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Objectives for the contribution

Do you agree with these objectives for our contribution?   No

1b. What is most important to you?
An interesting way to phrase a question...the headline will likely read 'a majority of submitters agreed with government's objectives'. So no...I agree with the concept, but not (evidently) what is understood by them.

What is most important is that the proposed course of action is insufficient and even antithetical to the purported goals.

A fair and ambitious contribution would see New Zealand make concrete steps towards lowering emissions. We are not doing that - and the document does not even propose to do that. Costs and impacts on society of INACTION are disregarded in the flawed analyses and there is no chance it will achieve the third objective.

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?
The EU has agreed to an ambitious 40% reduction which is favored. It makes meaningful progress and requires substantial change (therefore not allowing business as usual to proceed unhindered). New Zealand is capable of far more ambitious targets than the meagre ones set down. Additionally, NZ has agreed to a 50% reduction by 2050 already, within the Copenhagen Accord. There are 35 years between now and then. A net 1-2% reduction per year rather than the escalating emissions currently occurring.

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?
A minor contribution will lead to many New Zealander's and our Pacific neighbour's suffering even worse impacts of climate change. New Zealand will stand to receive many thousands of environmental refugees, lose large areas of arable land and important ecosystems.

Adjusting policy settings to progressively reduce emissions will require the wealthy and polluting to cover the true cost of their impacts, thereby increasing overall environmental quality. The money raised by polluter-pays approaches will more than adequately address impacts of any initiative on the poor (who will suffer the most immensely under a do nothing scenario).

A major contribution will allow New Zealand to stand on the international stage with some dignity and lead the
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...like we used to.

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? The question disappeared as the form is poorly constructed.

Summary

5. How should New Zealand take into account the future uncertainties of technologies and costs when setting its target? The cost of not addressing climate change will be far greater than the cost of any initiative. Science tells us present efforts are not near enough and that should be of deep concern to government.

Other comments

6. Is there any further information you wish the Government to consider? Please explain. Every MP was sent a copy of Naomi Klein's This Changes Everything. Kindly read it.