

<b>Name</b>	Chris and Kay Ogilvie
<b>Email</b>	
<b>A Zero Carbon Act is important to me because...</b>	Mankind (that is you and I) is making the planet uninhabitable; our Grandkids are inheriting a disaster. We need to make many changes, preferably years ago. This law is better late than never.
<b>Q1. What process should the Government use to set a new emissions reduction target in legislation?</b>	Not only should the Government set a target for 2050 in legislation now, but this should be incremental, with say 3 yearly targets in the interim.
<b>Q2. If the Government sets a 2050 target now, which is the best target for New Zealand?</b>	Even the Pope recognizes that we need the most ambitious target: reducing total greenhouse gases to net zero by 2050. I also 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.
<b>Q3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?</b>	By taking all possible action now, using all the scientific knowledge we have now, as well as updating all the time and including ALL polluters, all individuals and organizations that contribute to climate change need to be included. This should be treated as the national (actually international) emergency it is. All costs, financial, social, environmental of NOT doing enough need to be assessed, and widely publicized to help people understand the realities. As somebody has said, "When the ship is sinking, EVERYONE bails" But too many people still have little understanding of what is happening.
<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. It may become MORE urgent.
<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>	Yes - I agree with 5-year budgets set 10-15 years in advance, so that 3 are in effect at all times.
<b>Q6 - Q7. Should the Government be able to alter emissions budgets?</b>	No - emissions budgets should not be altered in response to "economic changes" as this undermines their long-term certainty. However, the ability to revise budgets in light of major changes in scientific understanding or international agreements should be permitted.
<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>	I agree that the Government and the Climate Commission should take the following factors into consideration when advising on and setting budgets: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• quality scientific knowledge regarding climate change</li> <li>• technology relevant to climate change</li> <li>• we are a wealthy country; changes to the distribution of wealth would ensure that the poorer sectors are not burdened more than the rich by the costs of climate change.</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>
<b>Q9. Should the Zero Carbon Bill require Governments to set out plans within a certain timeframe to achieve the emissions budgets?</b>	Yes - we must learn from the mistakes of the UK's Climate Change Act and specify a strict time frame for producing a plan, AND implementing it

<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 treat all people as equals.</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. That is the governments job.</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>The Commission should advise the Government on policy settings in the NZ ETS. It should not make decisions itself with respect to the number of units available in the NZ ETS, or its implementation.</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 (including emissions trading)</li> <li>• resource economics and impacts (including social impacts, labour markets and distribution)</li> </ul> <p>• No one racial, religious or ethnic group should have any greater representation than any other.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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.</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>
<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></p>	<p>I agree with the proposed functions below, but recognise that nuance is required in terms of how local councils are involved:</p> <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>
<p><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></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Further comments</b></p>	<p>Thank all involved for getting on with this. We should NOT allow any one racial, religious or ethnic group to wield more influence than others; I don't go with Maori (or pakeha, or Chinese) having their own representation. We are all in it together. It is clearly urgent, we are entering into a period of many unknowns. The Public needs WAY more accurate information, far too many folk are painfully unaware. The last ice age was caused by a lowering of the world temperature of about 5 degrees. How can we possibly think that two or three or so degrees of temperature rise will be anything other than a total disaster for life as we know it?</p>

