

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



Copy of your submission

---

## Contact information

Name Luke Easterbrook

Organisation (if applicable)

Address [REDACTED]

Telephone [REDACTED]

Email [REDACTED]

## Objectives for the contribution

Do you agree with these objectives for our contribution? Yes

1b. What is most important to you?

I think that a fair contribution should be based on what we need to do to mitigate the negative effects on climate change. Fair should be based on our population/land area and international agreements that we have signed up to. Fairness shouldn't just be based on what others are doing.

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?

We should focus on transport, energy and waste as areas where we can make reductions or collect tax and target households. I believe we should not make as many cuts/taxes on industry (industrial transport included) or agriculture because this will reduce our competitiveness and in the case of agriculture have a net negative effect.

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?

I think that the emphasis should be on what we need to do and when we need to do it by, rather than how much do we want to spend. I think we could make quite a high reduction for households and then reduce tax/ increase benefits for lower incomes so that those most vulnerable are not disproportionately affected by such cuts, but still have incentives to reduce what they use.

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?

I think reduction of transport emissions will be quite important domestically. I also think this question doesn't make that much sense.

## Summary

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

People need incentives to change behaviour. We shouldn't worry too much about increasing the cost of some activities (such as travel) for households. This will indicate that there is a real environmental cost to driving and

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



Copy of your submission

---

provide incentives to reduce emissions by doing less driving, or using a low carbon transport option like electric cars, public transport, cycling or walking.

It's really a bit of a chicken and egg situation. If we only take into account the extraction (and market manipulation) cost of oil compared to renewable energy then we will get nowhere fast.

We need to focus on the true cost, which incorporates the environmental cost.

## Other comments

6. Is there any further information you wish the Government to consider? Please explain.  
I think we need to be very ambitious with our target. We should be quite aggressive with taxing emissions for households in order to shape the behaviour to low carbon options. At the same time we need to adjust our tax system so that families with lower income and those on welfare are not unduly affected.

We should take a more measured approach with industry and industrial transport that more closely follows what other countries are doing with their emissions in order to stay competitive.

We should continue to be involved in research into reducing emissions in agriculture. But we should not be taxing our agricultural producers more than other countries are. We need to stay competitive in agriculture. We also need to push the issue of food supply and food security as a global issue that will require action at a global level to reduce emissions. That's not to say it should never be taxed, it might be appropriate to tax food in order to shape what people eat (e.g. eating more low carbon protein).

In summary I believe we can be quite aggressive in how we tax households for emissions, but a more measured approach is required for industry and agriculture in order to stay competitive in the global market.