

# Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Helen Elizabeth McCormick

## Reference no: 7747

**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

I'd be Ok with option three (Climate Change Commission set exact target) but I have no confidence it would be listened to: NZ Govt's record at listening to science advice has proved to be patchy at best. I'd like the goal of net zero carbon (and carbon-equivalent) emissions in the legislation now, so it promotes investment in measurement and reporting of progress from day one.

### 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

"Stabilising" short-lived gases is far more difficult to work out than just offsetting or reducing them all. If you want to go easy on methane in the first few years, fine - but our farmers are going to have a lot of shocks coming at them in the next twenty years with plant-based food disruption. Maybe we should signal up front that we want fewer animals, a higher proportion of them producing premium and super-premium products (not bulk milk-powder), and start investing in the plant-based disruptive foods ourselves as a transition for the farming industry... and preparing for the death of long-haul tourism too... The more ambitious the target, the better - we need to light a fire under the businesses and finance to support innovation.

### Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

### Position

Domestic emissions reductions only (including from new forest planting)

### Notes

Our ambitions need to be big. If some other country has credits, good for them - but we need to reduce the entire world's emissions, not treat some other country's success (or exploitation of its population's poverty) as an excuse to do less ourselves.

### Clause

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

### Position

No

### Notes

I think it should certainly be possible to over-shoot and have net negative emissions... "Circumstances" create a slippery slope, and there is no particular evidence that changing rules around emissions would have that significant an impact in the event of major disaster - like an earthquake or volcanic eruption - or world war. The contrary opinion that hard times are a spur to innovation and help remove the hide-bound incumbents is another way to think about this.

### 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

Crucial that the budgets continue across changes of government.

### 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

Looking for a regular process of review and update based on progress that is independent of changes in government - review and

update every five years once the sequence is started.

**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**

The emissions budget in the end is just a budget - sometimes budgets get blown, but there is normally some soul-searching and uncomfortable conversations about why. Businesses operate budgets to set the parameters for future behaviour, then use regular forecasts to note changes in resource allocations and outcomes. I don't see why NZ can't do the same.

**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**

No

**Notes**

There is too high a weighting on vested interests here - would downgrade the fiscal and economic impacts in decision making to a single consideration where the Climate Change Committee is encouraged to seek advice from reputable sources including Treasury and from international sources about potential economic impacts. It's not the Climate Change Commission's place to set tax policy or make things easy for the elected government. If there are limits to what govt funding is used for, the govt can explain why. Similarly - and this is the big nut - if NZ business is reluctant to change, they also need to explain why and actually demonstrate harm instead of whining and threatening job losses.

**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**

No brainer. This is the "visibility" that businesses are asking for, so needs to be out in the public arena PDQ. If NZ Govt announces that all personal transport vehicles have to be zero emission by 2025, then businesses will get on with it!

**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**

The National Adaptation strategy is going to be a big piece of this, so working really closely with local govt is huge.

**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**

Actually a bit torn on this one... The NZ ETS has been a total joke so far, so having a commission with teeth in charge of it is attractive on the surface. But I believe in parliamentary sovereignty, so if the Commission has a large enough megaphone to hold the government to account and surface dodgy dealings, then advice is sufficient.

**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**

Yes

**Notes**

**Clause**

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

**Position**

Yes

**Notes**

It's happening now and the local councils are flailing. If not this bill, then the next bill/cab off the rank, please!

**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**

Yes

**Notes****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**

This actually needs to be expanded into reporting on potential stranded assets and environmental liabilities in standard financial reporting for businesses - particularly listed businesses. There are movements overseas to encourage businesses to report on these issues, so encouragement would help move towards greater standardisation and acceptance, moving them towards GAAP. Reporting is like sunshine...