

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



Copy of your submission

Contact information

Name Ashlee Gross

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 find this question less than useful; while there might potentially be some slight tradeoffs/balancing necessary between the three objectives, they appear to me to be largely complementary rather than in competition with each other, thus it seems unnecessary to me to choose one that I feel is most important.

One point I would like to note instead is that while I agree with the three objectives above, I think that New Zealand's action to date fall well short of achieving any of these three objectives, and based on signals from the Government of future intentions, I am extremely concerned that future Government action, including the post-2020 commitment, will not take us anywhere near achieve any of these 3 goals. I note particularly that I am extremely concerned, frustrated, saddened, angry and have even reached the point of feeling disgusted, by the signals of intended inaction that I think it is fair to say are given by this discussion document and the wider consultation process. The discussion document and these proposed questions for feedback have gone based the point of being leading, to being deliberately misleading. How can you have a section headed "fairness" which talks almost entirely about comparative costs with other developed countries while giving only one sentence to mentioning developing countries? How can you have a discussion about the cost of different courses of action without having any \$ figures on the cost of dealing with likely climate change effects under different degrees of temp rise? How, with all a scientific evidence pointing to the fact that we are going to have to eventually get to zero emissions, can you ask the public to discuss costs without giving any information on the relative cost of reducing emissions more now versus later?

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?

While I agree that we need to be practical in considering that our agricultural emissions per unit of output are low compared to other producers, however I feel this has been vastly over highlighted in the discussion documented, and is really mislabelled as part of a discussion on fairness. Our fair contribution should be determined based on per capita emissions while taking into account:

- our per capita emission compared to developed AND particularly developing countries
- our historic emissions
- the fact that though we are an above average source of emissions, we are predicted based on our geographic location to experience lower, less costly effects than other countries - which frees us up to contribute more \$ to our own mitigation and supporting developing countries in adaptation (this uses the same logic as claiming we should consider that reducing agricultural emissions will cost more that industrial should be a consideration of "fairness").
- the actual difference in our projected % population rate growth compared to other countries, however this should

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



Copy of your submission

be based on numbers and not blown out of proportion as an excuse as this document appears to lead the reader.

I do note that while the stated objective is to find a fair AND ambitious target, this question curiously omits to ask us to think about what would be ambitious.

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?

According to the discussion document it is a case no of reducing annual household consumption, but simply growing it slightly less, in order to manage a 40% target. I think that accepting slightly less growth in order to do the fair and ethical thing seems a very appropriate level of cost.

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?

Summary

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

Other comments

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