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Objectives for the contribution

Do you agree with these objectives for our contribution?   Yes

1b. What is most important to you?
It should be ambitious - better to over-achieve than under-achieve and experience the consequences of climate change
"Appropriate" management of costs and impacts will have to be clarified. Given than business owners benefit most from the profits (generated using resources and causing emissions), they should bear a greater proportion of the cost.
However, I think it is also "appropriate" for every household to bear some cost - given that they too, benefit from maintaining a stable environment.

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?
I accept we need primary producers to be able to continue exporting but I do not think the need to remain competitive should exempt the agriculture from bearing some of the cost
If the system is worked out fairly internationally and NZ is more carbon efficient than other countries (as stated by William Rolleston, president of Federated Farmers), NZ should be able to remain competitive - even more competitive than at present.

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?
I would have no problem with reducing household incomes by $1800 or more – the cost would be far outweighed by the benefits – both tangible (e.g. lower insurance premiums; less risk of increased electricity prices due to low hydro lake levels etc) and intangible (e.g being able to sit on my deck and watch a sunset; reduced risk of harm from severe weather events). It is the benefits that cannot be measured in economic models that I particularly want borne in mind during these negotiations. It is hard to put a dollar value on the ability to swim at the beach with my children – yet these opportunities are of greater “value” to me than the monetary costs listed.
Additionally reducing household consumption would cause further benefits for the environment – less emissions, less pollution, less waste.
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?

If agriculture generates our biggest proportion of emissions, I suggest it presents the most important opportunity to reduce emissions (if we reduce agricultural emissions by 10%, we reduce overall emissions by 4.8% compared to 1.7% and 2.2% respectively). I accept there may be greater scope for reduction in other areas and, in particular, support increasing our renewable transport and energy production.

Summary

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

Focus on the goal of reduced emission and accept that may change costs and see certain aspects of the economy become unprofitable - as has happened throughout history

Other comments

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

While I agree with the statement: “that certain countries should do more than others (eg, those with higher emissions per person, or higher income) and that developed countries should show leadership”, I would hate to see a goal of reduced emission production per capita be used to justify further population growth. As mentioned above, there are many intangible (e.g. having space) and tangible (e.g. less time in traffic) values to having a smaller population.
1a Do you agree with these objectives for our contribution?

✓ Yes

It should be ambitious - better to over-achieve than under-achieve and experience the consequences of climate change

"Appropriate" management of costs and impacts will have to be clarified. Given than business owners benefit most from the profits (generated using resources and causing emissions), they should bear a greater proportion of the cost.

However, I think it is also "appropriate" for every household to bear some cost - given that they too, benefit from maintaining a stable environment.

2 What would be a fair contribution for New Zealand?

I accept we need primary producers to be able to continue exporting but I do not think the need to remain competitive should exempt the agriculture from bearing some of the cost

If the system is worked out fairly internationally and NZ is more carbon efficient than other countries (as stated by William Rolleston, president of Federated Farmers), NZ should be able to remain competitive – even become more competitive than at present.

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?

I would have no problem with reducing household incomes by $1800 or more – the cost would be far outweighed by the benefits – both tangible (e.g. lower insurance premiums; less risk of increased electricity prices due to low hydro lake levels etc) and intangible (e.g being able to sit on my deck and watch a sunset; reduced risk of harm from severe weather events). It is the benefits that cannot be measured in economic models that I particularly want borne in mind during these negotiations. It is hard to put a dollar value on the ability to swim at the beach with my children – yet these opportunities are of greater “value” to me than the monetary costs listed.

Additionally reducing household consumption would cause further benefits for the environment with less emissions, less pollution, less use of non-renewable resources and less waste.

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?

If agriculture generates our biggest proportion of emissions, I suggest it presents the most important opportunity to reduce emissions (if we reduce agricultural emissions by 10%, we reduce overall emissions by 4.8% compared to 1.7% and 2.2% for transport and energy respectively). I accept there may be greater scope for reduction in other areas and, in particular, support increasing our renewable transport and energy production.
5. How should New Zealand take into account the future uncertainties of technologies and costs when setting its target?

Focus on the goal of reduced emission and accept that may change costs and see certain aspects of the economy become unprofitable - as has happened throughout history e.g. as technology has developed.

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

While I agree with the statement: “that certain countries should do more than others (eg, those with higher emissions per person, or higher income) and that developed countries should show leadership”, I would hate to see a goal of reduced emission production per capita be used to justify further population growth. As mentioned above, there are many intangible (e.g. having space) and tangible (e.g. less time in traffic) values to having a smaller population.