

# Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Dr Geoff DUFFY, **GEOFFREY GRAEME DUFFY**

## Reference no: 9970

Submitter Type: Individual

### Clause

1. What process should the Government use to set a new emissions reduction target in legislation?

### Notes

1. Carbon Dioxide is a low concentration, non-condensable, greenhouse gas [400ppm, 0.04% atmosphere]. It is also a poor absorber of SOLAR energy [2 solar bands only], and a very poor absorber of re-radiated, long-wavelength radiation back from earth [only another 2 bands]. [See attached] 2. Carbon Dioxide is LIMITED ONLY to radiation effects. 3. Water vapour is a condensable greenhouse gas [NZ sunny day, 20C, 10,000 ppm, 1% of atmosphere. This is >25 times higher than carbon dioxide in concentration]. Water vapour is far stronger in absorbing inbound solar radiation too, with >5 SOLAR energy absorption bands rather than 2 for CO>2, and on outbound radiation, from earth covers >80% of the re-radiation energy from earth. [See attached] 4. Water Vapour OVERALL is > 11 times more effective in RADIATION absorption than carbon dioxide across ALL the ENTIRE radiation spectrum [See attached] 5. But water vapour is not only far better than carbon dioxide; as it does FAR more than just interact with radiation. Water vapour is active in evaporation, condensation, and precipitation as well as radiation. Why?? 70.9% of the earth is ocean; 2/3 of the earth is covered by clouds at any time, so clouds form umbrella shields during daytime. Carbon dioxide does not do any of that! 6. Evaporation energy effects are enormous worldwide, and as water vapour condenses to form clouds, it gives up a massive heat energy. Precipitation as rain, snow, hail COOLS the atmosphere, sea and land worldwide. Carbon dioxide does not do that at all! 7. Winds, storms, thermals, and massive ocean currents, the rotating earth, ALL affect weather changes as well and just radiation. 8. All the above prove conclusively that carbon dioxide-radiation only is just one factor, and ALL the other mechanisms MUST be considered simultaneously! 9. Hence isolating carbon dioxide is most unwise, and carbon taxing will have a meaningless effect on weather. 10. It is not just photosynthesis with plants on earth, but plankton in the oceans (~71% planet) that take up CO>2, produce oxygen, and use the 'C' to make ALL the organic molecules in plants and the shells in the sea (and more) ... CO>2 is vital for all trees, fruit, crops and more. CO>2 is the feedstock!! [Please NOTE: CLIMATE is a 30 to 50 year average of weather trends. It is only a PATTERN or average number (temp, winds, rain etc..) at a particular location. Weather changes, hourly, diurnally, daily, weekly, monthly ... so the various AVERAGES will change too to give various Climate Change patterns. These average patterns will change from year-to-year. IF the average time-span of the analysis is too small eg 7 or even 10 years, we will get the WRONG VIEW of what Climate really is!] [2018 to 2050 is LESS than 50 years and IF this period is used, it makes any true climate change assessment erroneous]

### Clause

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

### Notes

Data and evidence is presented under POINT 1 with Attachments. Clearly carbon dioxide at 400 ppm, (methane at <1.8 ppm) is far too small in concentration and far too weak in radiation absorption ability to have an appreciable effect on weather change. Water vapour at up to 4% in the tropics (40,000 ppm) and 5 - 15,000ppm in New Zealand is far, far better with all radiation interactions than CO>2, and also does far more in causing weather changes [evaporation >> humidity, and condensation clouds and then precipitation (rain >> cooling, scrubbing dust, and removing some CO>2 from the air as carbonic acid)].

### Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

### Notes

It is unwise to set any targets as it is easily proven that radiation-CO>2 ONLY is NOT the key issue. Much better to aim to reduce pollution, and reduction of unburned materials, and improve systems like diesels that produce unburned particulates (soot).

### Clause

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

### Notes

ONLY if there is any new evidence that carbon-type gases have ANY appreciable effects. No published evidence so far showing either mankind is causing it OR that radiation-CO>2 is primary. In fact, actual evidence shows it is impossible for CO>2 to be the major cause [See Attached]

### 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**

Any plan must be based on ACTUAL evidence-of-cause ... not an idealistic, unproven concept as CO<sub>2</sub> is strictly limited to radiation-only and there is far, far more involved in weather eg winds, storms etc.. Cannot use models as the entire 102 have failed so far! [see Attached]

**Clause**

6. Should the Government be able to alter the last emissions budget (i.e. furthest into the future)?

**Notes**

AS there is not one single research paper showing that carbon dioxide / methane are THE key radiation gases, it is unwise to follow any consensus [See Evidence attached] Certainly man-made CO<sub>2</sub> is a fraction of ALL atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> [ ~5% ]

**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**

These issues must be continuously monitored and changes must be made if new evidence is revealed. There is clear satellite evidence that there has been NO mean worldwide temperature rise for over 20 year while carbon dioxide went up over 9%. Simply: there is NO correlation at all!! ... not connected.

**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**

MUST examine ALL evidence objectively >> BEFORE <<< taking any planning action!

**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**

The preponderance of evidence is counter to carbon dioxide and methane being major factors ... they are just too limited.; Limited in concentration; limited in radiation absorption, and limited ONLY to radiation which is but one mechanism. Winds, storms, tornadoes, clouds, sea mixing and currents, evap/condensation MUST >> ALL <<< be included SIMULTANEOUSLY

**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**

Must look far beyond radiation-GHG only . ... this is only one mechanism

**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

**Notes**

BEFORE Goals can be set .. ALL the other causes MUST be considered. CO<sub>2</sub> or CH<sub>4</sub> are just too small in the atmosphere to be the major causes of weather change! Call in the experts ... not just climate people, but atmospheric physicists, chemists and engineers .. Without understanding HUMIDITY alone, means all the plans will FAIL!

**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**

The NZETS is based on a yet unproven aspect that mankind is the major cause of climate change. FACTS: For Carbon Dioxide, 92% (38,000 billion tonnes in in the OCEANS), 5% (2,000 billion tonnes on the LAND), and only 2% (850 billion tonnes in in the atmosphere. FAR LESS than 10% of the 850 billion tonnes in the AIR (2% of all CO<sub>2</sub>) is due to mankind anyway!! Most CO<sub>2</sub> reactions are with plankton! IF you are HONEST ... you will examine the HUMIDITY effects too! [See Attached]

**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**

MUST, MUST, MUST have the CORRECT picture FIRST [not just radiation-GHG but winds, storms, evap/condensation, clouds, Humidity etc ]. IF anyone on the Committee ONLY has a narrow view of what really causes weather changes (climate long-term patterns), they will download their narrow views on the whole panel and may reach wrong or bad conclusions. All the areas mentioned on page 45 are valuable ... but the representatives MUST have a clear view of heat transfer (radiation, conduction, convection), evaporation and condensation, humidity etc ...OR it will be the blind leading the blind!

**Clause**

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

**Position**

Yes

**Notes**

CLIMATE is a longer time average pattern ... we MUST scan longer periods like 40 - 50 years!!! IF we take short 10 or 20 year periods we are bound to reach the wrong conclusions. The very fact that 2050 is only just over 30 years away show that the meaning of 'Climate' is not well understood so far!!

**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**

No

**Notes**

Weather changes locally depend on regions, which depend on globally interactions. ROARING 40'S, EARTH ROTATING, DOMINANT WINDS FROM SOUTH OF AUSTRALIA, SEA TEMPERATURES, WINDS, WAVES, HIGH AND LOW PRESSURE SYSTEMS, MOIST TROPICAL AIR MOVING SOUTH all HAVE AN enormous impact ON WEATHER AND THEN CLIMATE PATTERNS. One must KNOW what is happening in the atmosphere eg the temperature goes DOWN 6.5 C per 1 kilometre rise in elevation which affects both heat transfer, density difference and thus winds and thermals. Just to look at CO>2-radiation only is a gross over-simplification!

**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**

How can the Committee do that if they fail to see what the El Nino and El Nina effects have been for over the last 20 years. With NO temperature change for 20 years [See Attached] how can we plan and predict what will happen just over the next 30+ years??

**Clause**

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

**Notes**

IF we examine radiation-ONLY WITHOUT simultaneously examining evaporation/condensation as well as atmospheric mixing (storms, winds etc) as well as ocean current mixing, we are admitting that we do not understand what really causes weather changes and then climate patterns. All 102 computer models have failed to predict weather change [See Attached]. Evidence so far does not focus us on radiation-only as a the key factor (although indeed a most important factor) where clouds and water vapour dominate. IF .. IF .. the temperature has gone up 1 C over the last 100+ years for ANY reason, then the AVERAGE Humidity would have gone up by about 400ppm while CO>2 went up by say 120ppm, so water vapour affects are 3X those of CO>2 {see attached}. A KEY POINT: IF there is even NO CHANGE in temperature, and the Humidity goes UP by 2% or 5% >>> then that INCREASE in Water Vapour is far MORE than the increase in CO>2 over 100 years!! And Humidity changes over just a few minutes!! [See Attached]

Supporting documents from your Submission

28_years_NO_GLOBAL_TEMP_GRAPH.pdf	Uploaded on 07/18/2018 at 05:15PM
EFFECT_of_WATER_VAPOUR_INCREASE_IN_120_YEARS_IS_..	Uploaded on 07/18/2018 at 05:15PM
SHORT_ARTICLE_HOW_TO_PROVE_TO_YOURSELF_THAT_WATE..	Uploaded on 07/18/2018 at 05:15PM
UNI_PRESENTATION_1.pdf	Uploaded on 07/18/2018 at 05:15PM
THE_BIGGER_PICTURE_2.pdf	Uploaded on 07/18/2018 at 05:15PM

