

Consultation on setting New Zealand's post-2020 climate change target



Copy of your submission

Contact information

Name Briary Crawford-Zachernuk

Organisation (if applicable)

Address [REDACTED]

Telephone [REDACTED]

Email [REDACTED]

Objectives for the contribution

Do you agree with these objectives for our contribution? No

1b. What is most important to you?

It must set a path for a zero emissions world.

It must be fair and consider the needs of the most vulnerable domestically and globally, over and above the needs of the wealthiest.

Health must be included in the consideration of costs to NZ of climate change.

What would be a fair contribution for New Zealand?

2. What do you think the nature of New Zealand's emissions and economy means for the level of target that we set?

While agriculture makes up a significant part of our economy, a healthy economy will mean nothing in the context of a people and an environment who have traded in their health for this.

We must reduce carbon emissions. We must have peak emissions during this governments term, and decreasing emissions during the terms of every government who follow. We must be a zero carbon economy by 2050.

We must prove that it can be done, and challenge larger nations around the world to match our efforts.

Fairness must be central to our actions. Not to act on climate change ensures harm to everyone, but it is worst for the most vulnerable. Not to meet our treaty obligations, as failing to act on climate change would do, constitutes an unacceptable breach of trust.

It is too dangerous to burn the fossil fuels we have, and so we must not explore for any more fossil fuel reserves within NZ. We must stop mining or drilling of existing fossil fuels over the next decade.

How will our contribution affect New Zealanders?

3. What level of cost is appropriate for New Zealand to reduce it's greenhouse gas emissions? For example, what would be a reasonable reduction in annual household consumption?

As for how our contribution will effect New Zealanders, I firmly believe that the co-benefits alone of many changes are reason enough for major changes. Better insulation in homes could significantly decrease hospital admissions and improve inhabitants health status. Increased walking and cycling could help address our obesity and diabetes epidemic. Changes in urban planning, making neighbourhoods easy to walk around could help older people maintain their independence and decrease demand for rest home beds.

Consultation on setting New Zealand's post-2020 climate change target



Copy of your submission

We must determine how much consumption needs to be reduced and then find ways to do this which will allow people to continue to live full, healthy, meaningful lives.

4. Of the opportunities for New Zealand to reduce its emissions (as outlined on page 15 of the discussion document), which do you think are the most likely to occur, or be most important for New Zealand?

Summary

5. How should New Zealand take into account the future uncertainties of technologies and costs when setting its target?

Studies exist to show that a zero carbon economy is possible, in Australia and the United States, without relying on technologies not yet available. Targets must be based on large scale introduction of existing means of reducing carbon emissions.

We must have robust plans and commitments which meet our share of the reducing global carbon emissions. We must decrease emissions from this point in time onwards. There must be built in measures to penalise a failure to meet carbon emission reduction targets.

Other comments

6. Is there any further information you wish the Government to consider? Please explain.
We must also consider that New Zealand is not isolated from the effects of climate change on other nations. Culturally, socially, and economically, we are effected strongly by events around the globe.

Relying entirely on adaptation to climate change would mean adapting to tens or hundreds of millions of refugees displaced around the Pacific requiring homes. It would mean adapting to the impact of declines in food production of more than 25% of some staple food crops, and concomitant deaths from starvation. It would mean adapting to a world where violence and war from people facing restriction of resources becomes normal. It would mean adapting to a world where large swathes of southeast Asia have daytime temperatures that prove fatal for anyone attempting to work outdoors.

These are not things we want to adapt to.