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**A Zero Carbon Act is important to me because...**
The release of carbon-bearing gases into the atmosphere is the most important factor in human contribution climate change; the only way that this can be controlled is by the cessation of mining fossil carbon.

**Q1. What process should the Government use to set a new emissions reduction target in legislation?**
The Government should set a target for 2050 in legislation now.

**Q2. If the Government sets a 2050 target now, which is the best target for New Zealand?**
The most ambitious target: reducing total greenhouse gases to net zero by 2050. I also support taking a science-based approach to ensure our efforts to reduce emissions are as impactful as possible: we should aim for negative levels of long-lived gases, while reducing short-lived gases to sustainable levels.

**Q3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?**
By using domestic emissions reductions only (including from new forest planting). By a total cessation of mining fossil carbon in New-Zealand-controlled territories (since these are the only territories in which we can guarantee to control the mining of fossil carbon). It is feasible to capture carbon released from the burning of trees, by the planting of more trees; it is probably not feasible to capture the carbon released by the burning of fossil carbon by the planting of trees, because of the quantities involved.

**Q4. Should the Zero Carbon Bill allow the 2050 target to be revised if circumstances change?**
The 2050 target should not be altered in response to “economic changes” as this undermines its long-term certainty. However, the ability to revise the 2050 target in light of major changes in scientific understanding or international agreements should be permitted.

**Q5. 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?**
Yes, I agree with 5-year budgets set 10-15 years in advance, so that 3 are in effect at all times.

**Q6 - Q7. Should the Government be able to alter emissions budgets?**
No - emissions budgets should not be altered in response to “economic changes” as this undermines their long-term certainty. However, the ability to revise budgets in light of major changes in scientific understanding or international agreements should be permitted.

**Q8. Do you agree with the proposed considerations that the Government and the Climate Commission will need to take into account when advising on and setting budgets?**
I agree that the Government and the Climate Commission should take the following factors into consideration when advising on and setting budgets:
- scientific knowledge regarding climate change
- technology relevant to climate change.

Economic, fiscal and social circumstances are likely to be used for avoidance of goals. The prevention of manmade climate change is more important than these.

**Q9. Should the Zero Carbon Bill require Governments to set out plans within a certain timeframe to achieve the emissions budgets?**
Yes - we must learn from the mistakes of the UK’s Climate Change Act and specify a strict time frame for producing a plan.

**Q10. 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?**
The Government’s policy plans to meet emission budgets should be comprehensive, fair, cost-effective, environmentally sustainable, and reflect a commitment to Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Te Tiriti o Waitangi must be overridden if its considerations hinder our progress in fighting manmade climate change.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q11. 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?</td>
<td>Yes - the Commission should not be a decision-making body. However, the Government should be legally required to consider and formally respond to the Commission’s advice, and to provide an explanation if they do not act on it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12. What role do you think the Climate Change Commission should have in relation to the New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme (NZ ETS)?</td>
<td>Emissions Trading Schemes are just ways of parasites making money at the expense of others. Emissions trading is just a way of avoiding the elimination of emissions. The fact that our forays into emissions trading to date have just been advertisements of our gullibility to be defrauded is perhaps another consideration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Q13. 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? | I agree with the following collective expertise:  
• climate change policy (including emissions trading)  
• resource economics and impacts (including social impacts, labour markets and distribution)  
• te Tiriti o Waitangi, te reo me ona tikanga Māori and Māori interests  
• climate and environmental science including mātauranga Māori  
• experience with addressing adaptation challenges like planning, insurance and local government  
• risk management  
• engineering and/or infrastructure  
• community engagement and communications.  
• business competitiveness  
• knowledge of the public and private innovation and technology development system.  

I think expertise in public health is also important.                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Q14. Do you think the Zero Carbon Bill should cover adapting to climate change? | No. Adaptation to climate change is a separate issue, and if included in the bill will no doubt be used to make the bill ineffective.                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Q15. The Government has proposed a number of new functions to help us adapt to climate change. Do you agree with the proposed functions? | The Zero Carbon bill must have nothing to do with irrelevancies like adapting to climate change. Adaptation is a separate issue.                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Q16. Should the Government explore setting up a targeted adaptation reporting power that could see some organisations share information on their exposure to climate change risks? | Yes.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |

Further comments

Agricultural emissions, apart from the burning of fossil fuels, are emissions of carbon fixed on an ultra-short-term cycle. Animal carbon emissions are of carbon that was fixed by agricultural processes within the previous twelve months. They are therefore irrelevant to climate change, apart from the fact that in some cases long-enduring carbon dioxide has been exchanged into short-enduring methane. Agricultural emissions, apart from the use of fossil fuels, must be left out of the equation. On the other hand, the carbon fixed on farms by trees must be given equal credit with the carbon fixed by trees off farms.