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Objectives for the contribution

Do you agree with these objectives for our contribution?   No

1b. What is most important to you?
Being fair must acknowledge our high contribution per capita to greenhouse gas emissions and we therefore should contribute more to reduction.
Also in estimating costs the costs of climate change need to be considered, not just the costs of actions to decrease emissions.
Similarly a full benefit analysis of actions needs to be considered eg the co benefits for health that arise from actions to decrease emissions.
The objective should clearly state that the object is to provide a clear pathway to zero emissions over the next decade or two starting now.
The objective could also include that we are setting an example of what a small country can do and in this way encourage commitment to similar targets from other countries.

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 need to set at least a 40% cut in domestic emissions by 2030 and move to 95% by 2050 (compared to 1990)
This needs to be broken down into annual steps in emission reduction.
It makes no difference that nearly half our emissions come from agriculture, this area is one we clearly need to pay attention to but also other sources of emissions such as transport.

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?
we need to set out the pathway to the above emission target and stick to it. The cost if we don’t is massive. We can set an example of what a small country can do. Numerous benefits arise from action to decrease emissions.
Narrow cost benefit approaches like that implied by the consultation paper are not helpful in allowing people full consideration of the issues.

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?
Cease mining coal, moratorium on fossil fuel exploration and instead increase investment in renewable energy. Increase forestry planting and other revegetation projects.

Summary

5. How should New Zealand take into account the future uncertainties of technologies and costs when setting its target?
   It shouldn't
What is certain is the effect increasing greenhouse gases are having on the climate and appropriate action needs to be taken now.
Government should give a clear signal about what is needed to avert catastrophic climate change.
we just need to get on with action to decrease emissions.

Other comments

6. Is there any further information you wish the Government to consider? Please explain.
The whole issue of health and wellbeing for people needs to be incorporated into our approach and action and the associated "accounting" that goes with it.
Much more emphasis needs to go on the negative consequences of continuing as we are now and on non action on decreasing emissions
The issue needs to become a cross party one with oversight of progress around targets by an independent commission.
This is an absolutely critical issue facing the world and needs to be addressed as at an appropriate level for such a crisis