

Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Rebecca Lee McMaster

Reference no: 11634

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

I think a staged approach to minimising and reducing our short-lived greenhouse gases within this timeframe should be considered, as it is a significant and difficult goal given our emissions profile (i.e. such a large proportion of greenhouse gases as a result of agricultural practices). I think this approach needs to be very carefully planned and managed so to be ambitious in our commitments AND to support our agricultural industry in this transition. I acknowledge this is complex and challenging and presents tremendous opportunities nationally and internationally while other markets look to change similarly. We could lead this change.

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

While I have selected the mix of national and international carbon units. I think there should be a significant cap on the international units, that drops back to zero within 10 years. I am concerned that the significant land use required to get our emissions to net zero would result in unsustainable and poorly thought through decisions and actions. I also think we need to get some runs on the board early in offsetting our emissions. I think there should be inbuilt incentives for Kiwi's to a) make sustainable land use choices to setup carbon sinks, and b) for Kiwi businesses to buy NZ credits. The international carbon units that we buy should meet the strictest criteria of legitimacy. I think the Government should significantly invest in R&D for emerging technologies and practices for sequestering carbon that we can be a leader internationally. There is a massive international opportunity here while all countries are trying to reduce/offset their net emissions through carbon trading. Wherever possible planting native forests should take precedence over short term plantation forests for achieving net anthropogenic emissions objectives.

Clause

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

Position

No

Notes

Changes should not be made due to economic reasons only, there should be a mix in which changes are considered. I.e. health and well being, social justice, economy, environment, new scientific understanding, matauranga Māori, or significant international agreements etc. If the Government does end up with the ability to review and adjust any of the emissions budgets they should do so within the bounds of recommendations set out by the Climate Change Commission, and should have bipartisan support in Parliament.

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

I support this so that it provides clarity to all that will be affected by it, and doesn't degrade due to short-term, election-cycle changes.

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

Unless the budgets are to be made more ambitious due to advancements in our efforts. However, if the option "the third emissions budget should be able to be changed but only when the subsequent budget is set" that the change is no more than 2%. To allow for any extenuating national circumstances. If the Government does end up with the ability to review and adjust any of the emissions budgets they should do so within the bounds of recommendations set out by the Climate Change Commission, and should have bipartisan support in Parliament.

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

No

Notes

If the Government does end up with the ability to review and adjust any of the emissions budgets they should do so within the bounds of recommendations set out by the Climate Change Commission, and should have bipartisan support in Parliament.

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

I do agree, however I think there needs to be a strong consideration and consultation with regard to Te Ao Māori that meets or exceeds the obligations of Te Tiriti o Waitangi. There needs to be a strong partnership here with and for Māori.

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

Definitely! Without this we won't get anywhere.

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 most important issues to consider are Te Tiriti o Waitangi obligations and fairness within Aotearoa-NZ. This means health equity is essential in planning and monitoring - all regressive policies (including ETS settings) must be effectively offset for vulnerable communities. The substantial co-benefits to health from well-designed reduction and mitigation must be considered. Other considerations include sustainable economic opportunities and technology relevant to climate change, to grow a fairer, just, sustainable Aotearoa-NZ. The Government must work in Te Tiriti partnership, and with NZ's most vulnerable communities (those already disadvantaged and those working in high-emissions industries), to create a hopeful, fairer future.

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

The Commission can also advise how NZ stays within these budgets, how NZ can best adapt to climate change, and monitor progress on NZ's emissions reductions. The Commission should not be a decision-making body. However, the Government should be legally required to consider and formally respond to the Commission's advice, and to provide an explanation if they do not act on it.

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

The Commission should not be a decision-making body. However, the Government should be legally required to consider and formally respond to the Commission's advice, and to provide an explanation if they do not act on it.

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

However I think you need to omit "engineering" and only have "infrastructure" specialists. I think desirable attributes would also include, "innovator", "changemaker", "system strategist/thinker" also "health sector leader" and "ethics specialist" and expertise from the "insurance sector" would be advisable I propose a larger pool of Climate Commissioners so that Commissioners can be called in according to the focus area - for example, adaptation policy recommendations would require the oversight of Commissioners with Tiriti and equity expertise, local government, community and adaptation experience. In addition to climate science, I see mātauranga Māori; Te Tiriti O Waitangi, te reo me ona tikanga Māori and Māori interests as high priority essential expertise amongst Commissioners. Health expertise must also be included, and it is essential that all Commissioners have equity expertise, and that equity issues are not marginalised. Finally, I consider that expertise in achieving social change is also important. It is important that vested interests are not part of the Commission, particularly those with a financial interest in maintaining the health-harming status quo. In health, we have seen too many crucial policy processes derailed by those who have a financial stake in continuing to do harm. The Commissioners should be sector experts, with a high level of standing in society.

Clause

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

Position

Yes

Notes

Definitely. This should involve the Government setting a National Adaptation Plan that sets a clear direction to local government and helps co-ordinate the response across different sectors and including iwi and hapū. I agree with the proposal to make Adaptation a separate advisory work stream, to avoid overtaking the Commission's top priority climate mitigation role.

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

I support the following adaptation provisions (which include the health sector): a national climate change risk assessment a national climate adaptation plan regular review of progress towards implementing the national adaptation plan an adaptation reporting plan Mitigation and adaptation are often deeply interlinked - so often mitigation and adaptation can be addressed together in the same policy (e.g. housing). But care must be taken in designing adaptation policies to ensure that climate-damaging emissions are not increased. Adaptation must be dealt with by a separate working group, to avoid distraction from the top priority of mitigation. A health adaptation plan must be put in place that covers both health sector adaptation and health-protecting adaptation in other sectors.

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

For an effective and timely transition to a zero carbon economy it would be in our best interests to share information. This would be an effective strategy for strong leadership in the international community.

Clause

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

Notes

I would like to see the following opportunity realised : "benefit from mātauranga Māori (traditional knowledge) and te ao Māori through our Treaty of Waitangi partnership." (discussion doc) in true partnership and respect that extends beyond 'obligations' in Te Tiriti o Waitangi. I think we need to consider other factors, other than the economy as a benchmark for how ambitious our targets are, like health and wellbeing of the populace. We can advance the economy while causing detrimental health effects if we're not careful. I think that any plans made should not impact our biodiversity negatively. We should actively plan to support those who will be most affected by this transition, either by physical or social impacts. I think local government needs more support in their local planning for mitigation and adaptation of climate change. I think compliance across all aspects of local government needs to be reviewed in order to meet our future challenges and goals. I think it will be highly likely that the Insurance sector will start to make the biggest impact in adapting to climate change impacts (and thereby forcing the hands of many developers, local bodies, individuals and communities). I think it would be wise to be on the same page as the insurance industry, as they are heeding the scientific evidence and future climate models in ways that others are not yet. They potentially have the most to lose, from a monetary perspective, so they are further ahead in this area. I hope to see significant levels of support for our agricultural sector in this transition, as they will arguably be most effected by the decisions we make now. I am heartened DairyNZ and others are supporting this Act. I think communication needs to be clearer on the far reaching "costs" and implications of NOT acting in our most ambitious pursuit of a zero carbon

economy. While we transition into this carbon zero economy I look forward the narrative including climate positive/carbon negative industry, so we create a stream of businesses that are taking more carbon than they produce. That aren't just forestry or large scale carbon sequestering. I think we need to escalate the circular economy in New Zealand, rapidly. I think we'll excel in the circular economy, especially if there is a push from central government to develop in this area. I would wholeheartedly back the Government in providing incentives to moving into the circular economy.