

# Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Anna Dobson

## Reference no: 583

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 goal to reach net zero emissions by the second half of the century and the Climate Change Commission advises on the specific target for the Government to set later

### Notes

Legalise industrial hemp to sequester carbon and for soil remediation, medical cannabis and alternative materials manufacturing. Also enact laws to phase out animal farming of all sorts and enable subsidisation of plant based diets for humans and animals. This will achieve net zero emissions. Lets be clear on who the actual perpetrators of carbon emissions are: Farming.

### 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

Legalise industrial hemp to sequester carbon and for soil remediation, medical cannabis and alternative materials manufacturing. Also enact laws to phase out animal farming of all sorts and enable subsidisation of plant based diets for humans and animals. This will achieve net zero emissions. Lets be clear on who the actual perpetrators of carbon emissions are: Farming.

### Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

### Position

Domestic emissions reductions (including from new forest planting) and using some emissions reductions from overseas (international carbon units) that have strong environmental safeguards

### Notes

Coordinate local net zero emissions strategies with international net zero emission agreements, to increase the environmental benefit and effect.

### Clause

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

### Position

Yes

### Notes

The 2050 target should only be revised to achieve net zero emissions locally if the current strategies in place to reduce carbon emissions are insufficient as regards time frame or capacity. I think NZ could achieve net zero emissions by 2035 and we should try with stricter strategies and more forceful and defined conditions.

### 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

Yes. Having a defined timeframe enables real time and frequent checking of efficacy of the strategy against the goal in order to determine if more action is required to achieve the goal within the timeframe, or sooner than the specified time frame. A timeframe enables fine focus on the effectiveness of the strategies outlined to achieve the goal, and allows time to introduce further strategies to increase the success of the goal .

### Clause

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

### Position

Yes - each incoming Government should have the option to review the third budget in the sequence

### 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**

Yes

**Notes**

Only if the goal of achieving net zero emissions, is achieved within a shorter timeframe than 2050.

**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****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**

Yes. Timeframes will hold governments accountable ideally.

**Clause**

10. 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?

**Notes**

A national climate change risk assessment Climate change exacerbates existing risks and creates new risks. Many councils and communities are already dealing with some of these. At the moment, our actions to adapt are ad hoc and we cannot measure our effectiveness. To address this, we propose introducing a compulsory national climate change risk assessment that is updated regularly. The Climate Change Adaptation Technical Working Group has recommended that this type of assessment is a priority. If we can get a better understanding of which areas and communities are the most exposed and vulnerable to risks, we can ensure we are taking the most effective actions to address these. Our first step is determining what the risks are for people, infrastructure, the natural environment and the economy. This information needs to be accessible and standardised to help decision-makers, including iwi and hapū, communities, transport and infrastructure sectors, private sector firms, and central and local government. A risk assessment would need to align with and inform other risk work by the Government. It could provide valuable information to the National Security System and the Ministry for Civil Defence and Emergency Management and other interested agencies. The proposed national climate change risk assessment would:

- identify risks to New Zealand that arise from, or are worsened by climate change
- provide the necessary evidence to improve how we communicate current and future risks and opportunities
- provide a foundation for investment and decision-making, and guide future work
- inform development of a national adaptation plan
- inform planning and actions to minimise the cost of future climate-related disaster response and recovery
- contribute to an approach across all sectors to help stimulate action in a systematic way
- provide accessible and standardised information for decision-making.

Placing this requirement in primary legislation means future risk assessments continue to take a broad view across the economy and society and there will be continuity over time, creating a more stable policy environment. A national climate change risk assessment would be publicly available, updated at five-yearly intervals and the Climate Change Commission would hold responsibility for this. While the Commission is being set up, central government could initiate the first risk assessment, with future assessments falling under the responsibility of the Climate Change Commission. Future assessments could include information obtained from the adaptation reporting power, if developed (see below). All of that above I am in agreement with. Also I am in agreement with all of this: What expertise could the Climate Change Commission have? We seek your views on the range of expertise that the commissioners could have. The UK Committee consists of a chair plus five to eight committee members and an adaptation sub-committee with five members. The members have a high level of standing in society and are sector experts rather than representatives of particular stakeholder groups. We consider our Commission should have similar credibility and the following essential expertise:

- climate change policy (including emissions trading)
- resource economics and impacts (including social impacts, labour markets and distribution)
- te Tiriti o Waitangi, te reo me ona tikanga Māori and Māori interests
- climate and environmental science including mātauranga Māori
- experience with addressing adaptation challenges like planning, insurance and local government
- risk management
- engineering and/or infrastructure
- community engagement and communications.

Desirable, but non-essential, expertise could include:

- business competitiveness
- knowledge of the public and private innovation and technology development system.

Including the expertise needed in the Commission in the Zero Carbon Bill aligns with the UK approach and the recommendation of our Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment. This is who I think could be consulted: People involved in Industrial Hemp - hemp to sequester carbon, and Vegan food producers growing plants for meat/dairy/wholefood and processed food types. Vegans growing plants for industrial level manufacturing should be subsidised and supported in the ways that meat farmers have been for years. Meat and dairy farming need to be phased out of existence as they are the primary contributors to carbon emissions. Plant production for carbon sequestering and human and animal food production needs to be prioritised, legally and financially endorsed in preference to animal meat and dairy production to fully achieve net zero emissions. anything less and you are merely pandering to the financial and conflicting interests of the Meat and Dairy Lobbies.

**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**

Yes. I would like for the Climate Change Commission to have the strongest level of influence on New Zealand governance and legislation. I would like to vote for Decision making powers in this regard.

**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**

Makes decisions itself in respect of the number of units available in the NZ ETS

**Notes**

same answer as above.

**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**

Also include those manufacturers and industries with known net zero emission histories ie Vegan plant based food manufacturing, Horticulture ie Hemp Industry, Organic Horticulture. Exclude all animal exploitation based industries such as meat and dairy farming from being a stakeholder. Meat and Dairy farming are the culprits of continuing carbon emissions. Continuing to include the perspectives of the Meat and Dairy industry and their interests which conflict with reducing carbon emissions would be an ignorant decision to make.

**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**

Again: The strategy of banning Meat and Dairy industries within New Zealand is the most New Zealand can do to achieve net zero emissions by 2050 alongside endorsing and enabling Vegan food production and Industrial hemp/horticulture/native forest tree creation to sequester carbon. These contributions to the strategy are essential.

**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**

Ban Meat and Dairy Farming in New Zealand as their continued industry presence will compromise and sabotage the goal of net zero emissions. Subsidise financially and legally endorse and support Vegan plant based food production businesses for human and animal food, create a greater list of plant species enabled to sequester carbon such as Industrial Hemp, Manuka, Horticulture, NZ Native forests in a polyculture not a monoculture.