

# Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

## Reference no: 1149

**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

### 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

Aspirational

### Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

### Position

Domestic emissions reductions only (including from new forest planting)

### Notes

Clean up our own act where we can monitor and control effectively

### Clause

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

### Position

Yes

### Notes

Change will continue unavoidably

### 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

Don't be last minute dreamers

### 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

### 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

**Notes**

Too complex to comment

**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**

See later

**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**

No

**Notes**

Monitoring is too big a job for the Commission and the function would compromise the Commission's independence. It should critique the monitors.

**Clause**

12. What role do you think the Climate Change Commission should have in relation to the New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme (NZ ETS)?

**Notes**

Don't agree with the ETS. It will generate much churning, consume resources that would be better spent incentivizing improvements. Taxing emitters better.

**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**

Depends on whether monitoring is to be a Commission function

**Clause**

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

**Position**

Yes

**Notes**

We alone will barely influence CC and must deal with reality- not some ideal.

**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**

No

**Notes**

See high tech comment later

**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**

No

**Notes**

**Clause**

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

**Notes**

I know there is no silver bullet to fix CC. Nevertheless long term gains will come from the high tech sector and we must stay up with innovations and the govt must have resources to contribute and incentivize. Among the many technologies that are fast evolving in China and India is nuclear thorium. The word nuclear is toxic politically in NZ but we must change that when Thorium technologies evolve. At present our regulatory environment condemns everything vaguely nuclear and fails to distinguish between environmentally safe and unsafe. Potentially Thorium plants could: Be scaleable down to units the size of shipping containers thus eliminating kilometers of high voltage transmission lines and our whole national grid The energy could benefit the whole economy and replace gas generation It can make safe nuclear waste It can produce rare earths as a by product and break China's monopoly on these products that are so vital for high tech solutions It could provide abundant power for our future green transport and all the other uses we have for it. Tree planting is e temporary fix. Reducing emissions is long term. Given abundant electrical energy we could clean up our farming and industrial emissions too.

**You have elected to withhold your personal details from publication.**