

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



Copy of your submission

Contact information

Name Bob Lack & Susie Collier

Organisation (if applicable)

Address [REDACTED]

Telephone [REDACTED]

Email [REDACTED]

Objectives for the contribution

Do you agree with these objectives for our contribution? No

1b. What is most important to you?

No problem with the third bullet, but the first two are weasel words. The key objective is that it must be effective in averting the disaster which confronts humanity. Sure, to achieve international co-operation all countries will need to be seen internationally to be making a fair and ambitious contribution, but internal perceptions about equity and management of costs must be managed by government if that's what's necessary to achieve the outcome. We've had far too much guff about not jeopardising the economy - it isn't a choice between economy and environment - if we bugger up the latter then the former won't matter. There is need for genuine leadership here, so that New Zealanders accept whatever steps are needed.

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?

That we have a high degree of flexibility if only we wish to use it. We could radically reduce agricultural, vehicle, generation and industrial emissions if only we had leaders with the guts to lead.

How will our contribution affect New Zealanders?

3. What level of cost is appropriate for New Zealand to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions? For example, what would be a reasonable reduction in annual household consumption?

We are not convinced that any reduction would be necessary, but we are sure that if NZers were convinced of the need we could reduce average consumption by 20% or more. Just look, for example, at what happened to household consumption in the UK during WWII. Even the highest of the figures mentioned on page 14 of the discussion document only represents 2% - trivial in the context of the issues, and trivial with good leadership.

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?

The matters on page 15 are less "opportunities ... to reduce ... emissions" than potential ancillary benefits of doing so. The last one (keeping in step to protect the economy) seems to us to be unduly cautious. We are rich enough to take some risks moving ahead. Extending renewable electricity to other sectors (e.g. transport) seems highly desirable, but it may require government leadership to ensure we aren't just running electric cars from fossil fuel generation. Forest sins certainly seem desirable, and will have other benefits as mentioned, but again leadership will be needed to make this happen.

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



Copy of your submission

A key opportunity not mentioned here is a proper price on carbon - either a tax or a properly working ETS.

Summary

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

By being pessimistic about likely success and by being over-generous with funding the costs - it's called prudent avoidance!

Other comments

6. Is there any further information you wish the Government to consider? Please explain.
How do we avoid this critical issue remaining a political football? How do we put in place effective policies which will last across several electoral cycles, irrespective of what parties are in government? Surely this can only be achieved if the present government swallows its pride, shows true leadership, and reaches out to all parties, to try to form some sort of multi-party consensus.