Dear Minister, I support the passing of legally binding climate law. The law must be fair, ambitious and consistent with the climate science and international frameworks by including all gases and all sectors. The legislation should establish the goal of limiting warming to 1.5 degrees. We should not settle for 2 degrees warming, that would lock in devastating impacts on Pacific Island states and cause significant extinctions. That is not acceptable. To give us the best possibility of achieving no more than 1.5 degrees warming by the end of the century, there must be rapid cuts in all greenhouse gases beginning now. I support a net-zero target of 2040 with the majority of cuts occurring over the next decade. I support all greenhouse gases being included in the law, consistent with international climate frameworks. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change makes it clear that methane reduction is critical to success in tackling climate change. It is politically and scientifically untenable for New Zealand’s climate law to exclude any gases from our biggest emitting sector - the agricultural sector. I support the establishment of a Climate Commission, whose role should be to devise binding budgets. The Climate Commission should have statutory teeth, otherwise it is merely an advisory group that governments could ignore. Climate budgets should be legally binding and set a bare-minimum ambition, which must be achieved or bettered by government within the prescribed timeframes. While budgets should be binding, policy recommendations from the Commission should be just that - recommendations. I support the 'firewall' principle, that New Zealand’s targets must be achieved by actual cuts in our own emissions, and not through the purchase of overseas carbon credits or an over-reliance on forests as carbon sinks While consensus across political parties is good, any cross-party agreement should not be achieved at the cost of strong climate law. Climate change is the greatest challenge facing humanity. It would be wrong to have broad agreement on weak law, when what is urgently needed to address the problem is strong law. As well we must urgently look at the bigger picture. The total sum of Non Renewable Natural Resources as existing at 1800 have since been consumed at an exponentially increasing rate. We have less than 25% left and are consuming them at a rate soon to reduce as we have used up most of the available NRNRs. This is not taken into account in current economic studies and business practices not government planning for our future. Harvesting and consuming energy both use Non Renewable Natural Resources. The rate at which we consume energy directly tracks the rate of consumption of NRNR. The only answer is to use less energy. To have a future we need to redesign how we live. Transport has to be minimalised. Food grown locally not transported or imported is a first step and employment close to dwelling is an important pattern. Extinguishing out wasteful consumption of NRNRs is vital. Our present path has been well explored and described. Data shows very little harvesting of NRNRs will be possible within 20 years. Climate shift is a result of our stupid use of NRNRs. But it is the stripping and wasteful exploitation of NRNRs that will cause collapse of human civilisation long before climate shift. The world needs pathways to transformational change if we are to avoid catastrophic warming. This is the scale of the challenge. The science is clear: the only way we can succeed is with big ambition. New Zealand must be bold and pass strong law for the sake of our precious earth and future generations. We must consume much less and make locally unprocessed food a priority. Yours sincerely, Bob Waters