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Objectives for the contribution

Do you agree with these objectives for our contribution?   No

1b. What is most important to you?
Fairness’ must not only be assessed by our ‘fair share’ of Global emissions, but it should NOT be modified in any way by any "unique national circumstances", because every country will have some of these and the objective is to prevent future annihilation of the Global community by now making all necessary contributions to bring climate change to a complete end as soon as possible. Affordability’ and 'costs' are irrelevant when New Zealand should be put on the equivalent of a war-footing in order to bring an end to emissions in the short term and to lead other counties and the Global community to hold warming to 2 degrees.
Certainly, yes, our contribution should be a long term one, but there is no evidence of any perspective of long term planning in the Discussion Document, so I would have little faith in

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?

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?

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?
NZ must make full use of its forests as a source of bio fuels, method to sequestrate atmospheric carbon, emelioration of the impacts of pollution by other sectors, cleaner water, future sustainable building materials, recreation, and all sustainable environmental services they provide

Summary

5. How should New Zealand take into account the future uncertainties of technologies and costs when setting its target?
NZ should take NO ACCOUNT of the so called "uncertainties". That is because the problem is too urgent and to severe.. We have no more time for procrastinating and waiting.. This is the right time (and last chance) for making a decision - and it has to be made on available evidence.. For the sake of my grand-daughter that decision can ony be to go all out to stop Climate Change as soon as possible (which I realise is not for some decades possibly
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centuries even if we cut emissions to ZERO in June 2015).

Other comments

6. Is there any further information you wish the Government to consider? Please explain.
1. This rushed consultation on such an important subject is lamentable and seemingly tendentious. The document should get down to the 'nitty gritty' and focus on the only important aspect - which is to curb emissions; the more and sooner the better. Rather it focusses on manufacturing support for wimpish excuses and pitiful apologies for doing what needs to be done - by inappropriately dwelling upon "rules", not yet existing "technologies", "international carbon markets", NZs small total emission profile (while failing to be embarrassed by its high per head emissions), already high level of renewable hydro, and so on. Bah humbug. Just get on with the important focus - that of curbing emissions.

2. The country should aid its case in addressing Climate Change by adopting and maintaining a "polluter pays" principle with regard all emissions. I don't know, but this may require a carbon tax, rather than a revamp of ETS. NZ should immediately cease 'picking winners' in this regard. Present policies of pandering to agriculture aren't working and are a distortion to the whole economy and particularly the primary industries. Because dairying has a high level of existing level of emissions, is no reason to favour it. It already has valuable technologies it is not using to their fullest (like nitrate inhibitors) because it does not meet its emission obligations. Throw it to the wolves, I say, just like other sectors. Recall how efficient farming became in the 50s and 60s, when under duress it evolved world-leading technologies to simply survive. It will do the same in 2015 - but only if challenged.

3. The Discussion Document is a perfunctory document. It is ‘deceptive’ in failing to describe appropriately the true ultimate extent of the impacts of Climate Change. It is time we all came to realise the enormous extent of what we are dealing with. Potentially ultimately preempting massive disruption to the global economy, environment and human population. These horrendous but likely scenarios make the Document’s considerations of ‘household costs’ - of only a few hundred dollars - particularly pathetic and pithy. Really, what's that all about when equally possible scenarios will probably involve the complete disruption of the current standards of living of those households?

4. On the point of future projections, the modelling carried out for this Document is deficient in that it assumes and is based upon business as usual domestically and around the Globe. Where are the projections based upon NZs trading partners suffering economic disruption, the cost of freight for our international products becoming prohibitive, prohibitive, costs of production rendering most of what we trade now uneconomical and so on?..