

# Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Tanya Didham

## Reference no: 11785

### Submitter Type:

#### 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

We need to make a commitment to this. We know the science, and what we need to achieve, so we just have to set that goal.

#### 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

NZ can do it - we are small enough, and have enough alternative energy sources at our fingertips that we could make it work.

#### Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

#### Position

Domestic emissions reductions only (including from new forest planting)

#### Notes

We know our main emissions are from agriculture and transport. Transport is something that will change globally, as this is a major emission-source worldwide - we just need to stay ahead of the 8-ball - given R&D money this sector could change everything. There aren't many countries with our access to hydro and thermal, solar, wind etc..., but still, if we want our transport fleet to become electric, we will pretty much have to change how we power everything else. A nationwide electric train network would be a great start. Get those long-haul trucks off the road. People love trains - they just have to be affordable, and safe. I personally would much rather catch the train down to Dunedin to see nana in the school hols. This time round the price of petrol (literal and environmental) put me off. "New Zealand's emissions profile is unusual among the 43 Annex I countries, as nearly half of our emissions come from the Agriculture sector. Typically the Agriculture sector constitutes only a small proportion of gross emissions (12.1 per cent on average in Annex I countries)." Our farming practises are something that we (and only we) can change. For example, from the late '90s, it changed drastically on the Canterbury Plains from relatively low impact sheep and crop farming, to high intensity, industrial dairying. Monoculture and high intensity 'farming' are not true farming practises, they are highly polluting extraction methods. Extracting resources - fresh water, land quality, animals - for maximum profit, but leaving the pollution and environmental degradation for the future public to deal with. To control land use, you could retain guardianship of the land (e.g. only lease, never sell public land); and have very strict laws about land use in place. We have done neither over the last 30 years, and we need to - as much as we can - get our land back under our own care. And I do mean that in a kaitiakitanga way. We need to diversify farming, and actually farm, i.e. protect and preserve the land and resources for future generations. We need to go back to rotational land use; quit our use of chemical fertilisers and pesticides (most of them petroleum-based); plant our excellent carbon-sinking natives everywhere. Forestry need not be exclusively radiata e.g. plant fast-growing, soil-restoring hemp on the Canterbury Plains. We should, in the first instance, protect our ability to grow food for the people who live here, now and into the future.

#### Clause

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

#### Position

No

#### Notes

Whether or not circumstances change - you don't change the target, you simply fail to meet the target. The target is not unrealistic, it's 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?

#### Notes

If that helps, to break it down in chunks like that, then yes. But we need to keep the big picture in mind, and beware of robbing Peter to pay Paul.

**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**

There would be no reason to do this. Either you meet your first target or you don't. Either way, you don't need to change future targets. You will either be ahead, or borrowing future carbon - you don't need to change the wording, and you certainly don't want to change the end target!

**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**

Above!

**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 agree to a point, but I think the environment must carry more weight than the 'economy' - nebulous a concept as that is - because the economy is entirely based on the environment. That's true everywhere, but especially obvious here in NZ where we rely primarily on tourism and agriculture. "The Commission could also consider the three government objectives for climate change policy: sustainable economy, global and local leadership and creating a just and inclusive society." Yes - please do consider those also, especially the last one!

**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**

Science has to be the basis of all decision-making around this. Including protection of coastal properties and development of any kind near waterways. Industry polluters must be kept informed, and hopefully on-board - they may contribute to finding best practise - but they cannot guide policy. Reducing emissions is not negotiable.

**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

**Notes**

Mostly agree, but again - we have to stop looking at this through the prism of economic loss, and start looking for the economic positives. Transition to renewable energy is going to employ a lot of people, we can develop new and innovative technologies for things like home energy production and local transport. A bright, green future.

**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****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****Clause**

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

**Position**

Yes

**Notes**

The two things are intricately related.

**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**

This is really important - literally the future of humanity is at stake -so let's get it right.