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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>1. What process should the Government use to set a new emissions reduction target in legislation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>The Government sets a 2050 target in legislation now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>It is essential for global emissions to peak and start declining by 2020 at the latest if we are to return to safe concentrations of GHGs by the end of this century. There is not time to postpone emissions reductions. Deep reductions need to begin immediately. This will only happen with strong policy and legislation in place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>2. If the Government sets a 2050 target now, which is the best target for New Zealand?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Net Zero Emissions - Net zero emissions across all greenhouse gases by 2050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>This is the best of the options. However, the science suggests that net carbon uptake is needed to avoid warming of more than 1.5C. Further, there is evidence that it would be possible to continue to emit a small amount of methane and nitrous oxide while remaining below 1.5C provided there is sufficient CO2 uptake - this may be a more feasible option given NZ’s economy and should be given consideration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Domestic emissions reductions only (including from new forest planting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>The global challenge is too great to delay domestic action. NZ is in a position that it would be possible to achieve carbon uptake and minimal non-carbon dioxide LLGHG emissions domestically and should do so. Even strong environmental safeguards do not prevent emissions leakage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>4. Should the Zero Carbon Bill allow the 2050 target to be revised if circumstances change?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Assuming the circumstances are scientific understanding and not economic or other circumstances. The targets should be based on what is scientifically necessary - if the knowledge on what this means advances, so too should our goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>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?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>It is essential that these require rapid and deep emissions cuts rather than delaying reductions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>6. Should the Government be able to alter the last emissions budget (i.e. furthest into the future)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>No - emissions budgets should not be able to be changed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>The budget should be based on science not government policy. Changes should only be allowed if the scientific knowledge changes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clause
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
There will be increasing occurrences of exceptional circumstances - it does not make sense to use the impacts of climate change as an excuse to delay action

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
No
Notes
The budgets should be based on science. The remaining considerations certainly need to be addressed - however this should not happen through revising the budget but through other means

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
Without government action, policy and legislation it will be impossible to achieve the targets.

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
There should be flexibility in the approaches. Bottom up and top down initiatives will be needed. Businesses, all levels of government and community will need to be engaged in setting the plans.

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

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
Makes decisions itself in respect of the number of units available in the NZ ETS
Notes
The commission should be independent of the government to avoid changes in policy when government changes

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
Position
Yes
Notes
However I note that climate science should be higher on this list

Clause
14. Do you think the Zero Carbon Bill should cover adapting to climate change?
Position
Yes
Notes
Or if not then this should be covered by another 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
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
There seems to be insufficient scientific rigour in developing the three very simple options. The options are both insufficiently ambitious (for carbon) and perhaps more ambitious than totally necessary (for methane and nitrous oxide). Please refer to scientific literature such as Hansen J, Sato M, Kharecha P, Beerling D, Berner R, Masson-Delmotte V, Pagani M, Raymo M, Royer DL, Zachos JC: Target Atmospheric CO2: Where Should Humanity Aim? The Open Atmospheric Science Journal 2008, 2:217-231