

# Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Sarah Gordon

## Reference no: 10974

**Submitter Type:** Business / Industry

### 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

Zero Carbon Bill is a bit of a misnomer if you are also looking at reducing methane and other shorter living gases. I don't think the distinction is understood by the wider public. It would be better to take the time to engage qualified people onto the Climate Change Commission who are experts in their field and let them advise the government/cabinet who may have a different agenda depending on their own personal drivers

### Clause

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

### Position

Net Zero Long-Lived Gases and Stabilised Short-Lived Gases - Long-lived gases to net zero by 2050 while also stabilising short-lived gases

### Notes

Currently there is not a viable commercial affordable option for farmers to attain this goal while still being able to maintain a profitable business. I recently attended a workshop and while the science was explained well there were still no practical options for farmers to use although some of these are being explored by scientists currently

### 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

It is important to invest in infrastructure that will stop effluent being poured into the sea every time there is a weather event. I have been told that Rotorua District Council discharge effluent into the forestry which seems a pretty archaic way of handling sewerage. There needs to be conformity across district council along such lines as effluent treatment and disposal. It is not only businesses and farming that contribute but also councils who are charged with maintaining standards. To me this seems pretty hypocritical.

### Clause

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

### Position

Yes

### Notes

It makes sense to allow change when presented with new information not just to lock onto a solution and follow it regardless of whether circumstances change

### 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

### 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

It is important that there is the opportunity to revise our options as more scientific information comes to hand, eg if it is going to bankrupt the country to achieve the last little bit you would question the wisdom of doing this.

**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**

as above, the safeguard being that it is under exceptional circumstances - this would need to be clarified as to what this constitutes

**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 important to break the goal down into manageable chunks with definite time frames

**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 provision of sound, accurate tools to measure emissions - at the moment it seems as though tools that weren't designed for the job are being shoe horned to fit eg Overseer, which for years people have been qualifying using it by saying " this tool wasn't really designed for this but it is all we have" Surely after all this time something fit for purpose could have been developed

**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****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**

need an independant commission outside of politics to maintain a consistent approach not one governed by who happens to be in power at any one time

**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**

As long as there is a balance i.e. not weighting towards any of those listed attributes in particular - if there is a bias it should be towards people with technical knowledge and also as long as the best people are picked not the people that will give the current government the answers they want to hear.

**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**

It is important that a realistic and balanced view is taken over this bill, not singling out of one industry as a scapegoat. It is also important that people have a realistic view of the science behind the bill and that the Carbon credit side of things is well understood and possibly needs a second tier where for instance if you have areas of planting on farms that you may not get a monetary value of

carbon credits but it should offset your emissions to a measurable degree as this will encourage planting of waterways, gullies, etc that might not fit into the current criteria as far as size and species but surely has a value to carbon monoxide sequestration.