

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



Copy of your submission

---

## Contact information

Name pamela henson

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?

It's most important to me that it IS fair and ambitious, as well as being seen to be so. I would like to see NZ as a leader in this movement to reduce emissions.

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?

This is a stunningly obscure question. Even after reading the document I dont really understand it. Clearly the document is skewed so we think we can't reduce emissions much and that it would be unfair to expect it of us. I dont entirely agree. Dr. Mike Joy's research suggests that the dairy industry is currently very inefficient, as it is paying farmers less than the cost of production of milk. He also suggests that reducing the number of cows on a given acreage would increase the amount of milk produced, thus reducing animal emissions at the same time as improving efficiency and payouts to farmers.

Motor vehicle emissions could be reduced by increasing the efficiency of exhaust systems, improving the frequency and efficiency of public transport and continuing the initiative to increase bicycle use. Business trips overseas are dangerous to the environment and could be reduced by using technology. Some forms of regulation or incentives/disincentives will be important in this process.

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?

We should definitely target a reduction of 40%, because the difference to households between that and the 5% target is not that great financially, but would be huge in terms of emissions. I certainly dont think households should bear the total brunt of this reduction in emissions. Businesses ought to be responsible for finding innovative ways to cut their emissions too.

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? they are all important.

Summary

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



Ministry for the  
**Environment**  
*Manatū Mo Te Taiao*

Copy of your submission

---

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

Not at all. It's a complete unknown and to say that oh yes technology will sort it out is to leave the future of the planet to chance. We have to base our strategies on the situation now, then there will be no nasty surprises in the future. It is basic risk management.

Other comments

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

I feel and think the government should take the strongest possible measures to reduce the effects of carbon emissions on climate change. Otherwise it will in the future, if there is a future, be known as the government that was too weak to show leadership, to preserve the planet for our descendants. I think the reasons given in the discussion document for making little change at home but using carbon credits instead are setting a truly weak example. We can make big changes with a positive attitude and affirmative publicity.