

# Your submission to Zero Carbon Bill

Hilary Webb

## Reference no: 12834

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 2050 target in legislation now

### Notes

As I understand and support this choice, a legislative commitment will be protected from shorter term political interference and changes in commitment. The emissions budgets enable some flexibility when so much can change in 32 years, without undermining the fixed commitment.

### 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

The long-lived stock gases are the primary concern. NZ's short-lived flow gas profile is unique and I believe agriculture will rise to the challenge.

### Clause

3. How should New Zealand meet its targets?

### Position

Domestic emissions reductions only (including from new forest planting)

### Notes

I have reservations about planting lots of plantation forestry and would prefer to see permanent forest, preferably native forest. Despite the lower sequestration rates, it is genuine carbon capture, with potential for a more diverse range of insitu industries than just producing wood for the commodity market (or to be burnt for fuel).

### Clause

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

### Notes

I'd like to be able to increase the short-lived gas target if technological solutions pop up.

### 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

Fantastic mechanism

### Clause

6. Should the Government be able to alter the last emissions budget (i.e. furthest into the future)?

### Position

Yes - the third emissions budget should be able to be changed but only when the subsequent budget is set

### Notes

allows for some flexibility and ensures tradeoffs are addressed across the 3rd & subsequent budgets

### 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****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**

Nice balance of economic and sustainability considerations.

**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**

Accountability is important, and ensures commitment

**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**

I wonder if Maori would be comfortable making commitments on behalf of future generations?

**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**

Accountability is important

**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**

Advising the Government on policy settings 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**

Innovation will be a huge part of success, but may not be required for the CCC

**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

**Notes**

So - my understanding is this function would provide a consistent national approach to issues like coastal erosion that individual TLA's have been facing and setting precedents on an ad hoc basis. This would provide stability and assurance for those affected and for insurers.

**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**

Yes - because addressing climate change in policy and planning has been beyond the brief of TLAs so this would be a start to quantifying the risks.

**Clause**

Do you have any other comments you'd like to make?

**Notes**

1. I am excited about the potential for NZ to develop and export climate change technologies to late adopters - huge potential to transform NZ into a knowledge economy. Imagine selling our livestock methane vaccines to the US - huge return on investment! Develop an electric car/tractor industry here, subsidise if you have to, and stop all mass imports of second hand cars. 2. I have reservations about land use change (assuming this means pastoral farming to forestry) as a mechanism for addressing climate change for the following reasons: a. There is time to address methane levels, and a genuine will by farmers to address climate change. Farmers experience the effects of climate change every day, every year. They need to be a key part of finding a solution, rather than having it imposed on them as land use change. b. The dairy industry will do, and is already proactively doing, what is has to in order to remain in business. This drive to survive will foster innovation. c. We need to preserve the option to be competitive in future land-based industries. Imagine, for instance, a world that demands llama or alpaca fibre, possum fur or wool instead of synthetic fibres. New Zealand is already good at these small-scale industries, so it would be a backward step to lose this capacity through land use change. d. Climate change may create opportunities for NZ's temperate climate to provide more food to the world through horticulture. Land use change may restrict this option and push up the price of arable land. 3. I have concerns about the impacts on low-income households, especially rural poor: a. Low-income families should receive a subsidy for electric cars & home insulation (already partially done through previous home insulation initiatives). b. Rural (lifestyle & urban too if they wish) households need the option to be self-sufficient rather than be forced to rely on electricity or gas (expensive and often not available in rural areas) so they can stay healthy and warm during winter power cuts, for instance. Innovative small scale technologies such as solar panels and wind mills could be subsidised on proof of removal of log burners or diesel generators. Thank you for the opportunity to submit onthis imprtant matter