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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?
By far the most important consideration of all is to avoid signing on to the TPP or any similar agreements that include industry(or investor)-vs-state dispute resolution tribunals, which would nullify any constructive result of this current effort. Any restraint on carbon dioxide production can hardly avoid impinging on the real or expected profits of multiple corporations that would be empowered by the TPP to sue New Zealand for those real or imagined damages before such private tribunals. This would not only disempower the Parliament and the voter, but would cost New Zealand taxpayers serious money, while making nonsense of our work to help control global climate change. No conceivable benefit from any such treaty could possibly be worth such a cost.

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?
It should be ambitious, and help to offset previous failures. This should include massive investment in all forms of public transport, and a re-emphasis on rail shipment of freight, both of which are more energy-efficient than road transport, and in the long run are also more economical in terms of the required infrastructure and the ongoing costs.

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?
This is the wrong question to ask. Ask instead how well we can afford the multiple impacts of continuing increases in the global heat budget, and the sure-to-rise cost of petroleum products. Otherwise our short-term gain from current low prices and building more roads will tie us into a long-term loss. If we seize this opportunity to emphasize energy-efficient public transport, and rail transport for heavy goods, all New Zealand will benefit, regardless of what the rest of the world does or does not do.

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?
Personally, I doubt that any programmes will be implemented to an extent noticeable by anyone except those who can game the system, who will count their profits.
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5. How should New Zealand take into account the future uncertainties of technologies and costs when setting its target?
Act on what is now certain: sea level rise, weather extremes, and more costly petroleum. Respond with massive improvements in public transport, preparation for high tides and weather-related emergencies. This will benefit all New Zealanders, regardless of the rate of climate change and regardless of the (non)responsiveness of the big carbon dioxide emitters, and regardless of how much methane is released from permafrost and undersea clathrates.

Other comments

6. Is there any further information you wish the Government to consider? Please explain.
To repeat: By far the most important consideration of all is to avoid signing on to the TPP or any similar agreements that include industry(or investor)-vs-state dispute resolution tribunals, which would nullify any constructive result of this current effort. Any restraint on carbon dioxide production can hardly avoid impinging on the real or expected (or imagined or dreamed-of) profits of multiple corporations that would be empowered by the TPP to sue New Zealand for those real or imagined damages before such private tribunals. This would not only disempower the Parliament and the voter, but would cost New Zealand taxpayers serious money, while making nonsense of any attempt we might make to help control global climate change or to minimize its impact on New Zealanders. No conceivable benefit from any such treaty could possibly be worth such a cost.
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Objectives for the contribution
1a. We have set the following three objectives for our contribution:
   • it is seen as a fair and ambitious contribution – both by international and domestic audiences
   • costs and impacts on society are managed appropriately
   • it must guide New Zealand over the long term in the global transition to a low emissions world.

   Do you agree with these objectives for our contribution?

X
Yes
No

1b. What is most important to you?
Seriousness of purpose and the determination to act in the real world rather than make empty promises, as opposed to the many unmet goals and pledges so far produced by similar agreements.

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?

It should be ambitious, and help to offset previous failures. This should include massive investment in all forms of public transport, and a re-emphasis on rail shipment of freight, both of which are more energy-efficient than road transport, and in the long run are also more economical in terms of the required infrastructure and ongoing costs.

How will our contribution affect New Zealanders?
3. What level of cost is appropriate for New Zealand to reduce it greenhouse gas emissions? For example, what do you think would be a reasonable impact on annual household consumption?

This is the wrong question to ask. Ask instead how well we can afford the multiple impacts of continuing increases in the global heat budget, and the sure-to-rise cost of petroleum products. Otherwise our short-term gain from current low prices and building more roads will tie us into a long-term loss.
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?

Personally, I doubt that any will be implemented to an extent noticeable by anyone except those who can game the system, who will count their profits.

Summary

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

New Zealand should expect and prepare for the worst here at home, considering that whatever this small country does will have little effect on the global troubles to come. But when considering the uncertainties mentioned, whether in setting carbon reduction goals or taking precautionary measures against future disasters, it will be important not to use optimistic interpretations or a need to “wait and see” as an excuse for inaction or delayed action.

Other comments

6. Is there any further information you wish the Government to consider? Please explain.

By far the most important consideration of all is to avoid signing on to the TPP or any similar agreements that include industry(or investor)-vs-state dispute resolution tribunals. Any restraint on carbon dioxide production can hardly avoid impinging on the real or expected profits of multiple corporations that would be empowered by the TPP to sue New Zealand for those real or imagined damages before such private tribunals. This would not only disempower the Parliament and the voter, but would cost New Zealand taxpayers serious money, while making nonsense of our work to help control global climate change. No conceivable benefit from any such treaty could possibly be worth such a cost.
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