

CORRECTION

[View Article Online](#)
[View Journal](#) | [View Issue](#)



Cite this: *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 2022, 15, 3998

DOI: 10.1039/d2ee90044k

rsc.li/ees

Correction: Bridging capital discipline and energy scenarios

Sam Uden,^a Robert Socolow^b and Chris Greig^{*c}

Correction for 'Bridging capital discipline and energy scenarios' by Sam Uden *et al.*, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 2022, <https://doi.org/10.1039/d2ee01244h>.

The broader context section for this article was missing. It should have appeared as follows.

Modeled energy scenarios, such as those prepared by the IPCC's Working Group III, are the main analytical tools relied upon to inform climate change policies at global and national scales. It is important, then, that scenarios are feasible – meaning the modeled sequence of actions (*i.e.*, progressive expansion in clean electricity, fuels, materials, *etc.*) resembles what could be delivered in reality. To the extent there is a disconnect, adopted policies may fail to assure mitigation targets. This Opinion highlights one important such disconnect related to asset mobilization. That is, the difference between the way models assume assets are mobilized, compared to the approach exhibited by risk-taking commercial enterprises. Bridging this fault-line is essential to reduce the risk of target shortfall. We describe a conceptual approach to do so, termed 'reverse-engineering', and highlight the value of cultivating a new community of applied researchers working with practitioners to advance the reverse-engineering technique.

The Royal Society of Chemistry apologises for these errors and any consequent inconvenience to authors and readers.

^a Conservation Strategy Group, LLC, Sacramento, CA, USA

^b Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, USA

^c Andlinger Center for Energy and the Environment, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, USA. E-mail: cgreig@princeton.edu

