

Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

David Scanlon

Reference no: 9987

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

This is to be a net zero emissions target for 2050 but set now. With a Climate Change Commission managing the process with the Government.

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

We could and should reduce reduce net carbon dioxide emissions to zero long before 2050.

Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

Position

Domestic emissions reductions only (including from new forest planting)

Notes

NZ also needs to stop the continual loss of carbon stored in soil from poor farming practices and forestry clear felling. Domestic reductions only force NZ to adopt the best and most efficient practices. NZ should be selling international carbon units not buying them.

Clause

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

Position

Yes

Notes

But only to increase the target if it is found that the collective global reductions set for 2050 fall short of what we need to achieve.

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

We need to do it in this way so it is not all left to the last possible moment, as per usual in NZ. In fact I propose that we always maintain 15 years of budgets in advance covering the whole time till 2050.

Clause

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

Position

No - emissions budgets should not be able to be changed

Notes

Not being able to change budgets forces us to achieve them. It is better to over achieve than fail to meet targets. If however we fall short in any budget, of course, we must immediately make up the short fall.

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

We should always have the ability to increase any of the budgets. But not decrease them until 2050 targets have been met.

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 is essential that we always have set plans for at least two preferably three budgets in advance. Having set plans from government within a time frame of say six months is necessary for this to happen. Plans will take a period of time to be implemented and gain results. So any delay can cause more delays in any current or future budget. This could be disastrous in achieving goals.

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 government needs to work with an independent Climate Change Commission to set targets. I am concerned that the options listed on page 44 are often quoted as serious considerations for making most past and current decisions by government. Yet the burden of the costs are usually carried by those that are least able to bear them. We need to create an equitable policy for Climate Change. We need to ban the lobby groups and make it fair. ie distribute the cost on a sectors/ groups ability to pay. Targets must be set to reach a zero 2050 goal but I propose realistic representation of the groups and peoples that make up NZ be given in an open transparent system to ensure fair distribution of costs for all.

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

No

Notes

I do not want a possibility where the Climate Change Commission advises and the government ignores and nothing is done to reach a 2050 target, or that target is revised down. I keep thinking of the possibility that sometime in the future a Climate change denier could come into government and kill Bill. As actually happened in the USA when Trump replaced Obama. I agree that the Climate Change Commission should provide advise but that they should also have some power (as does the Reserve Bank Governor) to affect change rather than be a toothless tiger. This would counter any government that was delaying the plans or trying to introduce plans that would not realistically attain goal reductions (through political tactics). I feel that we need at the beginning of this legislation a safe guard that if for any reason the government is delaying or interfering with the attainment of reduction goals that the Commission has some power to intervene to high light the governments actions to the NZ people and to step in an make plans and budgets when the government has failed to.

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

Makes decisions itself in respect of the number of units available in the NZ ETS

Notes

The ETS in its current form has been ineffective in reducing emissions in NZ. It needs to be overhauled to become effective. It makes very good sense to have a Climate Change Commission fully control and run the ETS, as an independent body. With full power to manage and implement all necessary changes to make it effective. It could be a very important and effective tool to achieve Reduction means. I also believe only a body independent of government will be able to remove some of the exemptions, make permits and allocations more realistic and make the changes that are politically problematic to make.

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

Notes

No one person (Commissioner) could possibly have expertise in all ten fields that are listed on page 45. It would be expected that the

Commission would enjoy such expertise within its committees. I once again state the importance of the inclusion of representatives of all stake holder groups. They have very important expertise as member of their stake holder group.

Clause

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

Position

Yes

Notes

We need to start adapting now for Change that is locked in. Zero Carbon and climate change are so closely interconnected that it makes good sense to put them on the same bill. I also propose that a fund be set up somewhat like the EQC fund to set aside money now to help meet future costs from climate change effects, to do research and to educate New Zealanders.

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?

Notes

Not sure what the definition of a targeted reporting power means. It is my opinion that NZ needs a body that would co-ordinate the climate change reaction plans of various government, local government and non government bodies so as to mitigate future loses.

Clause

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

Notes

We are all depending you.