

# Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Heather Jean Roberts

## Reference no: 12015

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 goal to reach net zero emissions by the second half of the century and the Climate Change Commission advises on the specific target for the Government to set later

### Notes

I would like the commission to work out what a target means so that the legislated target is meaningful. I would like the target to be aimed at getting to net zero by 2040, to increase the likelihood of getting there by 2050 even if unexpected things come up.

### 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

If it is not possible to set 'net zero' then priority should be given to long-lived gases, but my ideal would be fully net zero.

### 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

In general I believe in a globalised system rather than NZ acting as if we are a sealed-off entity. However, there are very few countries in the world that already have net zero emissions. If we used international units, that involves putting an extra burden on the countries in which they are generated, as they have to offset both their own emissions and ours. I do not wish to put that burden onto countries much poorer than our own. I would be happy with a scheme that enabled us to buy international units from countries with similar (or higher) wealth to our own, but I would like to restrict international units from poorer countries to those from countries that do not have emissions of their own to offset. This, however, feels too logistically complicated, hence why I have chosen domestic emission reductions only.

### Clause

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

### Position

Yes

### Notes

If we proceed faster than expected, future targets can be adjusted so that we reach net zero sooner. If there is a crisis of some kind that means we need to stop reducing our emissions for some time, future targets can be adjusted such that we still reach the goal by 2050. This should only be allowed if the crisis is severe and if the revised targets remain realistic.

### 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

That's great as it allows those affected to make plans in a predictable environment.

### 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

**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**

Only under very exceptional circumstances. To establish this, we'd need a high bar - perhaps 2/3 of the House have to agree the circumstances are exceptional, or perhaps both the governing party/parties and the largest party in opposition - something like that.

**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 think it is a good list. Social circumstances and the current science are particularly important to me.

**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**

Budgets need to be realistic - e.g. achievable with current technologies rather than just with technologies we hope will have eventuated in 10 years' time. There needs to be plans to help people who will be adversely affected - e.g. increases in Benefit levels if they make essentials a lot more expensive or money allocated for re-training if the plan will lead to a particular industry becoming uneconomic. Increased taxation for this is OK, although it may not be necessary as money could be saved along the way as well, and new industries will bring in new tax.

**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**

But there should be consequences to not meeting targets. I don't know how to achieve this (as it would be the government itself needing to be sanctioned and we don't have national bodies higher than the government), but it feels important. I don't know if there is a way the Climate Change Commission could do this, but if they could that would be good. They must at least make sure the public knows if targets aren't being met.

**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**

I would like the commission to make this decision, but there should be a mechanism for the government to over-ride it. I don't like the idea of an unelected body constraining the elected government.

**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**

I think the list of essential expertise is good. I would like it also to be required that someone is there who knows about current and near-term technology, so that they can advise on what is currently realistic.

**Clause**

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

**Position**

No

**Notes**

I wouldn't mind if it did, but it doesn't feel essential.

**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**