

<b>Name</b>	Budyong (Roger) Hill
<b>Email</b>	
<b>A Zero Carbon Act is important to me because...</b>	A Zero Carbon Act is more than just important to me. I believe it is CRITICAL to achieve carbon zero by 2050 and a Zero Carbon Act and Climate Commission seem to be the best means of achieving this goal. Those of us alive now owe it to our descendants to get this right. The consequences of getting it wrong are highly likely to be disastrous for them and life in general on our beautiful planet. I wish to commend the Generation Zero group for the thoroughness and dedication they have brought to this essential task of raising public awareness and identifying realistic solutions for us all to strive for. In particular, I fully support their focus on the four core principles of Fairness, Cost Effectiveness, Comprehensiveness and Environmental Sustainability as an overarching guide to how we proceed with the task at hand.
<b>Q1. What process should the Government use to set a new emissions reduction target in legislation?</b>	<p>The Government should set a target for 2050 in legislation now.</p> <p>We must aim high. The community need a very clear signal that we are faced with a crisis if we don't tackle this challenge full on.</p>
<b>Q2. If the Government sets a 2050 target now, which is the best target for New Zealand?</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>I wish to highlight and support the Generation Zero "two baskets" approach, which means taking a scientific approach to different gases. It does not mean treating the agricultural sector differently from other sectors. Nitrous oxide, which is primarily emitted through agricultural practices, is a long-lived greenhouse gas. It absolutely must be reduced to net zero. The science is clear that methane emissions must also be reduced. However, it is simply not necessary to reduce methane to net zero to stop global warming.</p>
<b>Q3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?</b>	<p>By using domestic emissions reductions only (including from new forest planting).</p> <p>Again I say we must aim high. I do not support purchasing international carbon credits as a means of reaching our targets. We are a wealthy resourceful nation which has an obligation to the fellow inhabitants of our one and only planet to lead by example. If there are international credits available that have integrity then they should be used to assist third world countries to meet their targets and if necessary funded through aid from richer countries. We're all in this together and we all will reap the consequences together if we don't support each other to reach carbon zero for the whole planet as soon as possible.</p>

<p><b>Q4. Should the Zero Carbon Bill allow the 2050 target to be revised if circumstances change?</b></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Economic reasons are used regularly to avoid taking important actions necessary to maintain the environmental integrity of our planet and the ecosystems that keep it liveable for us and other lifeforms. Our thinking is all wrong and our processes for measuring GDP and "growth" that ignore the environmental costs are very short sighted and selfish. We must change this approach or we are doomed.</p>
<p><b>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?</b></p>	<p>yes - I agree with 5-year budgets set 10-15 years in advance, so that 3 are in effect at all times.</p> <p>This is essential. No fudging for economic reasons please.</p>
<p><b>Q6 - Q7. Should the Government be able to alter emissions budgets?</b></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Also in a situation of an extreme natural disaster targets may need to be revised providing the overall target of carbon zero by 2050 is maintained.</p>
<p><b>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?</b></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"> <li>• scientific knowledge regarding climate change</li> <li>• technology relevant to climate change</li> <li>• economic circumstances and the likely impact of a decision on the economy, as well as the competitiveness of particular sectors of the economy</li> <li>• fiscal circumstances and the likely impact of the decision on taxation, public spending and public borrowing</li> <li>• social circumstances and the likely impact of a decision on fuel poverty</li> <li>• energy policy and the likely impact of a decision on energy supplies and the carbon and energy intensity of the economy.</li> </ul> <p>The three government objectives for climate change policy of building a sustainable economy, taking leadership in a global and local context and creating a just and inclusive society must be kept in focus at all times.</p>
<p><b>Q9. Should the Zero Carbon Bill require Governments to set out plans within a certain timeframe to achieve the emissions budgets?</b></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.</p> <p>We know without a doubt that some governments will put off setting the plans for achieving emissions budgets if it is not set in law. Again no fudging please. A six month time limit is adequate.</p>
<p><b>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?</b></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><b>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?</b></p>	<p>Yes - the Commission should not be a decision-making body.</p> <p>An important aspect of the Commission's task is as a public watchdog. It would therefore have a conflict of interest in holding itself to account over its own policy decisions if it had a decision making role.</p>
<p><b>Q12. What role do you think the Climate Change Commission should have in relation to the New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme (NZ ETS)?</b></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><b>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?</b></p>	<p>I agree with the following collective expertise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• climate change policy (including emissions trading)</li> <li>• resource economics and impacts (including social impacts, labour markets and distribution)</li> <li>• te Tiriti o Waitangi, te reo me ona tikanga Māori and Māori interests</li> <li>• climate and environmental science including mātauranga Māori</li> <li>• experience with addressing adaptation challenges like planning, insurance and local government</li> <li>• risk management</li> <li>• engineering and/or infrastructure</li> <li>• community engagement and communications.</li> <li>• business competitiveness</li> <li>• knowledge of the public and private innovation and technology development system.</li> </ul> <p>I think expertise in public health is also important and should be added to this list.</p>
<p><b>Q14. Do you think the Zero Carbon Bill should cover adapting to climate change?</b></p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>This may require a separate adaptation sub-committee within the Climate Commission.</p>
<p><b>Q15. The Government has proposed a number of new functions to help us adapt to climate change. Do you agree with the proposed functions?</b></p>	<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"> <li>• a national climate change risk assessment</li> <li>• a national adaptation plan</li> <li>• regular review of progress towards implementing the national adaptation plan</li> <li>• an adaptation reporting power</li> </ul> <p>The issue of local government involvement needs clarification. LGNZ has produced an excellent Climate Change policy and a significant number of mayors have signed their declaration which is commendable. Unfortunately, in our case in Marlborough, there appears to be an element of signing the document to look as if we're doing the right thing but there does not appear to be corresponding actions at the policy level in particular in regard to taking mitigation measures. Councils need to be encouraged in every way possible to make their contribution to meeting our targets.</p>
<p><b>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?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>

**Further comments**

Thankyou for the opportunity to contribute to this important process. In particular I wish to thank the current government for having the foresight to see the seriousness of the situation we are faced with and the guts to take this course of action. I'm convinced that the majority of NZer's are supportive and any pressure from vested interests to dilute what has to be done needs to be resisted. I look forward to seeing how the final Zero Carbon Act evolves.