

Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

John Boon

Reference no: 653

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

It's already too late to consider any other option.

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 other options will still cost us a fortune in the downstream impacts of climate change and introduce massive, unpredictable risks of catastrophe. Better to apply more braking now and ensure we are safe later, than try to stop and turn the climate on a sixpence, which may well be impossible, later.

Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

Position

Domestic emissions reductions only (including from new forest planting)

Notes

International carbon units have been tried and are a scam, which New Zealanders knowingly subscribe to. Relying on them would be to rely on the lowest standard provider in the world that sets the lowest market price. All we would achieve is the illusion and cost of a system of failure.

Clause

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

Position

No

Notes

There may be a change of government and previous governments have been faint hearted or even backtracked on essential progress towards climate change. Everything should be done to compel us to stick to our guns or even do better - but not back down.

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

But only if they meet or exceed the end goal and do not place that in jeopardy.

Clause

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

Position

No - emissions budgets should not be able to be changed

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

No

Notes

We should not allow for a government to back down on the overall target to satisfy the demands of any industry or lobby group. There should only be able to be trade-offs - so the ultimate goal is attained.

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

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

There's not enough representation from or commitment to alternative energy and micro generation. Active support through legislation and regulation for micro generation can only help relieve pressure on other aspects of any carbon neutral strategy in a way that places little burden on public coffers. Where is this directly represented in the make up of the commission?

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

But it seems pretty toothless in the proposed form and will be brushed aside by ministers and ministries that do not have clear directives to make substantial change to lead the community by example.

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

And where they can be sourced from. It should also have a specific mandate to regulate in order to prevent scams and trading in fraudulent credits: for instance banning credits from countries known to allow fraudulent trading.

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

No

Notes

Alternative energy as micro generation and smarter consumption (e.g. EVs) needs to be represented by someone who is not in the thrall of the carbon industry.

Clause

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

Position

No

Notes

It's an admission of failure. If that becomes inevitable then another mechanism is needed. Zero Carbon is the fence at the top of the cliff and should not immediately become the ambulance at the bottom.

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

I'm involved as a community representative in flood plain management planning. I can attest to the fact that almost nobody in New Zealand understands the cost NOW of society having to adapt for climate change that is within the bounds of the Paris Accord. For instance, it will add 16% more flood water volume to our planning for defences. This translates to millions of dollars. If the government could educate the country about the cost of doing nothing, or the cost in climate change of only doing enough to meet the Paris Accord - then public attitudes would be very different. People assume doing nothing costs nothing and doing little costs little.

Clause

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

Notes

Why is there not more emphasis on changing regulation of the power industry? At best this industry has green-washed whilst introducing many barriers to entry for micro generation in discriminatory pricing in which those who invest in green power micro generation are effectively subsidising those who do not. This works against any zero carbon strategy the government may have. The industry needs re-regulating to ensure a positive contribution and support for those who personally want to help make zero carbon a reality at their own cost and risk. It's low hanging fruit for the government.