

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



Copy of your submission

---

## Contact information

Name Emma Neale

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?

The wording in this question is very open to interpretation - but I think the national contribution needs to have in mind intergenerational equity, and protecting not just NZers but all Pacific peoples, which in reality broadens out to the full biosphere. We need to aim for at least 40% reduction in emissions by 2020. We need to be ambitious, moral world leaders in our aims - to set a precedent similar to our nuclear free stance in the 1980s - and have a government contribution that shows we are placing ethics, not finances, first.

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?

'Fair' and 'just' means doing the most possible on this urgent and grave matter. We need to aim for the highest level of contribution. We need to be ambitious innovators. We must decouple all of our activity from greenhouse gas emissions. We need to transition from animal-based agriculture to rotating crops/food sources with lower emissions and which also, per calorie, are more efficient to grow for human consumption than mass-farming animals. (As animals need crops, and the replenish time for plant crops is much shorter than it is for animal herds.)

We need to be world leaders. We need to work backwards from future predicted harm, and ask what is the best way to protect people from future climate crisis NOW. Better that we go through a massive, willed, societal change as a preventative NOW than have to deal with unprecedented levels of public health issues, sea level rise and globally fatal levels of sea acidification, climate crisis refugees, drought, disease, famine.

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?

The reasonable reduction would be to aim for the highest emissions reduction target but to use domestic policy to protect the poorest and most vulnerable members of society - ie to aim for a far more equitable distribution of resources than we have now.

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?

Reduce transport emissions by investing in public transport and placing restrictions on private car use.  
Increase warm housing stock, climate-proof current under-performing housing stock.

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



Copy of your submission

---

Convert Tiwai Aluminium smelter into a site that produces solar panels.  
Divert oil company subsidies/all investment in fossil fuel exploration and extraction to funding the infrastructure changes we'll need to achieve a zero carbon future.

## Summary

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

Go for investments that already have obvious, proven benefits: passive solar energy; water storage; recycled grey water; plant food crops for human consumption.

## Other comments

6. Is there any further information you wish the Government to consider? Please explain.  
The effects of climate change have already started. We need action now, not in an ever-postponed future. We need moral leadership from the government; we need a government that realises there is no economy without an environment, and that a philosophy of endless growth is illogical. We have finite resources so we cannot have infinite growth. We need a government that makes its decisions based on the widest humanitarian grounds, and that when comparing itself to other countries, is proud to lead with the most ethically water-tight action. We need to aim for 40% emissions reduction by 2020. We need to say, not, 'this is too difficult,' but 'this is essential for survival' - and the cost of not making this contribution is far more terrifyingly severe than the hardship of transition.