

Name	Jordan Redding
Email	
A Zero Carbon Act is important to me because...	<p>A Zero Carbon Act is important me because I live in this world. The decisions that I make in life have an impact on others. Likewise the decisions we make as a country have an impact. We live inter-connected lives, not only spatially but temporally. The Zero Carbon Act is a positive step in addressing the negative impact we as a nation and I as an individual have on the planet.</p> <p>As a Christian, I believe in a God who created this world in loving freedom, a God who is actively at work in the world bringing healing and life. As humans, I believe, we have a responsibility to share in God's work, stewarding and caring for this world and all life-forms that inhabit it.</p>
Q1. What process should the Government use to set a new emissions reduction target in legislation?	The Government should set a target for 2050 in legislation now. Although I also wonder whether we need to set a limit on greenhouse gas emissions as well. After all, emissions that we pump into atmosphere before 2050 will continue to have a warming effect decades and centuries later.
Q2. If the Government sets a 2050 target now, which is the best target for New Zealand?	The most ambitious target: reducing total greenhouse gases to net zero by 2050. I also support taking a science-based approach to ensure our efforts to reduce emissions are as impactful as possible: we should aim for negative levels of long-lived gases, while reducing short-lived gases to sustainable levels. A two-baskets approach, treating long-lived and short-lived gases differently is important to ensure a smooth economic transition as well as to recognise the complexity of the issue.
Q3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?	By using domestic emissions reductions only (including from new forest planting). While carbon credits (even verifiably beneficial credits) may be an easy way to meet our targets they are not addressing the problem itself. We also should not rely on new forest planting. While it is an important growing industry, forestry presents its own issues (e.g. land erosion, conservation issues). We need to be reducing emissions in our energy sector, in the agricultural sector, and in our own lifestyles. Enabling individuals and families to do this efficiently and easily will be important.
Q4. Should the Zero Carbon Bill allow the 2050 target to be revised if circumstances change?	The 2050 target should not be altered in response to "economic changes" as this undermines its long-term certainty. However, the ability to revise the 2050 target in light of major changes in scientific understanding or international agreements should be permitted.
Q5. 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?	Yes - I agree with 5-year budgets set 10-15 years in advance, so that 3 are in effect at all times.
Q6 - Q7. Should the Government be able to alter emissions budgets?	No - emissions budgets should not be altered in response to "economic changes" as this undermines their long-term certainty. However, the ability to revise budgets in light of major changes in scientific understanding or international agreements should be permitted. There should also be some flexibility in light of unforeseen national disasters. In extreme circumstances it may be necessary for a Government to alter a budget to make it less ambitious. But there should be measures in place to make sure this can't be abused simply because a budget is too difficult or too expensive to accomplish.

<p>Q8. Do you agree with the proposed considerations that the Government and the Climate Commission will need to take into account when advising on and setting budgets?</p>	<p>I agree that the Government and the Climate Commission should take the following factors into consideration when advising on and setting budgets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • scientific knowledge regarding climate change • technology relevant to climate change • economic circumstances and the likely impact of a decision on the economy, as well as the competitiveness of particular sectors of the economy • fiscal circumstances and the likely impact of the decision on taxation, public spending and public borrowing • social circumstances and the likely impact of a decision on fuel poverty • energy policy and the likely impact of a decision on energy supplies and the carbon and energy intensity of the economy.
<p>Q9. Should the Zero Carbon Bill require Governments to set out plans within a certain timeframe to achieve the emissions budgets?</p>	<p>Yes - we must learn from the mistakes of the UK's Climate Change Act and specify a strict time frame for producing a plan. Twelve months from the setting of the next budget sounds reasonable.</p>
<p>Q10. 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?</p>	<p>The Government's policy plans to meet emission budgets should be comprehensive, fair, cost-effective, environmentally sustainable, and reflect a commitment to Te Tiriti o Waitangi.</p>
<p>Q11. 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?</p>	<p>Yes - the Commission should not be a decision-making body. But the Government should be required to report to the Commission and to respond publicly to official advice from the Commission.</p>
<p>Q12. What role do you think the Climate Change Commission should have in relation to the New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme (NZ ETS)?</p>	<p>The Commission should advise the Government on policy settings in the NZ ETS. It should not make decisions itself with respect to the number of units available in the NZ ETS, or its implementation.</p>
<p>Q13. 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?</p>	<p>I agree with the following collective expertise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • business competitiveness • knowledge of the public and private innovation and technology development system. <p>I think expertise in public health is also important.</p>
<p>Q14. Do you think the Zero Carbon Bill should cover adapting to climate change?</p>	<p>Yes. This may require a separate adaptation sub-committee within the Climate Commission. Having a robust, unified approach to adaptation will be increasingly important over time. Sea-level rise, increasing frequency and severity of extreme weather events, as well as a generally warming climate will disproportionately affect some areas of the country as well as vulnerable and lower socio-economic demographics. We need a plan that will fairly and equitably provide for those most affected.</p>

Q15. The Government has proposed a number of new functions to help us adapt to climate change. Do you agree with the proposed functions?	<p>I agree with the proposed functions below, but recognise that nuance is required in terms of how local councils are involved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a national climate change risk assessment • a national adaptation plan • regular review of progress towards implementing the national adaptation plan • an adaptation reporting power
Q16. Should the Government explore setting up a targeted adaptation reporting power that could see some organisations share information on their exposure to climate change risks?	<p>Yes</p>
Further comments	<p>I'm delighted this is happening. I hope the Act will be ambitious and strong in addressing our domestic emissions. While I think there is some scope as to how ambitious we make this Act, the science is now clear: we need to drastically reduce our emissions now. No doubt this will not be easy, but the alternative (doing nothing or simply not enough) will be far more difficult. The time has come (and is well overdue) for radical action on anthropogenic climate change.</p>