

## Submission on New Zealand's post 2020 climate change contribution under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

I am extremely disappointed at the sham of a consultation process which the government has undertaken to obtain input to New Zealand's Climate Change Target to be presented to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). The theoretical consultation process began with the publishing of the discussion document in May 2015 with submissions closing by 3 June 2015. This is a very rushed process. Only 15 public meetings have been organised over a very short period of time, these have not been advertised sufficiently well, so this process cannot be regarded as consultation. The budget we have been told is limited. When this process is compared to the Flag referendum with a budget of \$26 million, and consultation over a period of 10 months, with over 80% of New Zealanders not wanting to change the flag, it is obvious this National Party government does not care about the future for New Zealanders.

In the forward to the discussion document The Honourable Mr Grocer talks about our unique circumstances as an excuse to do little to reduce our emissions further. Yes we already have a large renewable energy component to our electricity generation which is great but it is not 100% renewable. 22% of our carbon dioxide emissions are from coal and gas thermal generations. This should be phased out quickly and can be done now when electricity demand is flat.

Carbon dioxide is the greatest issue for climate change since it is the gas that is contributing the greatest volume to atmospheric change and lasts for longer. Carbon dioxide is the gas that is causing acidification of the oceans. While methane is an important greenhouse gas its volumetric contribution is less, and its longevity is less within the atmosphere, and in the global scheme of things our methane contribution is very small. New Zealand's methane contribution is only being highlighted by our global trading partner friends who have significantly greater emissions than New Zealand does.

Our transport and industrial carbon dioxide emissions can also be targeted for reduction relatively easily. Electrification of railways and promotion of railways ahead of road transport would go a long way. As would promotion of electric cars through installation of fast charge facilities paid for by the removal of tax subsidies for the fossil fuel industry. When the Tiwai point smelter closes in 2017 our industrial CO<sub>2</sub> emissions will decrease significantly and there is then the opportunity to replace the coal that Fonterra uses at Edendale with Manapouri electricity which is a win win for New Zealand's emissions.

Our increasing population is also seen as a reason for doing nothing on greenhouse emissions compared to other countries. The population increase is solely a political decision of allowing more migrants into the country. Therefore reversible.

There is a huge risk to New Zealand in expecting to use carbon credits in the future to compensate for doing nothing. What will be the price of carbon after 2020 ? **How** will we pay for these credits, taxpayer or emitters ?

More needs to be done to encourage planting, and replanting, of forests.

The discussion document talks about the costs of reducing our greenhouse gas emissions. Where are figures on the cost of doing nothing !!!

New Zealand is in a unique position to be a leader in reducing greenhouse gas emissions, especially CO2, and showing leadership on the climate change issue, which is sadly absent from the present National Party government.

I believe that reducing our present carbon dioxide emissions by 40% of our 2013 total emissions (Figure 2 in discussion document), by 2030, through a combination of CO2 emission elimination and plantation forestation, should be an achievable target that is taken to the UNFCCC.

I also believe that the final target taken to UNFCCC should be a cross party consensus since the National Party will not be the government right through to 2030. So what gives them the right to make binding long term decisions that successive governments will have to abide with?

R D Johnstone

[REDACTED]