| **A Zero Carbon Act is important to me because...** | I would like to see this world we live in continue to be livable in the distant future. I am all for progress and new technological advancement. However I think we should be mindful of the effects we have on the world we live in and minimise the negative effects we have it. At a minimum we should make no change to the environment.

I am extremely appalled that there are now areas in this world where good quality air for breathing and drinking water is not easily obtainable due to pollution. Profit and progress at all cost is not sustainable in the long term.

There’s already fewer living flora and fauna, some being threatened in with extinction because no one care enough to ensure they could survive in the long term. This sort of short term thinking has to end before we lose more and ultimately end up with a planet that humans are unable to live in.

Time to stop and think about what damage we are doing to this world, reduce it as much as possible so what we have left is available for many many many years to come.

I also think more thought should be put into reducing carbon emissions than what is being done now.

I want a world that humans can live in for thousands of years to come without requiring us to retreat into created atmospheres. |
| Q1. What process should the Government use to set a new emissions reduction target in legislation? | The Government should set a target for 2050 in legislation now. I would like to see wide support for this legislation, regardless of where you are in the political spectrum. This target should be there regardless of who is in government. |
| Q2. If the Government sets a 2050 target now, which is the best target for New Zealand? | The most ambitious target: reducing total greenhouse gases to net zero by 2050. I also support taking a science-based approach to ensure our efforts to reduce emissions are as impactful as possible: we should aim for negative levels of long-lived gases, while reducing short-lived gases to sustainable levels. |
**Q3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?**

By using domestic emissions reductions only (including from new forest planting). Emissions is not only what comes out from vehicles and burning of fuel, it comes from what is produced by waste. Waste at the end of life of a product as well as during the creation and use of a product.

Are we creating unnecessary waste?

We should ensure NZ as a whole work towards these targets. For example public transport should aim for low emissions vehicles and not expand their use of fossil fuels.

Businesses, projects and all should include consideration towards reducing carbon emissions and reduce waste as part of their planning process. Anyone designing products or services should also include reduction and disposal at end of life and of waste and by products. Can they make something using recycled material or can the waste and end of life of what they make or create be broken down and recycled?

There should also be research being done on how to reduce these emissions. For example there's one recent study finding a particular seaweed added to food cows eat reduced methane emissions. Is there research in NZ to see if we have plants that will produce similar effect?

Are what we wear contributing to the carbon emissions? This not only refers to what is used to make the fabric and clothes we wear but how we wear them. Is the uniform or workplace dress code such it is only possible to wear them during summer if the office is air conditioned?

Why is insulation and even renewable energy (eg solar panels) not encouraged in new homes being built in NZ? A well insulated home not only means healthier people living in it but also less energy consumption required to heat the home in winter. Well planned homes will also ensure the insulated home is not too hot in the summer without requiring mechanical means of cooling.

We have a lot of waste going into landfill when some of it can be redirected for reuse and/or to be recycled.

**Q4. Should the Zero Carbon Bill allow the 2050 target to be revised if circumstances change?**

The 2050 target should not be altered in response to “economic changes” as this undermines its long-term certainty. However, the ability to revise the 2050 target in light of major changes in scientific understanding or international agreements should be permitted.

**Q5. 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?**

yes - I agree with 5-year budgets set 10-15 years in advance, so that 3 are in effect at all times.

**Q6 - Q7. Should the Government be able to alter emissions budgets?**

No - emissions budgets should not be altered in response to “economic changes” as this undermines their long-term certainty. However, the ability to revise budgets in light of major changes in scientific understanding or international agreements should be permitted.
### Q8. Do you agree with the proposed considerations that the Government and the Climate Commission will need to take into account when advising on and setting budgets?

I agree that the Government and the Climate Commission should take the following factors into consideration when advising on and setting budgets:
- scientific knowledge regarding climate change
- technology relevant to climate change
- economic circumstances and the likely impact of a decision on the economy, as well as the competitiveness of particular sectors of the economy
- fiscal circumstances and the likely impact of the decision on taxation, public spending and public borrowing
- social circumstances and the likely impact of a decision on fuel poverty
- energy policy and the likely impact of a decision on energy supplies and the carbon and energy intensity of the economy.

### Q9. Should the Zero Carbon Bill require Governments to set out plans within a certain timeframe to achieve the emissions budgets?

Yes - we must learn from the mistakes of the UK’s Climate Change Act and specify a strict time frame for producing a plan.

### Q10. 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?

The Government’s policy plans to meet emission budgets should be comprehensive, fair, cost-effective, environmentally sustainable, and reflect a commitment to Te Tiriti o Waitangi.

### Q11. 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?

Yes - the Commission should not be a decision-making body. However, the Government should be legally required to consider and formally respond to the Commission’s advice, and to provide an explanation if they do not act on it.

### Q12. What role do you think the Climate Change Commission should have in relation to the New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme (NZ ETS)?

The Commission should advise the Government on policy settings in the NZ ETS. It should not make decisions itself with respect to the number of units available in the NZ ETS, or its implementation.

### Q13. 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?

I agree with the following collective expertise:
- climate change policy (including emissions trading)
- resource economics and impacts (including social impacts, labour markets and distribution)
- te Tiriti o Waitangi, te reo me ona tikanga Māori and Māori interests
- climate and environmental science including mātauranga Māori
- experience with addressing adaptation challenges like planning, insurance and local government
- risk management
- engineering and/or infrastructure
- community engagement and communications.
- business competitiveness
- knowledge of the public and private innovation and technology development system.

I think expertise in public health is also important.

### Q14. Do you think the Zero Carbon Bill should cover adapting to climate change?

Yes. This may require a separate adaptation sub-committee within the Climate Commission.

### Q15. The Government has proposed a number of new functions to help us adapt to climate change. Do you agree with the proposed functions?

I agree with the proposed functions below, but recognise that nuance is required in terms of how local councils are involved:
- a national climate change risk assessment
- a national adaptation plan
- regular review of progress towards implementing the national adaptation plan
- an adaptation reporting power
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q16. Should the Government explore setting up a targeted adaptation reporting power that could see some organisations share information on their exposure to climate change risks?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Further comments</strong></td>
<td>I would like to see more being done to reduce waste, recycle and/or reuse of items. It would be great if we can lead by example. There's already work done in NZ and overseas to improve on this. We need to ensure more is being done and perhaps government leads by example.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>