## Clause 1. What process should the Government use to set a new emissions reduction target in legislation?

**Position**
The Government sets a 2050 target in legislation now

**Notes**
We believe that the Government should set a 2050 target in legislation now. We know that climate change will have a range of impacts on society and we believe society needs some certainty about how New Zealand will work towards mitigating our contribution to climate change. As educators, it makes sense to us to call for a specific goal now as we know that further delays can only exacerbate the impacts.

## Clause 2. If the Government sets a 2050 target now, which is the best target for New Zealand?

**Position**
Net Zero Emissions - Net zero emissions across all greenhouse gases by 2050

**Notes**
We support net zero emissions of all greenhouse gases by 2050. We need to take a bold approach as we believe the risks from climate change impacts are too great to do less. We understand that different gases contribute differently to warming and hence potential climate change impacts, but they all contribute and therefore we must ways to reduce their emission.

## Clause 3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

**Position**
Domestic emissions reductions only (including from new forest planting)

**Notes**
As environmental educators, a core principle we believe in is personal and social responsibility. Emissions are our responsibility so we should aim to reduce these through domestic means only. We do not support that option to opt out by buying out as this sends the completely wrong signal regarding behaviour change. Buying emission reductions from overseas can only ever be a short term solution. It also sends the wrong signal about how New Zealanders treat their own country and the planet, something which is against our own philosophy and marketing brand. Careful thought needs to go into forest planting to ensure the right mix of planting.

## Clause 4. Should the Zero Carbon Bill allow the 2050 target to be revised if circumstances change?

**Position**
No

**Notes**
We say no, and that we need to take responsibility for what we do. In exceptional circumstances, we would agree to a possibility of change but only within all of the criteria specified for setting carbon budgets – see Q8

## Clause 5. 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?

**Position**
Yes

**Notes**
We say yes. The budgets will be key for transparency and education. They provide the opportunity for learning about climate change emissions in a concrete way and a transparent monitoring of our commitments. We believe that the budget setting should be outside of the political process and so five year cycles would generally work well.

## Clause 6. Should the Government be able to alter the last emissions budget (i.e. furthest into the future)?

**Position**
No - emissions budgets should not be able to be changed

**Notes**
We say no. We have to stay on track. There is a danger of allowing flexibility in that altering budgets may become too easy to do. In
exceptional circumstances that are drawn from all the criteria for setting carbon budgets (see Q8), some possibility for change may be allowed.

Clause 7. Should the Government have the ability to review and adjust the second emissions budget within a specific range under exceptional circumstances? See p36 Our Climate Your Say

Position No

Notes We say no. This issue is too important to allow for change. However, in exceptional circumstances that are drawn from all the criteria for setting carbon budgets (see Q8), some possibility for change may be allowed.

Clause 8. Do you agree with the considerations we propose that the Government and the Climate Change Commission take into account when advising on and setting budgets? See p44 Our Climate Your Say

Position Yes

Notes Yes we agree with the list of considerations as proposed. However, we are concerned about the lack of focus on ecosystem health, and believe that this must be a cornerstone when setting carbon budgets. We strongly recommend overt inclusion of a consideration about ecosystem health.

Clause 9. Should the Zero Carbon Bill require Governments to set out plans within a certain timeframe to achieve the emissions budgets?

Position Yes

Notes We say yes. It is important to have definite planning on this urgent issue. We agree with the PCE recommendation for planning to be in place within six months of setting an emissions budget.

Clause 10. 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?

Notes We believe that the Government needs to consider the following: A much stronger focus on education about climate change, its causes and impacts. Many New Zealanders are concerned about climate change but lack the knowledge and skills to mitigate and adapt. We recommend an emphasis on education for mitigation, but also believe that education for adaptation will be important. Government needs to address the required education that carbon budgets imply. How ecosystems will be impacted by climate change and work towards setting carbon budgets that minimise impacts on those systems. We need more scientific research to inform this. The people in society who are most vulnerable to climate change already, and those who may become vulnerable to policies and plans set to meet carbon budgets. There is little doubt that behaviour change is required, and this will have social, cultural and economic ramifications. How just transitions can be put in place to enable these vulnerable groups to succeed in a low carbon world. The role of Te Tiriti o Waitangi and tangata whenua in determining carbon budgets, using a blend of mātauranga Māori and other knowledge to find the best solutions.

Clause 11. 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? See p42 Our Climate Your Say

Position Yes

Notes We say yes. The Climate Change Commission needs to be independent of Government, but provide advisory and monitoring functions, and not policy.

Clause 12. What role do you think the Climate Change Commission should have in relation to the New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme (NZ ETS)?

Position Advising the Government on policy settings in the NZ ETS

Notes We say to advise Government only.

Clause 13. 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? See p45 Our Climate Your Say

### Clause 14.
**Do you think the Zero Carbon Bill should cover adapting to climate change?**

**Position**
Yes

**Notes**
We say yes. As the impacts of climate change are already being felt, and there has to date been a fragmented response to this, as greater impacts occur in future, adaptation will be crucial and the Bill needs to address this through education and other means.

### Clause 15.
**The Government has proposed a number of new functions to help us adapt to climate change. Do you agree with the proposed functions? See p47 Our Climate Your Say**

**Position**
Yes

**Notes**
We say yes. Any adaptation plan must include an element of education across informal and formal sectors.

### Clause 16.
**Should we explore setting up a targeted adaptation reporting power that could see some organisations share information on their exposure to climate change risks?**

**Position**
Yes

**Notes**
We say yes, providing sharing of data is done with appropriate safeguards.