

# Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Ken Telford, **Don Telford Ltd (Kenneth Don Telford)**

## Reference no: 10175

**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 goal to reach net zero emissions by the second half of the century and the Climate Change Commission advises on the specific target for the Government to set later

### Notes

### Clause

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

### Position

Net Zero Carbon Dioxide - Reducing net carbon dioxide emissions to zero by 2050

### Notes

CO2 is the big problem lets concentrate on that while we get some good science around the question of Methane.

### Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

### Position

Domestic emissions reductions only (including from new forest planting)

### Notes

Selling carbon units is good revenue but does absolutely nothing to solve global co2 levels. Another entity buys carbon credits to offset their emissions then carries on pouring co2 into the atmosphere. Carbon credits are ridiculous if you're serious about global warming. Another scam.

### Clause

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

### Position

Yes

### Notes

We're entering unknown territory. Are we being realistic in our targets. Not a good idea to set things in concrete only to find they are unachievable

### 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

A budget is a budget, allows the flexibility to change if targets achieved/not achieved. Care will be needed when budget levels set - has to be realistic

### 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

Again- there is a need to be realistic

### 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**

need to ensure realistic goals are set

**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**

Realistic values. Include all the science, not just the negative stuff. No consideration is being made for the uptake and storage of Carbon in the soil/pasture/vegetation/shelter belts? All of these things have a huge influence. After all it is what the cows eat that produces the Methane, how does the Carbon get into the cow so it can come out. Very Basic science = carbon cycle. Current view is all one sided.

**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**

Yes

**Notes**

Can't be left up to government need sound independent advice from a range of experts

**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**

Personally think the ETS is a scam -we shouldn't be involved Thin air = commodity, come on!!

**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**

**Clause**

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

**Position**

Yes

**Notes**

**Clause**

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

**Notes**

We need to get all the data in front of us before making decisions. Listen to the unbiased scientific research, not the science reported by those with a vested interest.