

Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Juliet Neill, Priscilla JULIET NEILL

Reference no: 11631

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

My reservation is that, given the urgency with which scientists agree we should act, that the target should be brought forward to 2030. The target date must definitely not be pushed further away.

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

The aim should be for negative CO2 emissions. Whilst short lived gases, such as methane could be seen to be less of a threat, they are in fact much more damaging for the period in which they are around. To stabilise them is not an option, particularly as fossil methane is now being released in the Arctic tundra, thus further increasing damaging emissions. If levels are to be stabilised, to what level should they be stabilised? This has not been made clear. Short lived gases much be reduced to net zero as well.

Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

Position

Domestic emissions reductions only (including from new forest planting)

Notes

Carbon trading can be used to shrug off our responsibilities to reduce. We must do our own work to reduce greenhouse gases.

Clause

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

Position

Yes

Notes

But only if the date is moved to a sooner one. It must certainly be no later than 2050, and if at all possible moved to 2030.

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

However, provision of 3 year budgets could be allowed, as circumstances change and new evidence is brought to light. The time period should definitely not be extended.

Clause

6. Should the Government be able to alter the last emissions budget (i.e. furthest into the future)?

Position

No - emissions budgets should not be able to be changed

Notes

Exceptions should be made when more scientific information suggests that a budget should be revised. The time period should not be extended, but could be shortened.

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 outlined in previous questions. Budgets must not be cut, but there can be provision for increasing allocations.

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

The following should be taken into account when allocating budgets. - Scientific knowledge with regard to climate change. - Technology as it appertains to climate change - Economic and fiscal circumstances independent of the free market, growth paradigm. Energy choices and their impact on the economy. People on low incomes should not be disproportionately disadvantaged.

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

There must be a strict timeframe for producing a plan - the sooner the better.

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

We have a crisis on our hands and we are near the point of no return. So extreme urgency is called for. A whole shift in the economic system is called for, and in order to effect change, we have to move from a growth economy to a circular economy.

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

This is a difficult one. If the Commission is purely advisory, then there needs to be some assurance that successive governments can not choose to ignore whatever advice is given in favour of short term profit, or to appease other governments and corporations.

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

The ETS simply allows us to shirk our responsibility to take meaningful action, and thus should be abandoned. The Commission should act in an advisory role that promotes real change, not carbon trading.

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

Expertise required must involve top scientist, economists, environmental and town planners, those with community knowledge, representation from the business community, tangata whenua, those involved in health and social change.

Clause

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

Position

Yes

Notes

This might require a sub-committee who are able to work in with local councils.

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

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

Once again, please respond to the urgency of the situation and implement action as soon as humanly possible.