

Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Ross Goudie

Reference no: 12510

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

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

OPTION 2 in the light of the following information I support a 2050 target which is ambitious, clear, and science-based. which allows for the practicalities of New Zealand's emissions, particularly from agriculture. It is important to take a science-based approach to ensure our emission reduction efforts are as impactful as possible. This means adopting a "two basket" approach, which recognises the difference between long-lived greenhouse gases (such as carbon dioxide and nitrous oxide) and short-lived greenhouse gases (such as methane). Applying a two baskets approach to achieve a net zero 2050 all gases target would mean: ● Combining long-lived gas reductions with permanent carbon sinks (e.g. through permanent forestry and carbon sequestration in soil) to achieve negative long-lived emissions by 2050; and ● Reducing short-lived gases to sustainable levels. ● Commitment to reducing short-lived gases like CH₄ to lower levels This would balance out to net zero across all gases, but in the most impactful way possible. Short-lived gases do not need to be reduced to net zero to stop temperature rise. They only need to be stabilised. New Zealand should aim for a sustainable level of short-lived emissions which fits with the Paris Agreement goals to keep global warming well below 2C, striving to 1.5C. Long-lived emissions, however, contribute to global warming until they are reduced all the way to zero. Because these gases exist in the atmosphere for millennia, finding ways to absorb more of these gases from the atmosphere than the amount we are emitting (known as "negative" emissions) is the most ambitious and impactful contribution New Zealand could make to counteract global warming. Accordingly, the Zero Carbon Act should prioritise reducing long-lived emissions to net zero, and then to negative emissions, by 2050 or sooner. The second option provides a fair contribution from agriculture over its whole profile, within the context of a bipartisan political framework. The principal emphasis must be on emissions reduction across the economy, avoiding over dependence on forests, which have limited capacity in the long term. In summary: ● I supports the most ambitious, clearest, science-based target enabling effective consideration of the difference between gas properties. ● We need to reduce all greenhouse gases, including methane. ● Applying two baskets thinking to our 2050 target, the most ambitious and impactful approach would be to achieve negative long-lived gas emissions, while reducing short-lived gas emissions to sustainable levels. Getting to this point would mean that New Zealand is contributing to global cooling. ● Set the framework for a constructive political debate within a bipartisan framework. Note: a two baskets approach means taking a scientific approach to different gases. It does not mean treating the agricultural sector differently from other sectors. Nitrous oxide, which is primarily emitted through agricultural practices, is a long-lived greenhouse gas. It absolutely must be reduced to net zero. The science is clear that methane emissions must also be reduced. However, it is simply not necessary to reduce methane to net zero to stop global warming.

Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

Position

Domestic emissions reductions only (including from new forest planting)

Notes

as long as forests get the current global price.

Clause

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

Position

Yes

Notes

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

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

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 generally agrees with the proposed list of considerations to take into account when setting emission budgets: ● scientific knowledge about climate change ● technology relevant to climate change ● economic circumstances and, in particular, the likely impact of the decision on the economy and the competitiveness of particular sectors of the economy ● fiscal circumstances and, in particular, the likely impact of the decision on taxation, public spending and public borrowing ● social circumstances and, in particular, the likely impact of the decision on fuel poverty ● energy policy and, in particular, the likely impact of the decision on energy supplies and the carbon and energy intensity of the economy ● the government's obligations under the Treaty of Waitangi ● the three government objectives for climate change policy: sustainable economy, global and local leadership and creating a just and inclusive society

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

Engage with community groups to understand and enhance community capabilities in responding to climate Change

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

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 generally agrees with the proposed list of expertise which should be collectively held by the Climate Commission: ● climate change policy (including emissions trading) ● resource economics and impacts (including social impacts, labour markets and distribution) ● te Tiriti o Waitangi, ● climate and environmental science ● experience with addressing adaptation challenges like planning, insurance and local government ● risk management ● engineering and/or infrastructure ● community engagement, communication and action. Desirable, but non-essential, expertise could include: ● business competitiveness ● knowledge of the public and private

innovation and technology development system.

Clause

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

Position

Yes

Notes

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 government being required to prepare a national climate risk assessment, and a national policy plan to address these risks. A monitoring and reporting framework is also important. We need to think carefully about how local councils should be involved in these processes.

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