

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



Copy of your submission

Contact information

Name Scott Dalziel

Organisation (if applicable)

Address [REDACTED]

Telephone

Email [REDACTED]

Objectives for the contribution

Do you agree with these objectives for our contribution? Yes

1b. What is most important to you?

Q1. I'm happy with the objectives with the following comments.

1. I have no faith in the current top down decision making process to distribute the contributions fairly. It is desirable to include a means for voluntary involvement or at very least public input in determining what is a fair distribution.

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?

Q.2 In Box 4 the statement that the world needs 70% more food by 2050 is used as a justification for continuing and perhaps even increasing agricultural levels of methane. This totally ignores the fact that this is driven by our own economic well being not the world's need for food.

I seriously question the use of carbon credits from overseas activities to achieve our national goal, unless the outcome is a clear contribution to overall world reduction.

Some of the comments already made above indicate my preference for a more radical way of ordering our economy to achieve this important objective.

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?

Q.3 It is not clear what the annual household consumption of \$73,000 refers to. If it refers to the cost of greenhouse gas emissions then it is significantly above the actual income of many households. If it refers to income then it indicates the serious inequality that already exists which itself contributes to undermining the achievement of emissions targets.

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?

Q.4 All of the opportunities outlined in the section have a potential, and all of them are most likely to occur if there is a concerted effort by planners and politicians to bring individual members of the community on board with contributing what they can.

Summary

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



Copy of your submission

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

Q5 I have already made a comment about where improved technology should sit in the planning "mix". Some of the comments I made earlier about the structure of our economy have a bearing on the uncertainties. A couple of examples of the perverse elements in that economy

1. As people find ways to use energy more efficiently the cost goes up to maintain the profit margin of those who have economic control of the production. (a fact which underscores the value of those resources remaining in public control)

2. The economic system persists in attempting to distribute costs equally across the population but the production of emissions is progressive depending on the amount of energy and other resources used in creating higher income.

Here is an example of how we might achieve a fair contribution to the goal using some of the ideas referred to above.

By a public process we might achieve a majority agreement to reduce our use of private transport by 10% across the board and devise a means to measure that. Then the absolute effect of that would be greater for the more affluent members of our society than for people on low incomes (even when the greater cost of running an old vehicle is taken into account)

Other comments

6. Is there any further information you wish the Government to consider? Please explain.

This submission accepts in general terms the proposition that the currently occurring changes in the world's climate are caused by the growth of greenhouse gases coming from a wide variety of human activities.

Those activities are directly controlled by the dominant economic system by which we seek to improve our individual well being.

That system is controlled by a small group of corporations who "own" (ie control) most of the world's wealth, and determine the access of the rest of the human population to a share of that wealth.

This top down structure is repeated in the document (New Zealand's Climate Change Target)

As a consequence it makes no mention at all of the contribution ordinary New Zealanders already make by their involvement in waste minimization efforts and minimizing their use of private cars.

Is this because such efforts do not figure in either the thinking or behaviour of the planners responsible for this document?

Certainly there is little attempt here to discover what kind of action ordinary citizens are prepared to take to achieve the necessary greenhouse gas reductions.

One of the consequences of that structure is that access to an improved quality of life for the majority is dependent on the wealthy few maintaining their wealth advantage and even increasing it.

It follows that that controlling group is unwilling to countenance action that undermines their advantage. Reducing greenhouse gas emissions is one such action.

So the very system that causes the climate change problem is the same system whose most powerful people and organizations block political attempts to impose limits on activities that reduce the greenhouse gas emissions to levels that lower the temperature of the earth's atmosphere.

The science behind climate change is widely accepted, and there is a widespread though not universal desire to see action taken to stop further degradation of our environment.

That cannot happen while the dominant preoccupation of our economic system is focussed on increasing the wealth of the few who claim to own the natural resources of the planet.

So there is an urgent need to focus on the social and political levers that can develop universal support for the actions necessary to control greenhouse gas emissions but also develop a more universal sense of responsibility for how our individual actions can contribute to the health of the planet rather than destroying it.

So the focus of this submission is widen the focus beyond the minimalist concern of world governments with greenhouse gas emissions and begin to address of how to reorganize our economic system, to better preserve the limited resources of the planet and the diversity of life on it.

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



Copy of your submission

So my major objection to the current discussion document is that it begins from the assumption that current economic goals are the only possible starting point.

If instead we began from a starting point of how we might seriously involve ordinary people in achieving the goal of say a 10% reduction on 1991 levels, we might explore the willingness to reduce individual emissions by that amount in terms of their use of individual transport use, retaining ,electrifying, and improving the use of regional railways(Northland and Gisborne, perhaps initially by subsidizing this as a carbon credit). This could be offset by a deliberate increase in individual investment in domestic solar energy production.

Then it might be possible to treat the additional reductions achieved by technological innovation as a bonus, an over achievement of the target.This submission accepts in general terms the proposition that the currently occurring changes in the worlds climate are caused by the growth of greenhouse gases coming from a wide variety of human activities.

Those activities are directly controlled by the dominant economic system by which we seek to improve our individual well being.

That system is controlled by a small group of corporations who "own" (ie control) most of the worlds wealth, and determine the access of the rest of the human population to a share of that wealth.

This top down structure is repeated in the document (New Zealand's Climate Change Target)

As a consequence it makes no mention at all of the contribution ordinary New Zealanders already make by their involvement in waste minimization efforts and minimizing their use of private cars.

Is this because such efforts do not figure in either the thinking or behaviour of the planners responsible for this document?

Certainly there is little attempt here to discover what kind of action ordinary citizens are prepared to take to achieve the necessary greenhouse gas reductions.

One of the consequences of that structure is that access to an improved quality of life for the majority is dependent on the wealthy few maintaining their wealth advantage and even increasing it.

It follows that that controlling group is unwilling to countenance action that undermines their advantage. Reducing greenhouse gas emissions is one such action.

So the very system that causes the climate change problem is the same system whose most powerful people and organizations block political attempts to impose limits on activities that reduce the greenhouse gas emissions to levels that lower the temperature of the earth's atmosphere.

The science behind climate change is widely accepted, and there is a widespread though not universal desire to see action taken to stop further degradation of our environment.

That cannot happen while the dominant preoccupation of our economic system is focussed on increasing the wealth of the few who claim to own the natural resources of the planet.

So there is an urgent need to focus on the social and political levers that can develop universal support for the actions necessary to control greenhouse gas emissions but also develop a more universal sense of responsibility for how our individual actions can contribute to the health of the planet rather than destroying it.

So the focus of this submission is widen the focus beyond the minimalist concern of world governments with greenhouse gas emissions and begin to address of how to reorganize our economic system, to better preserve the limited resources of the planet and the diversity of life on it.

So my major objection to the current discussion document is that it begins from the assumption that current economic goals are the only possible starting point.

If instead we began from a starting point of how we might seriously involve ordinary people in achieving the goal of say a 10% reduction on 1991 levels, we might explore the willingness to reduce individual emissions by that amount in terms of their use of individual transport use, retaining ,electrifying, and improving the use of regional railways(Northland and Gisborne, perhaps initially by subsidizing this as a carbon credit). This could be offset by a deliberate increase in individual investment in domestic solar energy production.

Then it might be possible to treat the additional reductions achieved by technological innovation as a bonus, an over

achievement of the target.

General Comments:

I am quite cynical about this process.

1. The very short time frame of the notification of and the small number of the public meetings associated with this supposedly public involvement leads me to question the integrity of the process, or the likelihood that any notice

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



Copy of your submission

will be taken of submissions.

2. That makes me doubt the willingness of those involved at a political level to devolve responsibility for achieving the targets to the public in a way that enables us to own the targets and the achievement of them. In the long run that is essential for a successful outcome in my view.