

# Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

John Adams

## Reference no: 9511

**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

Why 2050 though? For all this time we've been busily saying how urgent it all is AND steadily increasing our emissions. The result of that has been to increase our cumulative emissions AND make it all even more urgent. I was surprised to see the date of 2050 being talked about. Originally (see the book) we were going to get this sorted by 2020, but too many years of government creative accounting have killed off that dream. Now, please give us something to feel positive and proud about - how about a target of 2040? Lets do this!

### 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

The other "options" are all politically motivated ("let's avoid the challenges"), but we live in a world of science. We have no choice but to set ourselves the most challenging target. Since both long-term and short term gasses are stuffing up the climate we have an ABSOLUTE responsibility to deal with them both - and soon.

### Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

### Position

Domestic emissions reductions only (including from new forest planting)

### Notes

Under no circumstances should we get into that horrific charade again. That was a dirty ploy of a previous government. Remember EVERY country will be needing to reduce their emissions to zero, so there should be no "pollution permits" to buy. It was a scam before and it would be a scam again. And remember how NZ buying dodgy units got us all sorts of embarrassing prizes for shonky accounting. We've got a problem to solve here and it won't be fixed by creative accounting.

### Clause

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

### Position

Yes

### Notes

ONLY to make the requirements more demanding and sooner - to take account of the fact that NZ has changed its ways or that the science globally is looking worse than we thought. Under no circumstances should a crummy government have the power to soften the targets just so that they can make a bit more profit from pollution.

### 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

Everyone benefits from knowing what the plan is and what's expected. And the plans need to be out there well ahead of the political cycle.

### 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**

It's not about "incoming government" - it's about science. It seems remarkably few in any "incoming government" actually understand the science. Best not to let the politicians get anywhere near these plans.

**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**

As above - we all benefit if there is certainty. AND these budgets are to be built on a basis of science not populist vote winning.

**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**

Yes

**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**

It seems ridiculous to me that we might imagine that this change would happen without a plan. For years we have been asking for a plan and we've been ignored by government. OF COURSE we need a plan.

**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**

When we say "advise" can we assume that the Commission is science led and made up of people who both understand and care rather than the sort of business-friendly time wasters that we've tended to see in the past. Advice that would detract from the ability to meet the targets because someone wants to make more profit is not real advice. It's the same as the last wasted 9 years. Similarly monitoring - needs to be scrupulous and science based - not the creative accounting nonsense that got us where we are now.

**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**

Its a question of who we trust most. Politicians are supposedly "democratic" but have been shown (for 9 years) to be worse than useless. Of course it will be politicians that appoint the Commission. Surprisingly, you haven't asked whether we value the ETS which has failed miserably so far. Who best to restore it? Or who best to replace it?

**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**

Science. Science. Science. None of this business-friendly populist nonsense. we have a job to do.

**Clause**

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

**Position**

Yes

**Notes**

Somewhere, somehow, some legislation needs to alter the RMA so that applications need to be viewed in light of their impact ON the climate rather than just the impact of the climate on the proposal. This legislation is another opportunity to do that.

**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**

Absolutely.

**Clause**

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

**Notes**

As will be clear from the comments above - I am concerned that NZ has wasted almost a decade (with significant cumulative emissions in that time) because politics was allowed to get in the way of science. It is urgently time to turn that around and set up systems that are distinctly science led. I am concerned that the conversation about co-benefits has not been well explored. At the presentation in Hawke's Bay (and presumably elsewhere), the idea of land use change was put up as a "challenge" whereas we already have a number of influential sectors and leaders clamouring for land use change for a wide variety of reasons - notably water quality & quantity. So land use change should properly go on the "benefits" side of the balance sheet. When we start to actively consider the co-benefits of some of the proposed actions we see a wide variety of social and environmental gains to add to the GHG benefits. This tends to encourage us to look at even bolder and more creative solutions. Small changes bring small benefits and limited alteration to the status quo - conversely, what we are needing is major benefits and profound alterations to the status quo so we should be looking at the most grand and radical of changes.