

Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Reference no: 1139

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 2050 target in legislation now

Notes

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

Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

Position

Domestic emissions reductions only (including from new forest planting)

Notes

Clause

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

Position

No

Notes

I would only support changes to a more ambitious goal

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

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

I would only support changes for more ambitious goals, not reductions

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

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 and these plans need to be informed by SMART objectives, indicators, and a transparent monitoring strategy. There needs to be transparency also on the achievement (or not) of the targets and the further actions taken.

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 needs to be focus on (1) the biggest emissions source, the animal agriculture, and (2) the transport system, where NZ has a very large potential for improvement (reducing dependency to car, serving not only environmental objectives but also health, inclusion, equality and participation in the local economy)

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**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

The Commission's recommendations should be key elements of decision. If the Government were not to follow them, a strong case should be required.

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

There needs to be a strong competence in *change* management, especially transitioning out of animal agriculture and car-dependent transport system. Transitioning *out of* but also with a clear vision of "towards what". "Engineering/infrastructure" is very vague; I think that there needs to be competences in the transport system (beyond infrastructure) and in water and energy engineering and conservation.

Clause

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

Position

Yes

Notes

Every aspect of the forward planning needs to take into account the climate change, probably beginning with the Zero Carbon Bill.

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

I can't find these functions in the document

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

Reporting should be independent

Clause

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

Notes

The document is overly focused on the economy. I find it very inappropriate, given that it is question here of (1) our survival as a species, (2) our moral obligations towards the living beings and our future generations and (3) the development of New Zealand as a nation and society. Vision needs to lead, not the economy. The economy needs to transition in a way that supports the vision. In the

opportunities, a few key elements are missing: (1) modal shift in transport: reduced overall costs (infrastructure, environment, health, participation in the local economy, people's well-being) (2) Increased accessibility and participation, through a less car-dominated system. The current situation makes it difficult for whole demographics to participate in the economy, education, or other opportunities (see work of Karen Witten et al, on transport-related severance in NZ). Philipp McCann had made a clear case for more accessible and better functioning cities - I had put some key points and links here: <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/case-cities-new-zealands-economy-tamara-bozovic/> (3) better water quality, through decreased dairy and animal farming (I do hope that the biggest generator of pollution will be tackled and that animal-oriented agriculture will transition to plant-based sustainable farming, for environmental but also moral and ethical reasons). This will have positive outcomes on health but also tourism, matching the "100% pure" label In terms of solutions, the EVs should not be presented as one for cleaner air, given their high emissions of thin particles (<https://www.thenewamerican.com/tech/item/23226-study-electric-vehicles-pollute-more-than-gas-powered-cars>). They are also hardly an environmentally-friendly solution at all, given the needs for non renewable materials, roads, further contribution to urban sprawl and continued need of roads & road renewals. The end of oil will mean the end of asphalt too, but also the need for more resource-efficient transport solutions. Finally, while I am thankful for the opportunity to contribute (noting I am not a New Zealander but do consider myself as a contributor to this society), I regret the level of language of this document and the formulation of the questions, making them not necessarily accessible to all.

You have elected to withhold your personal details from publication.

Supporting documents from your Submission

Rose-Witten-McCreanor-2009--Transport_related_so..	Uploaded on 06/19/2018 at 09:58PM
McCann-2009-Economic_geography_globalisation_and..	Uploaded on 06/19/2018 at 09:58PM