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#### 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**
Actions must be led by a bipartisan and scientific approach to ensure certainty.

#### 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**
To deal with CO2 only would not be accepted by the community at large due to the unfortunate perception that the Ag industry is largely responsible for all our problems. This is obviously not the case as the short term gas Methane and CO2 are quite different in their source and in our ability to deal with Methane without major disruption to our rural communities and export industry. To go to Net Zero emission in all gases would devastate our rural communities as it would totally kill off our pastoral farming systems and the infrastructure around them and associated jobs right across the economy. The proposal to increase forestry planting in rural areas coming on top of pressures to reduce methane or Nitrous Oxide emissions could create a collapse of our rural resilience. Forestry has always been an exploitive industry and seldom gives back to the communities. It can be a social and cultural black hole. We should remember we are dealing with these problems primarily for the better survival of human race. The human race means, at its grassroots level, communities of people and we should remember that. We favour the second option. It will achieve the desired CO2 reduction plus see a lowering of atmospheric Methane and Nitrous Oxide levels due to sciences yet to be developed. It is noted that the Sheep & Beef sector has been making headway in producing less carbon intensive products already. We do not favour Methane from ruminant animals being included in the ETS. Better to work hard on solutions to lower Methane production via vaccination or diet supplements combined with genetics. These things are happening now and are unlikely to be improved or speeded up by the bureaucracy and cost of having Methane in the ETS. We would like to see the language used to measure progress against targets changed under the new bill. For instance to use a pie graph showing Ag contributing over 50% of total emissions is meaningless and unhelpful and will only get worse over time as CO2 is lowered. Better to talk only of progress towards targets eg Agriculture 1990-2014 + 15% Energy 1990-2014 + 36%.

#### 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**
This option allows for international co-operation which may be important.

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

**Position**
Yes

**Notes**
Targets and budgets should always be reviewable rather than allowed to drift. Technology may even allow targets to be lifted.

#### 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
Budgets should always be reviewable. That is what budgets are for.

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

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
Communities and their resilience

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
Yes, we need a panel of widely varied expertise.

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
An independent role maybe alongside the Reserve Bank and Treasury

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
Ensure expertise needed on community resilience eg land use changes.

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
Adaptation is always important.

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
Provided that it does not end up just another Bureaucratic cost centre.