

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



Copy of your submission

---

## Contact information

Name Dr David Jackson

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?

Our contribution needs to be ambitious. Since the Rio conference in 1986, NZ has been 'fiddling' round the edges in this area. Our current target of 5% below 1990 levels, but being 21% in fact above, indicates how poorly various Governments have grapples with this issue, and we have not made the sort of 'sea change' necessary to make meaningful changes. Therefore we need a reduction in the range of 30-40% by 2030.

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?

We are a developed country and have the economic wherewithal to address climate change targets without seriously impacting our quality of life. We should not hide behind the fact that much of our emissions comes for agriculture and therefore it too hard. The impacts of climate change are hard too. It is going to be a bit uncomfortable to make meaningful changes, but the consequences of not making significant changes are far worse.

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?

This question is the wrong way round. We are talking about the functioning of the planet - the ecosystem on which we all depend. The real question should be what is the CO2 and temperature target that the planet needs to be reasonably functional (and the consensus is that a 2 degree rise is the most we can tolerate). We then need to do what we need to to achieve that. Cost on households should not be the driving factor - and it is notable that the incremental costs of reaching higher targets e.g. 20% below to 1990 to 30% below are relatively small. And given the stakes for Earth are so high, we need to go for as bold a target as we can.

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?

I am not opposed to use of off-shore arrangements if a) they can be legally validated b) their longevity and effectiveness is sound e.g. credits bought in the Ukraine are not much use, and equally credits that might be manipulated by the Mafia or organised crime, or corrupt Governments are unlikely to be real of effective, and c) overseas credits should only be used if there is a win-win e.g. to save tropical forests, or to do demonstrable good to the populace of a poor country (as opposed to lining the pockets of an elite or a dictator).

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



Copy of your submission

---

## Summary

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

The target should be the target and we just need to work around these uncertainties to achieve it - like any business does in negotiating economic and fiscal uncertainties in achieving their targets. To take too much account of the costs on the economy is a recipe to do very little - as have happened over the last nearly 30 years. It cannot continue to be business as usual - that approach manifestly has not worked to date.

## Other comments

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