

Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Reference no: 219

Submitter Type: Individual

Clause

1. What process should the Government use to set a new emissions reduction target in legislation?

Position

The Government sets a 2050 target in legislation now

Notes

Net Zero emissions by 2050 is a minimum requirement for climate justice

Clause

2. If the Government sets a 2050 target now, which is the best target for New Zealand?

Position

Net Zero Emissions - Net zero emissions across all greenhouse gases by 2050

Notes

The 2050 target must include all greenhouse gases. I see no reason why the level of methane currently produced is defensible and could be allowed to stabilise. The warming driven by this methane is already part of the climate change contribution to recent devastating extreme weather events. Net Zero for all emissions is in fact a weak target considering that most pathways for meeting the 2 degrees Paris target include negative emissions (ie. Less than Net Zero) and from a climate justice perspective there is no reason why New Zealand deserves to avoid responsibility any more than other high emitting per capita nations.

Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

Position

Domestic emissions reductions only (including from new forest planting)

Notes

Clause

4. Should the Zero Carbon Bill allow the 2050 target to be revised if circumstances change?

Position

Yes

Notes

Yes, but only in a positive direction (ie. negative emissions, or net zero emissions sooner)

Clause

5. The Government proposes that three emissions budgets of five years each (i.e. covering the next 15 years) be in place at any given time. Do you agree with this proposal?

Position

Yes

Notes

Clause

6. Should the Government be able to alter the last emissions budget (i.e. furthest into the future)?

Position

Yes - the third emissions budget should be able to be changed but only when the subsequent budget is set

Notes

Clause

7. Should the Government have the ability to review and adjust the second emissions budget within a specific range under exceptional circumstances? See p36 Our Climate Your Say

Position

No

Notes

Clause

8. Do you agree with the considerations we propose that the Government and the Climate Change Commission take into account when advising on and setting budgets? See p44 Our Climate Your Say

Position

Yes

Notes

The list of considerations lacks any accounting for the international impacts of our carbon emissions. These impacts are a primary driver for reducing emissions, and should be considered.

Clause

9. Should the Zero Carbon Bill require Governments to set out plans within a certain timeframe to achieve the emissions budgets?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

11. The Government has proposed that the Climate Change Commission advises on and monitors New Zealand's progress towards its goals. Do you agree with these functions? See p42 Our Climate Your Say

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

12. What role do you think the Climate Change Commission should have in relation to the New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme (NZ ETS)?

Position

Advising the Government on policy settings in the NZ ETS

Notes**Clause**

13. The Government has proposed that Climate Change Commissioners need to have a range of essential and desirable expertise. Do you agree with the proposed expertise? See p45 Our Climate Your Say

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

14. Do you think the Zero Carbon Bill should cover adapting to climate change?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

15. The Government has proposed a number of new functions to help us adapt to climate change. Do you agree with the proposed functions? See p47 Our Climate Your Say

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

16. Should we explore setting up a targeted adaptation reporting power that could see some organisations share information on their exposure to climate change risks?

Position

Yes

Notes**Clause**

Do you have any other comments you'd like to make?

Notes

In the context of the devastation that will be wrought by climate change, for a wealthy nation such as New Zealand to adopt a Net Zero target for 2050 is a weak commitment. To achieve a much swifter drawdown of emissions is well within technical and social possibilities. It would require a more radical accounting for our global responsibilities and the purpose of our economy. In this context, I would like to object to the framing of the discussion document suggesting that strong climate action will still allow for economic growth, but that it may be reduced. Placing economic growth above a stable climate is the reason for the swiftly developing climate crisis. These priorities need to be inverted.

You have elected to withhold your personal details from publication.