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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?
Firstly, I'd like to add my disappointment towards this process. Climate change is one of the biggest issues the world faces in the 21st century, yet the Government is spending less money on this process than that of the flag. Secondly, the consultation document excludes various factors including health, education etc. Thirdly, if this is to be an ambitious long term plan, then we need to make the target of a zero-emissions economy, that is the only possible "ambitious" "long-term" plan we can make.

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 believe New Zealand is self-sustaining in enough areas to reduce CO2 emissions almost completely. Our climate is perfect for renewable energy sources to be researched, developed and used. Becoming world leaders in these three areas with regards to renewable energy would outweigh our current "benefits" of fossil fuel importation and exploration and reduce the risk to the environment - that would be ambitious, and longterm.

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 don't believe this question is relevant. The question should be, what is the cost of not doing enough? THE LONG-TERM COST. I know a lot of poor people and a lot of rich people, neither care about the short-term cost, as long as their environment is there for the long-term for their children to enjoy as they did.

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? You pay advisers almost $2.9 million to answer these questions, ask the real questions. Again, I am appalled at the lack of seriousness of this process.

Summary

5. How should New Zealand take into account the future uncertainties of technologies and costs when setting its target?
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We should aim to decrease CO2 emission by AT LEAST 40% compared with 1990 levels by 2030 like the EU - one of the world's biggest polluters, if they can we can, let's be "ambitious". Once that target is met, we should then move to aim for a zero-CO2-emitting economy by 2050. It's possible. It's ambitious.

Other comments

6. Is there any further information you wish the Government to consider? Please explain.
Firstly, I have cause for concern about the seriousness this issue is being given by the current Government. The lack of funding, in comparison to the flag, for this process is appalling and I have made those views clear in my local paper. In addition, in Budget 2015 the Government cut Monitoring and Enforcement expenditure by almost 30% and cut over 85% of funding for the cleaning up of rivers in New Zealand. Secondly, We should aim to decrease CO2 emission by AT LEAST 40% compared with 1990 levels by 2030 like the EU - one of the world's biggest polluters, if they can we can, let's be "ambitious". Once that target is met, we should then move to aim for a zero-CO2-emitting economy by 2050. It's possible. It's ambitious. Thirdly, please not Methane is as much of an issue as CO2, as I'm sure you know, so please factor that into your submission to the UN. Ag pollution also includes the contamination of water, and water is predicted to be a very scare resource by 2050, so keep that in mind when thinking of the "long-term" target. One final word, sustainability.