Check for updates

OPINION ARTICLE

REVISED Sequestering seawater on land: a water-based solution to global issues [version 2; peer review: 2 approved with reservations, 1 not approved]

Stéphane Boyer^{1,2}, Marie-Caroline Lefort^{1,2}¹Environmental and Animal Sciences, Unitec Institute of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand²Bio-Protection Research Centre, Lincoln University, Lincoln, New Zealand

v2 First published: 13 May 2016, 5:889
<https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.8739.1>

Latest published: 25 Apr 2017, 5:889
<https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.8739.2>

Abstract

The 'surplus' of oceanic water generated by climate change offers an unprecedented opportunity to tackle a number of global issues through a very pragmatic process: shifting the excess water from the oceans onto the land. Here we propose that sea-level rise could be mitigated through the desalination of very large amounts of seawater in an international network of massive desalination plants. To efficiently mitigate sea-level rise, desalinized water could be stored on land in the form of crop, wetlands or new forests. Based on a US\$ 500 million price to build an individual mega desalination plant with current technology, the cost of controlling current sea-level rise through water desalination approaches US\$ 23 trillion in investment and US\$ 4 trillion per year in operating costs. However, the economic, environmental and health benefits would also be immense and could contribute to addressing a number of global issues including sea-level rise, food security, biodiversity loss and climate change. Because these issues are intimately intertwined, responses should aim at addressing them all concurrently and at global scale.

Keywords

Biodiversity loss , Climate Change , Desalination , Food security , Sea-level rise , Sustainable Development Goals

This article is included in the **Climate** gateway.

Open Peer Review

Approval Status ? X ?

	1	2	3
version 2 (revision) 25 Apr 2017		X view	? view
version 1 13 May 2016	? view	X view	

1. **J.H. Martin Willison**, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada

2. **Tushaar Shah**, International Water Management Institute, Anand, India

3. **Corey Bradshaw** , Flinders University, GPO Box 2100, Adelaide, Australia

Any reports and responses or comments on the article can be found at the end of the article.

Corresponding author: Stéphane Boyer (stephane.boyer@gmail.com)

Competing interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Grant information: The author(s) declared that no grants were involved in supporting this work.

Copyright: © 2017 Boyer S and Lefort MC. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. Data associated with the article are available under the terms of the [Creative Commons Zero "No rights reserved" data waiver](#) (CC0 1.0 Public domain dedication).

How to cite this article: Boyer S and Lefort MC. **Sequestering seawater on land: a water-based solution to global issues [version 2; peer review: 2 approved with reservations, 1 not approved]** F1000Research 2017, 5:889 <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.8739.2>

First published: 13 May 2016, 5:889 <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.8739.1>

REVISED Amendments from Version 1

This new version of the manuscript addresses the comments provided by two reviewers. In brief, a new section entitled 'Feasibility, on-going costs and environmental impacts' has been added to the manuscript. The existing section entitled 'Desalinizing the excess seawater' has also been modified to include more up to date information.

See referee reports

Introduction

Although the impacts of climate change on the oceans are 'harder to see than receding glaciers'¹, the rise in sea-level and its economic and social consequences are already visible for people inhabiting low lying oceanic islands². Seawater thermal expansion and the melting of glaciers and polar icecaps^{3,4} have led to an average sea-level rise of 3.2 [2.8 to 3.6] mm per year between 1993 and 2010⁵. Rising oceans cause coastal land to be lost or become inhabitable⁶ and will likely generate millions of 'climate change migrants'⁷ as well as major economic and environmental damage in the near future^{1,8}. However, this 'surplus' of water offers an unprecedented opportunity to tackle a number of global issues through a very pragmatic process: shifting the excess water from the oceans onto the land.

Storing desalinized water

Here we propose that sea-level rise could be mitigated through the desalination of very large amounts of seawater in an international network of massive desalination plants.

The resulting economic, environmental and health benefits would be considerable. Desalinized seawater could be used to grow crops in desertified and drought-prone areas⁹, which could directly contribute to increased food security in countries where water resources for agriculture are limited, by the reliable production of local food. Water is also needed to refill lakes and river systems dried up from human consumption and rising temperatures, as is already done for the Jordan River in Israel¹⁰. The second largest reserve of freshwater after polar icecaps, is groundwater, but its depletion in recent years due to increased water demand (mainly for agriculture) and to a very long recycling time¹¹, is also contributing to sea-level rise¹². Desalinized water could be used to counterbalance groundwater depletion and maintain current levels. To ensure long-term 'storage' on land, desalinized water could also be 'captured' in the form of restored wetland vegetation and novel forested areas. Wetlands provide essential ecosystem services, particularly relevant in a changing climate¹³, but 87% of wetland areas have been lost since 1700 AD¹⁴. Novel forests will not only capture and store water, they would also act as important carbon sinks (Figure 1), thereby supplementing existing forests, which may have reached saturation¹⁵, and mitigating climate change¹⁶. These restored or newly created habitats will also contribute to the conservation of particularly vulnerable and declining biodiversity^{14,17}, thus tackling yet another major global issue.

Desalinizing the excess seawater

Today's desalination plants are designed mainly to produce potable water for human consumption, but also to support agricultural activities. As freshwater resources are becoming more unreliable in many parts of the world, the number and the size of these facilities are rapidly increasing. The world's largest desalination plant, *Ras al Khair* has recently been built in Saudi Arabia. Once fully operational, it will be capable of producing 1,025,000 m³ of desalinated water per day. Another example of megaplant is the *Sorek* desalination plant in Israel, which reached full capacity in 2015 and is now producing up to 624,000 m³ of desalinated seawater per day, thereby providing potable water for 20% of Israeli households¹⁸.

Although most of the ca. 18,000 existing desalinization plants are smaller than the Saudi Arabian or the Israeli mega plants, globally 85 million m³ of desalinated water were produced per day in 2015¹⁹ and this figure is predicted to further increase in the future. Yet this is still a drop out of oceans that expand every year by 9–12 trillion m³. To counteract the current increase, 46,000 mega plants like the one in Israel would be required. With an individual price tag of US\$ 500 million, the Israeli model (*Sorek*) is much cheaper than the Saudi Arabian Megaplant (\$7.2 bn). But building 46,000 of them would still cost US\$ 23 trillion. Such amount is difficult to comprehend as it represents more than the GDP of Europe or that of the US (\$18 tn each) and more than twice the GDP of China (\$11 tn). However, it needs to be put into perspective with the potential cost of inaction. For example, in absence of sea level rise mitigation action, coastal flood damage in the world's 136 largest coastal cities could cost US\$ 1 trillion per year by 2050²⁰ and the relocating the 13.1 million people living in coastal areas threatened by sea-level rise in the US only is projected to cost more than \$ 14 trillions²¹.

Feasibility, on-going costs and environmental impacts

In addition to the costs of building desalination megaplants, the on-going processing costs of sea water also needs to be taken into account. The methodology used in *Sorek* and most modern desalination facilities is reverse osmosis²² (RO), a process which has high energy efficiency and is currently used in 65% of desalination facilities around the world²³. During the RO process, seawater is forced through semi-permeable membranes at 27 times atmospheric pressure to overcome the osmotic pressure of seawater²⁴. To achieve this, RO still requires large amounts of energy, which on average accounts for 30–60% of the production cost of desalinated water^{25–27}. The cost of producing 1 m³ of potable water in *Sorek* is currently \$0.58¹⁸. This type of plant may therefore require \$102 millions of operational costs per year and is predicted to use 525 GWh megawatts in 2020²⁶. Based on the above rate, operating 46,000 clones of *Sorek* could cost around \$4 tn and require the equivalent of 15% of the global primary energy supply of the year 2014²⁸. When Frieler *et al.*²⁹ investigated the possibility of storing the excess sea water as ice in the Antarctic, they estimated that the energy costs of pumping sea water onto the Antarctic ice shelf, could require 12% of the global primary energy supply of the year 2012 under optimistic assumptions. The authors concluded that producing such amount of energy in the Antarctic was a major technical limitation to their solution. Similarly, operating the proposed network of desalination

Figure 1. Schematic illustration of how excess atmospheric carbon and excess seawater could be captured in the trunk or stem of different woody species; clockwise: baobabs, Douglas fir, vines and screwbean mesquite (data from 42–45).

megaplants represents a major energetic challenge, not only because of the enormous amount of energy required, but also because the production of this energy should not rely on fossil fuel and result in massive emissions of carbon dioxide. Therefore, an important area of research and innovation lies in the production of renewable energy such as solar, wind and tide-generated electricity to power desalination plants. Facilities that are being built today are already turning towards renewable sources of energy^{30,31} and it is likely that the energetic impediments described above will reduce with time and as technology advances³². The recent launch of the Global Clean Desalination Alliance, at the Paris COP21 meeting also demonstrates a political ambition to reduce carbon dioxide emissions from desalination processes.

Rapid decline in the total cost of desalinated water with increasing plant capacity³³ has led to cost of desalinated water to approach that of conventional water supply²⁰. However, transportation of

desalinated sea water remains a major hurdle, which has the potential to significantly affect the cost and therefore feasibility of the proposed concept. If most desalinated water was used within 1000km from the cost and 500m elevation, the production and transportation costs will likely remain under \$2 per cubic meter³⁴. If such costs are likely to be acceptable when relating to potable water for human consumption, they may be less justifiable if the water is used to grow forests, or replenish wetlands, but, could be defensible for agriculture in areas where food security is poor. Another important consideration is the fact that desalinated water used in agriculture (and by extension for the restoration of natural habitats) does not require the same quality as drinking water³⁵. An acceptable salinity for irrigation water is < 1600 ppm of total dissolved solid as opposed to less than 400 ppm for drinking water³³. As a consequence, desalination for agriculture purposes or storage on land is technically less challenging and can be significantly cheaper^{33,36}.

One recurrent issue with sea water desalination is the potential impact on the environment. Reverse osmosis produces significant waste in the form of hyper-salinized brine³⁷, which is usually released in the ocean³⁸, and used membranes, which are usually disposed of in landfill³¹. These by-products could cause significant environmental issues in a scenario involving the construction of thousands of large desalination plants. A review by Roberts *et al.* 2010³⁹ revealed that the main environmental effects occur within tens of meters of the discharge site. The careful selection of these sites is therefore of prime importance to limit the potential adverse impacts of desalination plants on marine ecosystems. The development of new, more efficient and environmentally-friendly desalination technology is another important area of research.

Incentives to engage on the proposed path

The projected acceleration of sea-level rise⁴⁰ means that the desalinating capacity required for the proposed response is always increasing. A critical tipping point is the melting of Antarctica's ice shelves, which is projected to become irreversible if atmospheric warming exceeds 1.5 to 2 degrees Celsius above current temperatures⁴. This point could be reached in less than 50 years under the current emission scenario³. Given the timeframe required to deploy a worldwide array of massive desalination facilities, as well as the means and infrastructures to redistribute desalinated

water where needed, it may not be achievable in the next 50 years. However, benefits from engaging on the proposed path will be perceptible from the onset. The consequences of initiating the construction of massive desalination facilities will directly contribute to 9 of the United Nations' 17 Sustainable Development Goals⁴¹ (Figure 2). The progression to these positive outcomes is stepwise. At a local scale, these include the creation of jobs, the development of infrastructure, the driving of innovation in water treatment methods, and the possibility of increasing food production in famine-prone areas through the reliable and sustainable provision of water for agriculture. These outcomes should be seen as incentives to engage in the development of large-scale seawater desalination facilities, particularly in areas where freshwater availability is unreliable and food security is poor.

Conclusion

Although a radical option, the proposed strategy remains simple in principle, relies on existing and continuously improving technology and is scalable to mitigate sea-level rise and contribute to addressing a number of global issues including food security, climate change and biodiversity loss. Because these issues are intimately intertwined, solutions that only address one of them have a limited chance of success. There is a pressing need for proposing and testing more proactive and ambitious ways to address multiple

Figure 2. Milestones of the proposed sea-level rise mitigation strategy, direct benefits and how they relate to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

global issues under one sole umbrella. The massive financial investment required to mitigate sea level rise through seawater desalination is likely to be balanced by significant socio-economic and environmental benefits. This perspective raises a number of critical questions relating to the financing and ownership of thousands of mega desalination plants around the world; the mechanism for distributing desalinated water to agriculture and other means; and the governance of such a global cooperation. The other major hurdle, is a global political plan to engage in a worldwide coordinated effort for mitigating sea-level rise.

Author contributions

S.B. developed the concept. S.B and M.-C.L. wrote the manuscript and prepared the figures.

Competing interests

No competing interests were disclosed.

Grant information

The author(s) declared that no grants were involved in supporting this work.

References

- Allison EH, Bassett HR: **Climate change in the oceans: Human impacts and responses.** *Science*. 2015; **350**(6262): 778–82.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- McCubbin S, Smit B, Pearce T: **Where does climate fit? Vulnerability to climate change in the context of multiple stressors in Funafuti, Tuvalu.** *Glob Environ Chang*. [Internet]. Elsevier Ltd; 2015; **30**: 43–55.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Wouters B, Martín-Español A, Helm V, *et al.*: **Glacier mass loss. Dynamic thinning of glaciers on the Southern Antarctic Peninsula.** *Science*. 2015; **348**(6237): 899–903.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Golledge NR, Kowalewski DE, Naish TR, *et al.*: **The multi-millennial Antarctic commitment to future sea-level rise.** *Nature*. 2015; **526**(7573): 421–5.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- IPCC: **Climate Change 2014: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.** *IPCC*. 2014; 151.
[Reference Source](#)
- Popkin G: **Breaking the Waves.** *Science*. 2015; **350**(6262): 756–9.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Nicholls RJ, Hanson SE, Lowe JA, *et al.*: **Sea-level scenarios for evaluating coastal impacts.** *WIREs Clim Chang*. 2014; **5**(1): 129–50.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Hinkel J, Lincke D, Vafeidis AT, *et al.*: **Coastal flood damage and adaptation costs under 21st century sea-level rise.** *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2014; **111**(9): 3292–7.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Burn S, Hoang M, Zarzo D, *et al.*: **Desalination techniques — A review of the opportunities for desalination in agriculture.** *Desalination*. [Internet]. Elsevier B.V.; 2015; **364**: 2–16.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Bismuth C, Hansjürgens B, Yaari I: **Technologies, Incentives and Cost Recovery: Is There an Israeli Role Model?** In: Hüttl RF, Bens O, Bismuth C, Hoechstetter S, editors. *Society - Water - Technology SE - 16* [Internet]. Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2016; 253–75.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Gleeson T, Befus KM, Jasechko S, *et al.*: **The global volume and distribution of modern groundwater.** *Nat Geosci*. 2016; **9**: 161–167, In press.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Wada Y, Van Beek LP, Sperna Weiland FC, *et al.*: **Past and future contribution of global groundwater depletion to sea-level rise.** *Geophys Res Lett*. 2012; **39**(9): 1–6.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Costanza R, de Groot R, Sutton P, *et al.*: **Changes in the global value of ecosystem services.** *Glob Environ Chang*. [Internet]. Elsevier Ltd; 2014; **26**: 152–8.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Davidson N: **How much wetland has the world lost? Long-term and recent trends in global wetland area.** *Mar Freshw Res*. 2014; **65**(10): 934–41.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Hedin LO: **Biogeochemistry: signs of saturation in the tropical carbon sink.** *Nature*. 2015; **519**(7543): 295–6.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Canadell JG, Raupach MR: **Managing forests for climate change mitigation.** *Science*. 2008; **320**(5882): 1456–7.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Newbold T, Hudson LN, Phillips HR, *et al.*: **A global model of the response of tropical and sub-tropical forest biodiversity to anthropogenic pressures.** *Proc Biol Sci*. 2014; **281**(1792): pii: 20141371.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Faigon M: **Success behind advanced SWRO desalination plant.** *Filtr Sep*. 2016; **53**(3): 29–31.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Sumner T: **New desalination tech could help quench global thirst.** *Science News*. 2016; **190**(4): 22.
[Reference Source](#)
- Hallegatte S, Green C, Nicholls RJ, *et al.*: **Future flood losses in major coastal cities.** *Nat Clim Chang*. [Internet]. 2013; **3**(9): 802–6.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Hauer ME, Evans JM, Mishra DR: **Millions projected to be at risk from sea-level rise in the continental United States.** *Nat Clim Chang*. 2016; **6**: 691–5.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Gude VG: **Desalination and sustainability - An appraisal and current perspective.** *Water Res*. [Internet]. Elsevier Ltd; 2016; **89**: 87–106.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Ballaqih H, Al-Nory MT, Nopiah ZM, *et al.*: **Environmental and economic performance assessment of desalination supply chain.** *Desalination* [Internet]. [cited 2017 Apr 19]; 2017; **406**: 2–9.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Kim SJ, Ko SH, Kang KH, *et al.*: **Direct seawater desalination by ion concentration polarization.** *Nat Nanotechnol*. Nature Publishing Group; 2010; **5**(4): 297–301.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Yan H, Cao C, Bai G, *et al.*: **Proceedings of The 20th Pacific Basin Nuclear Conference.** 2017; 865–72.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Spiritos E, Lipchin C: **Water Policy in Israel.** [Internet]. Becker N editor. Water Policy in Israel. (*Global Issues in Water Policy*). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands; 2013; **4**: 101–123.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Semiati R: **Energy issues in desalination processes.** *Environ Sci Technol*. 2008; **42**(22): 8193–201.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- International Energy Agency: **Key world energy statistics.** *Statistics (Ber)*. [Internet]. 2016; 80.
[Reference Source](#)
- Frieler K, Mengel M, Levermann A: **Delaying future sea-level rise by storing water in Antarctica.** *Earth Syst Dyn*. 2016; **7**(1): 203–10.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Caldera U, Bogdanov D, Breyer C: **Local cost of seawater RO desalination based on solar PV and wind energy: A global estimate.** *Desalination*. [Internet]. Elsevier BV; 2016; **385**: 207–16.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Shahabi MP, Mchugh A, Anda M, *et al.*: **Environmental life cycle assessment of seawater reverse osmosis desalination plant powered by renewable energy.** *Renew Energy*. [Internet]. Elsevier Ltd; 2014; **67**: 53–8.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Shahzad MW, Burhan M, Ang L, *et al.*: **Energy-water-environment nexus underpinning future desalination sustainability.** *Desalination*. [Internet]. Elsevier BV;

- 2017; **413**: 52–64.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
33. Sarai Atab M, Smallbone AJ, Roskilly AP: **An operational and economic study of a reverse osmosis desalination system for potable water and land irrigation.** *Desalination*. [Internet]. 2016; **397**: 174–84.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
 34. Zhou Y, Tol RS: **Evaluating the costs of desalination and water transport.** *Water Resour Res*. 2005; **41**(3): 1–10.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
 35. Quist-Jensen CA, Macedonio F, Drioli E: **Membrane technology for water production in agriculture: Desalination and wastewater reuse.** *Desalination*. 2015; **364**: 17–32.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
 36. Zarzo D, Campos E, Terrero P, *et al.*: **Spanish experience in desalination for agriculture Spanish experience in desalination for agriculture.** 2016; **3994**(April): 52–66.
 37. Miller S, Shemer H, Semiat R: **Energy and environmental issues in desalination.** *Desalination*. [Internet]. Elsevier BV; 2015; **366**: 2–8.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
 38. Pérez-González A, Urtiaga AM, Ibáñez R, *et al.*: **State of the art and review on the treatment technologies of water reverse osmosis concentrates.** *Water Res*. 2011; **46**(2): 267–83.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
 39. Roberts DA, Johnston EL, Knott NA: **Impacts of desalination plant discharges on the marine environment: A critical review of published studies.** *Water Res*. [Internet]. Elsevier Ltd; 2010; **44**(18): 5117–28.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
 40. Watson CS, White NJ, Church JA, *et al.*: **Unabated global mean sea-level rise over the satellite altimeter era.** *Nat Clim Chang*. 2015; **5**: 565–568.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
 41. United Nation: **Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 25 September 2015.** 2015.
[Reference Source](#)
 42. Saito T, Yasuda H, Sakurai M, *et al.*: **Monitoring of Stem Water Content of Native and Invasive Trees in Arid Environments Using GS3 Soil Moisture Sensors.** *Vadose Zo J*. 2016; **15**(3).
[Publisher Full Text](#)
 43. Chapotin SM, Razanameharizaka JH, Holbrook NM: **A biomechanical perspective on the role of large stem volume and high water content in baobab trees (*Adansonia* spp.; Bombacaceae).** *Am J Bot*. 2006; **93**(9): 1251–64.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
 44. Cermák J, Kucera J, Bauerle WL, *et al.*: **Tree water storage and its diurnal dynamics related to sap flow and changes in stem volume in old-growth Douglas-fir trees.** *Tree Physiol*. 2007; **27**(2): 181–98.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
 45. Pire R, Ojeda M, Pereira A, *et al.*: **Extracción de N, P y K en tres cultivares de vid en la zona de el Tocuyo, estado Lara. (Removal of N, P and K in three grape cultivars in El Tocuyo, Lara state, Venezuela.).** *Rev Fac Agron (LUZ)*. 2001; **18**: 201–16.
[Reference Source](#)

Open Peer Review

Current Peer Review Status: ? X ?

Version 2

Reviewer Report 10 July 2017

<https://doi.org/10.5256/f1000research.12368.r14765>

© 2017 Bradshaw C. This is an open access peer review report distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Corey Bradshaw

College of Science and Engineering, Flinders University, GPO Box 2100, Adelaide, SA, 5001, Australia

This is an interesting paper, but I have a fundamental disagreement with the central tenet - the suggestion that increased terrestrial water retention and storage could in any way impede sea level rise, let alone 'mitigate' it. While I appreciate and agree with the general discussion regarding the myriad uses and benefits from increasing terrestrial storage (ecologically, agriculturally, etc.), there is no feasibility that the rate could be sufficiently high enough to impede sea level rise. By the authors own back-of-the-envelope calculations, the magnitudes are so wildly different that it is ridiculous to contemplate.

That said, I appreciate the other ideas in the manuscript, although I have some questions regarding the underlying assumptions. The central tenet assumes that there has been a net transfer of water from terrestrial to the marine environment following anthropogenic disturbance (in addition to climate-driven thermal expansion of the oceans). Has this been established? Has this occurred, and can you demonstrate it? What about the uptake of water vapour as global temperatures rise? How is that factored into your calculations?

I also found it an amazing oversight that the authors did not mention the only demonstrated scalable, low-emissions technology currently available for power the enormously electricity-hungry technology of desalination: nuclear fission. Not only are 100% renewable scenarios not feasible for even basic demand (doi:10.1016/j.rser.2017.03.114), there is absolutely no way they could conceivably power massive desalination at the scales mentioned. The ONLY technology would be nuclear. Full stop.

Figure 1 is poorly captioned and incomplete. It is not clear to which components of storage the different symbols and lines refer. A much more detailed caption is required.

Minor

- watch split infinitives

- carbon 'dioxyde' (dioxide)
- separate numbers from units that describe (you cannot write 1000kilometres, so '1000km' is also incorrect)

Is the topic of the opinion article discussed accurately in the context of the current literature?

Yes

Are all factual statements correct and adequately supported by citations?

Partly

Are arguments sufficiently supported by evidence from the published literature?

Partly

Are the conclusions drawn balanced and justified on the basis of the presented arguments?

Partly

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

I confirm that I have read this submission and believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard, however I have significant reservations, as outlined above.

Reviewer Report 24 May 2017

<https://doi.org/10.5256/f1000research.12368.r22190>

© 2017 Shah T. This is an open access peer review report distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Tushaar Shah

IWMI-TATA Water Policy Research Program, International Water Management Institute, Anand, Gujarat, India

I raised a number of issues with the proposal described in this article. The authors have touched upon one or two in their revision but have ignored the rest by claiming that, " This paper is meant to be an opinion, not a review. As such, we chose to focus on explaining what the core idea is and discuss its implications." Implications is what I had thought the authors would offer in the revision. I am not at all sure the authors have teased out the full implications of their proposal in the revision which still remains a 'trial balloon floating off into the unknown' in the words of my co-reviewer. Moreover, how can one counter a scientific contribution offered as an opinion? As a reviewer, my comments are then my opinion. If the authors really believe in their proposal, they cannot dismiss questions like: Given the overall costs, is the problem worth solving? is there a more cost-effective and environmentally safer way to achieve the same goal? Will energy use in desalination and transport of sea water accelerate global warming? Even if the proposal is

technically feasible, is it economically feasible? I find no attempt to tackle these issues and I hold fast to my view that the 'proposal advanced is unrealistic..' and 'its science is unacceptably poor'.

Is the topic of the opinion article discussed accurately in the context of the current literature?

Partly

Are all factual statements correct and adequately supported by citations?

Partly

Are arguments sufficiently supported by evidence from the published literature?

Partly

Are the conclusions drawn balanced and justified on the basis of the presented arguments?

Partly

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

I confirm that I have read this submission and believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to state that I do not consider it to be of an acceptable scientific standard, for reasons outlined above.

Version 1

Reviewer Report 23 January 2017

<https://doi.org/10.5256/f1000research.9403.r14081>

© 2017 Shah T. This is an open access peer review report distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Tushaar Shah

¹ IWMI-TATA Water Policy Research Program, International Water Management Institute, Anand, Gujarat, India

² IWMI-TATA Water Policy Research Program, International Water Management Institute, Anand, Gujarat, India

Title and Abstract: The main title is fine; the sub-title "a water-based solution to global issues" is vague; desalination of sea water is the central argument of the article and should appear in the title somewhere.

Article Content: The article proposes a bold, nay sensational, solution to the potential consequences of seawater rise due to global warming. The proposal to the humankind is: begin by investing US \$ 23 trillion in building 46,000 mega desalination plants to desalinate 9-12 trillion m³

of sea water every year, and use it for agriculture, wetland restoration, groundwater recharge, afforestation and in general, meeting fresh water scarcity around the world. Once this threshold capacity is commissioned, build more desalination plants to take care of increased global warming as it accelerates thermal expansion and further seawater rise. Doing this would protect low-lying island nations and coastal communities globally although other threats from climate change and warming will still challenge the humankind.

I would have normally thought the proposal bizarre, even reckless. But global warming and sea water rise are formidable and complex challenges and the world needs to be receptive to all manner of ideas, even if they sound bizarre. I would have thought that a policy proposal of such gigantic economic and ecological dimensions should be advanced with analytical effort of commensurate magnitude and depth; but this is missing in this analysis which I find a trifle casual in its approach. In fact, I am afraid the article has not subjected, to even a preliminary scrutiny, the various implications of its proposals using evidence freely available on the internet.

For example, there are important questions of technical feasibility that have not been touched, leave alone addressed. If fossil energy is to be used for desalination, how much will the 46,000 mega-desalination plants themselves contribute to further global warming and seawater rise (unless, of course, they all use solar or wind power)[1]? At a very conservative 5 kWh/m³ [2], producing 9-12 trillion m³ of desalinated sea water per year would use 45-60 trillion kWh of thermal energy every year, over two times the 22.7 trillion kWh of total electricity the world generated in 2012 [3]. The article provides no hint of how much more energy would be needed to transport desalinated water from plants to places of use, with what further impact on global warming? Given that the world's annual use of groundwater around 2010 was estimated at only 1.1 trillion m³ (Margat and van der Gun 2013 p.6), do depleted aquifers have empty storage to absorb a significant portion of the 9-12 trillion m³ that desalination plants will have to dispose of every year? Likewise, given that the world's total annual water withdrawals for all uses are of the order of 4 trillion m³ [4] is it possible for the earth to absorb 9-12 trillion desalinated sea water/year that will be made available from desalination plants on fields, forests and wetlands?

A redeeming aspect, the authors suggest, is that agricultural water use would not require removing all salts from seawater to make it drinking water quality and therefore will cost less money and energy. This is a dangerous proposal. Dumping 9-12 trillion m³ of partially desalinated seawater with say 10,000 ppm salts (compared to 35,000 ppm in sea water) could, over a decade or two salinize soils in the surface of the entire earth to the same level as the lower Indus basin in Pakistan, with frightening consequences.

Are there competing ideas/proposals for coping with sea water rise that we can compare the present proposal with? The authors are silent on this. Would it not be far cheaper to build levees around low-lying island nations to counter sea level rise? Might it be more cost effective to desilt the seas to expand their storage and use the silt to build the levees? Many geoengineering proposals are dismissed for being far less bizarre than the one proposed here; but injecting aerosols into the atmosphere to reflect sunlight away from the earth[5] would be far cheaper and a lot less riskier than 46,000 mega desalination plants and might resolve all problems of global warming than just seawater rise.

Would it be cheaper to live with those impacts or use the money saved to compensate people-at-risk from seawater rise? Climate Central estimated that worldwide 147-216 million people live on

land that will be below sea level or regular flood levels by the end of the century, assuming emissions of heat-trapping gases continue on their current trend [6]. The Boyer-Lefort article proposes a one-time investment in building desalination plants at US \$ 106,500-156,000 per person-at-risk but glosses over US \$ 42,000-82,000/year per person-at-risk ever after in operational cost of desalinating sea water at US \$ 1/m³ [7]. Would it take a lot more money to help these communities to make a transition to the Netherlands-type dykes-and-levée ecosystem to cope with rising sea level?

Developing countries have been, for over two decades, fighting hard to get the world to commit US \$ 100 billion in assistance to help them move to low-carbon technologies; but without any success. After all, US \$ 100 billion to protect the global carbon sinks is just 1 percent of the US \$ 9-12 trillion the idea proposed here would cost. If this has not clicked, what would it take to persuade the world to invest *a third* of its GDP (estimated in 2014 at US \$ 78 trillion [9]) in desalination plants to mitigate the impacts of sea level rise?

There are also other important questions about economic feasibility. Does this proposal compare well with other comparable proposals doing rounds? A 2014 report from World Energy Agency estimated that it would cost US \$ 44 trillion in investments, between now and 2050, for the world to change entirely to renewables and halt climate change and sea water rise all together [9]. A similar analysis by IPCC estimated the investments required to stabilize GHG levels in the atmosphere at US \$ 13 trillion. These clearly appear to be far better deals than the one proposed here since even after 46,000 mega desalination plants, most ill-effects of global warming, bar sea water rise, will continue to afflict the humankind.

Conclusion: Overall, even a cursory examination suggests that the proposal advanced is unrealistic, even disingenuous. I would have expected authors to undertake a modicum of scrutiny before offering their piece for publication. I do believe that its science is unacceptably poor.

References:

Margat, Jean and Jac van der Gun. 2013. *Groundwater Around the World: A Geographic Synopsis*, London: Taylor and Francis.

[1] Which authors hint at but make no effort to cost.

[2] <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Desalination>

[3] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_energy_consumption

[4] <http://www2.worldwater.org/data.html>

[5] <https://royalsociety.org/topics-policy/publications/2009/geoengineering-climate/>

[6] <http://www.climatecentral.org/news/new-analysis-global-exposure-to-sea-level-rise-flooding-18066>

[7] <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Desalination>

[8] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gross_world_product

[9] <https://www.technologyreview.com/s/527196/how-much-will-it-cost-to-solve-climate-change/>

Is the topic of the opinion article discussed accurately in the context of the current literature?

Partly

Are all factual statements correct and adequately supported by citations?

Partly

Are arguments sufficiently supported by evidence from the published literature?

Partly

Are the conclusions drawn balanced and justified on the basis of the presented arguments?

Partly

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

I confirm that I have read this submission and believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to state that I do not consider it to be of an acceptable scientific standard, for reasons outlined above.

Author Response 22 Apr 2017

Stéphane Boyer

The reviewer seems to have misread the paper on two important points.

- First, the proposed strategy does not 'begin' by investing US \$23 trillion. We propose a gradual process where the building of desalination megaplants would obviously take many years. The figure of \$23 tn corresponds to the current price to build 46,000 clones of the *Sorek* plant. This is only a conservative estimate of what it could cost. It is very unlikely that all plants will be exactly the same and it is very unlikely that their cost will remain the same through time.
- Second, the paper does not mention the building of 'more desalination plants to take care of increased global warming'. We simply stress the fact that the building of the proposed plants would inevitably have a positive impact on the mitigation of global warming.

The original manuscript stated that 'an important area of research and innovation is the production of renewable energy such as solar, wind and tide-generated electricity to power desalination plants'. We have now developed this into a new subsection focusing on the main technical limitations of operating the proposed plants (i.e. energy consumption and

environmental impacts). We also mention the issue around transportation with support from the literature.

The reviewer's concern about 'annual water withdrawal for all use' being limited to 4 trillion m³ makes little sense because we propose to store a large proportion of the water in forest, wetlands and as groundwater. On the latter, although the annual use of groundwater was 1.1 trillion m³ in 2010, the renewing of this resource is very slow and as a result, the estimated global groundwater depletion during 1900–2008 alone was estimated to be ~4.5 trillion m³ (Konikow 2011) and the rate of depletion likely increased after 2008.

Our statement about agriculture was that 'water used in agriculture does not require the same quality as drinking water' the reviewer's interpretation as 'dumping 9-12 trillion m³ of partially desalinated seawater with say 10,000 ppm salts' is quite a jump. An acceptable salinity for irrigation water is < 1600 ppm of total dissolved solid as opposed to 400 ppm for drinking water (Sarai Atab et al. 2016). We have now added this information to the manuscript.

This paper is meant to be an opinion, not a review. As such, we chose to focus on explaining what the core new idea is and discuss its implications rather than reviewing all other potential solutions, which have been published and discussed at length elsewhere. This is not the point of this manuscript. We also want to stress that the paper is limited in its length.

With regards to alternative solutions involving renewable energies. All recent simulations show that if the world changed entirely to renewable energies by 2050, sea level rise will continue to rise, possibly for centuries due to sea-level rise commitment (Leverman et al. 2013), including the melting of antarctic sea shelves (Golledge et al. 2015). Even under the rather unlikely IMAGE 2.6 scenario, which includes very aggressive emissions reductions early in the 21st century and deployment of negative emissions technologies later in the century to achieve radiative forcing of 2.6 W/m² in 2100, the reviewer's statement does not stand. Although 100% of renewable energy by 2050 would be a prodigious achievement, it would cost more than the investment we propose (\$44 vs \$23 tn), and it would most certainly not 'halt climate change and sea water rise' as claimed by the reviewer.

We do not claim to propose a silver bullet that would surpass all other solutions proposed to date. However, we believe storing desalinated seawater on land is a valuable solution and one that is worth exploring because

1. It is novel
2. It brings specific advantages that could be complementary to other solutions presented to date,
3. It can create a number of positive outcomes from its inception, even if the building of 46,000 *Sorek*-like plants is not achieved
4. It is easily reversible as opposed to other geoengineering solutions. If need be, the plants can simply be turned off.
5. As time goes by, our capacity to succeed is likely to increase (due to better performing and cheaper technology being developed)

6. It has the potential to be a long-term solution as opposed to the temporary storing of water as snow on the Antarctic proposed by Friedler et al. (2016) for example.

References cited in this response

- Frieler K, Mengel M, Levermann A. Delaying future sea-level rise by storing water in Antarctica. *Earth Syst Dyn.* 2016;7(1):203–10.
- Konikow LF. Contribution of global groundwater depletion since 1900 to sea-level rise. *Geophys Res Lett.* 2011;38(17):1–5
- Levermann A, Clark PU, Marzeion B, Milne G a, Pollard D, Radic V, et al. The multimillennial sea-level commitment of global warming. *Proc Natl Acad Sci [Internet]*. 2013;110(34):13745–13750. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23858443>
- Golledge NR, Kowalewski DE, Naish TR, Levy RH, Fogwill CJ, Gasson EGW. The multi-millennial Antarctic commitment to future sea-level rise. *Nature [Internet]*. 2015;526(7573):421–5. Available from: <http://www.nature.com/doi/10.1038/nature15706>
- Sarai Atab M, Smallbone AJ, Roskilly AP. An operational and economic study of a reverse osmosis desalination system for potable water and land irrigation. *Desalination [Internet]*. The Authors; 2016;397:174–84. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.desal.2016.06.020>

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Reviewer Report 25 August 2016

<https://doi.org/10.5256/f1000research.9403.r15875>

© 2016 Willison J. This is an open access peer review report distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

J.H. Martin Willison

¹ School for Resource and Environmental Studies, Dalhousie University, Halifax, NS, Canada

² School for Resource and Environmental Studies, Dalhousie University, Halifax, NS, Canada

This is an interesting conceptual paper. It is well written and the concept is clearly outlined, but the analysis is very incomplete. In its current form, the paper is just a trial balloon floating off into the unknown. For example, the paper briefly refers to a desalination plant in Israel that uses reverse osmosis (RO) technology. The plant is described as the largest in the world, yet the reference used to support this statement is undated. I found other sources indicating that it is indeed a very large RO plant and does supply 20% of Israel's potable water, but may no longer be the largest in the world. Remarkably, the paper lacks reference to an even larger desalination plant in Saudi Arabia at Ras al Khair which uses both RO and distillation. About 50% of Saudi

Arabia's potable water needs are supplied by desalination (mostly obtained by distillation) and desalinated water has long been used in Saudi Arabia for growing crops. A more thorough analysis of the concept would examine both cases.

Clearly, sea levels are rising due to addition of water and thermal expansion. Also clearly, water removed by desalination temporarily reduces sea levels by moving water from the ocean phase to various freshwater phases (such as groundwater, lakes, bottles, land plants, and so on). In addition, there will probably be an increase in the amount of water in atmospheric phases (cloud, etc.). Huge problems with this proposal are not addressed, however, and are mostly not acknowledged. Monetary cost is addressed, but this should be the least of our concerns.

Where would the excess salt go and what would be the effects of local increases in ocean salinity? How much energy is consumed in the desalination, brine management, and water distribution processes and how much of that is generated by burning fossil fuels? Manufacture, maintenance and operation of the desalination plants involves mining, metal processing, transport of materials, and so on. Will the removal of water by desalination compensate for the impact of those processes on the climate system, or will this 'solution' simply add to the problem by creating more sea level rise than is reduced by desalination? How would the water be moved from its ocean-side sources to places where it would be useful for plant growth? How much energy will that cost, and how much of it would be fossil-fuel derived? What are the potential agricultural and forest productivities? How would food be delivered from production site to market? Given that the Mediterranean basin is likely to be a suitable initial site (noting that desalination in Israel is identified as a prime example), what are the regional socio-political implications of such a huge project on this region? Where are the production sites and the markets in the Mediterranean basin model? Would such a large-scale project relieve or exacerbate socio-political tensions in the region? How does the potential for desalination in the Mediterranean basin region compare with the experience of desalination in the Red Sea basin?

Without a deeper analysis to answer the wide range of questions that this concept invites, I am left unconvinced that the concept could be beneficial. A better start might be to do a full environmental and socio-economic cost-benefit analysis of the large desalination plants in Israel and Saudi Arabia and try scaling up the costs and benefits of the concept from there.

Groundwater depletion is a serious global problem, but many of the places where this is happening are in the centres of large continents, far from any ocean. I suggest that moving water over long distances makes the concept unrealistic in full cost-benefit terms. Perhaps desalination could be used to create green corridors along routes of prevailing winds, and in that way help water to move further inland, but there is no hint of this large-scale geo-engineering idea in the paper, and I would anyway tend to dismiss it as not feasible without a detailed analysis of a specific site, such as the Arabian peninsula. Realistically, to make a difference at a global level, massive quantities of water would have to be desalinated and moved from the oceans towards the middle of large dry continents (Asia, Africa, Australia) using wholly renewable sources of energy. How much, how far, and at what environmental costs?

All in all, I think this paper is intellectually stimulating but too preliminary to be indexed as a scientific paper.

Is the topic of the opinion article discussed accurately in the context of the current

literature?

Partly

Are all factual statements correct and adequately supported by citations?

Partly

Are arguments sufficiently supported by evidence from the published literature?

Partly

Are the conclusions drawn balanced and justified on the basis of the presented arguments?

Partly

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

I confirm that I have read this submission and believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard, however I have significant reservations, as outlined above.

Author Response 22 Apr 2017

Stéphane Boyer

Thanks for the review.

At the time of the original concept of the paper, *Sorek* was the biggest fully operational desalination plant. As pointed out by reviewer 1, another plant in Saudi Arabia: *Ras al Khair* is now the world's biggest in terms of quantity of water produced. We have modified the manuscript to also mention that plant. Because the cost of building *Ras al Khair* is about 14 times that of *Sorek*, the latter remains a more economic solution for the proposed idea. Therefore, we maintained the focus on the *Sorek* model. We also provide new references regarding the data for the *Sorek* plant (Faigon 2016).

We acknowledge that the proposed concept comes with a number of issues and not all of these are addressed in the paper. Our aim here is to propose a new potential solution to mitigate sea-level rise and foster new thinking in the scientific community.

Overall there will probably be no excess salt because the aim is, at best, to maintain the existing volume of water in the ocean. However there will be significant local increases in ocean salinity, which are likely to cause environmental issues. This is now discussed. The amount of energy needed to power a large desalination plant is considerable. Powering 46,000 of them may seem difficult to conceive at the moment, but this would only happen through time. Desalination plants that are built today for potable water consumption or to support agricultural activities are already turning towards renewable sources of energy (see citations in the revised manuscript: Caldera et al. 2016; Shahabi et al. 2014). There is no reason why this would not be the case for the proposed plants. Again, the idea is not to build 46,000 plants at once. It would be a gradual process. As time goes by, it is likely that the costs of building desalination plants will decrease, as for the cost of solar energy

technologies over this past decade, while their capacity and the portion of energy from renewable sources will increase.

For each plant, there should be careful considerations of sustainability and environmental issues just like it is the case for plants that are built today.

The aim of the paper is to propose a global solution. It is not to select sites or analyse the socio-political implications for a particular region. It is obvious that every country engaged in this effort would face very specific social, political, economic and geographic issues some of which may depend on when these countries engage in the process. It is for example therefore difficult to predict the socio-economic or political state of a particular country 5, 10 or 20 years ahead. We don't think it is sensible to extrapolate a full environmental, socio-economic, cost-benefit, geographic and political analysis of one region. For these reasons, the case study and extrapolation is really not the angle we want to take.

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Comments on this article

Version 2

Reader Comment 16 Apr 2019

Richard Estrada, Statewide Renewable, LLC, Texas, USA

Desalination would not only help reduce water levels and capture carbon but also reduce clean water scarcity. Much of the water could be used to recharge aquifers as well. Many aquifers in N. Africa and in the USA have been depleted over the last half century.

The energy concern I believe can be mitigated with renewable energy. The upfront cost is great but selling clean water to countries, municipalities, states etc over time could make the initial investment worthwhile. Also with the plants located on the coasts wind energy and wave energy could be tapped in an effective way.

Competing Interests: I am a solar developer based in Texas

The benefits of publishing with F1000Research:

- Your article is published within days, with no editorial bias
- You can publish traditional articles, null/negative results, case reports, data notes and more
- The peer review process is transparent and collaborative
- Your article is indexed in PubMed after passing peer review
- Dedicated customer support at every stage

For pre-submission enquiries, contact research@f1000.com

F1000Research