

# Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Paula Warren

## Reference no: 10057

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 believe the Commission should give advice on how to get there, but there needs to be a clear end point commitment.

### 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 need to be ambitious. we have been failing to take win-win steps that would reduce emissions and improve our quality of life (e.g. building motorways instead of improving other modes). I believe this can be done in a way that will be good for our wellbeing in the long term - it's not a cost but an investment.

### Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

### Position

Domestic emissions reductions (including from new forest planting) and using some emissions reductions from overseas (international carbon units) that have strong environmental safeguards

### Notes

But the focus should be domestic emissions management. We should only use international ones for short term solutions while new approaches to things like methane are worked on, and as a way of supporting things like protected area creation and management in developing countries.

### Clause

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

### Position

No

### Notes

You can always change the Act, but the debate should stay focused on how to meet the target, not whether to shift it.

### 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

The reasoning in the discussion document seems sound.

### 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

But not revised down unless there is evidence that the effect will be compensated for in the next period. So this should only be possible where the aim is to benefit from technology or opportunities on the horizon, not just to reduce effort.

### 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**

slippery slope. There are always exceptional things happening. The best way to provide for those is insurance - do better in the previous period.

**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**

But they are too focused on negatives. They should also be looking at the positives - will this approach to reducing carbon help improve resilience, wellbeing, etc. For example people tend to make fuss about things like fuel taxes because of the cost to poor households, but the real cost to them is poorly designed cities that oblige them to own and run a car (or many cars). Better public transport, urban design and walking/cycling infrastructure would be far better for poor households. So they need a transition, not continuation of the car-based system and low fuel costs.

**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**

We do in other areas, so this should be no problem.

**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**

Search for the win-wins. In transport, transition to an equitable, sustainable, low cost systems that improve public health and mental wellbeing. In agriculture, reducing stock numbers but increasing value. In carbon sink work, improving ecology, eg by protecting wetlands and planting riparian areas. We particularly need to avoid the short term fixes that have long term negative effects. Pine trees on unstable slopes come to mind.

**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**

Your question and the options in the document don't seem to match. I support the middle option - advice and the government must respond. That should be the case for the PCE and Ombudsman as well.

**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 ETS is a dog. Get rid of it and use a range of mechanisms including a carbon tax.

**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**

I'm not quite convinced by the list. Assuming the target is zero, we don't really need people with expertise in climate. What we need is expertise in determining how we most efficiently and quickly get to zero. So an understanding of how to stage it across the 15 years that targets are being set for, and what sectors can be most beneficially pushed during each period.

**Clause**

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

**Position**

Yes

**Notes**

**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**

Needs to be clear how this integrates with other things. For example sea level rise and the RMA coastal provisions. Flood effects and work on 3 waters and the SC&RC Act. We need to have some significant changes in how we approach "natural hazards" or we will end up with both climate change and adaptation ruining the environment. We need to learn to live with natural systems, not constantly fight them with engineering works.

**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****Clause**

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

**Notes**

We need to start right now, not wait for this. We need to capture the win-wins. For example there is no excuse to keep building roads, or to not electrify the rail freight system, or to not re-open mothballed tracks. We can make a lot of improvements to our transport systems that will make our economy more robust, improve people's lives, and reduce emissions as well. Similarly, reducing stock numbers for water pollution reasons while increasing value from remaining stock is a good thing to do and will reduce emissions. Where is MFE's reporting on this stuff? What happened to the sustainable urban work? Why did we get motorways instead of public transport over the last 10 years at huge cost, with the projects not even meeting normal NZTA cost benefit standards? Why would anyone build a motorway with a BCR below 1 knowing that it would reduce rail use?