

# Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Molly Melhuish, **Molly Melhuish**

## Reference no: 11240

**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

### 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

### Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

### Position

Domestic emissions reductions only (including from new forest planting)

### Notes

Including separate targets for methane (short-lived) and CO<sub>2</sub> + N<sub>2</sub>O (long-lived) Also count the sequestering of carbon in soil as well as trees, see Renquist submission to Productivity Commission

### Clause

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

### Position

No

### Notes

Not unless a 1.5 degree objective is shown to be necessary.

### 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 - each incoming Government should have the option to review the third budget in the sequence

### Notes

Each of these should be able to be revised to be more stringent if new information indicates the need

### 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

Each of these should be able to be revised to be more stringent if new information indicates the need

### 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**

Consider the likely impact of the decision on fuel poverty, and also (not stated in the discussion document, the likely impact of the decision on the embodied carbon in infrastructure built - power stations require high-carbon equipment (steel, concrete and roading) whereas thick timber construction including high-rise actually sequester carbon.

**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**

**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**

Work with a re-purposed EECA which must address climate-changing emissions as well as energy. It must re-emphasise household energy efficiency. Must consider embodied carbon in the building of housing and infrastructure is critical - steel, concrete and roading cause high carbon emissions. An energy-efficient-first policy would be much more employment-intensive and require less high-energy high-carbon materials.

**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**

A decision-making role would give too much power to its Board. Appointed Boards for energy regulation keep Comcom, EECA and the EA beholden to the previous government's policies.

**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**

Advising the Government on policy settings in the NZ ETS

**Notes**

**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**

Move from "desirable" to "essential" - - knowledge of the public and private innovation and technology development system.

**Clause**

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

**Position**

Yes

**Notes**

Resilience is essential as climate changes, New technology is our friend! in improving resilience. Distributed energy - solar, batteries, micro-grids, improved wood burners - make cut-off communities resilient.

**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**

Of the 4 functions listed, a national adaptation plan should include R&D to explore new-technology solutions - see above

**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**

NZ policy puts far too much emphasis on the ETS. Pricing incentives get overridden by special deals for favoured businesses. See the European Directive "Energy Efficiency First" (Nov 2016) and draft Directive, "Renewable Energy" for varied policy directives to reduce carbon emissions. They emphasise that emissions pricing needs additional support for specific sectors. Funded R&D and demonstration is needed to kick-start markets - buildings, land use, new-technology home and institutional wood burning, and utilisation of forestry wastes. Technology is our friend!