

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



Copy of your submission

---

## Contact information

Name Dermot Coffey

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?

Fair and ambitious contribution. Climate change is the single greatest challenge that we know of in the 21st Century. We are already committed to a significant rise in average temperatures by 2100 with the changes apparent already- ambitious reductions in carbon emissions are essential now to minimise this.

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 nature of the target should be a minimum of 40% below 1990 levels by 2030. With the nature of the NZ economy this will mean big changes in the CO2 emissions- the changes in agriculture will need to be over a longer term and I would foresee some necessity to use international carbon markets to offset this.

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?

The quoted level of costs are reasonable- \$1800 approx /year for a 40% reduction vs \$1200/year for a 5% reduction. I would like to see the costs disproportionately borne by higher income households and for industry and agriculture to be forced to pay adequately for the pollution they cause (not just with respect to climate change, but the effects of the dairy industry in particular on water quality). The discussion document talks mainly about costs to households, while ignoring the other benefits a low carbon economy will have in terms of personal health, economic resilience and liveability of cities.

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?

1-An immediate improvement in the government's plans for active transport and mass transit within cities, and lower carbon freight options between cities i.e. rail

2-Plans to reduce the dependence on and influence of the dairy industry

3- a target of 95% renewable electricity generation, taking into account the likely increases in demand when e.g. electric vehicles become more popular. There should be a government-led plan to support small scale solar generation and home energy storage with new generation batteries as will become cheaper and popular.

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



Ministry for the  
**Environment**  
*Manatū Mo Te Taiao*

Copy of your submission

---

## Summary

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

Completely novel technologies should of course be viewed with some scepticism but the technology is there right now to massively cut carbon emissions, with the price dropping every year for the main long-term players like PV energy generation, electric vehicles and home batteries.

## Other comments

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

The consultation process has been a disgrace. I am politically unaffiliated, but the lack of leadership shown by the current government on this issue has been pathetic. This is the single biggest challenge facing the country and the world and the one on which this government will be able to leave a lasting legacy. NZ faces becoming something of a pariah internationally with its current path, and the effects of this shouldn't be ignored. The "100% Pure" marketing campaign is rightly held up as a huge success internationally, but the government's current stance will have the opposite effect of this, and to a much greater degree. There are costs to be factored in should no mitigating changes be made- obviously globally if nothing is done, but also locally should the rest of the world move on with and NZ be left behind. The experience in Germany has shown that GDP growth can be decoupled from rising emissions and the time is right now for NZ to join in.