

# Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Barry Reginald Phease

## Reference no: 725

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

Whatever target is set in legislation now will be too timid, and as more information comes to light the targets will need to be tightened. However the legislation should state that no government can loosen the targets once set.

### 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

We have to stop experimenting with the climate. By 2050 it should be pretty apparent that whatever we are doing is not enough. Short lived gases are a significant contributor to climate change and we have to reduce them

### Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

### Position

Domestic emissions reductions only (including from new forest planting)

### Notes

The cost of (credible) climate credits is going to balloon and if we rely on them then it will be much more costly than doing it domestically. So far I have not seen any advantage to us from including forest planting. It is generally a short term crutch that avoids doing the job properly and the cost of maintaining the carbon sink is going to rise over time, so we will end up wanting to pay it back with negative emissions in the future.

### Clause

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

### Position

Yes

### Notes

It will need to be changed over time as the extent of the problem becomes more apparent. It should only be allowed to be changed to become more severe.

### 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

It seems as good as any option. The budgets need to be strict enough that we are not relying on doing most of it in the last few periods before 2050. There may be technology advances that make it easier then, but expecting them is close to "cargo cult" thinking. The best way to make sure that technology advances happen is to make them attractive now, but setting proper targets. We had a chance in 1990 to phase the targets in gently over time, but we passed that up. Now we no longer have that luxury.

### 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

I think at the end of each 5 year period, the budget for the next periods should be reviewed (downwards) as the conditions will have changed. Either there are more options for reductions, or the extent of the problem will have become more apparent.

**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**

Yes, see above.

**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**

There are also other considerations, e.g. a better understanding of the real costs of adaptation.

**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**

"Aspirational" targets are not enough any more. There have to be concrete measures and measurements to see progress. It would be very risky to set a target and then wait 5 years to see if it is being met. There will also have to be industry targets. There are economic measures (e.g. tax on petrol) which should help to change behaviour, but I think there need to be planned measures (e.g. urban intensification, public transport etc) that give people more options to avoid emissions.

**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**

Industry need to be consulted. At the moment the ETS provides selected industries a subsidy, which can't continue. So industry groups need to know that they are going to have to do their fair share, but they should be consulted on how they do it. Budget advisers and other groups working with disadvantaged groups should be consulted for ways that economic incentives don't make life more difficult. Science and engineering should help to provide targets for industries and individual gases. There may be things that can't be produced in NZ within our emissions budgets. We have to look to transition the economy to better suit our situation. At some stage we have to say that protecting certain jobs (e.g. coal mining) is just too risky and expensive.

**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**

Of course the government of the day will set the membership and the CCC needs to be protected from political whims.

**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**

Governments are too keen to ignore advice that they don't like.

**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

**Notes**

the committee and sub-committee need to have people who will be respected and understand the issues and any numbers put to them. The categories mentioned are broadly right, but it will depend more on individuals understanding the problem and not being beholden to any particular sector It is more important to have experts working for them and writing the reports than having experts on the committee.

**Clause**

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

**Position**

Yes

**Notes**

The adapting we do now is reactive, and most of it is not accounted for properly. When a sea wall is rebuilt after a storm it is not written down to climate change. There needs to be pro-active adaptation (which will be much more expensive than people are allowing for). How do we get people to abandon homes near the beach? What about health effects?

**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

**Notes**

Yes, they are pretty general. I think that more will be found when the work is started.

**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**

Sounds like a good idea. At the moment it is pretty much being left up to councils who are afraid of being sued.

**Clause**

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

**Notes**

This consultation document is a lot better than the last one. I attended a meeting and had reports of other meetings where the vast majority of the feedback was ignored in the final outcome. Make sure this process is genuine this time.