kroeker, K. J., Kordas, R. L., Crim, R., Hendriks, I. E., Ramajo, L., Singh, G. S., Duarte, C. M. and Gattuso, J.-P.: Impacts of ocean acidification on marine organisms: quantifying sensitivities and interaction with warming, Glob. Chang. Biol., 19(6), 1884–1896, doi:10.1111/gcb.12179, 2013.

Lackner, K. S., Brennan, S., Matter, J. M., Park, a.-H. a., Wright, a. and van der Zwaan, B.: The urgency of the development of CO2 capture from ambient air, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci., 109(33), 13156–13162, doi:10.1073/pnas.1108765109, 2012.

Lawrence, D. M., Hurtt, G. C., Arneth, A., Brovkin, V., Calvin, K. V., Jones, A. D., Jones, C. D., Lawrence, P. J., de Noblet-Ducoudré, N., Pongratz, J., Seneviratne, S. I. and Shevliakova, E.: The Land Use Model Intercomparison Project (LUMIP): Rationale and experimental design, Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., 0, 1–42, doi:10.5194/gmd-2016-76, 2016.

MacDougall, A. H.: Reversing climate warming by artificial atmospheric carbon-dioxide removal: Can a Holocene-like climate be restored?, Geophys. Res. Lett., 40(20), 5480–5485, doi:10.1002/2013GL057467, 2013.

Mao, J., Phipps, S. J., Pitman, A. J., Wang, Y. P., Abramowitz, G. and Pak, B.: The CSIRO Mk3L climate system model v1.0 coupled to the CABLE land surface scheme v1.4b: evaluation of the control climatology, Geosci. Model Dev., 4(4), 1115–1131, doi:10.5194/gmd-4-1115-2011, 2011.

Matear, R. J. and Hirst, A. C.: Long-term changes in dissolved oxygen concentrations in the ocean caused by protracted global warming, Global Biogeochem. Cycles, 17(4), n/a-n/a, doi:10.1029/2002GB001997, 2003.

Matear, R. J. and Lenton, a.: Quantifying the impact of ocean acidification on our future climate, Biogeosciences, 11(14), 3965–3983, doi:10.5194/bg-11-3965-2014, 2014.

Mathesius, S., Hofmann, M., Caldeira, K. and Schellnhuber, H. J.: Long-term response of oceans to CO2 removal from the atmosphere, Nat. Clim. Chang., (August), doi:10.1038/nclimate2729, 2015.

Matter, J. M., Stute, M., Snaebjornsdottir, S. O., Oelkers, E. H., Gislason, S. R., Aradottir, E. S., Sigfusson, B., Gunnarsson, I., Sigurdardottir, H., Gunnlaugsson, E., Axelsson, G., Alfredsson, H. A., Wolff-Boenisch, D., Mesfin, K., Taya, D. F. d. l. R., Hall, J., Dideriksen, K. and Broecker, W. S.: Rapid carbon mineralization for permanent disposal of anthropogenic carbon dioxide emissions, Science (80-.)., 352(6291), 1312–1314, doi:10.1126/science.aad8132, 2016.

Matthews, H. D., Gillett, N. P., Stott, P. a and Zickfeld, K.: The proportionality of global warming to cumulative carbon emissions., Nature, 459(7248), 829–32, doi:10.1038/nature08047, 2009.

Meehl, G. a., Moss, R., Taylor, K. E., Eyring, V., Stouffer, R. J., Bony, S. and Stevens, B.: Climate Model Intercomparisons: Preparing for the Next Phase, Eos, Trans. Am. Geophys. Union, 95(9), 77–78, doi:10.1002/2014EO090001, 2014.

Meinshausen, M., Raper, S. C. B. and Wigley, T. M. L.: Emulating coupled atmosphere-ocean and carbon cycle models with a simpler model, MAGICC6 - Part 1: Model description and calibration, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 11(4), 1417–1456, doi:10.5194/acp-11-1417-2011, 2011.

Meissner, K. J., Weaver, A. J., Matthews, H. D. and Cox, P. M.: The role of land surface dynamics in glacial inception: A study with the UVic Earth System Model, Clim. Dyn., 21, 515–537, 2003.

Millennium Ecosystem Assesment: Ecosystems and Human Well-Being: Synthesis, Island Press, Washington, D.C., 2005.

Ming, T., de_Richter, R., Shen, S. and Caillol, S.: Fighting global warming by greenhouse gas removal: destroying atmospheric nitrous oxide thanks to synergies between two breakthrough technologies, Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res., doi:10.1007/s11356-016-6103-9, 2016.

Morice, C. P., Kennedy, J. J., Rayner, N. a. and Jones, P. D.: Quantifying uncertainties in global and regional temperature change using an ensemble of observational estimates: The HadCRUT4 data set, J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., 117(8), 1–22, doi:10.1029/2011JD017187, 2012.

National Research Council: Climate Intervention, National Academies Press, Washington, D.C., 2015.

O'Neill, B. C., Tebaldi, C., Van Vuuren, D. P., Eyring, V., Friedlingstein, P., Hurtt, G., Knutti, R., Kriegler, E., Lamarque, J. F., Lowe, J., Meehl, G. A., Moss, R., Riahi, K. and Sanderson, B. M.: The Scenario Model Intercomparison Project (ScenarioMIP) for CMIP6, Geosci. Model Dev., 9(9), 3461–3482, doi:10.5194/gmd-9-3461-2016, 2016.

Orr, J. C., Najjar, R. G., Aumount, O., Bopp, L., Bullister, J. L., Danabasoglu, G., Doney, S. C., Dunne, J. P., Dutay, J.-C., Graven, H., Griffies, S. M., John, J. G., Joos, F., Levin, I., Lindsay, K., Matear, R. J., McKinley, G. A., Mouchet, A., Oschlies, A., Romanou, A., Schlitzer, R., Tagliabue, A., Tanhua, T. and Yool, A.: Biogeochemical protocols and diagnostics for the CMIP6 Ocean Model Intercomparison Project (OMIP), Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., 0(July), 1–45, doi:10.5194/gmd-2016-155, 2016.

Oschlies, A. and Klepper, G.: Research for assessment, not deployment, of Climate Engineering: The German Research Foundation’s Priority Program SPP 1689, Earth’s Futur., 5(1), 128–134, doi:10.1002/2016EF000446, 2017.

Peters, G. P., Andrew, R. M., Boden, T., Canadell, J. G., Ciais, P., Le Quéré, C., Marland, G., Raupach, M. R. and Wilson, C.: The challenge to keep global warming below 2 °C, Nat. Clim. Chang., 3(1), 4–6, doi:10.1038/nclimate1783, 2013.

Phipps, S. J., Rotstayn, L. D., Gordon, H. B., Roberts, J. L., Hirst, a. C. and Budd, W. F.: The CSIRO Mk3L climate system model version 1.0 – Part 1: Description and evaluation, Geosci. Model Dev., 4(2), 483–509, doi:10.5194/gmd-4-483-2011, 2011.

Pongratz, J., Reick, C. H., Raddatz, T., Caldeira, K. and Claussen, M.: Past land use decisions have increased mitigation potential of reforestation, Geophys. Res. Lett., 38(15), 1–5, doi:10.1029/2011GL047848, 2011.

Le Quéré, C., Moriarty, R., Andrew, R. M., Canadell, J. G., Sitch, S., Korsbakken, J. I., Friedlingstein, P., Peters, G. P., Andres, R. J., Boden, T. A., Houghton, R. A., House, J. I., Keeling, R. F., Tans, P., Arneth, A., Bakker, D. C. E., Barbero, L., Bopp, L., Chang, J., Chevallier, F., Chini, L. P., Ciais, P., Fader, M., Feely, R. A., Gkritzalis, T., Harris, I., Hauck, J., Ilyina, T., Jain, A. K., Kato, E., Kitidis, V., Klein Goldewijk, K., Koven, C., Landschützer, P., Lauvset, S. K., Lefèvre, N., Lenton, A., Lima, I. D., Metzl, N., Millero, F., Munro, D. R., Murata, A., Nabel, J. E. M. S., Nakaoka, S., Nojiri, Y., O’Brien, K., Olsen, A., Ono, T., Pérez, F. F., Pfeil, B., Pierrot, D., Poulter, B., Rehder, G., Rödenbeck, C., Saito, S., Schuster, U., Schwinger, J., Séférian, R., Steinhoff, T., Stocker, B. D., Sutton, A. J., Takahashi, T., Tilbrook, B., van der Laan-Luijkx, I. T., van der Werf, G. R., van Heuven, S., Vandemark, D., Viovy, N., Wiltshire, A., Zaehle, S. and Zeng, N.: Global Carbon Budget 2015, Earth Syst. Sci. Data, 7(2), 349–396, doi:10.5194/essd-7-349-2015, 2015.

Le Quéré, C., Andrew, R. M., Canadell, J. G., Sitch, S., Korsbakken, J. I., Peters, G. P., Manning, A. C., Boden, T. A., Tans, P. P., Houghton, R. A., Keeling, R. F., Alin, S., Andrews, O. D., Anthoni, P., Barbero, L., Bopp, L., Chevallier, F., Chini, L. P., Ciais, P., Currie, K., Delire, C., Doney, S. C., Friedlingstein, P., Gkritzalis, T., Harris, I., Hauck, J., Haverd, V., Hoppema, M., Klein Goldewijk, K., Jain, A. K., Kato, E., Körtzinger, A., Landschützer, P., Lefèvre, N., Lenton, A., Lienert, S., Lombardozzi, D., Melton, J. R., Metzl, N., Millero, F., Monteiro, P. M. S., Munro, D. R., Nabel, J. E. M. S., Nakaoka, S., O&apos;Brien, K., Olsen, A., Omar, A. M., Ono, T., Pierrot, D., Poulter, B., Rödenbeck, C., Salisbury, J., Schuster, U., Schwinger, J., Séférian, R., Skjelvan, I., Stocker, B. D., Sutton, A. J., Takahashi, T., Tian, H., Tilbrook, B., van der Laan-Luijkx, I. T., van der Werf, G. R., Viovy, N., Walker, A. P., Wiltshire, A. J. and Zaehle, S.: Global Carbon Budget 2016, Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., 1–3, doi:10.5194/essd-2016-51, 2016.

Renforth, P., Jenkins, B. G. and Kruger, T.: Engineering challenges of ocean liming, Energy, 60, 442–452, doi:10.1016/j.energy.2013.08.006, 2013.

Riahi, K., van Vuuren, D. P., Kriegler, E., Edmonds, J., O'Neill, B. C., Fujimori, S., Bauer, N., Calvin, K., Dellink, R., Fricko, O., Lutz, W., Popp, A., Cuaresma, J. C., KC, S., Leimbach, M., Jiang, L., Kram, T., Rao, S., Emmerling, J., Ebi, K., Hasegawa, T., Havlik, P., Humpenöder, F., Da Silva, L. A., Smith, S., Stehfest, E., Bosetti, V., Eom, J., Gernaat, D., Masui, T., Rogelj, J., Strefler, J., Drouet, L., Krey, V., Luderer, G., Harmsen, M., Takahashi, K., Baumstark, L., Doelman, J. C., Kainuma, M., Klimont, Z., Marangoni, G., Lotze-Campen, H., Obersteiner, M., Tabeau, A. and Tavoni, M.: The Shared Socioeconomic Pathways and their energy, land use, and greenhouse gas emissions implications: An overview, Glob. Environ. Chang., 42, 153–168, doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.05.009, 2017.

Rickels, W., Klepper, G., Dovern, J., Betz, G., Brachatzek, N., Cacean, S., Güssow, K., Heintzenberg, J., Hiller, S., Hoose, C., Leisner, T., Oschlies, A., Platt, U., Proelß, A., Renn, O., Schäfer, S. and Zürn, M.: Large-Scale Intentional Interventions into the Climate System? Assessing the Climate Engineering Debate., 2011.

Ridgwell, A., Maslin, M. A. and Watson, A. J.: Reduced effectiveness of terrestrial carbon sequestration due to an antagonistic response of ocean productivity, Geophys. Res. Lett., 29(6), doi:10.1029/2001GL014304, 2002.

Rogelj, J., Luderer, G., Pietzcker, R. C., Kriegler, E., Schaeffer, M., Krey, V. and Riahi, K.: Energy system transformations for limiting end-of-century warming to below 1.5 °C, Nat. Clim. Chang., 5(6), 519–527, doi:10.1038/nclimate2572, 2015a.

Rogelj, J., Schaeffer, M., Meinshausen, M., Knutti, R., Alcamo, J., Riahi, K. and Hare, W.: Zero emission targets as long-term global goals for climate protection, Environ. Res. Lett., 10(10), 105007, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/10/10/105007, 2015b.

Sanz-Pérez, E. S., Murdock, C. R., Didas, S. A. and Jones, C. W.: Direct Capture of CO_2 from Ambient Air, Chem. Rev., acs.chemrev.6b00173, doi:10.1021/acs.chemrev.6b00173, 2016.

Schäfer, S., Lawrence, M., Stelzer, H., Born, W., Low, S., Aaheim, A., Adriázola, P., Betz, G., Boucher, O., Carius, A., Devine-Right, P., Gullberg, A. T., Haszeldine, S., Haywood, J., Houghton, K., Ibarrola, R., Irvine, P., Kristjansson, J.-E., Lenton, T., Link, J. S. A., Maas, A., Meyer, L., Muri, H., Oschlies, A., Proelß, A., Rayner, T., Rickels, W., Ruthner, L., Scheffran, J., Schmidt, H., Schulz, M., Scott, V., Shackley, S., Tänzler, D., Watson, M. and Vaughan, N.: The European Transdisciplinary Assessment of Climate Engineering (EuTRACE): Removing Greenhouse Gases from the Atmosphere and Reflecting Sunlight away from Earth., 2015.

Schuiling, R. D. and Krijgsman, P.: Enhanced weathering: An effective and cheap tool to sequester CO 2, Clim. Change, 74(1–3), 349–354, doi:10.1007/s10584-005-3485-y, 2006.

Scott, V., Gilfillan, S., Markusson, N., Chalmers, H. and Haszeldine, R. S.: Last chance for carbon capture and storage, Nat. Clim. Chang., 3(2), 105–111, doi:Doi 10.1038/Nclimate1695, 2013.

Scott, V., Haszeldine, R. S., Tett, S. F. B. and Oschlies, A.: Fossil fuels in a trillion tonne world, Nat. Clim. Chang., 5(5), 419–423, doi:10.1038/nclimate2578, 2015.

Séférian, R., Gehlen, M., Bopp, L., Resplandy, L., Orr, J. C., Marti, O., Dunne, J. P., Christian, J. R., Doney, S. C., Ilyina, T., Lindsay, K., Halloran, P., Heinze, C., Segschneider, J. and Tjiputra, J.: Inconsistent strategies to spin up models in CMIP5: implications for ocean biogeochemical model performance assessment, Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., 8(10), 8751–8808, doi:10.5194/gmdd-8-8751-2015, 2015.

Smith, P.: Soil carbon sequestration and biochar as negative emission technologies, Glob. Chang. Biol., n/a-n/a, doi:10.1111/gcb.13178, 2016.

Smith, P., Davis, S. J., Creutzig, F., Fuss, S., Minx, J., Gabrielle, B., Kato, E., Jackson, R. B., Cowie, A., Kriegler, E., van Vuuren, D. P., Rogelj, J., Ciais, P., Milne, J., Canadell, J. G., McCollum, D., Peters, G., Andrew, R., Krey, V., Shrestha, G., Friedlingstein, P., Gasser, T., Grübler, A., Heidug, W. K., Jonas, M., Jones, C. D., Kraxner, F., Littleton, E., Lowe, J., Moreira, J. R., Nakicenovic, N., Obersteiner, M., Patwardhan, A., Rogner, M., Rubin, E., Sharifi, A., Torvanger, A., Yamagata, Y., Edmonds, J. and Yongsung, C.: Biophysical and economic limits to negative CO2 emissions, Nat. Clim. Chang., 6(1), 42–50, doi:10.1038/nclimate2870, 2015.

Sonntag, S., Pongratz, J., Reick, C. H. and Schmidt, H.: Reforestation in a high-CO 2 world-Higher mitigation potential than expected, lower adaptation potential than hoped for, Geophys. Res. Lett., (May), 1–8, doi:10.1002/2016GL068824, 2016.

Taylor, K. E., Stouffer, R. J. and Meehl, G. a.: An Overview of CMIP5 and the Experiment Design, Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc., 93(4), 485–498, doi:10.1175/BAMS-D-11-00094.1, 2012.

The Royal Society: Geoengineering the climate., 2009.

Tokarska, K. B. and Zickfeld, K.: The effectiveness of net negative carbon dioxide emissions in reversing anthropogenic climate change, Environ. Res. Lett., 10(9), 94013, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/10/9/094013, 2015.

UNFCCC: Paris Agreement of the 21st session of the Conference of Parties on climate change., 2016.

Unger, N.: Human land-use-driven reduction of forest volatiles cools global climate, Nat. Clim. Chang., 4(October), 907–910, doi:10.1038/nclimate2347, 2014.

Vaughan, N. E. and Gough, C.: Expert assessment concludes negative emissions scenarios may not deliver, Environ. Res. Lett., 11(9), 95003, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/9/095003, 2016.

Vaughan, N. E. and Lenton, T. M.: A review of climate geoengineering proposals, Clim. Change, 109, 745–790, doi:10.1007/s10584-011-0027-7, 2011.

Vichi, M., Navarra, A. and Fogli, P. G.: Adjustment of the natural ocean carbon cycle to negative emission rates, Clim. Change, 1–14, doi:10.1007/s10584-012-0677-0, 2013.

Walker, J. C. G., Hays, P. B. and Kasting, J. F.: A negative feedback mechanism for the long-term stabilization of Earth's surface temperature, J. Geophys. Res., 86(C10), 9776, doi:10.1029/JC086iC10p09776, 1981.

Wang, X., Heald, C. L., Ridley, D. a., Schwarz, J. P., Spackman, J. R., Perring, a. E., Coe, H., Liu, D. and Clarke, a. D.: Exploiting simultaneous observational constraints on mass and absorption to estimate the global direct radiative forcing of black carbon and brown carbon, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 14(20), 10989–11010, doi:10.5194/acp-14-10989-2014, 2014.

Wang, Y. P., Law, R. M. and Pak, B.: A global model of carbon, nitrogen and phosphorus cycles for the terrestrial biosphere, Biogeosciences, 7(7), 2261–2282, doi:10.5194/bg-7-2261-2010, 2010.

Weaver, A. J., Eby, M., Wiebe, E. C., Bitz, C. M., Duffy, P. B., Ewen, T. L., Fanning, A. F., Holland, M. M., MacFadyen, A., Matthews, H. D., Meissner, K. J., Saenko, O., Schmittner, A., Wang, H. and Yoshimori, M.: The UVic earth system climate model: Model description, climatology, and applications to past, present and future climates, Atmosphere-Ocean, 39(4), 361–428, doi:10.1080/07055900.2001.9649686, 2001.

Wolf-Gladrow, D. a., Zeebe, R. E., Klaas, C., Körtzinger, A. and Dickson, A. G.: Total alkalinity: The explicit conservative expression and its application to biogeochemical processes, Mar. Chem., 106(1–2), 287–300, doi:10.1016/j.marchem.2007.01.006, 2007.

Wu, P., Ridley, J., Pardaens, A., Levine, R. and Lowe, J.: The reversibility of CO2 induced climate change, Clim. Dyn., doi:10.1007/s00382-014-2302-6, 2014.

Zhang, Q., Wang, Y. P., Matear, R. J., Pitman, A. J. and Dai, Y. J.: Nitrogen and phosphorous limitations significantly reduce future allowable CO 2 emissions, Geophys. Res. Lett., 41(2), 632–637, doi:10.1002/2013GL058352, 2014.

Zickfeld, K., Eby, M., Weaver, A. J., Alexander, K., Crespin, E., Edwards, N. R., Eliseev, A. V., Feulner, G., Fichefet, T., Forest, C. E., Friedlingstein, P., Goosse, H., Holden, P. B., Joos, F., Kawamiya, M., Kicklighter, D., Kienert, H., Matsumoto, K., Mokhov, I. I., Monier, E., Olsen, S. M., Pedersen, J. O. P., Perrette, M., Philippon-

Berthier, G. G., Ridgwell, A., Schlosser, A., Schneider Von Deimling, T., Shaffer, G., Sokolov, A., Spahni, R., Steinacher, M., Tachiiri, K., Tokos, K. S., Yoshimori, M., Zeng, N. and Zhao, F.: Long-Term Climate Change Commitment and Reversibility: An EMIC Intercomparison, J. Clim., 26(16), 5782–5809, doi:10.1175/jcli-d-12-00584.1, 2013.

Zickfeld, K., MacDougall, A. H. and Matthews, H. D.: On the proportionality between global temperature change and cumulative CO_2 emissions during periods of net negative CO_2 emissions, Environ. Res. Lett., 11(5), 55006, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/5/055006, 2016.

CDR-MIP GMDD manuscript tables

Table 1. Overview of CDR-MIP experiments. In the "Forcing methods" column, "All" means "all anthropogenic, solar, and volcanic forcing". Anthropogenic forcing includes aerosol emissions, non-CO_2 greenhouse gas emissions, and land use changes.

Short Name	Long Name	Tier	Experiment Description	Forcing methods	Major purpose
C1	Climate and carbon cycle reversibility experiment	1	CO_2 prescribed to increase at 1% yr^{-}1 to 4x pre-industrial CO_2 and then decrease at 1% yr^{-1} until again at a pre-industrial level, after which the simulation continues for as long as possible	CO_2 concentration prescribed	Evaluate climate reversibility
C2_pi-pulse	Instantaneous CO_2 removal / addition from an unperturbed climate experiment	1	100 Gt C is instantly removed (negative pulse) from a steady-state pre-industrial atmosphere; 100 Gt C is instantly added (positive pulse) to a steady-state pre-industrial atmosphere	CO_2 concentration calculated (i.e., freely evolving)	Evaluate climate and C-cycle response of an unperturbed system to atmospheric CO_2 removal; comparison with the positive pulse response
C2_yr2010-pulse	Instantaneous CO_2 removal / addition from a perturbed climate experiment	3	100 Gt C is instantly removed (negative pulse) from a near present-day atmosphere; 100 Gt C is instantly added (positive pulse) to a near present-day atmosphere	All; CO_2 concentration calculated (i.e., emission driven)*	Evaluate climate and C-cycle response of a perturbed system to atmospheric CO_2 removal; comparison with the positive pulse response
C2_overshoot	Emission driven SSP5-3.4-OS scenario experiment	2	SSP5-3.4-overshoot scenario where CO_2 emissions are initially high and then rapidly reduced, becoming negative	All; CO_2 concentration calculated (i.e., emission driven)	Evaluate the Earth system response to CDR in an overshoot climate change scenario
C3	Afforestation/ reforestation experiment	2	Long-term extension of an experiment with forcing from a high CO_2 emission scenario (SSP5-8.5), but with land use prescribed from a scenario with high levels of afforestation and reforestation (SSP1-2.6)	All; CO_2 concentration calculated (i.e., emission driven)	Evaluate the long-term Earth system response to afforestation/ reforestation during a high CO_2 emission climate change scenario
C4	Ocean alkalinization experiment	2	A high CO_2 emission scenario (SSP5-8.5) with 0.14 Pmol yr^{-1} alkalinity added to ice-free ocean surface waters from the year 2020 onward	All; CO_2 concentration calculated (i.e., emission driven)	Evaluate the Earth system response to ocean alkalinization during a high CO_2 emission climate change scenario

*In this experiment CO_2 is first prescribed to diagnose emissions, however, the key simulations calculate the CO_2 concentration.

Table 2. Climate and carbon cycle reversibility experiment (*C1*) simulations. All simulations are required to complete the experiment.

Simulation ID	**Simulation description**	**Owning MIP**	**Run length (years)**	**Initialized using a restart from**
piControl	Pre-industrial prescribed CO_2 control simulation	CMIP6 DECK	100*	The model spin-up
1pctCO2	Prescribed 1% yr^{-1} CO_2 increase to 4× the pre-industrial level	CMIP6 DECK	140**	*piControl*
1pctCO2-cdr	1% yr^{-1} CO_2 decrease from 4× the pre-industrial level until the pre-industrial CO_2 level is reached and held for as long as possible	CDR-MIP	200 min. 5000 max.	*1pctCO2*

*This CMIP6 DECK should have been run for at least 500 years. Only the last 100 years are needed as a control for C1.

**This CMIP6 DECK experiment is 150 years long. A restart for C1 should be generated after 139 years when CO_2 is 4 times that of *piControl*.

Table 3. Instantaneous CO_2 removal from an unperturbed climate experiment (*C2_pi-pulse*) simulations.

Simulation ID	**Simulation description**	**Owning MIP**	**Run length (years)**	**Initialized using a restart from**
esm-piControl	Pre-industrial freely evolving CO_2 control simulation	CMIP6 DECK	100*	The model spin up
esm-pi-cdr-pulse	100 Gt C is instantly removed (negative pulse) from a pre-industrial atmosphere	CDR-MIP	100 min. 5000 max.	*esm-piControl*
esm-pi-co2pulse	100 Gt C is instantly added to (positive pulse) a pre-industrial atmosphere	CDR-MIP	100 min. 5000 max.	*esm-piControl*

*This CMIP6 DECK should have been run for at least 500 years. Only the last 100 years are needed as a control for C2.1.

Table 4. Instantaneous CO_2 removal from a perturbed climate experiment (*C2_yr2010-pulse*) simulations.

Simulation ID	**Simulation description**	**Owning MIP**	**Run length (years)**	**Initialized using a restart from**
historical	Historical atmospheric CO_2 (and other forcing) is prescribed until a concentration of 389ppm CO_2 is reached	CMIP6 DECK	160*	*piControl*
yr2010co2	Branching from *historical,* atmospheric CO_2 is held constant (prescribed) at 389ppm; other forcing is also held constant at the 2010 level	CDR-MIP	105 min. 5000 max.	*historical*
esm-hist-yr2010co2-control	Control run forced using CO_2 emissions diagnosed from *historical* and *yr2010co2* simulations; other forcing as in *historical* until 2010 after which it is constant	CDR-MIP	265 min. 5160 max.	*esm-piControl* or *piControl*
esm-yr2010co2-noemit	Control run that branches from *esm-hist-yr2010co2-control* in year 2010 with CO_2 emissions set to zero 5 years after the start of the simulation	CDR-MIP	105 min. 5000 max.	*esm-hist-yr2010co2-control*
esm-yr2010co2-cdr-pulse	Branches from *esm-hist-yr2010co2-control* in year 2010 with 100 Gt C instantly removed (negative pulse) from the atmosphere 5 years after the start of the simulation	CDR-MIP	105 min. 5000 max.	*esm-hist-yr2010co2-control*
esm-yr2010co2-co2pulse	Branches from *esm-hist-yr2010co2-control* in year 2010 with 100 Gt C instantly added to (positive pulse) the atmosphere 5 years after the start of the simulation	CDR-MIP	105 min. 5000 max.	*esm-hist-yr2010co2-control*

*This CMIP6 DECK continues until the year 2015 but only the first 160 years are need for C2_yr2010-pulse.

Table 5. Emission driven SSP5-3.5-OS scenario experiment (*C2_overshoot*) simulations. All simulations are required to complete the experiment.

Simulation ID	**Simulation description**	**Owning MIP**	**Run length (years)**	**Initialized using a restart from**
esm-hist	Historical simulation forced with CO_2 emissions	CMIP6 DECK	265	*esm-piControl* or *piControl*
esm-ssp534-over	CO_2 emission-driven SSP5-3.4 overshoot scenario simulation	CDR-MIP	85	*esm-hist*
esm-ssp534-over-ext	Long-term extension of the CO_2 emission-driven SSP5-3.4 overshoot scenario	CDR-MIP	200 min. 5000 max.	*esm-ssp534-over*

Table 6. Afforestation/ reforestation experiment (*C3*) simulations. All simulations are required to complete the experiment.

Simulation ID	**Simulation description**	**Owning MIP**	**Run length (years)**	**Initialized using a restart from**
esm-ssp585	CO_2 emission driven SSP5-8.5 scenario	C4MIP	85	*esm-hist*
esm-ssp585-ssp126Lu	CO_2 emission driven SSP5-8.5 scenario with SSP1-2.6 land use forcing	LUMIP	85	*esm-hist*
esm-ssp585-ssp126Lu-ext	CO_2 emission-driven SSP5-3.4 overshoot scenario simulation	CDR-MIP	200 min. 5000 max.	*esm-ssp585-ssp126Lu*
esm-ssp585ext	Long-term extension of the CO_2 emission-driven SSP5-8.5 scenario	CDR-MIP	200 min. 5000 max.	*esm-ssp585*

Table 7. Ocean alkalinization (*C4*) experiment simulations. "Pr" in the Tier column indicates a prerequisite experiment.

Simulation ID	**Tier**	**Simulation description**	**Owning MIP**	**Run length (years)**	**Initialized using a restart from**
esm-ssp585	Pr	CO_2 emission driven SSP5-8.5 scenario	C4MIP	85	*esm-hist*
esm-ssp585-ocean-alk	2	SSP5-8.5 scenario with 0.14 Pmol yr^{-1} alkalinity added to ice-free ocean surface waters from the year 2020 onward	CDR-MIP	65	*esm-ssp585*
esm-ssp585-ocean-alk-stop	3	Termination simulation to investigate an abrupt stop in ocean alkalinization in the year 2070	CDR-MIP	30*	*esm-ssp585-ocean-alk*
esm-ssp585ext	3	Long-term extension of the CO_2 emission-driven SSP5-8.5 scenario	CDR-MIP	200 min. 5000 max.	*esm-ssp585*
esm-ssp585-ocean-alk-ext	3	Long-term extension of the *esm-ssp585-ocean-alk* simulation	CDR-MIP	200 min. 5000 max.	*esm-ssp585-ocean-alk*

*If the *esm-ssp585ext* simulation is being conducted this may be extended for more than 200 more years (up to 5000 years).

Table 8. Model output frequency for 3-D models with seasonality. Box models and EMICs without seasonality are expected to generate annual global mean output for the duration of all experiments. For longer simulations (right column) if possible 3-D monthly data should be written out for one year every 100 years. For models with interannual variability, e.g., ESMs, monthly data should be written out for a 10-year period every 100 years so that a climatology may be developed. The years referred to in the table indicate simulations years, e.g. years from the start of the run, not that of any particular scenario.

Experiment Short Name	**Individual simulation output frequency**	
	Monthly gridded 3-D output	**Annual global mean output + climatological output at 100 year intervals**
C1	*piControl* (last 100 years) *1pctCO2* *1pctCO2-cdr* (initial 200 years)	*1pctCO2-cdr* (from year 200 onward)
C2_pi-pulse	*esm-piControl* *esm-pi-cdr-pulse* (initial 100 years) *esm-pi-co2pulse* (initial 100 years)	*esm-pi-cdr-pulse* (from year 100 onward) *esm-pi-co2pulse* (from year 100 onward)
C2_yr2010-pulse	*esm-hist-yr2010co2-control* (initial 105 years) *esm-yr2010co2-noemit* *esm-yr2010co2-cdr-pulse* *esm-yr2010co2-co2pulse*	*esm-hist-yr2010co2-control* *esm-yr2010co2-noemit* *esm-yr2010co2-cdr-pulse* *esm-yr2010co2-co2pulse*
C2_overshoot	*esm-hist* *esm-ssp534-over* *esm-ssp534-over-ext* (initial 200 years)	*esm-ssp534-over-ext* (from year 200 onward)**
C3	*esm-ssp585ext* (initial 200 years) *esm-ssp585-ssp126Lu* *esm-ssp585-ssp126Lu-ext* (initial 200 years)	*esm-ssp585ext* (from year 200 onward)** *esm-ssp585-ssp126Lu-ext* (from year 200 onward)**
C4	*esm-ssp585* *esm-ssp585-ocean-alk* *esm-ssp585-ocean-alk-stop* (initial 200 years) *esm-ssp585ext* (initial 200 years) *esm-ssp585-ocean-alk-ext* (initial 200 years)	*esm-ssp585-ocean-alk-stop* (from year 200 onward)** *esm-ssp585ext* (from year 200 onward)** *esm-ssp585-ocean-alk-ext* (from year 200 onward)**

*In the *historical* and *yr2010co2* simulations output is needed only to diagnose (at least annually) CO_2 emissions.

**This is from scenario year 2300 onward.