

Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Ian Wroe

Reference no: 11773

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

Notes

I object to this limited set. Use of the word 'net' (allowing offsets) and omission of the word methane (using short-lived gasses) makes this question pretty disingenuous. No option here actually allows for Methane to be reduced. Methane impact cannot be ignored or side-tracked !! Just offsetting methane emissions and carrying on with the agricultural practice (option 3) is dangerous!! It is HALF our GHG emissions - this is HUGE deal. Failure to be clear on surveying for an opinion here is a weakness of this public consultation. I fear that many will be misled by deliberate structure of this question - which seems to intentionally duck the most pressing issue alongside timeline - Q/ is 2050 aggressive enough? A - NO - I have checked option 2 because it caps the growth of emissions from cattle. There is no option here to insist on an actual reduction of emissions from cattle. There is no question here on the aggressiveness of the timeline for change.

Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

Position

Domestic emissions reductions only (including from new forest planting)

Notes

Reliability, audit and integrity of international off-shore carbon sequestration programmes has a long way to go to be TRUSTWORTHY as an offset for NZ carbon emitting activity. Keep it onshore until things improve. Set policy to stimulate the domestic afforestation business in New Zealand and compete, rather than enable NZ business to give it away thro' purchase of offshore carbon units.

Clause

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

Position

No

Notes

The only acceptable revision would be to make it more aggressive a timeline to net zero GHG emissions. This Act is and should remain apolitical, target softening is not an option.

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

No

Notes

Softening targets in any way (such as stratification) is a failure to grasp the magnitude of the global risk and the local impacts that will follow. Set the targets and leave them alone.

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

Softening targets in any way (such as stratification) is a failure to grasp the magnitude of the global risk and the local impacts that will

follow. Set the targets and leave them alone.

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

Softening targets in any way (such as stratification) is a failure to grasp the magnitude of the global risk and the local impacts that will follow. Set the targets and leave them alone.

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

Absolutely necessary - urgency is in fact important, this is not often the case but is undeniable for the carbon act.

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

Imperative that the critical inclusion of agriculture (specifically dairy) emissions is NOT AVOIDED. Over 50% of our national GHG emissions are methane. The sector therefore MUST adapt to be part of the transition to a low-carbon economy. Failure to include and address this enormous driver of GHG generation in the New Zealand will make a mockery of the Carbon Act, and will represent gross dis-service to future generations, my children included. It is imperative that the Act delivers on this, because it is morally and ethically the right thing to do - regardless of political and economic optics.

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

Use a risk based approach to monitoring - where government oversight is applied to areas with the highest risk of failure to comply with climate goals, coupled to the severity of the risk to climate by non-compliance. Where the drivers to change are weakest, requires most policing by central agencies.

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

The NZ ETS has already been mis-handled and become totally ineffective, handing back ETS policy settings to any elected official is a mistake. History tell us that the scheme is easily undermined by flip flopping on ETS policy settings. Green washing is the biggest risk we face, hence any ETS should enable just a small fraction of our commitments. Science and the balance of risk/impact should guide the degree to which the country should rely upon an ETS mechanism. History tells us we should not rely upon a NZ government to get the policy settings right, so it becomes an inherently less reliable a choice for the future of the country.

Clause

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

Notes

Mitigation MUST come first - an adaptation bill/act can follow - if it compromises the speed of getting good legislation on a net reduction of GHG emissions passed into law then it should not be included in the Carbon Act. Adaptation is consequential, the degree to which this becomes material depends on the success or failure of efforts to mitigate. Make the main thing the main thing and keep the momentum.

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

Notes

Adaptation should not be the focus of the act - bias should be heavily to MITIGATION

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

Adaptation should not be the focus of the act - bias should be heavily to MITIGATION

Clause

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

Notes

METHANE The majority of the 16 questions here concern the proposed climate change commission and how far its powers should extend. This balance is disturbing. The most contentious question refers to the definition of what "zero carbon" actually means. Every option indicates a 'net' emission number, signalling that offsets are acceptable. Two scenarios cover all types of GHG which include methane. Neither allow for the actual reduction of methane. One would allow its growth with offsets, the other would call for stabilisation of the methane emissions. The question is devious and this is deeply concerning. Without good knowledge the intent of submissions here can easily be watered down and/or lost. This looks deliberate. Methane cannot be ignored. It cannot be merely offset, then carrying on with the current practice of cattle/sheep agriculture at scale. Methane It is HALF the problem in NZ and hence HALF the solution must lie here. Methane emissions need to be cut hard and fast, not stabilised at their present levels, and ducking this issue will be a disaster for the credibility of the ruling NZ government. As a secondary issue the questions on this topic should have been transparent and not coded so as to apparently side track the issue. The MAIN issue for New Zealand. OPPORTUNITY NZ should set an important precedent. New Zealand should become the first country in the world to put a price on agricultural emissions, academics and published authors and corporates have already done so, nation states are the laggards. Ethically speaking New Zealand can and should lead the way and MUST include ACTUAL REDUCTIONS in agricultural emissions. LACKS AMBITION The target date of 2050 for attaining this is woefully inadequate given the risks posed. 2035 seems much more impactful and urgent timeline for humanity to act decisively given that we are collectively running the risk for our children of catastrophic climate change...