

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



Copy of your submission

Contact information

Name Geoff Davidson

Organisation (if applicable)

Address [REDACTED]

Telephone [REDACTED]

Email [REDACTED]

Objectives for the contribution

Do you agree with these objectives for our contribution?

1b. What is most important to you?

Any goal must be backed by the political strength to ensure it will be achieved. A consensus of major parties is imperative. With the goal clearly enunciated, it must guide New Zealand over the long term in the global transition to a low emissions world.

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?

The National government committed to 30% by 2030 and 50% by 2050. That is the absolute minimum We can do better. Zero emissions is possible with today's technology and knowledge.

The following countries have already made INDCs to the UN process: Switzerland has pledged to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions by 50% by 2030 compared to 1990 levels, corresponding to an average reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by 35% over the period 2021-2030.

The EU has committed to a binding target of at least 40% reduction by 2030 compared to 1990.

Norway is committed to at least a 40% reduction by 2030 compared to 1990 levels.

How will our contribution affect New Zealanders?

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

If \$1800 per household per annum would give a 40% reduction by 2027 then let's start with \$2,000 per household per annum and really make an impact.

We should not rely on buying overseas credits but be entirely self-sufficient in our carbon reductions.

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?

The most advantageous method to reduce emissions is to offer incentives to lock-up much of our uneconomic hill country and actively encourage transition to native forests.

The ETS was never perfect, and has now been watered down to an ineffectual policy. Relying solely on exotic forestry will not produce the necessary volume of permanent carbon and the additional environmental qualities

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



Copy of your submission

derived from native forests compel the introduction of a revised ETS that recognises and encourages these benefits.

For the sake of the environment and water quality in particular, New Zealand should limit dairying to existing areas and not provide irrigation to additional farms.

Summary

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

New technologies will no doubt make the task of reducing our emissions easier and probably cheaper in the long term, particularly if the cost of doing nothing is factored into the equations. Accept the costs now and future gains will be a bonus.

Other comments

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

Your models do not attempt to show the impact of higher carbon prices on forest regeneration. Forestry generally has been a significant factor in offsetting growth in gross emissions. With higher carbon prices it will become a major component of our carbon response and it will be important for Government policy to ensure native forestry is a large part of that response. Without incentives to lockup native forests the alternative will be more erosion and polluted rivers. One simple clear policy can do so much to enhance our environment and reduce our carbon output.