

# Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Jock Allison, **Jock (Arthur John) Allison**

## Reference no: 9955

**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

There is no point in getting too far out front when it is clear that many developed countries are not meeting their commitments. see <http://www.iflscience.com/environment/only-three-eu-countries-on-track-to-meet-paris-climate-agreement-targets/>

### Clause

2. If the Government sets a 2050 target now, which is the best target for New Zealand?

### Position

Net Zero Long-Lived Gases and Stabilised Short-Lived Gases - Long-lived gases to net zero by 2050 while also stabilising short-lived gases

### Notes

With the recent publication of Myles et al (2018) on a new way to consider methane emissions in a much more environmentally sustainable way in comparison to the flawed Global Warming Potential (GWP) method promoted by the IPCC and used by governments, for the consideration of relativities with CO2 there is an opportunity to reduce some costs, by the adoption of realistic methods. Prof David Frame and our previous Climate Commissioner Adrian Macey (both from Victoria University) are co-authors in this publication. see <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41612-018-0026-8>, and [https://www.oxfordmartin.ox.ac.uk/news/2018\\_news\\_Climate\\_Pollutants\\_GWP](https://www.oxfordmartin.ox.ac.uk/news/2018_news_Climate_Pollutants_GWP). If this method is to be adopted, (and the science suggests this is a much more environmentally sustainable way to consider methane), then nitrous oxide should be treated similarly as this gas has a only half the half life in the atmosphere of CO2.

### Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

### Position

Domestic emissions reductions only (including from new forest planting)

### Notes

NZ should not be purchasing international carbon credits to meet commitments particularly when many developed countries are not meeting their commitments, and are not prepared to purchase such credits.

### Clause

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

### Position

Yes

### Notes

In the event that a) the climate doesn't continue to warm (there has been no warming for the last two decades, see <https://ktwop.com/2015/08/09/climate-models-would-fit-data-better-if-they-drastically-reduced-carbon-dioxide-forcings/>), b) other developed countries continue not to meet their emissions reductions commitments, c) new science modifying assessment of climate warming, and or the effectiveness of total emissions reduction becomes available. In a peer reviewed paper Bjorn Lomborg has noted that if the present commitments signaled by all countries are carried on to 2100 then at a cost of about \$US one trillion / annum, the total effect on temperature would be -0.17 degrees C by 2100. Further he has noted that for every one dollar spent, there would be a benefit of about 3 cents see file:///C:/Users/Jock/Downloads/Lomborg\_in\_The\_Oz%20(8).pdf. If this is correct then we should take a serious look at the proposed plans to commit \$billions to reducing emissions.

### 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

No

### Notes

There must be considerable flexibility in following the situation when there is no guarantee of continued world warming, or what the world climate will do in time going forward. There isn't even good information showing that CO2 causes most of the modest warming

observed to date. I note that the NZ Royal Society, and Professor James Renwick have been asked recently by the NZ Climate Science Coalition, to provide one scientific reference (not based on modelling) showing that CO2 is the main cause of global warming (which we haven't had in the last two decades) no specifications in published papers have been forthcoming.  
<https://www.climateconversation.org.nz/2018/06/royal-society-of-nz-refuses-to-reveal-evidence-of-man-made-climate-change/>

**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**

Any resident Govt, or incoming Govt has the right to change any policy.

**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**

Yes the Government should have that power.

**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**

Particularly when the scientific assessments have changed. The Climate Commission should instigate a forum on issues in debate, a) NZ's temperature record. NIWA say + 0.9 degrees C in the last 100 years, b) Independent analysis of the same NIWA data, using the same analytical methods NIWA claim to have used say +0.28 degrees C in the same period. Both estimates are published in the same scientific journal, NIWA should be expected to attend a scientific resolution of the difference. Thus at the moment New Zealand does not have an agreed official temperature record (NIWA's words).

**Clause**

9. Should the Zero Carbon Bill require Governments to set out plans within a certain timeframe to achieve the emissions budgets?

**Position**

No

**Notes**

No, the government in power must have flexibility to govern. No one has any real idea of what the climate is going to do going forward. The computer models of the IPCC, research institutions and member governments seem pretty sure that projections will come true. However in the last 20 years the satellite and balloon measurements have shown almost no warming in the last 20 years, in spite of the CO2 levels in the atmosphere increasing by more than 10%, and a period when about 1/3rd of all the human emissions have been emitted see . [http://www.drroyspencer.com/wp-content/uploads/UAH\\_LT\\_1979\\_thru\\_June\\_2018\\_v6.jpg](http://www.drroyspencer.com/wp-content/uploads/UAH_LT_1979_thru_June_2018_v6.jpg). The atmospheric records are the most accurate available, as they cover virtually all of the globe, not just the 25%+ that land based records cover. In addition the atmospheric records do not suffer the Urban Heat Island effect of intensive settlement etc. Further there are some suggestions that with very low levels of sunspots, there is a possibility of some cooling in the next few years, see <https://wattsupwiththat.com/?s=Svensmark>

**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**

1. Evidence that CO2 is causing climate change or warming, empirical evidence, not climate models. 2. Evidence that reduction in human emissions will have any effect at all on climate / temperature. It is noted that between 1990 and 2013, the world's human emissions have increased 60% (<http://blogs.worldbank.org/opendata/allaboutfinance/chart-global-co2-emissions-rose-60-between-1990-and-2013>). Clearly all of the Climate Conferences held world-wide in the past 20+ years have not been translated into any effectiveness in world emissions reductions, or any suggestion of same. Further the world emissions increased another 2% in 2017. It is not "who do we need you work with" The requirement is to get the science correct within our own grouping, clearly the "global warming" mantra presently is Government Policy, with scant regard for the actual scientific data. 3. We see and hear the Minister of Climate Change stating that now we have more storms, higher temperatures, wildfires, droughts and floods, all as a result of climate change, when in fact it is impossible to define what parts of the weather / climate are due to natural variation, and what is due to human effects.

**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****Clause**

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

**Notes**

As emissions reductions are unlikely to have any significant effect on climate change, better preparedness for adverse climatic events, is a sensible policy for any responsible government.

**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**

No

**Notes****Clause**

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

**Notes**

I will write re some other climate issues for the use by the Climate Commission. Please confirm that when this is done and sent to the Ministry of the Environment, that my submission will be forwarded to the members of the Commission. Many thanks, Jock Allison