

Submission to Tim Groser, Minister for Climate Change Issues

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

In reference to New Zealand's Climate Change Target Discussion Document May 2015

The world has not got time to procrastinate if we are to protect and secure the world's ecosystem we live in.

The world is realising that we all have seriously procrastinated and Paris is our chance to put on the breaks and put the increasing rate of Co2 emissions into reverse!

Our contribution to the new international climate change agreement is very important to us as a nation. We are a nation that can be proud of its achievements and leadership, e.g. Woman's right to vote.

I ask Tim Groser, Minister for Climate Change Issues that the Intended Nationally Determined Contribution (INDC):

- 1). Has a commitment to a global and New Zealand zero carbon target by 2050 or sooner, with a structured plan with steps outlining how to get there with the urgency to enable the commitment to be successful.
- 2). That all steps are made to ensure this is a transparent decision making process, that this target is credible, can be applied in cross-party plans, with a legislated, independent Climate Commission to ensure NZ meets its targets and stays within the global carbon budget.
- 3) To have an immediate divestment in the fossil fuel industry and to divert the investment into renewable energy alternatives required to meet our nation's requirements. The transferring of subsidies, funding and tax breaks presently supporting the fossil fuel industry to industries producing, distributing and using renewable energy.
- 4). To place an immediate moratorium on fossil fuel exploration, and within the decade phase out existing extraction.
- (5) How will our target affect households?

I ask for both costs and benefits on household be provided with the different targets

To use the words/terms that households "will be less 'well-off' than what would be expected without a target" or "worse off in terms of household consumption than if no target were taken" is misleading as it does not take in account of the benefits of avoiding the enormous cost of inaction. Remove the words "well off" and "worse off".

The effects of climate change, if not addressed by Government's such as ours, will be enormous costs on households. The increases of local body rates for relocation of low-lying airports, buildings, infrastructure due to sea level rise and sea inundation, the cost of sea defences, the effects of droughts, bush fires, floods and associate costs, and the hikes in insurance premiums, name a few costs of inaction.

To use the words that households will be less 'well-off' and "worse off" does not take in account the benefits of a fossil fuel free, clean environment.

Households will pay for the cost of inaction.

6). We cannot afford not to invest in the 40% below 1990 target

The differences in the targets and how it affects households is not that significant, especially to middle New Zealand.

TABLE 1: Impact of different targets on annual household consumption in 2027 (based on a \$50 per tonne carbon price)

5% below 1990 -\$1,270 per annum, 10% below 1990 -\$1,300 per annum, 20% below 1990 -\$1,400 per annum, 30% below 1990 -\$1,600 per annum, 40% below 1990 -\$1,800 per annum.

The difference of \$530 between 5% and 40% is not considerable.

\$530 per annum as far the best option as an investment to assist in securing a habitable world for the future. Please let us get on with it!

8). There is relationship between Carbon emission and wealth, so cost of the target can be fairly paid by taxes.

9) New Zealand's Climate Change Target needs to abide to the articles laid out in Te Tiriti o Waitangi



A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "S. F. Gerard", is centered on a light-colored rectangular background.

Sara Frances Gerard Date 3 June 2015

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Ph [Redacted]