

<b>Name</b>	John Simpson
<b>Email</b>	
<b>Phone</b>	
<b>Town / City</b>	
<b>A Zero Carbon Act is important to me because...</b>	The prospect of maybe 600ppm CO2 in the air and perhaps 70mm of sea level rise is daunting enough. The prospect of my children and grandchildren living or getting killed in the ensuing conflicts that would inevitably take place over food, water, living space and heat exhaustion are too horrifying to contemplate. No one, in my opinion, can say that NZ is safe from this or that it does not apply to us. If we have any morals then it's our duty to lead, not do the least we can get away with.
<b>Q1. What process should the Government use to set a new emissions reduction target in legislation?</b>	The Government could set a target for 2050 in legislation now, but maybe thats too vague and distant for 4 year politicians. The policy should be to beat that. Legislative targets need to be more specific and measurable and framed on an annual basis. In the manner of workplace performance contracts. A template that can be mandated on businesses and local authorities, else it will not happen
<b>Q2. If the Government sets a 2050 target now, which is the best target for New Zealand?</b>	Reducing total greenhouse gases to net zero by 2050 may not be aggressive enough. I support taking a science-based approach to ensure our efforts to reduce emissions are as impactful as possible: we should aim for negative levels of long-lived gases, while reducing short-lived gases to sustainable levels and adopting continuous reduction strategies with a target of zero. If the target is not zero then human nature is that no action will be taken until emissions breach any non-zero tolerance level. Such behaviour can be seen in appliance and engine efficiency.
<b>Q3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?</b>	First lead by example using domestic emissions reductions (including from new forest planting). Also mandate government and business sourcing and investment strategies such that only suppliers achieving approved levels of pollution and other ethical standards are eligible to tender.
<b>Q4. Should the Zero Carbon Bill allow the 2050 target to be revised if circumstances change?</b>	The 2050 target should not be altered in response to "economic changes" as this undermines its long-term certainty. However, the ability to revise the 2050 target in light of major changes in scientific understanding or international agreements should be permitted. Any attempt to play the "too expensive" or "too hard" card should be strenuously resisted.
<b>Q5. 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?</b>	Not aggressive enough - Budgets should be 4 years set 4-8 years in advance to coincide with governments contract with the electorate. Anything 12 years away is too late to have any effect by 2050.
<b>Q6 - Q7. Should the Government be able to alter emissions budgets?</b>	Yes but only downwards - experience shows that sovereign governments persistently fail to achieve financial budgets on projects such as construction, IT and defence, often by huge margins. A carbon emission target is something we cannot fail to achieve at any financial cost. We need to think of it as a "total war" situation against a threat to civilization itself.

<p><b>Q8. Do you agree with the proposed considerations that the Government and the Climate Commission will need to take into account when advising on and setting budgets?</b></p>	<p>I agree that the Government and the Climate Commission should take the following factors into consideration when advising on and setting budgets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impartial communication with the electorate based on truth and integrity and expressed as straightforward KPIs substantially independent of Party Politics</li> <li>• Scientific knowledge regarding climate change, unbiased by interest groups.</li> <li>• Technology relevant to climate change on the basis of the greatest and soonest possible impact for the least effort, risk and expense</li> <li>• Economic circumstances and the likely impact of a decision on the economy, in the long term. However there should not be any "sacred cows" either literally or figuratively.</li> <li>• Fiscal circumstances and the likely impact of the decision on, employment, taxation, public spending and public borrowing.</li> <li>• Social circumstances and the likely impact of a decision on the freedom, safety, dignity and quality of life of New Zealanders giving due regard to social (in)equality, living wages and fuel poverty</li> <li>• Energy policy and the likely impact of a decision on energy supplies and the carbon and energy intensity of the economy.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Q9. Should the Zero Carbon Bill require Governments to set out plans within a certain timeframe to achieve the emissions budgets?</b></p>	<p>We must learn from both the successes and shortcomings of the UK's Climate Change Act, together with those of other committed sovereign states and specify a strict time frame for producing a plan.</p>
<p><b>Q10. What are the most important issues for the Government to consider in setting plans to meet budgets? For example, who do we need to work with, what else needs to be considered?</b></p>	<p>The Government's policy plans to meet emission budgets should be comprehensive, fair, cost-effective, environmentally sustainable, and reflect a commitment to Te Tiriti o Waitangi.</p>
<p><b>Q11. 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?</b></p>	<p>Yes - the Commission should not be a decision-making body, with authority and responsibility and teeth.</p>
<p><b>Q12. What role do you think the Climate Change Commission should have in relation to the New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme (NZ ETS)?</b></p>	<p>Frankly I don't believe in emission trading schemes as they have never put a price on carbon consistent with the damage it does to the planet. Moreover I feel that they are too open to abuse and provide a "cop out" for polluters</p>
<p><b>Q13. 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?</b></p>	<p>I agree with the following collective expertise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• climate change policy (NOT including emissions trading)</li> <li>• resource economics and impacts (including social impacts, labour markets and distribution)</li> <li>• All of our interests</li> <li>• climate and environmental science including mātauranga Māori</li> <li>• experience with addressing adaptation challenges like planning, insurance and local government</li> <li>• risk management</li> <li>• engineering and/or infrastructure</li> <li>• community engagement and communications.</li> <li>• business competitiveness</li> <li>• knowledge of the public and private innovation and technology development system.</li> </ul> <p>I think expertise in public health is also important because of the known and unknown effects of outdoor and indoor CO2 especially as they approach 600ppm .</p>
<p><b>Q14. Do you think the Zero Carbon Bill should cover adapting to climate change?</b></p>	<p>Yes. This may require a separate adaptation sub-committee within the Climate Commission.</p>

<b>Q15. The Government has proposed a number of new functions to help us adapt to climate change. Do you agree with the proposed functions?</b>	I agree with the proposed functions below, but recognise that nuance is required in terms of how local councils are involved: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• a national climate change risk assessment</li><li>• a national adaptation plan</li><li>• regular review of progress towards implementing the national adaptation plan</li><li>• an adaptation reporting power</li></ul>
<b>Q16. Should the Government explore setting up a targeted adaptation reporting power that could see some organisations share information on their exposure to climate change risks?</b>	Yes
<b>Further comments</b>	Although NZ is a small country it needs to and can punch above it's weight to have credibility on the World Stage. I fear that we may witness conflicts, human migrations and disasters that could overshadow those of the first half of the 20th century if nothing is done.

The message has been sent from  
Entry ID: 85

at 2018-06-12 16:57:15 on Edge 17.17134