

Consultation on setting New Zealand's post-2020 climate change target



Copy of your submission

Contact information

Name Stephen Adams

Organisation (if applicable)

Address [REDACTED]

Telephone [REDACTED]

Email [REDACTED]

Objectives for the contribution

Do you agree with these objectives for our contribution? No

1b. What is most important to you? Energy security. Without energy life is cold, brutal and short.

What would be a fair contribution for New Zealand?

2. What do you think the nature of New Zealand's emissions and economy means for the level of target that we set?

New Zealand's economy is already powered in large parts by renewable sources, around 80%, but even if we reduced our CO2 emissions to zero it would have no detectable influence on global mean temperatures. That is assuming the IPCC model projections are accurate which is doubtful considering they are already running too hot. There has been no statistically significant increase in global mean temperatures over the last 18 years while around 25% of all of human CO2 emissions have occurred.

According to the IPCC there is no increasing trend in the amount of atmospheric Methane and this accounts for 44% of our emissions. So including those as part of our contributions is disingenuous.

https://www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/ar4/wg1/en/ch2s2-3-2.html

How will our contribution affect New Zealanders?

3. What level of cost is appropriate for New Zealand to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions? For example, what would be a reasonable reduction in annual household consumption?

Zero. None. What we spend has to be based on results. Why would we reduce our economy by 3.5 billion dollars if no net benefit is detectable. According to Bjorn Lomborg's testimony in 2013 it will cost the EU \$250 billion dollars a year until 2100 (that's \$20 trillion) to implement their carbon reduction plan and it will produce a reduction in warming of 0.05 degrees by 2100. See <https://junkscience.com.files.wordpress.com/2013/03/lomborg-congress-testimony-march-2013.pdf>

I think we would be better off to have that money available for actual problems like dealing with earthquakes of the like we experienced in Christchurch.

4. Of the opportunities for New Zealand to reduce its emissions (as outlined on page 15 of the discussion document), which do you think are the most likely to occur, or be most important for New Zealand?

Fuel and energy efficiency is most likely to occur in the future.

This is important but they don't need government taxation or subsidies to occur. They are produced by new

Consultation on setting New Zealand's post-2020 climate change target



Copy of your submission

technologies.

Summary

5. How should New Zealand take into account the future uncertainties of technologies and costs when setting its target?

We should weigh up the benefits versus the costs as discussed in 3. We would be much better off to adapt to climate change. We must also be concerned about natural climate change. Even if we stopped all man made emissions the climate would still we change. How are best placed to deal with that if we have wasted billions of dollars on a problem which might not be caused by humans.

Other comments

6. Is there any further information you wish the Government to consider? Please explain.

I think the government should consider the NIPPC report.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/reports/ccr2a/ccr2physicalscience.html>

The is a non-governmental review of the science which, I believe, should be taken into account just like the IPCC reports are.