

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



Copy of your submission

Contact information

Name Josh O'Neill

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?

As a whole, current international contributions do nothing to combat climate change and in most countries, emissions are getting worse. For New Zealand to be seen internationally as putting forward a "fair and ambitious" contribution makes no sense if the judges of that contribution are not making any serious effort to slow climate change. New Zealand needs to be seen as leaders by choosing a 40% reduction in emissions as science has dictated. There is no mention of this science in the discussion document.

If this science is not taken seriously, the economic costs to society will far outweigh the minor loss of income predicted in the discussion document.

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?

The government needs to look at the big picture and realise what is actually at stake here. A strong commitment to reducing greenhouse gases may have an impact on average income and business profits but a weak commitment may result in varying degrees of economic, and societal collapse for our following generations. A bit of self impose austerity now will be insurance for the future of New Zealand

A 40% minimum reduction in net emissions below 1990 levels by 2030 has to be our starting point.

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?

\$1800 would be a small price to pay for the future wellbeing of New Zealanders and their environment.

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?

"Fuel and energy efficiency can reduce costs to businesses and households." - This is a statement, not an opportunity. Fuel and energy producers need to be regulated to cut their emissions (i.e. they would have no reason to cut their emissions without regulation in place).

"Our high level of renewable electricity generation creates opportunities, including greater use of renewables in

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



Copy of your submission

other sectors, through the use of new technology." - We can't rely on slowly evolving technology to solve radical climate change. There is no silver bullet available now so NZ has to inspire the world by committing to a 40% reduction in emissions.

"A transition to a low-carbon economy leads to greater energy security and limits our vulnerability to oil price volatility, supply disruptions and potentially high future carbon prices." - This transition will only happen with a great commitment to a reduction in emissions. Science dictates that it's only "likely to occur" if the government commits to a minimum of 40%.

Summary

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

The discussion document pays little attention to the potential devastating costs on our heritage and future if climate change science is not taken seriously. The discussion document focuses on potential short term loss of income if NZ fully commits to a transition to a low emissions future.

Other comments

6. Is there any further information you wish the Government to consider? Please explain.
We may not have the ability to seriously reduce combined global emissions but we have the ability to inspire other nations by committing to a minimum of 40% reduction in net emissions below 1990 levels by 2030. This is where NZ can make a difference. We need to heed science and do the right thing. We need to risk a bit of uncertainty instead of risking our whole future.