

Name	Jude Murdoch
Email	
A Zero Carbon Act is important to me because...	New Zealand lags horribly behind most of the world in taking material steps to combat climate change: we have the fourth highest number of cars per capita in the world; our emissions trading scheme has largely been a joke in its adoption of 'hot air' credits, its indefinite exclusion of agriculture, and its inability to incentivise afforestation and act as a price signal in land usage decisions. Climate change is the greatest market failure the world has ever seen, and we only seem to be waking up to that fact now, which is tragic for a country that once led the world in progressive measures and genuinely laid claim to the '100% pure' tagline. Let's actually make this our 'nuclear free' moment, and put a statutory line in the sand on emissions in our country.
Q1. What process should the Government use to set a new emissions reduction target in legislation?	This target should be carefully set in primary legislation (an Act of Parliament) - not in secondary legislation, which can be changed more easily.
Q2. If the Government sets a 2050 target now, which is the best target for New Zealand?	The most ambitious target: reducing total greenhouse gases to net zero by 2050. Chasing this target should be informed by science and evidence to ensure our efforts to reduce emissions are as effective as is possible: we should aim for negative levels of long-lived gases, while reducing short-lived gases to sustainable levels.
Q3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?	By relying primarily on domestic emissions reductions only, including from afforestation, and also on international credits that are properly recognised and accredited as reducing emissions.
Q4. Should the Zero Carbon Bill allow the 2050 target to be revised if circumstances change?	The 2050 target should not be altered in response to "economic changes" as this undermines its long-term certainty. However, the ability to revise the 2050 target in light of major changes in scientific understanding or international agreements should be permitted.
Q5. The Government proposes that three emissions budgets of five years each (i.e. covering the next 15 years) be in place at any given time. Do you agree with this proposal?	Yes - I agree with 5-year budgets set 10-15 years in advance, so that 3 budgets are in effect at all times.
Q6 - Q7. Should the Government be able to alter emissions budgets?	No - emissions budgets should not be altered in response to "economic changes" as this undermines their long-term certainty. However, the ability to revise budgets in light of major changes in scientific understanding or international agreements should be permitted.
Q8. Do you agree with the proposed considerations that the Government and the Climate Commission will need to take into account when advising on and setting budgets?	I agree that the Government and the Climate Commission should take the following factors into consideration when advising on and setting budgets: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • scientific knowledge regarding climate change • technology relevant to climate change • economic circumstances and the likely impact of a decision on the economy, as well as the competitiveness of particular sectors of the economy • fiscal circumstances and the likely impact of the decision on taxation, public spending and public borrowing • social circumstances and the likely impact of a decision on fuel poverty • energy policy and the likely impact of a decision on energy supplies and the carbon and energy intensity of the economy.

<p>Q9. Should the Zero Carbon Bill require Governments to set out plans within a certain timeframe to achieve the emissions budgets?</p>	<p>Yes - we must learn from the mistakes of the UK's Climate Change Act and specify a strict time frame for producing a plan.</p>
<p>Q10. What are the most important issues for the Government to consider in setting plans to meet budgets? For example, who do we need to work with, what else needs to be considered?</p>	<p>The Government's policy plans to meet emission budgets should be comprehensive, fair, cost-effective, environmentally sustainable, and reflect a commitment to Te Tiriti o Waitangi.</p>
<p>Q11. The Government has proposed that the Climate Change Commission advises on and monitors New Zealand's progress towards its goals. Do you agree with these functions?</p>	<p>These functions are a start, but I think the Climate Change Commission should at the very least have greater powers to investigate, review and report on the relative progress of different parts of the economy in reducing emissions. This would work in a similar way to the new power being allocated to the Commission Commission to enquire into the state of competition in different sectors. The review power and function should be complemented with information gathering powers, and the ability to make recommendations for that the government consider particular policy changes to increase emissions reductions, where appropriate and feasible, in a particular sector.</p>
<p>Q12. What role do you think the Climate Change Commission should have in relation to the New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme (NZ ETS)?</p>	<p>The Climate Change Commission (CCC) should have full regulatory powers and oversight in relation to the NZ ETS. The CCC should be apolitical, acting as an independent Crown Entity market regulator much like the Financial Markets Authority, Electricity Authority, Commission Commission, and the Reserve Bank. The CCC should have its own statute that sets out its objective, functions, and powers - all of which should draw on the most salient and useful aspects of the functions and powers of the market regulators listed above. For example, the CCC should gain the industry and market review functions of the Commerce Commission and Electricity Authority. The CCC could also have an accreditation function (for recognising valid sources of carbon credits) similar to the FMA's function of licensing financial service providers.</p>
<p>Q13. The Government has proposed that Climate Change Commissioners need to have a range of essential and desirable expertise. Do you agree with the proposed expertise?</p>	<p>I agree with the following collective expertise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • climate change policy (including emissions trading) • resource economics and impacts (including social impacts, labour markets and distribution) • te Tiriti o Waitangi, te reo me ona tikanga Māori and Māori interests • climate and environmental science including mātauranga Māori • experience with addressing adaptation challenges like planning, insurance and local government • risk management • engineering and/or infrastructure • community engagement and communications. • business competitiveness • knowledge of the public and private innovation and technology development system.
<p>Q14. Do you think the Zero Carbon Bill should cover adapting to climate change?</p>	<p>Yes. This may require a separate adaptation sub-committee within the Climate Commission.</p>
<p>Q15. The Government has proposed a number of new functions to help us adapt to climate change. Do you agree with the proposed functions?</p>	<p>I agree with the proposed functions below, but recognise that nuance is required in terms of how local councils are involved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a national climate change risk assessment • a national adaptation plan • regular review of progress towards implementing the national adaptation plan • an adaptation reporting power

Q16. Should the Government explore setting up a targeted adaptation reporting power that could see some organisations share information on their exposure to climate change risks? Yes

Further comments