

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



Copy of your submission

Contact information

Name Callan Brash

Organisation (if applicable)

Address [REDACTED]

Telephone [REDACTED]

Email [REDACTED]

Objectives for the contribution

Do you agree with these objectives for our contribution? Yes

1b. What is most important to you?

Being seen internationally and domestically that we are ambitious about the way we handle the problem of climate change is paramount. It is our future generations who will have to deal with the consequences if we do not make a change to the way we are effecting the world. If we as a county can show our children and younger population that it is standard practice to do everything we can to protect our environment, then they will learn and continue to enforce that mentality to their own future generations. The time for change has already passed, and we must show the country and the world that we will do everything in our power to rejuvenate the environment to ensure human-beings remain extant and actively healthy.

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?

As stated in the discussion document, New Zealand forests have played a key roll in offsetting some carbon. Being that agriculture is our leading emissions contributor and that the farmland in New Zealand is particularly fertile, cost reductions or profit initiatives for farmers that convert part or all off there farm to forestry could play a vital roll in controlling emissions. This would not only lower the amount of livestock creating greenhouse gases, but create carbon offsets by forestry sinks to lower the emissions from other sectors. The reason that New Zealand is so heavily invested in agriculture is that it is profitable. If forestry could become as or more profitable than agriculture, then landowners would make that switch. Instead of having dairy, or other agriculture as New Zealand's main export, we export large quantities of timber products, which are currently needed world wide.

In reality, New Zealand should aim at being carbon neutral, not only becoming a world leader in carbon control, but also general control over our environment and social well being.

How will our contribution affect New Zealanders?

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

We need to aim for carbon neutral, weather that be 20% below 1990, or 120% below 1990. This would have to be a steady increase, but the longer we leave it, the more impact it will have to New Zealanders when we do increase costs to the public to lower our emissions. So this needs to happen now. Although achieving a target like this is costly, reduction benefits could be given to low-income earners and higher rates apply for people on large incomes. as well as that there could be business benefits to companies that invest or implement strategies to lower their own emissions output, and increased cost or penalties on companies that work in carbon heavy industry that do not implement such strategies.

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



Copy of your submission

There will be an out-cry of public who think it is too expensive or that they are being unjustly penalised in a business that doesn't partake in a carbon offset scheme, but if we don't take drastic action there will be no business to run, and our future generations will not have resources from which to make a living. By implementing ideas such as these, we create jobs, create better understanding of why we need to take action and care for our environment and create a healthier environment for New Zealanders to live.

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? All of the new opportunities should be implemented, some are easier than others, but in the likes of renewable energy, although we could aim for 90%, why not aim for 100%. If home owners could make a profit or lower their power bill to around \$0 every month by installing solar power and selling it back to the grid at a reasonable price (significantly higher than what it is currently bought back at) then New Zealanders would do that. It all comes down to money. If solar was on every single house in New Zealand, there would be a carbon sink that we could put towards the agriculture industry, jobs would be created for installers and maintenance of solar power, and the world would see New Zealand as a leader in the industry. Ideas like this could also be applied to electric cars, if grants were given to petrol stations that had options for electric recharge stations, and the company could make a profit from that, as well as the driver not having to pay as much as they would a petrol car, then these changes would happen. All and any idea's need to be investigated, and no option is too small to dismiss.

Summary

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

We need to stop looking JUST at the ways dealing with climate change cost our economy. We also need to see the positives for implementing new technologies and strategies to lower our emissions. If we look at the jobs created by employing new technology, or manufacturing products that help lower emissions we see a neutral effect to the economy. Although some aspects of lowering emissions costs, different areas can also be profitable. If we became manufacturers of new technology, such as electric fuel stations, leading solar power innovators or high productivity forestry exports then we could keep on top of the newest technology we use. By researching these unknown technologies thoroughly we gain a better understanding of what is needed/involved, especially cost wise. The beautiful thing about technologies today, there is always a better, more efficient way of implementing or producing each technology, meaning that it will always get cheaper until a better more advanced technology comes along, which then too will become cheaper. So, if we look at the cost of the technologies we might be using, allow for the most expensive option, see what impact it will have to New Zealanders, and although it may seem significant at the start, in the long run it will become cheaper and cheaper as New Zealand becomes greener and greener.

Other comments

6. Is there any further information you wish the Government to consider? Please explain. There should be an introduction of emission taxes, for business that are trading in areas where greenhouse gases are significant. Taxes could be based on the amount of emissions from the company and they can either pay the tax, or implement strategies such as funding for off shore initiatives (like the emissions trading scheme), or develop ways of lowering their emissions in-house, from things such as new technologies or procedure changes. These taxes could then be in-put into other areas to lower greenhouse gas, such as forestry grants, or grants for businesses who implement best environmental practice. This would in turn show New Zealanders that caring about things such as climate change and increasing greenhouse gas is standard, and that every part of our daily routine should involve consideration to "How will this affect the place where I live/work/play?"

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

Copy of your submission



Ministry for the
Environment
Manatū Mo Te Taiao