

# Setting New Zealand's post-2020 climate change target

## Submission form

### Contact information

Name	Linda Conning
Address	[REDACTED]
Telephone	[REDACTED]
Email	[REDACTED]

### Introduction

I have found the Discussion Document and this process frustrating. It focuses on narrow costs and options and does not look at the benefits to be achieved by reducing carbon emissions or our responsibilities to future generations.

The fact that our emissions have increased significantly since 1990 is shameful and irresponsible: Successive governments have allowed our rail networks to run down when they should have been maintained and extended to reduce the reliance on road transport, especially for transporting logs and other industrial products. Vehicles and other products should be taxed according to their emissions. I do not believe it is moral to offset emissions by payment as opposed to reducing them.

The "open economy" is a hindrance to achieving a low carbon economy because there is no regulation to guide business towards the outcome sought e.g. privatisation of the electricity market has allowed energy companies to renege from paying private individuals to sell excess electricity generated by renewable sources.

The electricity companies have a vested interest in the status quo and there are disincentives for individual or local community renewable energy generation. Fixed line charges are now greater than the actual electricity charge so there is not a realistic incentive for consumers to reduce their consumption.

There is considerable potential for increased generation of energy by renewables such as wind and solar. There are several companies that hold resource consents for wind farms but have not implemented them because they make more money from existing sources. This is where government taxation and regulation should intervene in the energy market.

The food production argument is a red herring – the fact is that most of the food we produce goes to wealthy people who don't need it, not the under-privileged. Our dairy industry has become high energy - reliant on pumping vast quantities of water and producing high levels of waste, much of which ends up in waterways rather than being recycled.

There have been no effective incentives to increase permanent forest carbon sinks, and the government is not even funding DoC to effectively reduce the effect of pests on the carbon sink potential of our protected forests.

## Objectives for the contribution

### 1a. We have set the following three objectives for our contribution:

- **it is seen as a fair and ambitious contribution – both by international and domestic audiences**
- **costs and impacts on society are managed appropriately**
- **it must guide New Zealand over the long term in the global transition to a low emissions world.**

**Do you agree with these objectives for our contribution?**

No

The objectives outlined in the discussion document are *political* objectives, not outcomes to achieve a low carbon economy, which should be the prime objective.

### 1b. What is most important to you?

The most important thing to me is that emissions are reduced as much as possible as soon as possible so that my grandchildren do not inherit a chaotic world created by rising sea levels and increased intensity of storms.

### What would be a fair contribution for New Zealand?

A fair contribution is to do what is achievable.

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

The target should reflect what is actually achievable, not what is relative to anyone else.

### 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 do you think would be a reasonable impact on annual household consumption?

The actual cost per household is actually not that much for those on reasonable incomes – as pointed out in the Discussion Document we are a wealthy country. Effect on families should be managed by taxation based on ability to pay, and social service benefits to those who cannot afford basic levels of consumption.

### 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?

Why are we not maximising our opportunities now? Governments have been too much influenced by climate change deny-ers and ideologies. Put these aside and make the target a transition to a low carbon, if not no carbon, economy. There are plenty of actions being proposed by various environmental and community organisations which should be started on now.

## **Summary**

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

By producing an action plan that will achieve actual emissions.

## **Other comments**

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

I support the proposals from the environmental groups and am very disappointed and frustrated that the Government is not acting in the best interests of future generations.

## **When your submission is complete**

Email your completed submission to [climate.contribution@mfe.govt.nz](mailto:climate.contribution@mfe.govt.nz)

**Submissions close at 5.00pm on Wednesday 3 June 2015.**