

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



Copy of your submission

---

## Contact information

Name Lynda Hannah

Organisation (if applicable) Living Legacies

Address [REDACTED]

Telephone [REDACTED]

Email [REDACTED]

## Objectives for the contribution

Do you agree with these objectives for our contribution? No

1b. What is most important to you?

There can be only one realistic objective - to reduce and reverse climate change. Everything else is fluff. Our contribution needs to reduce climate change, regardless of other countries' contributions, and regardless of how it is "seen". We are not putting on a show for anyone's entertainment or soliciting marks from judges; we are trying to ensure a safe and liveable climate for all present and future generations. Also, our contribution must guide New Zealand and every other country in the short, medium and long terms - starting immediately.

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 nature of New Zealand's emissions and economy means that we have a lot of work to do, but it has no relevance to the target. What matters is that carbon dioxide emissions reduce dramatically by mid century and we simply have to accept that. Economies can change easily with planning and innovation. The green technology sector is where the growth and innovation is, it's where the jobs are and New Zealand is missing out. The number of solar panels installed has tripled in the last 18 months according to the Electricity Network Association. Developing and subsidising oil drilling and coal mining is not just immoral, given what we know about climate change, it's also impeding New Zealand's ability to develop the clean green technologies of the future that we will need. I refer you to the New Climate Economy Report led by Lord Nicholas Stern that found that economies can grow while cutting emissions.

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 your own figures it would only cost an estimated \$1,800 reduction in annual household consumption for a 40% reduction, which is only \$530 more than a 5% reduction. I am stunned that the question even needs to be asked, the question really is why would we NOT go for at least a 40% reduction target when it would only cost us \$1800? What is the cost to future generations if we do nothing? Very considerably more. 40% reduction is the cheap option.

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?

There are many opportunities and they are all important and they all must occur - we can halve the number of

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



Copy of your submission

---

livestock and convert the remaining stock to organic. This will halve our agricultural emissions, enable the soil to act as a carbon sink (which it has the capacity to do under organic management), without decreasing export earnings due to the higher price of organic milk solids and organic meat, and even improve human health which will reduce health costs nationwide. We still have 22% of our energy coming from non-renewable sources and yet we have been called the Saudi Arabia of renewable energy because of the huge potential we have to be 100% renewable.

## Summary

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

Future technologies and costs can't be predicted. We should stick to what we know and what science tells us. Science has given a clear prediction of what will happen if we continue to emit greenhouse gasses. We can predict the cost to our farmers if there is an increase in drought and severe storms. We can predict the cost to our Pacific Island neighbours and coastal communities if sea levels rise. I can safely predict that infinite economic growth on a finite planet isn't possible.

## Other comments

6. Is there any further information you wish the Government to consider? Please explain.  
Please adopt a minimum target of a 40% reduction in carbon emissions below 1990 levels. The strategies and technologies already exist to do this and all that's lacking is political leadership. Thank you.