

Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:

Dooley, K;Harrould-Kolieb, E;Talberg, A

Title:

Carbon-dioxide Removal and Biodiversity: A Threat Identification Framework

Date:

2020-09-03

Citation:

Dooley, K., Harrould-Kolieb, E. & Talberg, A. (2020). Carbon-dioxide Removal and Biodiversity: A Threat Identification Framework. Global Policy, 12 (S1), <https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.12828>.

Persistent Link:

<https://hdl.handle.net/11343/251796>

Carbon-dioxide removal and biodiversity: A threat identification framework

Kate Dooley^{1,2*}; Ellycia Harrould-Kolieb^{1,2}; Anita Talberg¹;

¹ Australian-German Climate & Energy College, University of Melbourne

² School of Geography, University of Melbourne

*Corresponding author

This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the [Version of Record](#). Please cite this article as [doi: 10.1111/1758-5899.12828](https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.12828)

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

DR. KATE DOOLEY (Orcid ID : 0000-0001-5636-6691)

Article type : Special Issue Article

Corresponding Author Email ID: kate.dooley@climate-energy-college.org

Carbon-dioxide removal and biodiversity: A threat identification framework

30 character title: CDR and threats to biodiversity

Abstract

Carbon-dioxide removal (CDR) technologies offer the potential to contribute to the restoration and protection of natural ecosystems, the achievement of development goals and the safeguarding of human wellbeing. However, these technologies can also present risks to biodiversity, particularly those techniques that depend on large-scale manipulation of ecosystems and earth-system processes. Debates around the development of these technologies have historically focused on the dichotomy between the need to expand the knowledge base on all options related to emerging technologies, and the concern that research represents a slippery slope to deployment. This paper introduces a new approach to governing CDR research – one based on threat identification. We present a framework for assessing the impacts (positive or negative) on biodiversity and ecosystems from a spectrum of CDR interventions, so as to prioritize research to those CDR options that present minimal threats to biodiversity. Application of the framework indicates that while many CDR interventions present threats to biodiversity, certain options, such as regenerative CDR, may have positive impacts.

Policy implications

- A threat identification perspective that identifies impacts of proposed CDR options on the direct drivers to biodiversity loss suggests some types of CDR should be viewed as potentially harmful mitigation interventions, adding to the imperative for rapid and deep decarbonization to minimize future CDR reliance.

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

- Strong and effective CDR governance frameworks will be critical in cases where biodiversity impacts are dependent on the CDR implementation method.
- Ultimately, pursuing synergistic activities, such as CDR options that regenerate and restore nature, presents the lowest potential threat to biodiversity.
- The potential impacts of CDR activities on biodiversity need to be at the forefront of decision-making around whether to engage in research and the eventual deployment of these techniques.

1. Biodiversity and climate change

In May 2019, the Intergovernmental Panel on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) global assessment report concluded that “nature and its vital contributions to people, which together embody biodiversity and ecosystem functions and services, are deteriorating worldwide” (Díaz et al., 2019, p. 3). The acceleration of biodiversity loss is increasingly recognized as a crisis, posing risks to humanity and ecosystems on the same scale as climate change (Díaz et al., 2019). The two are inextricably linked; degraded ecosystems release more carbon thereby increasing the mitigative burden of climate change (Lade et al., 2019). In turn, ecosystems require functional resilience to sequester carbon over the long-term, and to resist, recover or adapt to changing conditions and disturbances that are becoming more rapid and severe under climate change (Seddon et al., 2019). Yet projected scenarios for limiting warming to well below 2°C and 1.5°C rely on large-scale carbon-dioxide removal (CDR) (IPCC, 2018) without serious consideration of any potential threats posed to biodiversity (Díaz et al., 2019).

Assessments of CDR options tend to focus on costs and potential, with limited attention given to constraints and impacts (see, for example: Fuss et al., 2018; McLaren, 2012). The IPCC notes that few studies have specifically addressed the impacts of proposed land-based CDR on ecosystems and land degradation (IPCC, 2019). Even fewer analyses include impacts on marine ecosystems. Analysis of the deployment dynamics of large-scale CDR in a risk-management framework remains a research gap (Fuss et al., 2018). Research identifying CDR options that minimize negative impacts on biodiversity could help to prioritize further research and implementation of those options following no-regret principles. In this paper we provide a policy relevant assessment tool to identify the impacts of proposed CDR options on the direct drivers to biodiversity loss. This paper does not provide a broad assessment of a range of CDR limitations and potentials, but rather a specific assessment of the impact of CDR on biodiversity (and, by extension, on ecosystem function).

2. Assessing the impact of CDR on biodiversity

The Convention on Biodiversity (CBD) defines biodiversity as “variability among living organisms from all sources including, inter alia, terrestrial, marine and other aquatic ecosystems and the ecological complexes of which they are part; this includes diversity within species, between species and of ecosystems” (CBD, 1992, Art.2). Biodiversity underpins ecosystem functioning and the provision of all goods and services that are essential to human health and wellbeing (Hooper et al., 2005; Raffaelli, 2006), and is necessary to sustain key ecosystem functions, structure and processes (Morton and Hill, 2014). Biodiversity plays a key role at all levels of the ecosystem services hierarchy; as a regulator underpinning ecosystem processes, as a final ecosystem service and as a good that is subject to valuation (Mace et al., 2012). Biodiversity is measured across multiple levels and dimensions, through indicators such as species richness (number of species) and species abundance (number of individuals in each species) that show the direction in which the key components of biodiversity are heading. The majority of indicators of ecosystems and biodiversity show rapid decline (Díaz et al., 2019). However, as purely quantitative metrics, these indicators are often poor tools for understanding the decline in biodiversity.

CDR can be categorized on the basis of different characteristics, such as geographical (land / marine / technology) or process-based (chemical / mechanical / biophysical) and can be classified into ever-smaller subcategories (Fuss et al., 2018; IPCC, 2013; McLaren, 2012; Smith et al., 2019). For our analysis we categorize CDR techniques into four distinct processes: those employing either land-use change; regenerative; marine; or chemical based processes. The distinction is not perfect as there are overlaps between categories, but it allows a clear overview of the various CDR options.

The literature contains conflicting research findings on the environmental and social impacts of CDR. Smith et al. (2019), who presented a comprehensive assessment of the impacts of land-based CDR options on the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and Nature's Contribution to People (NCP), suggested that all land-based CDR options have the potential to contribute positively to NCPs and SDGs. In contrast, the IPBES suggests that all proposed CDR methods included in the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) will have negative impacts on biodiversity (with mixed impacts on ecosystem services) (Díaz et al., 2019). We therefore start from the premise that whether CDR contributes to biodiversity loss or enhances biodiversity conservation and protection depends on the specific CDR process, and that consideration of the impacts of each CDR technique on biodiversity must be central to CDR governance and decision-making.

We focus on an upstream measure for biodiversity loss rather than specific ecosystem goods and services and the subjective values of these. We use the drivers of biodiversity loss as measures for assessing the pressures on biodiversity. Drivers of biodiversity loss include direct drivers (land/sea

use change, exploitation of ecosystems, pollution, etc) and indirect drivers such as demographic, economic and technological trends (Merino et al., 2019). We focus here on the contribution of CDR options to the direct drivers as a method for prioritizing low-threat interventions and identifying high-threat interventions that should be reconsidered. This method has not been explored in the sustainability literature, and presents a promising option for more detailed analysis.

3. Method

IPBES classifies the aggregated impacts of human actions on nature into five categories of direct drivers (in order of greatest impact): land-use / sea-use change; resource extraction; pollution; invasive and alien species; and climate change (Merino et al., 2019). These direct drivers result from an array of underlying causes - the indirect drivers of change - which are in turn “underpinned by societal values and behaviors that include production and consumption patterns, human population dynamics and trends, trade, technological innovations and local through global governance” (Díaz et al., 2019, p. 5). Figure 1 summarizes these five categories by providing an example of impact, the extent or severity, influence on other drivers, and factors that promote the driver. All five direct drivers show steady increases over the past five decades globally (Merino et al., 2019).

[FIGURE 1]

To improve the understanding of CDR impacts, we categorize CDR options broadly to include both land and marine options, and with enough specificity to distinguish ecosystem-based from industrial interventions (Figure 2). This categorization leaves out some CDR approaches such as ocean downwelling, and different end uses for biomass (including CCU) due to a lack of literature surveys that include these approaches, making assessment of their impacts difficult. In addition, our analysis is focused only on CO₂ removal techniques, although there is scope to expand our approach to methane capture methods.

[FIGURE 2]

We then constructed an evaluation framework based on the five direct drivers to biodiversity loss. We assessed each CDR option (Figure 2) for its potential impact on each of the five drivers (Figure 1), and ranked these impacts as positive, negative, dependent on implementation (positive-negative), or no impact. This valuation is presented in Figure 3, while the literature-based assessment used to

identify the potential threat different types of CDR options pose to biodiversity is summarized in Section 4.

4. Contributions of CDR options to the drivers of biodiversity loss

In this section, we report on the findings of the threat identification framework, which evaluates the potential impacts of each CDR method against the five drivers of biodiversity loss.

4.1 Land-use change

Land-use change, which has had the most impact on terrestrial ecosystems, is primarily driven by agricultural expansion (Merino et al., 2019). Land-use change is also inextricably linked with other direct drivers: agriculture and forestry are key introducers of invasive species, lead to increased nutrient and water resource extraction, which in turn leads to surface run-off and pollution.

Afforestation and reforestation

Afforestation and reforestation differ significantly in their contributions to biodiversity loss, yet CDR reviews often treat these interchangeably (see, for example: Fuss et al., 2018; Smith et al., 2019). Reforestation of natural forests on previously degraded lands can restore and rehabilitate lands with potential co-benefits (Lamb, 2005). Yet afforestation – planting trees in areas that do not naturally support forests – by definition introduces alien species, a direct drivers of biodiversity loss. Modern agriculture and forestry have introduced invasive and alien species to many areas, intentionally and unintentionally (IPCC, 2019). The impacts of reforestation vary with the method of implementation, and if based on introduced species, engender the same threat to biodiversity as afforestation (Lamb, 2005; Smith and Torn, 2013).

Trees require more water and soil nutrients than grassy biomes (Smith et al., 2019). Afforestation of grassland results in substantial resource input and loss of soil carbon from land conversion. Fertilizers can decrease soil nutrient availability, and increase run-off from forest plantations (Smith et al., 2019; Smith and Torn, 2013). Large-scale afforestation can deplete local water resources and disrupt hydrological cycles (Deng et al., 2017; IPCC, 2019; Lamb, 2005; Smith et al., 2019; Smith and Torn, 2013). Reforestation with introduced species will have the same requirement for nutrient and water input as afforestation. The majority of forest expansion occurs through natural succession, which minimizes the need for nutrient and water input to support forest growth (Chazdon et al., 2016). Reforestation of mixed native species, whether assisted or through natural succession, could increase biodiversity and restore waterways, reducing run-off and erosion (Chazdon et al., 2016; Lamb, 2005).

Bioenergy with carbon capture (and storage) (BECCS)

Increasing biomass supply to the extent projected in deep decarbonization scenarios is likely to involve substantial land-use change. This section discusses the CO₂ capture aspects only; storage is addressed in section 4.4.

The IPCC notes that bioenergy can have negative or positive effects depending on the scale of deployment, feedstock and prior land use, and finds impacts to ecosystem services at 500 - 400 Mha of bioenergy crop extent (IPCC, 2019). Modeled 2°C and 1.5°C mitigation pathways rely on BECCS with median bioenergy crop area at or above this extent (Popp et al., 2017; Rogelj et al., 2018). Limiting deployment to marginal land is often recommended to avoid competition with arable land (Robertson et al., 2017). However, the lower yield output of marginal lands can result in more extensive land area requirement for bioenergy crops, potentially resulting in detrimental impacts on biodiversity through the extent of land conversion (Fuss et al., 2018; IPCC, 2019). Smith and Torn (2013) identify grasslands as particularly vulnerable to conversion for bioenergy crops. Impacts on biodiversity are also influenced by the crop itself, with cellulosic bioenergy crops showing potential to reduce or eliminate negative biodiversity impacts when trade-offs are carefully managed (Robertson et al., 2017).

Resource extraction for bioenergy crops, even at smaller scales, creates demand for fertilizer and water (Boysen et al., 2017; Heck et al., 2018; IPCC, 2019). Smith and Torn (2013) found that sequestering 3.6 Gt of CO₂ via BECCS would require 16–75% of current global nitrogen fertilizer production, in excess of planetary boundaries for nitrogen flows (Boysen et al., 2017). Harvesting bioenergy biomass also depletes soil nutrients, particularly potassium (Smith and Torn, 2013). Intensive land management for large-scale expansion of bioenergy may result in nutrient leakage, with run-off to continental, coastal and marine water bodies causing species decline, eutrophication, toxin formation, and other impacts (Fuss et al., 2018; IPCC, 2019; Smith and Torn, 2013). These impacts are already accelerating from modern agricultural practices, the expansion of which, including for bioenergy crops, also results in the introduction of invasive species in different biomes (Díaz et al., 2019).

Effective climate mitigation via BECCS requires bioenergy to be carbon neutral, and to sequester additional carbon to compensate for process emissions (Fuss et al., 2018; Smith and Torn, 2013). If biomass crops displace existing land carbon stocks, carbon emissions can be higher than that removed via BECCS. This could take decades to centuries to be compensated by fossil fuel substitution or CCS (Davies-Barnard et al., 2015; Harper et al., 2018).

Biochar

The application of biochar to agricultural soils brings productivity and resilience benefits and creates a stable carbon pool. Crop productivity has been shown to increase by 10% on average following biochar soil amendment, while emissions of nitrogen and methane are reduced, and in temperate soils water losses are reduced (Fuss et al., 2018). However, biochar does not always have positive impacts on productivity and results show high variability (Jeffery et al., 2011). When realized, these productivity and other benefits could reduce demand for land, nutrient and water and enhance agroecosystem resilience when using biochar in agricultural soils, with positive benefits for food security, traditional farming and rural livelihoods,. Biochar can also build soil resilience to erosion, degradation, and contamination by absorbing both nutrients and pollutants, contributing to soil remediation and water purification (Smith et al., 2019).

These positive impacts could be tempered by additional land pressure if large quantities of biomass feedstock are required. At scales where biochar would contribute to climate mitigation, the requirement for biomass feedstocks contributes to biodiversity losses though the same drivers as discussed above for BECCS. While the use of agricultural and forestry biomass wastes as feedstock for biochar production would avoid competition for land (Smith et al., 2019), the limited availability of wastes constrains the scale and therefore the CDR potential of biochar.

4.2 Regenerative

Regenerative CDR options refers to the restoration of degraded lands, without change of land-use (eg: regenerative agriculture that increases productivity, or restoration of ecosystem function and carbon stocks in degraded forest).

Ecosystem restoration

Ecosystem restoration encompasses the restoration of degraded forestlands, peatlands and wetland ecosystems. While CDR research has often focused on afforestation and reforestation of previously cleared land, studies suggest that restoration of degraded natural forests should also be considered when developing terrestrial carbon management options (Asner et al., 2018; Böttcher et al., 2018; Roxburgh et al., 2006).

We refer to forest restoration as practices aimed at regaining ecological integrity in a degraded forest landscape (Smith et al., 2019), while reforestation (discussed above) would refer to the same practices in deforested landscapes. Restoring natural forest landscapes can enhance biodiversity, thereby improving ecosystem function and resilience, which decreases the risk of forest carbon stock reversal (Mackey et al., 2017; Smith et al., 2019). Degraded forests recover naturally if they are not further

disturbed by intensive human activities (Grace et al., 2014). Integrating biodiversity considerations can result in resilient and long-term ecosystem restoration (Williamson and Bodle, 2016). Forest restoration may threaten livelihoods and local access to land if subsistence agriculture is targeted (Smith et al., 2019). The CBD definition of primary forest landscapes includes use by indigenous and local communities living traditional lifestyles, which conserve and sustainably use biological diversity (CBD, 2010).

Other degraded natural ecosystems, in particular grasslands, peatlands and wetlands offer carbon sequestration potential through restoration. Grasslands are ecosystems dominated by herbaceous and shrub vegetation, covering approximately 40% of the ice-free land surface (White et al., 2000). Peatlands cover about 3% of the terrestrial surface area, in all climatic regions, and store 21% of the global total soil organic carbon stock (Leifeld and Menichetti, 2018). Intact peatlands contribute to a range of ecosystem functions such as habitat and biodiversity protection, water regulation and carbon sequestration and storage.

Soil carbon sequestration and agroforestry

Soil carbon sequestration and agroforestry can occur over large land areas, without decreasing land availability for agriculture (Smith et al., 2019; Zomer et al., 2016). Soil carbon is directly linked to soil health. Increasing carbon in degraded soils improves soil structure, regulating water flow and reducing water and wind erosion. It also filters pollutants, which then protects freshwater and coastal waters. Increased ground cover to sequester soil carbon can reduce the vulnerability of soils to degradation and landslides (Smith et al., 2019). Agroforestry also contributes to increasing soil carbon, and provides benefits beyond carbon sequestration such as increased habitat and landscape connectivity, watershed conservation and positive impacts on hydrological cycles (Zomer et al., 2016).

While enhanced soil carbon mostly reduces pollution and improves soil quality, increasing soil carbon requires a commensurate increase in nutrients (nitrogen, phosphorous and potassium). This could be derived from additional organic matter, but if external nutrient addition is required, it adds to resource extraction for synthetic fertilizers, and increases pollution if nutrients are lost to water courses (Fuss et al., 2018). While the theoretical potential for CDR via soil carbon sequestration is high, permanence and saturation are barriers to effectiveness (Smith et al., 2019). Increasing tree cover on agricultural lands provides additional carbon sequestration (Griscom et al., 2017).

4.3 Marine

More than 65% of the ocean is affected by changes in sea temperature, by-catch, habitat transformation, ocean acidification, and ocean pollution (Merino et al., 2019). Marine CDR options can add to these drivers or may contribute to and enhance ecosystem function.

Ocean fertilization

While it is proposed that the process of fertilizing the ocean would draw-down atmospheric carbon and lock it away in deep ocean sediments, there are a variety of ways in which it can exacerbate climate change. The impacts of ocean fertilization begin with the upstream effects of resource extraction from the mining of substances to be added to the ocean, such as phosphate-bearing rocks. This is an energy intensive process that also requires purification (Lampitt et al., 2008).

Manufacturing and transportation processes result in carbon emissions, with a footprint potentially larger than that of the carbon sequestered (Lampitt et al., 2008). The production of substantial algal blooms could increase heat transfer to the ocean surface via respiration, thereby increasing regional sea surface temperatures (Lawrence, 2002). The additional biomass produced that does not reach the ocean floor will release the captured carbon via remineralization (Lampitt et al., 2008). The movement of carbon dioxide from the upper to deep ocean will likely also shift ocean acidification from the surface to deeper waters (Cao and Caldeira, 2010).

The addition of nutrients can also cause eutrophication, lowering oxygen levels and potentially triggering fluxes of greenhouse gases with high warming potential, including methane and nitrogen (Law, 2008). This could negate any intended climate benefit (Jin et al., 2008). Eutrophication could also affect the abundance of phytoplankton species, including shifts towards harmful algal blooms and lowering biodiversity (Chisholm et al., 2001). Extended exposure to anoxia also leads to mortality, especially in sessile species, which can reduce the capacity of a system to support commercial fisheries and other ecosystem goods and services.

A redistribution of nutrients on a global scale may result from the substantial addition of nutrients, with some areas experiencing a decrease in nutrient supply and a subsequent decrease in biological productivity (Tripathy and Jena, 2019). This can result in a redistribution of phytoplankton, with colonizing and nuisance species moving into new areas (Lucas et al., 2007).

Artificial upwelling

Artificial upwelling, which brings nutrient-rich waters to the surface to stimulate phytoplankton and draw down CO₂, also brings with it carbon-rich waters and will therefore not necessarily lead to a reduction in the concentration of carbon dioxide at the ocean's surface, which is a necessary condition

for the enhanced uptake of CO₂ from the atmosphere (Oschlies et al., 2010). Uplifting large amounts of deep ocean water is highly energy intensive. Research into the use of renewables to power this uplift is ongoing, but these are not yet viable in the long-term (Pan et al., 2016). Upwelling of carbon-rich waters is also likely to exacerbate ocean acidification, which has been documented at natural upwelling sites along the west coast of the United States (Feely et al., 2008). It has also been suggested that deploying an array of ocean pipes bringing cooler waters to the surface could reduce sea-surface temperatures, although a cessation of the use of these pipes would likely result in an increase in sea-surface temperatures and atmospheric carbon to levels higher than would have occurred without the artificial upwelling (Oschlies et al., 2010). This transitory alleviation of climate change impacts is relevant to other forms of artificial upwelling as well. Moreover, while these activities will increase phytoplankton abundance in the upper ocean, most of the carbon taken up in their growth could be released back to the atmosphere within a year, with only a small proportion sequestered in the deep ocean (Shepherd et al., 2007). Similar to other forms of fertilization, artificial upwelling could shift species composition and therefore alter ecosystem function (Dutreuil et al., 2009).

Blue carbon

Coastal blue carbon bears closer similarity to terrestrial CDR than open-ocean approaches of fertilization, upwelling and alkalization. Tidal wetlands and seagrasses are some of the most productive vegetation types, but some of the most degraded natural systems globally. Revegetation and conservation are needed to realize their climate mitigating potential. Tidal wetlands sequester more carbon per unit than seagrasses, however seagrasses have the potential for higher total carbon sequestration rates due to greater area coverage. Overall, through restoration and the creation of coastal wetlands, blue carbon (excluding macroalgae) has the potential to more than double the current rate of carbon dioxide removal (National Academies of Science, 2019). These systems continue to decline, with drainage and excavation estimated to release 450 million tons of carbon dioxide globally each year (Pendleton et al., 2012). This trend can be reversed through better management, increased restoration and wetland creation (National Academies of Science, 2019). Such efforts have the added benefits of providing coastal protection from storms and wave attenuation, habitat provision for wildlife and commercially important species, improvements in water quality and offsetting hypoxia (Barbier et al., 2011). These systems can also moderate local water chemistry, thereby alleviating ocean acidification in proximate waters (Sippo et al., 2019, 2016).

Macroalgae

Macroalgae need to be considered separately to other coastal systems as they do not have root systems and soils to accumulate carbon; to ensure sequestration on a large scale, exportation and storage or

use is required (Howard et al., 2017; Krause-Jensen et al., 2018). Most carbon from macroalgae is thought to remain within the carbon cycle due to herbivory and is not sequestered (Howard et al., 2017). Seaweed aquaculture could sequester carbon through technology to facilitate the export of seaweed to the deep ocean, the impacts of which are unknown (Froehlich et al., 2019). Unlike restoration and conservation of other blue carbon sites, the cultivation of macroalgae could change local hydrodynamics, increase disease and invasive species risks, and divert nutrients away from natural food webs (Campbell et al., 2019).

4.4 Chemical

The chemical process of removing atmospheric carbon can employ large machines that scrub the air as it blows past, can accelerate the natural process of weathering that usually takes place over millennia, and includes the geological storage of sequestered carbon.

Direct air capture (DAC)

Proposed DAC methods include adsorption, absorption, membrane or chemical looping (Al-Mamoori et al., 2017). The most developed techniques are absorption either in a highly or moderately alkaline solution (CBD Secretariat, 2012), and adsorption methods onto solid sorbents (Kulkarni and Sholl, 2012). Once the carbon dioxide has been extracted, it must be compressed and then used or stored. This section discusses the capture aspects only; storage is covered below.

Techno-economic analyses of DAC methods generally suggest that environmental impacts are minor, especially compared to other CDR methods (Williamson and Bodle, 2016). However, when assessed against the drivers of biodiversity loss, potential negative impacts appear. The land area required for DAC is less than that for biomass-based CDR methods, but because of the low concentration of carbon dioxide in the air and the need therefore to maximize air contact area, large machines are likely to be needed; and if siting is remote, access roads would be needed (CBD Secretariat, 2012; Royal Society, 2009). In relation to resource extraction, impacts depend on the type of sorbent used; for example, amine-based solvents require large amounts of water (CBD Secretariat, 2012; Royal Society, 2009). The various stages of a DAC process—including heating, cooling, running fans, and pumping chemicals—are highly energy intensive (Zeman, 2007); although, renewable energy driven methods have been proposed for both adsorption and absorption methods (Brethomé et al., 2018; Breyer et al., 2019; Wohland et al., 2018). The pollutive aspect of DAC depends again on solvent. Some chemical solvents may pollute the local water or air in their production process, and there is concern that air downwind of a DAC installation may have toxic elements and could affect vegetation because of their low carbon content (Socolow et al., 2011) – although environmentally friendly alternatives have been proposed (Brethomé et al., 2018).

Carbon capture and storage (CCS)

Both DAC and BECCS rely on some form of carbon storage, the most common of which is CCS. The environmental impacts of CCS include the land-use change resulting from drilling wells and pipelines and dust pollution from this. The CCS process also calls for substantial energy use (EEA, 2011). The potential for carbon-dioxide leakage is a major concern that could affect both aquifers and the local airspace and therefore threatens all lifeforms (Benson et al., 2002; Damen et al., 2006; EEA, 2011; IPCC, 2005).

Enhanced weathering on land or lakes

This process could have some positive but also some negative impacts on the drivers of biodiversity loss. Mining the required minerals, for example limestone, could cause both land-use change and resource extraction impacts (CBD Secretariat, 2012; Royal Society, 2009). However, Rau (2011) proposes that waste stocks of limestone could be used to minimize the impact. Nonetheless, the energy costs of preparing the minerals is likely to be high (Williamson and Bodle, 2016). The application of the mineral could have additional beneficial climate change impacts. First, run-off into the oceans may reduce ocean acidity in the medium-term – although the initial spike in alkalinity could negatively impact ecosystems (CBD Secretariat, 2012; Hartmann et al., 2013). Second, more research is required to understand whether the lighter color of the minerals could increase soil albedo and thereby reduce localized warming (CBD Secretariat, 2012). Studies also suggest that the increased alkalinity of soils could benefit some species and vegetation productivity, but this is location- and species-dependent (Bronick and Lal, 2005; Haynes and Naidu, 1998; Holland et al., 2018). Similarly, increasing the pH of rivers and lakes could be considered a positive outcome, particularly if these had been previously acidified (CBD Secretariat, 2012; Köhler et al., 2010). However, a concern of adding olivine to soils relates to the risk of nickel accumulation, which could negatively impact on biodiversity (Berge et al., 2012).

Enhanced weathering in the oceans

Proposals include adding lime, carbonate minerals, olivine or other silicate minerals to the ocean or coast (GESAMP Working Group 41, 2019). As with enhanced weathering on land, there are potential land-use change and resource extraction implications from the mining of the chosen mineral (CBD Secretariat, 2012). Reduced ocean acidity is one likely impact, however the sudden spike in alkalinity could have deleterious effects locally (Henderson et al., 2008; Renforth and Henderson, 2017). How the mineral is transported will determine whether there are associated ship emissions, for example, which have known polluting effects (Renforth and Henderson, 2017); the Royal Society (2009) have proposed pipelines instead. The activities of enhanced weathering could promote coral growth

(Marubini and Thake, 1999; Renforth and Henderson, 2017), but additional research is needed to understand the wider marine ecosystem effects (Renforth and Henderson, 2017). There has also been the suggestion that the dissolution of iron and silica from the use of silicate minerals in enhanced ocean weathering could produce ocean fertilization effects (Renforth and Henderson, 2017), the impacts of which are detailed above.

5. Discussion

Land and sea-use change are the leading direct drivers of biodiversity loss (Díaz et al., 2019). CDR options requiring such changes at any scale (but particularly at the gigatons scale projected in climate scenarios) will add to already severe pressures on biodiversity. Land-use change is often linked to the other four drivers of biodiversity loss: resource extraction (for nutrients), pollution (from nutrient run-off), invasive species and climate change itself. The latter is because carbon is released through land-use change, which in the case of high-carbon ecosystems, will not be recaptured on timescales relevant to climate mitigation objectives.

Our analysis (Figure 3) finds that some CDR methods have an overwhelmingly positive impact on biodiversity, ameliorating all drivers of biodiversity loss, while others have overwhelmingly negative impacts. The beneficial methods are regenerative CDR options. The exception being their impact on climate change where the reversible nature of terrestrial carbon storage presents a risk of failed mitigation. However, the restoration of degraded ecosystems and their ongoing protection improves resilience to external stressors and reduces the risk of reversal (Seddon et al 2019). CDR options with negative impacts are those reliant on land-use change (in particular afforestation and BECCS), marine interventions with the exception of blue carbon (sharing traits with ecosystem restoration), and chemical interventions in terms of DAC, CCS and enhanced weathering in oceans, which raise many of the same impacts as ocean fertilization. In general, marine interventions that are not focused on restoration tend to cause pollution and invasive species, and in the case of ocean fertilization, resource extraction for mining phosphate-rich rocks (Lampitt et al., 2008). The effectiveness of ocean fertilization and enhanced weathering as climate mitigation strategies are questionable (Chisholm et al., 2001; Lampitt et al., 2008). DAC and CCS have negative impacts on resource extraction and pollution through the use of chemical sorbents (McCormack et al., 2016) and the risk of leakage from storage (Damen et al., 2006).

[Figure 3]

Some of the CDR methods analyzed could be either positively or negatively linked to the drivers of biodiversity loss, depending on how they are implemented. In these cases, strong governance frameworks are important. For example, whereas afforestation by definition represents an

introduction of exotic species (risking invasive species, nutrient requirements and resultant pollution), reforestation could be either negative – if implemented via monoculture plantations thus carrying the same risks as afforestation; or positive – if implemented with native mixed species in a manner that buffers and reconnects primary forests. Similarly, enhanced weathering over land could provide positive outcomes if the minerals are drawn from waste stocks rather than freshly mined (Rau, 2011), if all processing is powered from renewable energy sources (Brethomé et al., 2018) and if the activities are targeted to restore the pH of acidified lakes (Köhler et al., 2010). Blue carbon encompasses a range of CDR methods that can positively impact biodiversity (such as restoration and conservation of coastal ecosystems (National Academies of Science, 2019)) or negatively impact (such as seaweed aquaculture which could alter local hydrodynamics, increase invasive species risks, and divert nutrients (Campbell et al., 2019)). Other interventions, such as biochar, can be positive at small scales (Smith et al., 2019), but at large scale bring the same negative impacts as land-use change reliant CDR options.

These CDR options represent strong governance challenges at global to local scales. Assessing the drivers of biodiversity loss in governance frameworks is one way to link both local and global ecosystem considerations. The threat identification framework presented here, by highlighting the impacts of CDR options on the drivers to biodiversity loss, can help to identify and eliminate dangerous CDR methods early, but can also guide decision-making around how, when and at what scale to implement various methods. Ultimately, pursuing synergistic activities, such as regenerative CDR options, present the lowest threat to biodiversity. Nonetheless, policy-relevant assessment of individual CDR options requires context-based assessment with consideration of timeframe, scale, extent and reversibility.

Our framework offers a broad approach to guide CDR research efforts and to highlight positive options, while cautioning against progressing options that clearly contribute to known drivers of biodiversity loss. A similar framework could also be applied to research on options for other types of GGR (such as methane), to facilitate assessment of potential negative and positive impacts on biodiversity of such techniques. However, to ensure sustainable reliance of CDR methods, our framework alone is insufficient. Broad assessment framework must also be accompanied by quantitative and qualitative methods to assess and manage the timing, scale and cumulative effects of CDR interventions. It is widely accepted that the risks of CDR increase with the scale of intervention (Fuss et al., 2018). The IPCC reports a cumulative range of 150-1200 Gt CO₂ removal over the century (IPCC, 2018). Yet, recent research shows that the scale of required CDR depends on speed and urgency in reducing emissions (Strefler et al., 2018) and endogenous model assumptions such as discount rates (Emmerling et al., 2019), meaning that CDR reliance at the top end of the predicted range cannot be taken as a given.

6. Conclusion

The IPBES warns that the negative trends in biodiversity and ecosystem function are projected to continue or worsen, and that nature-friendly climate adaptation and mitigation will play important roles in achieving future societal and environmental objectives (Díaz et al., 2019). Our threat identification exercise suggests that, on the whole, reliance on CDR does not represent a nature-friendly mitigation strategy. Many CDR options drive the same processes that contribute to climate change and environmental degradation: land-use change and intensive agriculture for bioenergy crops; mining and resource extraction for DAC; pollution including greenhouse gases from ocean fertilization and upwelling. Any delay in mitigation that shifts the burden to future CDR options has a double-negative impact – first by increasing pressure on biodiversity through the processes that cause greenhouse gas emissions, and then again by increasing the drivers to biodiversity loss through the implementation of CDR options. With the exception of removal options that restore and regenerate nature, our analysis suggests that CDR should be viewed as an intervention with likely negative impacts on biodiversity loss, adding to the imperative for rapid and deep decarbonization to minimize any future CDR reliance.

References

- Al-Mamoori, A., Krishnamurthy, A., Rownaghi, A.A., et al., 2017. Carbon Capture and Utilization Update. *Energy Technol.* 5, 834–849. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ente.201600747>
- Asner, G.P., Brodrick, P.G., Philipson, C., et al., 2018. Mapped aboveground carbon stocks to advance forest conservation and recovery in Malaysian Borneo. *Biol. Conserv.* 217, 289–310. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2017.10.020>
- Barbier, E.B., Hacker, S.D., Kennedy, C., Koch, E.W., et al., 2011. The value of estuarine and coastal ecosystem services. *Ecol. Monogr.* 81, 169–193.
- Benson, S.M., Hepple, R., Apps, J., et al., 2002. Lessons Learned from Natural and Industrial Analogues for Storage of Carbon Dioxide in Deep Geological Formations.
- Berge, H.F.M. ten, Meer, H.G. van der, Steenhuizen, J.W., et al., 2012. Olivine Weathering in Soil, and Its Effects on Growth and Nutrient Uptake in Ryegrass (*Lolium perenne* L.): A Pot Experiment. *PLOS ONE* 7, e42098. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0042098>
- Böttcher, H., Hennenberg, K., Winger, C., 2018. Forest Vision Germany. *Oko Institut*, Berlin.
- Boysen, L.R., Lucht, W., Gerten, D., Heck, V., Lenton, T.M., Schellnhuber, H.J., 2017. The limits to global-warming mitigation by terrestrial carbon removal. *Earths Future* 5, 463–474. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016EF000469>

- Brethomé, F.M., Williams, N.J., Seipp, C.A., et al., 2018. Direct air capture of CO₂ via aqueous-phase absorption and crystalline-phase release using concentrated solar power. *Nat. Energy* 3, 553–559. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41560-018-0150-z>
- Breyer, C., Fasihi, M., Aghahosseini, A., 2019. Carbon dioxide direct air capture for effective climate change mitigation based on renewable electricity: a new type of energy system sector coupling. *Mitig. Adapt. Strateg. Glob. Change*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11027-019-9847-y>
- Bronick, C.J., Lal, R., 2005. Soil structure and management: a review. *Geoderma* 124, 3–22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2004.03.005>
- Campbell, I., Macleod, A., Sahlmann, C., et al., 2019. The Environmental Risks Associated With the Development of Seaweed Farming in Europe - Prioritizing Key Knowledge Gaps [WWW Document]. *Front. Mar. Sci*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2019.00107>
- Cao, L., Caldeira, K., 2010. Can ocean iron fertilization mitigate ocean acidification? *Clim. Change* 99, 303–311.
- CBD, 2010. Forest Biodiversity Definitions. *Conv. Biodivers.* URL <https://www.cbd.int/forest/definitions.shtml> (accessed 9.20.18).
- CBD, 1992. Convention on Biological Diversity. Entered Force 1992.
- CBD Secretariat, 2012. Geoengineering in relation to the convention on biological diversity: technical and regulatory matters (No. 66), CBD Technical Series. Montreal.
- Chazdon, R.L., Broadbent, E.N., Rozendaal, D.M.A., et al., 2016. Carbon sequestration potential of second-growth forest regeneration in the Latin American tropics. *Sci. Adv.* 2, e1501639–e1501639. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.1501639>
- Chisholm, S.W., Falkowski, P.G., Cullen, J.J., 2001. Dis-Crediting Ocean Fertilization. *Science* 294, 309–310.
- Damen, K., Faaij, A., Turkenburg, W., 2006. Health, Safety and Environmental Risks of Underground CO₂ Storage – Overview of Mechanisms and Current Knowledge. *Clim. Change* 74, 289–318. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-005-0425-9>
- Davies-Barnard, T., Valdes, P.J., Singarayer, J.S., et al., 2015. Quantifying the relative importance of land cover change from climate and land use in the representative concentration pathways: Land cover change: climate versus land use. *Glob. Biogeochem. Cycles* 29, 842–853. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014GB004949>
- Deng, Q., McMahon, D.E., Xiang, Y., et al., 2017. A global meta-analysis of soil phosphorus dynamics after afforestation. *New Phytol.* 213, 181–192. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.14119>
- Díaz, S., Settele, J., Brondízio, E., et al., 2019. Summary for policymakers of the global assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services 44.
- Dutreuil, S., Bopp, L., Tagliabue, A., 2009. Impact of enhanced vertical mixing on marine biogeochemistry: lessons for geo-engineering and natural variability 13.

- EEA, 2011. Air pollution impacts from carbon capture and storage (Technical report No. 14/2011). European Environment Agency, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Emmerling, J., Drouet, L., van der Wijst, K.-I., et al., 2019. The role of the discount rate for emission pathways and negative emissions. *Environ. Res. Lett.* <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ab3cc9>
- Feely, R.A., Sabine, C.L., Hernandez-Ayon, J.M., et al., 2008. Evidence for upwelling of corrosive "acidified" water onto the continental shelf. *Science* 320, 1490–1492.
- Froehlich, H.E., Afflerbach, J.C., Frazier, M., et al., 2019. Blue Growth Potential to Mitigate Climate Change through Seaweed Offsetting. *Curr. Biol.* 29, 3087-3093.e3. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2019.07.041>
- Fuss, S., Lamb, W.F., Callaghan, M.W., et al., 2018. Negative emissions—Part 2: Costs, potentials and side effects. *Environ. Res. Lett.* 13, 063002. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aabf9f>
- GESAMP Working Group 41, 2019. High level review of a wide range of proposed marine geoengineering techniques (Report No. 98), Reports and studies. IMO.
- Grace, J., Mitchard, E., Gloor, E., 2014. Perturbations in the carbon budget of the tropics. *Glob. Change Biol.* 20, 3238–3255. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.12600>
- Griscom, B.W., Adams, J., Ellis, P.W., et al., 2017. Natural climate solutions. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 114, 11645–11650. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1710465114>
- Harper, A.B., Powell, T., Cox, P.M., et al., 2018. Land-use emissions play a critical role in land-based mitigation for Paris climate targets. *Nat. Commun.* 9. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-05340-z>
- Hartmann, J., West, A.J., Renforth, P., et al., 2013. Enhanced chemical weathering as a geoengineering strategy to reduce atmospheric carbon dioxide, supply nutrients, and mitigate ocean acidification. *Rev. Geophys.* 51, 113–149. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rog.20004>
- Haynes, R.J., Naidu, R., 1998. Influence of lime, fertilizer and manure applications on soil organic matter content and soil physical conditions: a review. *Nutr. Cycl. Agroecosystems* 51, 123–137. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1009738307837>
- Heck, V., Gerten, D., Lucht, W., Popp, A., 2018. Biomass-based negative emissions difficult to reconcile with planetary boundaries. *Nat. Clim. Change* 8, 151–155. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-017-0064-y>
- Henderson, G., Rickaby, R., Bouman, H., 2008. Decreasing atmosphere CO₂ by increasing ocean alkalinity. The ocean dimension: would the concept work and what would be the environmental consequences? University of Oxford, Department of Earth Sciences and The James Martin 21st Century Ocean Institute.
- Holland, J.E., Bennett, A.E., Newton, A.C., et al., 2018. Liming impacts on soils, crops and biodiversity in the UK: A review. *Sci. Total Environ.* 610–611, 316–332. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.08.020>

- Hooper, D.U., Chapin, F.S., Ewel, J.J., et al., 2005. Effects of biodiversity on ecosystem functioning: a consensus of current knowledge. *Ecol. Monogr.* 75, 3–35.
- Howard, J., Sutton-Grier, A., Herr, D., et al., 2017. Clarifying the role of coastal and marine systems in climate mitigation. *Front. Ecol. Environ.* 15, 42–50.
- IPCC, 2019. IPCC Special Report on Climate Change, Desertification, Land Degradation, Sustainable Land Management, Food Security, and Greenhouse gas fluxes in Terrestrial Ecosystems. Full report. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Geneva.
- IPCC, 2018. Summary for Policymakers — Global Warming of 1.5 °C, in: Masson-Delmotte, V., Zhai, P., Pörtner, H.O., et al. (Eds.), *Global Warming of 1.5°C. An IPCC Special Report on the Impacts of Global Warming of 1.5°C above Pre-Industrial Levels and Related Global Greenhouse Gas Emission Pathways, in the Context of Strengthening the Global Response to the Threat of Climate Change, Sustainable Development, and Efforts to Eradicate Poverty.* World Meteorological Organization, Geneva, Switzerland, pp. 32.
- IPCC, 2013. Carbon and Other Biogeochemical Cycles, in: *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, pp. 465–570.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.015>
- IPCC, 2005. IPCC Special Report on Carbon Dioxide Capture and Storage. Prepared by Working Group III of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.
- Jeffery, S., Verheijen, F.G.A., van der Velde, M., Bastos, A.C., 2011. A quantitative review of the effects of biochar application to soils on crop productivity using meta-analysis. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 144, 175–187. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2011.08.015>
- Jin, X., Gruber, N., Frenzel, H., et al., 2008. The impact on atmospheric CO₂ of iron fertilization induced changes in the ocean's biological pump. *Biogeosciences* 5, 385–406.
<https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-5-385-2008>
- Köhler, P., Hartmann, J., Wolf-Gladrow, D.A., 2010. Geoengineering potential of artificially enhanced silicate weathering of olivine. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 107, 20228–20233.
<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1000545107>
- Krause-Jensen, D., Lavery, P., Serrano, O., et al., 2018. Sequestration of macroalgal carbon: the elephant in the Blue Carbon room. *Biol. Lett.* 14, 20180236.
- Kulkarni, A.R., Sholl, D.S., 2012. Analysis of Equilibrium-Based TSA Processes for Direct Capture of CO₂ from Air. *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* 51, 8631–8645. <https://doi.org/10.1021/ie300691c>
- Lade, S.J., Norberg, J., Anderies, J.M., et al., 2019. Potential feedbacks between loss of biosphere integrity and climate change. *Glob. Sustain.* 2, e21. <https://doi.org/10.1017/sus.2019.18>

- Lamb, D., 2005. Restoration of Degraded Tropical Forest Landscapes. *Science* 310, 1628–1632.
<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1111773>
- Lampitt, R.S., Achterberg, E.P., Anderson, T.R., et al., 2008. Ocean fertilization: a potential means of geoengineering? *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.* 366, 3919–3945.
<https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2008.0139>
- Law, C., 2008. Predicting and monitoring the effects of large-scale ocean iron fertilization on marine trace gas emissions. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 364, 283–288.
- Lawrence, M.G., 2002. Side effects of oceanic iron fertilization. *Science* 297, 1993–1993.
- Leifeld, J., Menichetti, L., 2018. The underappreciated potential of peatlands in global climate change mitigation strategies. *Nat. Commun.* 9. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-03406-6>
- Lucas, M., Seeyave, S., Sanders, R., et al., 2007. Nitrogen uptake responses to a naturally Fe-fertilised phytoplankton bloom during the 2004/2005 CROZEX study. *Deep Sea Res. Part II Top. Stud. Oceanogr.* 54, 2138–2173.
- Mace, G.M., Norris, K., Fitter, A.H., 2012. Biodiversity and ecosystem services: a multilayered relationship. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 27, 19–26.
- Mackey, B., Cadman, S., Rogers, N., Hugh, S., 2017. Assessing the risk to the conservation status of temperate rainforest from exposure to mining, commercial logging, and climate change: A Tasmanian case study. *Biol. Conserv.* 215, 19–29.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2017.08.032>
- Marubini, F., Thake, B., 1999. Bicarbonate addition promotes coral growth. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* 44, 716–720. <https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.1999.44.3.0716>
- McCormack, C.G., Born, W., Irvine, P.J., et al., 2016. Key impacts of climate engineering on biodiversity and ecosystems, with priorities for future research. *J. Integr. Environ. Sci.* 0, 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1943815X.2016.1159578>
- McLaren, D., 2012. A comparative global assessment of potential negative emissions technologies. *Process Saf. Environ. Prot., Special Issue: Negative emissions technology* 90, 489–500.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psep.2012.10.005>
- Merino, L., Minang, P.A., Sidorovich, A., et al., 2019. Chapter 2. Status and trends; indirect and direct drivers of change 2.1 Chapter 2.1. Status and Trends – Drivers of Change 245.
- Morton, S., Hill, R., 2014. What is biodiversity, and why is it important? *Biodivers. Sci. Solut. Aust.* 55–68.
- National Academies of Science, 2019. Negative Emissions Technologies and Reliable Sequestration: A Research Agenda. National Academies Press, Washington, D.C.
- Oschlies, A., Pahlow, M., Yool, A., et al., 2010. Climate engineering by artificial ocean upwelling: Channelling the sorcerer's apprentice. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 37.
<https://doi.org/10.1029/2009GL041961>

- Pan, Y., Fan, W., Zhang, D., et al., 2016. Research progress in artificial upwelling and its potential environmental effects. *Sci. China Earth Sci.* 59, 236–248.
- Pendleton, L., Donato, D.C., Murray, B.C., et al., 2012. Estimating global “blue carbon” emissions from conversion and degradation of vegetated coastal ecosystems. *PloS One* 7, e43542.
- Popp, A., Calvin, K., Fujimori, S., et al., 2017. Land-use futures in the shared socio-economic pathways. *Glob. Environ. Change* 42, 331–345.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.10.002>
- Raffaelli, D., 2006. Biodiversity and ecosystem functioning: issues of scale and trophic complexity. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 311, 285–294.
- Rau, G.H., 2011. CO₂ Mitigation via Capture and Chemical Conversion in Seawater. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 45, 1088–1092. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es102671x>
- Renforth, P., Henderson, G., 2017. Assessing ocean alkalinity for carbon sequestration. *Rev. Geophys.* 2016RG000533. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016RG000533>
- Robertson, G.P., Hamilton, S.K., Barham, B.L., et al., 2017. Cellulosic biofuel contributions to a sustainable energy future: Choices and outcomes. *Science* 356, eaal2324.
<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aal2324>
- Rogelj, J., Popp, A., Calvin, K.V., et al., 2018. Scenarios towards limiting global mean temperature increase below 1.5 °C. *Nat. Clim. Change* 8, 325–332. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-018-0091-3>
- Roxburgh, S.H., Wood, S.W., Mackey, B.G., et al., 2006. Assessing the carbon sequestration potential of managed forests: a case study from temperate Australia: Carbon sequestration potential. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 43, 1149–1159. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2006.01221.x>
- Royal Society, 2009. Geoengineering the climate: science, governance and uncertainty (Policy document). Royal Society, London, UK.
- Seddon, N., Turner, B., Berry, P., et al., 2019. Grounding nature-based climate solutions in sound biodiversity science. *Nat. Clim. Change* 9, 824–8477. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-019-0402-3>
- Shepherd, J., Iglesias-Rodriguez, D., Yool, A., 2007. Geo-engineering might cause, not cure, problems. *Nature* 449, 781–781. <https://doi.org/10.1038/449781a>
- Sippo, J.Z., Maher, D.T., Schulz, K.G., et al., 2019. Carbon outwelling across the shelf following a massive mangrove dieback in Australia: Insights from radium isotopes. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* 253, 142–158. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2019.03.003>
- Sippo, J.Z., Maher, D.T., Tait, D.R., et al., 2016. Are mangroves drivers or buffers of coastal acidification? Insights from alkalinity and dissolved inorganic carbon export estimates across a latitudinal transect. *Glob. Biogeochem. Cycles* 30, 753–766.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/2015gb005324>

- Smith, P., Adams, J., Beerling, D.J., et al., 2019. Impacts of Land-Based Greenhouse Gas Removal Options on Ecosystem Services and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.* 44, annurev-environ-101718-033129. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-101718-033129>
- Smith, L.J., Torn, M.S., 2013. Ecological limits to terrestrial biological carbon dioxide removal. *Clim. Change* 118, 89–103. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-012-0682-3>
- Socolow, R., Desmond, M., Aines, R., et al., 2011. Direct air capture of CO₂ with chemicals: a technology assessment for the APS Panel on Public Affairs. American Physical Society.
- Strefler, J., Bauer, N., Kriegler, E., et al., 2018. Between Scylla and Charybdis: Delayed mitigation narrows the passage between large-scale CDR and high costs. *Environ. Res. Lett.* 13, 044015. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aab2ba>
- Tripathy, S.C., Jena, B., 2019. Iron-Stimulated Phytoplankton Blooms in the Southern Ocean: a Brief Review. *Remote Sens. Earth Syst. Sci.* 2, 64–77. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41976-019-00012-y>
- White, R., Murray, S., Rohweder, M., 2000. Grassland Ecosystems: Pilot Analysis of Global Ecosystems. World Resources Institute, Washington DC.
- Williamson, P., 2016. Emissions reduction: Scrutinize CO₂ removal methods. *Nature* 530, 153–155. <https://doi.org/10.1038/530153a>
- Williamson, P., Bodle, R., 2016. Update on Climate Geoengineering in Relation to the Convention on Biological Diversity: Potential Impacts and Regulatory Framework (No. 84), Technical Series. Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, Montreal.
- Wohland, J., Witthaut, D., Schleussner, C.-F., 2018. Negative Emission Potential of Direct Air Capture Powered by Renewable Excess Electricity in Europe. *Earths Future* 6, 1380–1384. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018EF000954>
- Zeman, F., 2007. Energy and Material Balance of CO₂ Capture from Ambient Air. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 41, 7558–7563. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es070874m>
- Zomer, R.J., Neufeldt, H., Xu, J., et al., 2016. Global Tree Cover and Biomass Carbon on Agricultural Land: The contribution of agroforestry to global and national carbon budgets. *Sci. Rep.* 6. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep29987>



Climate Change

- Major driver of change in nature, with strong direct global impacts. Examples of climate change impacts on nature include sea-level rise and ocean acidification.
- Average global temperature increase passed 1°C in 2015.
- Increasingly exacerbates the impact of other drivers to biodiversity loss.
- Extinction risk is predicted to increase 3-fold at 3°C warming, increasing further for higher warming levels.



Changes in land and sea-use

- Agricultural expansion is the most widespread form of land-use change, mostly at the expense of old-growth forests, wetlands and grasslands.
- Land degradation is occurring in all land cover, land-use and landscape types, in all countries, with the largest relative negative impact on terrestrial and freshwater ecosystems since 1970.
- Land-use change is a major contributor to climate change.
- Intensive land use can lead to progressive changes in ecosystem function resulting in land abandonment.



Invasive species

- Negatively impacts native species, ecosystem function and services, economies and human health.
- Increase of 40% in cumulative records since 1980, 20% of the earth surface at risk.
- No substantial impact on other drivers.
- Trade, travel, habitat degradation and climate change exacerbate invasions.



Resource extraction

- Direct exploitation of living and non-living materials, via harvesting, logging, hunting and fishing, mining and freshwater withdrawals.
- Depletion of water resources interacts with many biophysical and societal drivers, contributing to negative impacts on nature and societies.
- Cascading effects of extraction can manifest as biodiversity losses and accelerated changes in climate, most prominently in tropical forests, marine, coastal and polar ecosystems.
- Overexploitation has consequences for biological dynamics and ecosystem function.



Pollution

- Strong negative effects on soil, freshwater and marine water quality and the global atmosphere due to pollutants from industrial, mining and agricultural activities, oil spills and toxic dumping, and underwater noises from shipping.
- Air, water and soil pollution continue to increase in some areas. Nitrogen emissions several orders of magnitude larger than pre-industrial times, acidifying freshwater ecosystems.
- No substantial impact on other drivers.
- Expansions of transport networks and resource extraction have a range of impact upon species and exacerbate pollution.



Land-use change

- **Afforestation** - planting trees on land that historically have not contained forests
- **Reforestation** - re-establishment through human intervention (planting, seeding, etc.) of land that has previously contained forests
- **BECCS** - bioenergy in combination with carbon capture and storage to remove CO₂ from the atmosphere
- **Biochar** - pyrolysis of biomass increases soil carbon stocks when added to soils



Regenerative

- **Ecosystem restoration** - reduced conversion and restoration of ecosystem function of forests, coastal ecosystems and peatlands.
- **Soil carbon** – land management change increases the soil organic carbon content
- **Agroforestry** - incorporation of trees in agricultural lands, increasing sequestration of carbon in trees and soils



Marine

- **Ocean fertilization** - nutrient addition increases phytoplankton abundance and enhances natural oceanic sequestration process
- **Artificial upwelling** – enhanced upwelling of cold, nutrient-rich, water from the deep ocean to the surface increases nutrient concentrations and rates of photosynthesis
- **Blue Carbon** - sequestration via coastal and marine vegetation, including mangroves, saltmarshes, seagrass beds and macroalgae



Chemical

- **DACS** - Industrial process that directly extracts atmospheric CO₂
- **CCS** - Storage of compressed CO₂ in geological formations (relied on for BECCS and DACCS)
- **Enhanced weathering land/lakes** - Dispersion of crushed minerals on land or lakes to chemically capture atmospheric CO₂
- **Enhanced weathering ocean** - Dispersion of crushed minerals on oceans or coasts to chemically capture atmospheric CO₂

	BECCS	    
Regenerative	Ecosystem Restoration	    
	Agroforestry	   
	Soil carbon	   
Marine	Ocean fertilization	   
	Upwelling	
	Blue carbon	  
	Macroalgae	  
Chemical	DACC	   

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Captions

- **Figure 1: The five categories of direct drivers to biodiversity loss** (based on Merino et al., 2019).
- **Figure 2: CDR categories**
- **Figure 3: Assessment of CDR options against the drivers of biodiversity loss.** Red = negative impact; green = positive impact; red/green = impacts could be positive or negative depending on implementation; grey = impact unknown. Where there is no direct link between CDR types and drivers to biodiversity loss, icons are not shown. Literature to support the impacts identified here is summarized in Section 4.

Author Manuscript

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved



Climate Change

- Major driver of change in nature, with strong direct global impacts. Examples of climate change impacts on nature include sea-level rise and ocean acidification.
- Average global temperature increase passed 1°C in 2015.
- Increasingly exacerbates the impact of other drivers to biodiversity loss.
- Extinction risk is predicted to increase 3-fold at 3°C warming, increasing further for higher warming levels.



Changes in land and sea-use

- Agricultural expansion is the most widespread form of land-use change, mostly at the expense of old-growth forests, wetlands and grasslands.
- Land degradation is occurring in all land cover, land-use and landscape types, in all countries, with the largest relative negative impact on terrestrial and freshwater ecosystems since 1970.
- Land-use change is a major contributor to climate change.
- Intensive land use can lead to progressive changes in ecosystem function resulting in land abandonment.




Invasive species

- Negatively impacts native species, ecosystem function and services, economies and human health.
- Increase of 40% in cumulative records since 1980, 20% of the earth surface at risk.
- No substantial impact on other drivers.
- Trade, travel, habitat degradation and climate change exacerbate invasions.




Resource extraction

- Direct exploitation of living and non-living materials, via harvesting, logging, hunting and fishing, mining and freshwater withdrawals.
- Depletion of water resources interacts with many biophysical and societal drivers, contributing to negative impacts on nature and societies.
- Cascading effects of extraction can manifest as biodiversity losses and accelerated changes in climate, most prominently in tropical forests, marine, coastal and polar ecosystems.
- Overexploitation has consequences for biological dynamics and ecosystem function.



Pollution

- Strong negative effects on soil, freshwater and marine water quality and the global atmosphere due to pollutants from industrial, mining and agricultural activities, oil spills and toxic dumping, and underwater noises from shipping.
- Air, water and soil pollution continue to increase in some areas. Nitrogen emissions several orders of magnitude larger than pre-industrial times, acidifying freshwater ecosystems.
- No substantial impact on other drivers.
- Expansions of transport networks and resource extraction have a range of impact upon species and exacerbate pollution.



Process	CDR type
Land-use change 	Afforestation     
	Reforestation     
	Biochar     
	BECCS     
Regenerative 	Ecosystem Restoration     
	Agroforestry    
	Soil carbon    
Marine 	Ocean fertilization    
	Upwelling 
	Blue carbon   
	Macroalgae   
Chemical 	DACCS    
	CCS   
	Enhanced weathering on land/lakes    
	Enhanced weathering in the ocean    