

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



Copy of your submission

---

## Contact information

Name Karen Hodge

Organisation (if applicable)

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?

Creating short term guidelines that will encourage significant and lasting changes to occur in a timely manner. The perceived "fairness" of our contribution shouldn't need mentioning! We should strive to do better than the minimum expected of us here.

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?

Firstly, any short term impact on the NZ economy of an ambitious emissions target pales in comparison to the longer term consequences of taking insufficient action. NZ should lead by example with a zero emissions target.

New Zealand's emissions and economy are both heavily contributed to by farming. The need to reduce emissions provides a good opportunity to diversify (which would also serve to increase our resilience). Additionally, this is an opportunity to invest in technologies to improve the emissions associated with agricultural industries - if NZ companies are encouraged to do this now, it would place New Zealand in a leading position worldwide when other countries start to recognise the need to focus on agricultural emissions.

New Zealand is a relatively small population, and as such big changes are relatively easier to implement compared to larger nations. This is an advantage for us.

I do not believe there is any legitimate argument for a target other than zero emissions for NZ.

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?

Any costs of reducing emissions now are negligible in comparison to the long term costs to health, and ultimately, to the economy if we delay achieving a zero emissions target. So whatever cost it takes is appropriate. Obviously, there are many poorer households in NZ that would not be able to shoulder much in the way of increased cost. Luckily there are a myriad of ways that individuals can contribute without a significant increase in personal cost.

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



Copy of your submission

Encouraging community gardens, effective public transport, ensuring houses are adequately insulated - all things that can be done on a relatively local scale with favourable investment to benefit ratios . . . Please remember, all the above examples would have benefits beyond simply reducing emissions - encouraging community cohesion, improving fitness and mobility by reducing use of cars, improving health of the young and old during winter (and subsequently reducing the incidence of asthma and pneumonia and resultant hospital emissions) - all can result in vast improvements in community health and free up money for investment elsewhere.

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?

All opportunities to reduce emissions should be taken. Obviously for NZ, a focus on agriculture and technological investment, as well as generation of renewable energy would be the case. However, the importance of individual contributions should not be ignored and as outlined above, would be beneficial for more than simply reducing emissions.

## Summary

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

Technology is more certain to grow as an industry than agriculture ... this would be a good opportunity to rethink our main industries. The cost of implementing climate change legislation is insignificant compared to the costs of not doing so - projected costs scenarios don't appear to take this into account. Nor are savings (such as improvements in community spirits / health) taken into account. What exactly are the people who are creating these cost projections thinking? Steps to reduce emissions don't sit in isolation - they have lots of longterm benefits aside from their short term economic costs.

## Other comments

6. Is there any further information you wish the Government to consider? Please explain.  
New Zealand is a small country - but that doesn't mean we can't make a big difference!! Even if the changes we make have a minimal impact on total global emissions, we have the opportunity to set an example for others to follow, and ultimately to have a massive impact. NZ has demonstrated it is capable of leading the world with women's rights and nuclear free policy - we can surely do the same here? When our targets are announced in Paris, I want to be proud to call myself a New Zealander, to point and say look what we can achieve! And if we can do this, who else has any excuse :)

These decisions cannot be made by people who are focused on being reelected for a three year term. There needs to be a longer term outlook than this. Additionally, legislation implemented needs to come with safeguards against subsequent governments making changes that undermine its effectiveness.

Finally, please, there is no hope of constructing effective legislation if New Zealand is vulnerable to being sued by massive corporations. To have any hope of being able to achieve any targets we set in an economically viable way, NZ must not sign the TPPA. This is only one of so many reasons, but it is such an important one. I can do nothing other than plead with you here. It would have such a negative impact :(