

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



Copy of your submission

Contact information

Name John Foulkes

Organisation (if applicable)

Address

Telephone

Email

Objectives for the contribution

Do you agree with these objectives for our contribution? No

1b. What is most important to you?

Providing a future New Zealand with an environment as advantageous as the one we have now.

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?

I think New Zealand should be ambitious. While we have a number of difficulties we also have a number of benefits, such as the availability of hydroelectric power. As a country that values the environment in both farming and tourism the quality of the environment must be important. Therefore an ambitious target is required.

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?

The costs shown in the Ministries document suggest that a much greater reduction can be obtained for a relatively small increase. At least an achievable target of 40% should be set. If successful policy makes improvements the target should be open to be increased.

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 the transition to a lower carbon economy will need to be a part of the solution. I disagree that we must wait until everyone else agrees before implementing this, steps can be taken now, and should be to examine and reduce day to day emissions. Reducing emissions through emerging technologies will likely play a part, however we cannot simply rely on expected technological improvements and not act to change how we consider our (NZ and/or personal) emissions.

Summary

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

I think setting an ambitious goal with measurable milestones and attempting to achieve those is an effective way forward. We should work with the best ideas/policy we have now and relying on future technologies to improve our

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



Copy of your submission

target instead of relying on future technologies to provide rapid relief. Uncertainties around costs should be considered, but can also be reviewed if and where they arise.

Other comments

6. Is there any further information you wish the Government to consider? Please explain.
Firstly I am pleased to note that targets reference 1990 levels instead of 2005 levels incorporated by some countries.

It is also important that the cost of any solution framework is appropriately spread over the population based on what people can afford and where the emissions are produced.

However I disagree with the suggestion that NZ is not required to take action because it has a different emission profile when compared to overseas countries (E.g. pg 11 and 12). The target set should be based on the best possible target NZ can reach instead of comparisons to appearing equal to other countries. In this way NZ can be a leader, instead of waiting for others to act first.

The ministry's three objectives are good starting points. However they appear to be worded to suggest that the appearance and long term possibility are viable targets. I would prefer that the targets are more ambitious, setting out desirables, instead of must achieves.

I was surprised by the relatively small difference in per capita costs between the minimum and 40% targets proposed by the ministry. While understanding that the total costs are considerable an approximately 50% increase in costs for a further 35% reduction appears to be worthwhile. This is especially the case when the total cost of a 40% solution appears to be 2% of the average annual consumption. As discussed in the public meeting in Auckland I also understand these figures do not take into account the possible growth due to funding in the science and industry required or the climate benefits and hence underestimate the positive impacts.

I ask the government to aim for an ambitious target and to put real measurements in place to ensure that each government is working towards those ambitions in a meaningful way. As a country based on our land and climate (in both tourism and agriculture) it is important for us to be able to act for the future of these. The target should be at least 40% with ambitions to improve on this where possible.

I also think an important part of the ministry's and government's role must be to encourage participation in these changes from their citizens. Business, Farmers and everyday citizens have a number of options to reduce their own emissions and I believe that it is an important part of the government/ministry's job to encourage this as well as creating meaningful policy changes.

Thank you for reviewing my submission.