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Objectives for the contribution

Do you agree with these objectives for our contribution?  Yes

1b. What is most important to you?
The descriptions of the objectives in the consultation document need work. Obj.1 devotes half of its description to justifying inaction.

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 'unique challenge' that NZs renewable energy production contains a large renewable energy portion is a straw man, as the majority of renewable energy was constructed prior to 1990. As 1990 is the base year for targets, this does not impact our ability to reduce our emissions.
That a large portion of emissions come from agriculture for export purposes is a reminder that any emissions measuring system must account for indirect emissions via trade. An equitable way of accounting for these must be a priority at Paris. This should not be used as an excuse for weak targets.

I support a 20% reduction below 1990 levels (gross emissions).

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?
The cost to NZers will likely be comparatively larger on lower income households. While market pricing will have to be a driver, care will need to be taken to ensure that domestic equity isn’t neglected. With that in mind, the range of results from the modelling from $1270 to $1800 are all affordable.

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 only equitable measure for reducing emissions is clear market pricing. The current ETS has been gutted through exemptions and shady international credits, this either needs to be strengthened or replaced.
Aside from Agricultural Mitigation Technologies, a clear price signal will achieve the goals of all the other initiatives described.

Summary
5. How should New Zealand take into account the future uncertainties of technologies and costs when setting its target?
Any technology change that enables reduced emissions will be welcomed, but we cannot rely on technology or any other step changes in meeting our targets. The target must be ambitious and internationally equitable regardless.

Other comments

6. Is there any further information you wish the Government to consider? Please explain.
The most important thing is that meaningful measures are in place to reduce emissions.