

From: [OilFree Otago](#)
To: [Climate Contribution](#)
Subject: Submission 9000
Date: Tuesday, 2 June 2015 9:32:32 p.m.
Attachments: [transcription_mfeconsultation_dunedin_21052015.pdf](#)

Dear Ministry for the Environment,

Attached is a transcription of those who spoke at the government Climate Change Contribution Consultation meeting in Dunedin 21 May 2015. These are the words representing more than 320 Dunedin residents and is therefore a submission from the people of Dunedin, not a submission from Oil Free Otago, who recorded and transcribed the words from that meeting.

The oral submissions in this document between them cover each of the questions in your online submission form and many more. Please read through them with the care and effort they deserve.

Yours sincerely,
Rosemary Penwarden from Oil Free Otago

--

Oil Free Otago Transcribes Consultation
Ministry for the Environment in Dunedin
Topic: Setting New Zealand's post-2020 climate change target
Glenroy Auditorium, Dunedin
21 May 2015 6:30pm

This is the transcription of the Ministry for the Environment's consultation in Dunedin on 21 May 2015, a public meeting held in the Glenroy Auditorium.

Oil Free Otago noted that no government official filmed or recorded the consultation meeting, and therefore transcribed what was said so that the government, in particular the Ministry for the Environment is able to receive our messages in full. This transcription from Dunedin has been sent as a submission on behalf of the over 320 people present on the consultation evening, 21 May 2015.

Three of the officials present at the meeting were Guy Beatson, Deputy Secretary for the Ministry for the Environment, Bruce Arnold from the Ministry for Primary Industries and Pauline Dougherty from the Ministry for the Environment. The names of two additional officials was not clear. The meeting began with brief introductions from the ministry officials, then a two-minute explanatory video, after which the meeting was then opened for public input.

Here is what was said at the Dunedin MFE Climate Change Consultation 2015:

1. ■ I've just got one thing that I want to point out. In 2009 the National government, government of the time, signed up to the Copenhagen Accord. The Copenhagen Accord that they signed up to made a commitment to keep global temperatures below 2 degrees above pre-industrial levels based on the best available science and the best data. If you look at scientific data today it's not possible to get below 2 degrees. That's just the scientific data. Yet all your literature is full of "we'll get below 2 degrees." It's not possible. To get below 4 degrees is going to require something along the lines of 10% reductions per year, year on year until we're down to zero. It's patently obvious that the market economy crashes. I don't envy your position. You're goddamn minister sent you along as the fall guys. You cannot get close to 2 degrees without crashing the market economy. I want you to stop being defensive. Cut the crap and I want the government actually front up and start doing something.
2. **Kia Ora, my name's** ■ I'm a young person and I'm concerned about the future of our country. I'm just wondering why there is no mention of the current government's legislated target to reduce NZ's greenhouse gas emissions by 50% by 2050 compared to 1990 levels in the discussion paper. Has the government forgotten about this target and I don't think 50% is enough anyway.

Ministry panel response: We'll answer questions at the end. [disagreement from the floor] OK fine, we'll answer them now. The answer to the 2050 target is that's it's not legislative. It was a target decided by the government and published by the government and no more. [loud disagreement]

3. [REDACTED] **student** I was wondering why your presentation didn't mention the current agenda to expand and explore for more fossil fuels which we know by the scientific data that we can't actually afford to burn so you haven't actually suggested a plan for phasing out that exploration and terminating any new exploration permits that are currently existing in NZ because without doing that any target that we set for reducing our current emissions is in a sense obsolete because we are enabling the continued reliance on fossil fuels through inviting fossil fuel companies to operate here in NZ. At the moment Simon Bridges our Energy Minister is in Melbourne and he says with 17 under-explored petroleum basins in our EEZ there are real opportunities to realise greater benefit for NZ so he is actively inviting these companies in. Do I get an answer to that or not?

Ministry panel response: I'm taking, by the ripple of applause, as a thing that further oil exploration is not something you want to see. I'm not taking that as a theme but as a point.

4. **Kia Ora tatou. I'm** [REDACTED] I'm a doctor and I'm the co-leader of Ora Taiao - NZ Climate and Health Council, part of a growing global movement of doctors very concerned about climate change and the great public health threat facing us but also knowing that good health centred policies to mitigate climate change can have great health benefits and great social and health equity benefits. I'm wondering whether the physics and the environmental systems determine the targets not some democratic process. Taking that as written I'm wondering whether you counted both the health and equity costs of climate change on the people of NZ, in particular our Maori and Pacific communities, and whether you've counted the benefits in your calculations; the really good health and equity benefits of health centred mitigation policies in your calculations in this discussion document?

Ministry panel response: the answer is that we have not but I'm taking that you think we should. [applause]

5. [REDACTED] When I read the document I get the impression this is an economic document. What we are facing is not an economic question, it's a moral and ethical question. Germans had to face after the war after the genocide was accepted by them. That is what future generations will be asking the leaders of this world and we are not leaders in climate change we are the followers. Countries like Denmark who have far less in energy resources are going to be carbon free in a few years. Do we have the ministers, I should say do we have the public servants who advise the ministers to put forward the urgency and the result of not acting of the world. The biggest upheaval in the future - people will die as a result of our not acting.

Ministry panel response: I'd like to say I acknowledge your question and your question is about the cost of the inaction and what I'm taking is that the cost of inaction greatly outweighs economic cost of what is in the discussion document.

From the floor: 1) My understanding from from what Marvin said is that the moral aspect is also missing from the discussion document. 2) the cost of the upside is not in there. You've only costed the downside.[applause]

6. **My question** was about your MPs; how many of them actually believe there is climate change? I went to a meeting at the Uni about 4 years ago – a meet the candidates meeting where Michael Woodhouse in answer to a question about climate change said he simply didn't believe in it. This was from a sitting MP. How many MPs in the National government actually don't believe there is climate change?

Ministry panel response: I'd like to really emphasise that we are officials fronting this meeting today. There's no way I can answer that question – Julie Anne Genter has probably got a better answer to that we've got. [from the floor: Where are the ministers?]

7. [REDACTED] from the Polytech I heard the word pragmatic early on and you're right to talk about old pragmatic. Pragmatic is what are we going to do when a third of our land mass is under water and we can no longer rely on dairy? What are we going to do when our ocean is acidifying and there's no longer food to feed the fish that we feed ourselves and export? That's a pragmatic question.

I hear a lot of talk about the triple bottom line but the only thing I see is the economy being paid attention to in the triple bottom line, not the social or the environmental ecological impacts. That's the triple bottom line. If we are actually going to address this question we need to pay attention to those other two bottom lines and realise that there is no economy without an environment.

I think I speak for everybody here; we're mad as hell, the government is corrupt, they do not do a damn thing for the people, especially the people of the future. They're out there selling off our country to the coal companies, to the oil companies. They don't give a damn about us. They're lining their pockets - they're sociopaths. We're going to act. We're going to show up at their doors with pitchforks. They should remember that. Things are cyclical.

This is getting to the point where it's ridiculous. We're on track for 4 degrees.

We cannot continue as if nothing is happening. We cannot continue blowing hot air like this and reduce the temperature. We can't do that. So we need to take back to them that this is a serious issue and drive it home because it affects them as well. They have children, they have families, they have a future to think about. It needs to be driven home. I'm sick of it.

8. **Good evening** Where does this drive for climate change targets lie with [in relation to] the TPP?

Ministry panel response: I'm sorry I'm not prepared to answer questions about the TPP, however, if there are general concerns about that in relation to climate change then I'm happy to take that to the ministers. [applause]

9. [REDACTED], **speaking for myself** One of the things that is overlooked is that we are a Pacific nation and what we are seeing is pacific nations that are highly vulnerable and places like Kiribas for which there is continual sea level rise and Tuvalu with continual flooding. We keep talking about NZ but we have a lot of pacific neighbours that we have to take into account. Now I think this is going to be a real issue we have to face about ecological refugees and that needs to be considered seriously.

10. [REDACTED] **from TPP action** I can answer about the TPP and that is that the TPP would give more power to the multi national corporations who are still seeking to extract more fossil fuels and that is what we don't want. So we can certainly say that we don't want the TPP. But what I would also like to say to the officials here and I think I speak for a few people now that what we would like to see is NZ actually making an example of what the country can do and stand up to reduce our emissions and support other countries who are trying to mitigate climate change. This needs to be something that we all act on together and NZ is a country that can take an example like we did with nuclear free. We can lead.
11. Hi everyone my name is [REDACTED] I just graduated from Otago University with a Masters in Climate Change Education and Conservation in Society. I have been to the climate change negotiations twice; COP 19 at Warsaw and COP 20 at Lima as NZ youth rep. I have quite a few points. Three main policies:
40% reduction of 1990 levels over the time period which IPCC see as appropriate based on the EU levels.
Also 2015 decarbonisation rates in line with science. I want to New Zealand to be part of that.
Also a memorandum on fossil fuel exploration and new investment in fossil fuels carbon expenditure – I don't want any more exploration. We can't afford more carbon...I want 30 years down the track for it only to be economically viable to take down those rigs. We don't want any more exploration.
I also want to draw attention to the finance and like was said before the co-benefits including health co-benefits are not included in any of the economics .It's ridiculous how much you guys have excluded in this. I know it's hard to quantify but it needs to be mentioned please, substantially mentioned. Also from a personal perspective - social discount rate. What social discount rate are you using for your economic impacts? If you are using a high one it's not appropriate as well, using the low one is far more appropriate including benefits for our economy.
Also, New Zealand is part of the **friends of the fossil fuel subsidies reform group**. It is disgusting that we are still doing that. Why are we still doing that? It's embarrassing as a New Zealander to be there listening to our ambassador for Climate Change Jo Tindall, talk about it and we're still doing it. Another question is: why was Dunedin left off the list for negotiations? Dunedin was the only major centre, minor centre as well left off. I was quite shocked. I contacted the DCC to see what they could do about it. And the other thing is that I think we are really, really undermining and not appreciating our Centre for Innovation and Technology. We are an incredibly innovative country and we've shown that now. We need to be more passionate about funding this area. Why are we not doing it?
12. My name is [REDACTED] and I'm a professor of chemistry from the University of Otago I'd like to read to you a section from your own summary document :
"Doing more than our fair share will also impact the competitiveness of NZ businesses and place unnecessary costs on households."
What happened to the New Zealand that we used to know; that was a world leader and innovator and not a follower?

13. [REDACTED], lecturer, speaking on behalf of myself. I have a process issue question: Why are we spending \$26m consulting on a flag? I understand that's happening now and I understand that at the last flag meeting there were 12 consultants in 10 people came to the meeting. Whereas here we have a much bigger issue. We weren't even going to have a meeting as was suggested but we've got a much bigger turnout. So my question is: How much is being spent consulting on this much bigger and more important issue?

Ministry panel response: so I'll do with that now if you don't mind. Significantly less than 26 million. I take your point about the relativity of importance and that clearly from the turnout tonight that feelings about this issue are stronger than they are about the flag.

14. Hi I'm [REDACTED], I'm a doctor and have an interest in public health and the future. I don't envy your positions I think we are in a tricky position between a rock and a hard place. Basically we have got an economic system which is very wasteful and is corrupt to its core because it is decoupled from the natural environment. That can be summed up by the phrase infinite growth on a finite planet is impossible. GDP growth and economic growth are linked to carbon emissions.

Indeed recessions have been the only thing that's really reduced carbon emissions.

But no one wants a recession do they?

GDP growth which is also linked to debt based money and that's I believe the elephant in the room. We need to get away from debt based money. I imagine not many people know what I'm talking about at this stage.

We need to go towards sovereign money which would mean democratic money creation from the public for the public good that would lead us to a more democratic economic system.

NZ is actually very well situated to lead the world in innovative new ways of creating a democratic sustainable economic system because it's a very resilient, self-sufficient country. I'm really interested to see if there's any kind of entertainment of the ideas around what I've just been talking about from you guys.

Ministry panel response: thank you those of it extremely profound questions but they're not questions I'm willing to answer.

15. **School child.** We pour many dollars into protecting our native species. Why don't we also spend an amount of money like that in protecting our oceans which can take most of actually the area of New Zealand from acidification by cutting our greenhouse emissions in that way?
16. **Speaking for myself** I wonder why in the consultation document there is no mention of our Pacific neighbours. It is my belief that we have a moral accountability particularly to the Cook Islands which were left in Trust to this nation at the end of the war and also to small nations. It's not good enough to say when their land becomes unsustainable we might take them as economic refugees. Currently the people helping build rain water tanks, the people teaching them about how to measure the increasing salinisation of their water. The people other than themselves building seawalls with their hands out of pieces of coral are mostly groups of young Roman Catholic volunteer students at high school level. I find it

extraordinary that in this consultation document there is absolutely no mention of sharing person power, expertise, money to help these people keep some sort of life in the place that is their whenua, their place. People are having to leave the graves of their ancestors because the water is flooding it and we are doing nothing and this consultation document behaves as if those Pacific nations do not exist.

17. [REDACTED] **Green Party MP**

Acknowledging that there is a lot of anger and frustration in the room and that your anger and frustration is really with the government of the day because they are the ones that set the policy and those ministers and politicians are the ones that are not here to hear you directly.

It's just the officials' job to listen to you so maybe don't take out so much anger on them. It's really our government that is failing us.

Today in the budget I don't think John Key mentioned climate change once in his speech. There is \$160m in subsidies to greenhouse gas pollution through the ETS in this budget and countless other ways in which we are not accounting for the full cost of carbon pollution. What's missing from this document is an assessment of the benefits of change. And the truth is, to survive and thrive in the future all of our society, all of our economic activity must be decoupled from greenhouse gas pollution. So the thing is that it is entirely achievable. There are countries in the world that are not larger than NZ who are changing direction and doing just that and we can learn from them.

I think what we need to take back to the government is:

- 1) the message that their policy needs to be directed at reducing greenhouse gas pollution and enabling households and families to live their lives well and to work and not be reliant on increasing pollution. That's doable if we change the direction.
- and 2) a realistic, fair and pragmatic target to take to the talks in Paris is at least 40% reduction in emissions by 2030.

18. [REDACTED] Retired professor from Energy Studies, University of Otago Physics department.

Does the NZ government want to stay below 2 degrees?

Ministry panel response: Yes.

Do they know what emissions reductions need to be to stay below 2degrees?
Internationally?

Ministry panel response: Yes. It's in the document.

I didn't see it in the document. I repeated the calculation and I'll tell you. From 2021 it needs to be 7% per annum. The head of the International energy agency very recently said the reduction has to be 18% per annum from 2020. The target of 40% reductions is too low by nearly half. The only scenario in the IPCC 2014 document which keeps us below 2 degrees is RCP 2.6. The only way that scenario keeps us below 2 degrees is in fact by carbon capture and storage after 2070. I'm sure you know all about this. I'm sure you've read the IPCC document, I hope so at least.

So why are we talking about 40%, 20%? If you read the literature today and I looked at the weighting. The current pledges are nowhere near close to keeping us below 2 degrees. How have we got this enormous mismatch between what is needed to keep us below 2 degrees and what people think they can do to keep us below 2 degrees? I'll stop there.

[Bob's answers to questions from the floor] To keep below 2 degrees we would have to decrease by 7% per annum from 2021. That would be on the basis of each country doing the same thing. But if you take into account the fact that we are a rich country and a lot of poor countries want to increase their emissions we will actually have to do better than that. Carbon capture and storage (CCS) is really, really difficult. The chances of society being in an economic position by 2070 to actually put in place carbon capture and storage is *extremely* unlikely. When you put CO₂ into the atmosphere half of it gets sucked down but when you take it back out again for every ton you take out the atmosphere only reduces by half a ton. It's really difficult sucking it out. Which means I don't think we can do carbon capture. Which means we have to do the 7% per annum.

We are already over 20% above 1990. Does that mean we have to reduce more quickly? No that's from 2020. That includes the increases from now. The RCP 2.6 only takes into account carbon dioxide with forestry. The methane emissions are not taken into account. All the other Kyoto gases are not taken into account in RCP 2.6 which is the only scenario the IPCC gives for keeping below 2 degrees. We don't need to worry about methane - the whole part in the document about methane emissions is a furfee. It does need to be discussed in terms of the future because methane is an enormous trigger and the positive feedback of methane will be devastating once it gets underway but in terms of staying below 2 degrees it is not in the IPCC document.

The IPCC document is really tricky there are about 5 different kinds of carbon dioxide – with and without land use, et cetera – that would take me far beyond my two minute speaking limit. But the other thing I'd like to ask is that the government does a proper cost analysis of what's going to happen when we go up to 3 degrees or 4 degrees and that needs to be costed out including the islands going under, the refugees, the fact that we won't be able to sell our milk to anyone because everyone else will be broke.

19. **Wise Response Society**. Retired University ecologist. There has been very little time given from publication of the document to submissions. Along with Sustainable Dunedin City we had to act rapidly. We had a public meeting on Monday with virtually no publicity and got more than 200 people there. We had 8 speakers and we addressed more issues than your document recognises. Your document recognises just 4 main issues: sea level rise, drought, fire and floods. We talked about health issues. We talked about our biodiversity on which we depend for their ecosystem services. There are much wider issues than this document addresses. We put a resolution to that meeting and it was carried unanimously. I'd like to think that this government in making its submission will address and consider the issues that are being presented at these very well attended public meetings around the country. And can you assure us that the government will release publicly the document it takes to Paris?

I would further like to read out the resolution passed unanimously by more than 200 people last Monday and that is: **This public meeting strongly urges the NZ government to endorse both the moral imperative and the economic, social and environmental opportunities of a rapid transition to a low carbon economy as a society. To this end it should adhere to the mitigation options proposed by the IPCC mitigation report of last year which keeps us below 2 degrees. This meeting moved that our government should propose effective**

greenhouse gas emissions targets along these lines to the Paris climate summit.

Can I have your assurance that the government will in fact release publicly their submission to the Paris conference? Thank you

[From the floor:] Before Paris, not during or after!

Ministry panel response: the intention of the government as stated as the table that intended nationally determined contribution with the United Nations framework for the convention on climate change secretariat in the middle of the year. Um you will have already seen the tabled contributions of the European Union, Switzerland the government of New Zealand is obligated to do the same thing. [from the floor: will we know them beforehand?] Um, the intention is that when it's tabled with the secretariat, that is the point at which it is made public. There's been a few questions about the process so when we wrap up will talk about the next steps

20. ■■■ I speak for myself. This is a hard question for everyone. I agree with scientist Bob Lloyd that 40% reductions are pointless and beyond that it is not scientific because we'll increase emissions by another 70% between now and when you want to reduce them. There's two contending things here: reduce CO₂ equivalent emissions by about 7 to 10%. On the other hand you've got every single nation's economists saying that you cannot reduce those emissions because the slowdown in the economy means that the market economy will crash. It seems to me governments are invested in the economy and are hoping and waiting for carbon capture or some other fairy dust to come along and make everything OK. My question is this: if the government is ever going to be serious about this do you believe the mentality exists within your departments, within the civil service, to make the radical step change which is going to be needed throughout society to be serious about this? It's not a smart ass question, I'm asking whether you think you're already too institutionalised, and the ground is too narrow to be imaginative enough to give the necessary advice to make the changes we need. The other side to this is there are a lot of people here that are very middle class. To be clear, for this radical step change you have to give up everything - your pension funds gone. Your idea of buying houses to get funding for material wealth gone - that's all market economy dependent. It's all gone. Are you going to make that change? You can't just leave it up to these guys. Some of you really have to think about it. You don't have Kiwi Saver. You do something sensible. Don't put it all on these guys.
21. ■■■ I shifted here a couple of years ago to study the NZ government's approach to reducing emissions from agricultural production. Since I got here there hasn't really been much action and I'm very curious as to why this was. A couple of years ago you were ahead of the world; that's why I came here. What actions do you plan on taking in terms of reducing carbon emissions, methane emissions, equivalent emissions from the agriculture sector while still providing for economic wellbeing for the most impoverished members of our society?
22. ■■■ I moved here to do a PhD. My question for the government, and for other people here: Does New Zealand think of itself as an environmental leader and if so how important is it that you keep that reputation? As the person before me mentioned, she came here

specifically because of that reputation. I have a house mate who came from Brazil because of that reputation. So, something to think about.

23. **██████ medical student. Medical students for Global Awareness.**

This group focuses on global health issues and we believe that climate change is one of them. Tonight I am speaking for myself. In this meeting we have been talking about the future impact of climate change and on setting targets but for me I remember learning about this in primary school and focussing on the future impacts of climate change and I wonder when we are going to start changing that to the present tense? While targets are probably a good political thing to do I'm not quite sure they're practical. I think we should be more broad thinking and be like - here's what we are going to do and when we should start this and start planning what we are going to do now. I hear we'll do it in 5 years or 20 years and that's the target but we're not actually coming up with the steps year by year to reach that target. I imagine we'll be there in 5 years' time and saying oh actually we haven't been doing anything all this time about climatic change.

So thinking in the present rather than in the future because it's affecting people over the world now and that's only going to get worse. It's already started.

24. **Male.** Discussion of registered carbon charges. I suggest the funding for road transport, which subsidises the carbon intense road sector for \$2billion a year, against all the peer reviews that did not support that. There is no mention of market forces in the document. For sectors such as farming there's no talk about registered charges to reward those who de-intensify and punish those or take back user charge on those who don't. So there are none of those market forces. In the case of industry we live in hope that there will be realistic charges that will shift the burden and they can support low carbon future oriented companies that we want shift the money to and the charges on them away from the subsidies for the dinosaurs. Why don't we embrace the market forces when this government says to the people to embrace them? And when we come to the future unlike where we go to ANZAC now and celebrate our forebears who led - won't we be ashamed by the past, who chose to be followers.

25. **██████████** I'm an educator and I work for enviroschools and I'd just like to know: when is the support going to come for educators to talk about climate change. I think the support has been taken away. There's no education for sustainability advises, pre service, post service, it's not there. I know that there are people who have tried to make contact with the Ministry and say we would like to talk about sustainability and they're told: don't go there. That's not a topic that we want to talk about. It should be in our schools and our teachers and educators need to be supported to be able to do that was in schools – primary, secondary and further. I take my hat off to those students who are here - well done teachers, because I think you have to be creative in your teaching to bring in climate change and sustainability as a whole. But it should be part of the New Zealand curriculum.

26. **██████████** Good evening I'm Graham. I'm a resident of Dunedin by choice. I find it really good living here because I don't get hayfever, I don't have to feed mosquitoes that carry diseases and my skin operates well. 2° warmer challenges all those health benefits. The

front, that your representation of costs could do with rethinking, restating – ha, when you ask a question like: what is the appropriate reduction in household incomes to deal with this? Well the answer is none, isn't it? I mean that's obvious. Um, what does need to be said is that people need to know that the economic analysis of this stuff on New Zealand has been done. It was commissioned by – I don't think this government probably – but the previous one. It was done by Infometrics. They looked at an optimised model of the New Zealand economy as it is today, and at what an optimised model would look like in an environment where there's a halfway sensible price on carbon. And then they asked themselves, well, how do we get from one to the other? And the answer to that was, two things: number one, start now! The longer you wait the more expensive it's going to get! Secondly, there are considerable benefits in allowing an economic system with innovations the way people have been talking about tonight is absolutely what I've seen in my studies of New Zealand companies, if you let that loose, we can cope with this. Not only that, we can become highly competitive in the new realities that are coming our way whether we like it or not – so let's get on with it!

██████████ At the meeting on Monday evening I gave a suggestion and that is that we should retrench Tiwai Point as an aluminium smelter and turn it into a silicon smelter to make solar cells.

31. Hi I'm ██████████, I'm talking on behalf of myself but I've worked quite a bit with the data output from the general circulation model that we run forward over 100 years using various emissions scenarios. No matter what emissions scenarios we run with the output is quite frankly very, very frightening. Anyone who has seen that data will say the same. The other thing that you get constantly asked is that ever since the early 1990s scientists have been saying that within the next five years we need to act and we need to act urgently and we need to do it within that five years. Now five years has been and gone a number of times since then and throughout that period we have kept saying the same thing and we have kept doing nothing and those five years keep ending. And people keep asking, how come we still saying the same thing, and the reason for that is what Bob's just alluded to – is that there may be models that will keep us under 2° but we're having to make more and more desperate assumptions about what emissions cuts we will make at some point, not quite now, but at some point in the near future, and that those emissions cuts we're putting into the models today are very extreme and not really very realistic. So we know that by 2070 on a global level we need to be at carbon zero. Our carbon dioxide emissions for the whole globe need to get to below zero and beyond that we need to have net negative carbon dioxide emissions, so we need to be capturing and storing carbon dioxide. Now today we have the technology to supply our industry and our transport and our energy needs without carbon dioxide but we don't have the technology to capture and store, so we need to work with what we've got. And, in talking about New Zealand, we talked about the fact that our emissions profile is quite different to any other developed country and in talking about that we seem to be hiding behind some of the difficulties presented to us, rather than acknowledging the opportunities they offer us, and would like to say as, look at those opportunities and acknowledge that we have low CO2 emissions and we have a very easy path to take to make those even lower. So I'd like to see us be bold and I'd like to see us be

actually realistic about what we need to do if we want to keep a world that's okay for us – and I'd like to see us by 2040 commit to New Zealand's carbon dioxide emissions being zero. And I'd like to say why can't we separate out the greenhouse gases and talk about New Zealand's carbon dioxide emissions and talk about our agricultural emissions, and when we go to the international global table say that New Zealand, by 2040, will be taking our carbon dioxide emissions to zero. The other thing I want to say as that in the British Guardian on Monday was published an article about a new study out by the International Monetary Fund and they were saying that in 2015, this year, on a global scale, the subsidies to the fossil fuel industry amount to US\$5.3 trillion. Lord Nicholas Stern, a climate economist from the London School of Economics said that that is an underestimate in terms of how much it takes into account the financial costs of climate change. On a global level I'd like to see some of those subsidies going towards what we have to do in moving to a carbon zero infrastructure.

32. **Student, Otago University** As we sit here our carbon emissions are rising NOW. We need to act on this problem NOW – it's something that affects every single person on this entire planet. It doesn't matter if you're on the minimum wage; it doesn't matter if you earn millions of dollars; it is going to affect every single person, and at the end of the day does it really matter if you have that nice car or all of those things, it affects everybody. It's not an issue in New Zealand that targets one select group, it affects all of us, and so many people in this room are putting their heart and soul into trying to do their bit for the environment. And I just want to know, is our government putting their heart and soul into it too? Because that's what we need. We need everyone to work together and we need to do this now and we really really really really need to do something about it.
33. [REDACTED] Thank you my name is [REDACTED] and I just want to ask a question of the civil servants. Thank you for being here tonight, I know it's quite hard work doing this. You have a minister who is also minister for trade negotiations. And he does negotiations on climate change. But what is actually needed is a minister at home, here, working and coordinating with all the government departments. When I was Minister for the Environment I was 18th in Cabinet. Environment was not all that high on the agenda. It was lower than the economy. It still has that problem and that has consequences for us in this country if we keep on putting economic growth over environmental security. So I'm asking you this question: in those very early days in the 90s there was very little coordination across government departments on this issue of climate change. We need people who can work with us on new forms of energy, on transport that's railways rather than roads, that's powered in different ways, on building standards so that we don't need to use so much electricity, on urban design - and we look at Auckland and despair - on agricultural research to replace the fart tax that so many people seem to have forgotten how powerful that movement was against the government at the time. So I'm thanking you for your work, but wanting that evidence that there is really good work going across departments.

Guy, from Ministry: I guess these two parts to that. The first is – why isn't the Minister for Climate Change Issues not coordinating across the government, um, I guess as a mere humble official the notion of allocating ministerial portfolios is not

quite within my purview. Um, the second part of it and it's never good enough, right? Coordination across a government which has 40 odd thousand people working for it is an extremely difficult thing. Um, however um, we're doing quite a lot in terms of keeping all of the key agencies across the government through something called the natural resources sector to work together. That includes energy, it includes transport, it includes urban design and resource management. Um, we're doing a lot, um, we could probably do more.

34. [REDACTED] My name is Aaron Hawkins. I'm not a scientist, I'm a writer, so my comments aren't scientific they're emotional and possibly irrational and probably selfish. We talk a lot about future generations when we talk about these kinds of conversations and I guess I just wanted to acknowledge as part of this process and part of this meeting – the anger and anxiety that is felt by people of my generation and those that are younger than us at constant inertia of this government and all previous governments actually, that got us to the point we're at now, that the idea of even having children is such a huge ethical and moral issue for us to deal with. Because if the status quo continues, the idea of the world that we would be responsible for bringing them into, is terrifying. And that is the situation that we're in now. I just want to acknowledge that it's a real issue for us. Thanks.
35. Hello my name is [REDACTED] and I'm from **Generation Zero** and I think about what Aaron is talking about and nearly freak out every single day. I nearly cried in a public meeting on Monday. One of the key points for our submission is that for our targets to be effective they need to be held within the long-term credible net zero carbon strategy that has cross party political support. And that's not something that we've seen in this document or at any of the discussions that we've seen. 2030 is not long-term – I'll only be 40 by then. So you need to think longer than that. We cannot use uncertainty in policy or interventions as an excuse for inaction. We have the tools. Now we have to fix it.
36. Thank you very much I'm [REDACTED] I like to think that I know a good number of people in this room and I wish to acknowledge not only your concerns here but also what we already have done. Jenny Upton mentioned about education. Many of us probably already have had substantial alert to this concern, 20, 30 years even in some cases I'm sure. And a lot is being done. A lot of us have made choices is to live more simply, to consume less, reflecting this issue. The issue began from a reductionist point of view. We're talking about carbon. Before that it was ozone. But what's next? We have to make substantial change in our lives and some mentioned the middle-class folk amongst us. The reality is we have to change across the board. This market economy, this laissez-faire madness, has to be over. If it's not over it will be a riot. That's how acute I think the response to this incredible circumstance we find ourselves in will present itself. I have the sense that it doesn't matter how concerned we are for those passing critical moments of carbon emissions and I'm sure even if we don't make 2° and it goes up to 3°, 4° there will be some humans lingering on. Future generations, yeah, I'm absolutely gutted to think that we are leaving such a mess for the next generation and the one following. I feel gutted. I feel belittled in the sense of my duty as announcing myself as an elder. That is not shared with many others in this society, who have a gluttonising, exploiting, self-serving perspective of this economy. We have to

move on. We have to start rejigging what our goals are and one of the things we need to do on a personal level is transfer personal consumption, material consumption into environmental concern. We have to start recharging our natural world. And I'd like to think that within the range of submissions that come forward that we recognise this transition that we have to make, and many people, Naomi Klein and many others have highlighted this concern, that we have to go through an immense transition and be prepared for massive change. Thank you.

37. I'm a **student** and I'm speaking for myself. I think that the problem we facing is bigger than anything we've ever faced before and it's worldwide. We need to start acting now. We must do what we can to make the change now and in the future. Developing countries' emissions are going to increase so we must do more than our fair share. We need to live up to our clean green image. Let's be a world leader and let's make change now.
38. Hi I'm [REDACTED] and I'm a student and I agree with the first guy. In part because it's a political process, investigation are missing on exactly how to go about reducing carbon emissions. Get smart people. We have the passion, ability and drive to literally outline step by step the processes to decrease every single producer of emissions. Just see what's possible for extremes are proposed, for example more buses and less cars, electric cars mainly for intercity driving, given we have all the renewable energy. It will be expensive and the tech isn't perfect but it's just an example of what could be looked into. Industry processes must have a way of decreasing emissions more research needs to be done as to the exact processes that they use. So to summarise it's not whether or not we should reduce but how we do it, like, exactly how we can do it. There is absolutely no downside into serious research into how we can do it, so that's what we should do. Cheers.
39. [REDACTED] Kia ora kotou katoa, my name is Jinty MacTavish and I'm a Dunedin city councillor but I'm speaking tonight in a personal capacity. I want to make three points. The first is about the target. I'd like everyone who was here tonight supporting a 40% reduction by 2030 targets to hold up their hands or your piece of paper and I want to speak to this. Six years ago I stood in a room and I requested a 40% by 2020 target. 40% by 2020. At the time that was an achievable target. It was achievable given the right plan and the right policy settings. And the government at the time failed to listen to those strong requests, failed to put in place a plan and failed to put in place those policy settings and so now we are paying the price. And so now you are looking for at a roomful of people standing in front of you, many of whom are the same people who were standing here six years ago saying 40% by 2020. And they are now saying 40% by 2030. Why are they saying that? I would guess, and if you guys agree with me I would ask you to give a round of applause, I would guess that they're not saying to you that we would not accept a more ambitious target. On the contrary I think that many people in this room would love to see a more ambitious target [*loud applause*]. Bob Lloyd is right. 40% by 2030 is a compromise position. And I think it is critical for you guys to go away and go back to your ministers and tell them that what we're saying is not the most ambitious that would like to be, but that anything less is totally unacceptable.

The second point I would like to make is reiterating that made by Alex McMillan from Ora Taiao. And that is about co-benefits. We are seeing the co-benefits of emissions reductions here in Dunedin. Not on the scale that we would like to be seeing if we were given the support and policy to support those reductions at a national level but I would like to give two examples of things that we have put in our long-term plan which are delivering multiple co-benefits as well as reducing emissions. Just off the top of my head, today we put \$75,000 into a cosy homes trust to improve the efficiency of Dunedin's homes. Not only will this provide economic benefits, health benefits and social benefits for our community but, hopefully, if we do it right, it will also reduce our emissions as a city. Secondly our long-term plan includes a significantly increased budget for our cycle infrastructure. Again, not only will that have economic benefits, health and social benefits for our community, but it will decrease our carbon emissions.

The final point that I would like to make is about the plan. There are a couple of people who have spoken to this tonight but I think it's a really important message. We're just going through the process, mandated by statute, mandated by central government, of developing a 10 year plan for our community. A long-term plan. I think we can argue that it's not as long term as we should be looking for this consultation process, but it's what is mandated by government. They require us to put on line by line, a budgeted account of where we are going to spend our money to get to our target, to get to those strategic outcomes that we want for our community. I don't think we should accept anything less in relation to a target set by government in relation to climate change emissions. Any target needs a plan. So tonight just to reiterate those three points, I think that we are asking for no less, well certainly I am asking for a no less than 40% by 2030 target. I'm here asking for you to cost in the co-benefits of action on climate change and I'm asking you to put in place a plan that clearly articulates how we are going to meet that target. Kia ora kotou.

40. ■ Hello I'm a member of Oil Free Otago, but I'm speaking for myself, mostly as a mother. And my question is not for any of you upfront because I do not have the misconception that this government is going to go to the next round of climate change meetings and do anything that is very worthwhile. Instead, my question is for all of you in the audience. And I want to know what we are all prepared to do when they come back again and nothing changes? And how we're going to change our leaders locally to make this even more important in all our lives, by talking to our neighbours. I believe completely in nonviolent and peaceful demonstrations. So I'd like to know if anyone wants to join me some time to try to close down the motorways, create a general strike, because, I'm not joking, we can't keep living like this day after day while our national government is not doing anything to improve the situation. At the very least we need to go about our way of kicking them out of power and all of their cronies who truly do rule our world [applause]. So we can belong to any group we want, and if you want to come and join Oil Free Otago and we can talk about how to change our country. And thank you to everyone here who's doing day-to-day work. We have the tools and we can fix our country. Thank you for all the work you all doing out there because you're the ones who are making the difference.

41. Kia ora kotou katoa. I'm ■ and I'm speaking for myself. I'm a great-grandmother. My great mokopuna was born 10 weeks ago. I was listening to your mihi mihi at the beginning

talking about our mokopuna. So my whero is to all of you. Do you really mean what it is you're saying when you use those words? Kia ora kotou.

42. [REDACTED] Hello my name is an Annabeth Cohen and I'm also a supporter of Oil Free Otago as well as a number of other organisations around Dunedin and campus that are concerned with the environment and climate change. I'd like to acknowledge everything that everyone has said tonight. I haven't heard anything that I disagree with yet. I just want to echo the request to stop subsidising the fossil fuel industry, and primarily my first question for you is: does the Ministry for the Environment have any comment on the existence of New Zealand Petroleum and Minerals as a government organisation?

Guy, from Ministry panel: No

I could have guessed that one. So, when you're working across government, is there any plan to curtail those subsidies to the fossil fuel industry that are directly inhibiting your work for the environment?

Guy: Ah, you're asking officials about questions of government policy – we explain what government policy is, we can't tell you what the nature of what our advice is looking forward.

I'm not sure I understood that.

Guy: Let me say it again. We can explain what the current government policy is. I can tell you about the links we are making with between government agencies, but no more than that.

Are there any plans to reduce the burning of coal or to reduce the expiration of fossil fuels and deep sea drilling?

Guy: I'm not aware of that advice but I work for the Ministry for the Environment.

Okay so as you're working for the Ministry for the Environment, does the Ministry for the Environment have an opinion about deep sea drilling or about the fact that we're still burning coal?

Guy: In the course of this discussion, no.

43. [REDACTED] I'd just like to say what a massive place of privilege we come from and New Zealand. So, we can argue about semantics and the potential drop in GDP all we want but we are so lucky that that's all we have to worry about at the moment. There are people overseas who are starving because of climate change. And I think we just need to have a little more perspective when you sit there (not necessarily you guys of course) – when our government officials sit there in their mansions they are so lucky that that insulated from a lot of the effects of climate change and they just need to have maybe a bit more empathy with the rest of the human race when they make these decisions. So please, represent us well in Paris. And good luck with sorting this one out.

44. [REDACTED] I've spoken before but one of the things I want to say is that obviously there's a lot of disillusionment at what the government will actually do when they come to talk to us about these things, so, it's really important to make sure everyone gets their written submissions in so we have as loud voice as possible. And also, just reiterating the actual power of the government. I know that they haven't done a lot with this issue but, not to sound sensationalist, but if it was a war how much effort would they be putting in? How much

leadership would they be taking? It isn't war but this is going to affect the entire human race. If they were taking that same leadership they wouldn't be going: OK, so Nazi Germany's looking pretty bad but how is that going to affect our economy if we send our troops over there? They would recognise the moral and ethical obligation and then they would take the action to do what it takes, rather than dicking around with this discussion. And also as with war is the importance of public support. So although everyone's here tonight and is being really supportive, it's really important for wider support to push the government for that sort of action.

45. My name is [REDACTED] and I work at the University of Otago and I'm speaking for myself. This document is just one of a series of back downs that have been made by a series of governments in New Zealand. It's not the first but I hope it will be the last. And I never thought I would say this but when I read this document it makes me feel ashamed to be a New Zealander [*loud applause*]. I have just two simple questions, not for you guys but for you guys (audience). There are hundreds of people here. How many of you think that we are doing enough? How many people think we are not doing enough? [*unanimous hands up*] Now, apparently we live in a democracy [*laughter*]. I've been to a lot of public meetings over a lot of different issues but I don't think I've ever been to a public meeting over a contentious issue like this with hundreds of people present and there's been a unanimous voice coming from that meeting. You guys need to take that message back to your ministers. They're not here tonight. It's been pointed out that you are the fall guys and you're doing it tough but actually you have a responsibility too, not just to be bland about this issue but to actually relay the feeling that there is in the community about what's happening in our world and in our country and I think future generations will judge us harshly and they will judge us for an absolute lack of leadership on this issue so I think you need to take a very strong message back to our leaders. Thank you.
46. My name is [REDACTED] and I'm speaking for myself. One of the things that took me to the Museum reserve last year when Wise Response made their launch was the call that action be pan political. They wanted to be sure that we all found out what was essential to be found out that would make a difference to what we're facing. I commend Wise Response for continuing. May I suggest that all of us get in behind them and work together. This is really important. We can't just have one government making promises and then another one coming along and making changes. We have to work on this as a united global population. It's really, really, really hard work.
47. Hello my name is [REDACTED] and I'm head of digital technology at Cavanagh College. The four young men and women here are the head prefects of Cavanagh College. They were at the dawn service as the sun rose and they were standing at the edge of the shadow of the earth. It was amazing. We could see every colour of the earth, starting with indigo. The message on that day was 'Lest we Forget'. The idea was that we push them into the front today and get them to do the talking, but they're just enjoying hearing you. I guess if they had a question it would be – let me tell you a little bit about what I teach. I cannot speak for myself; I don't believe there is one. I teach earth systems science, complex systems analysis, integrated systems studies, and I get told off for the whole lot because it's not what I'm

supposed to do. Today I was teaching introductory programming and the difference between local and global variables. The problem is there are no local variables. This is a global situation. Thank you for coming down and I'll just leave you with one challenging thought – that your beach is going to look beautiful when you're shipping half a million tonnes of sand to it. Interestingly we're shipping schist rock to Australia and steel is coming back from Australia too. We can't talk sensibly about this without talking about global. We don't have countries. There are no boundaries any more. I stand here but it's Earth that I stand on.

48. My name is [REDACTED] I'm one of the head prefects of Cavanagh College. Today as I stand here at my first public meeting of this sort I've heard curses from you, I've seen tears, I've seen many of you shake your head at what each other of had to say. I do not want my classmates to do that when they are this age at these meetings. It's a simple task I ask for: Enviroschools – there are just not enough of them in Dunedin; Cavanagh College, Bayfield College, Taeri College – that's three I can think of. That's just not enough. There are at least 15 high schools in the greater Otago region. At least all of them need to be enviroschools. My classmates, my friends, my family, my brothers and sisters, my friends in schools in other cities, need to know about what's going on. We need to hear more, we need to be taught more. I believe someone else said it today, we just need to know more about what's going on for our future. We need this help. It is our future we have to look forward to. I can't remember who said it but someone said – “we ask not for heavier burdens but for broader shoulders”. We know these burdens we will receive but we just need every single student in Otago to know exactly what we can do to help carry it. Thank you.
49. [REDACTED] I've got a question. We know that Maori communities already are under systemically mediated inequities in health, social and economic outcomes and unfairly vulnerable to the impacts of climate change. I want to know what consultation has happened with Iwi, hapu and whanau about this discussion document.

Ministry panel response: I think of the 14 to 16 meetings with been having around the country, five of those meetings have been on Marae.

50. Kia ora tatou. My name is [REDACTED] I wasn't going to come to this meeting because I'm a primary school teacher and usually by the time I get home I've expended all the energy that I have. I'm sure there are others who do just as much work as me, I'm not putting myself above them. However, I am a public servant I guess, and as a public servant I make sure that what I do is based on ethical and moral principles. *[to the panel]* I wouldn't want to be in your shoes, as many people have said today, but I do encourage you to advise your Ministers. I have had contact with the people from the Ministry of Education and invariably it is what the Minister says that is what happens and I think actually, and I think the point was raised here that the Ministry for the Environment doesn't seem to know much about the environment. I would like you to go away from this meeting and make it your duty, your ethical and moral duty, to take the messages that have been far more eloquently put than I can, to the Minister loud and clear and tell the Minister that the government needs to change its policy, that the government needs to grow some balls and make a stand on

principle. And if they would like the motivation that they need to do that then I invite them along to my classroom to stand in front of 31 individuals who are going to have to live with the consequences of climate change for far longer than I will, and tell them that they are doing their utmost to change the situation, that they are facing what they are doing with morality and ethics, not just GDP.

51. Thank you I'm [REDACTED] I'm here to offer a few thoughts that I've got about this issue. I'm reminded of a quote by an internationalist called John Ewan. He said when you try to pick out anything by itself you find it attached everything else in the universe. The question I've got is for the panel: are you familiar with the book called Merchants of Doubt? By Naomi Oreskes and Erik Conway. No? I recommend that you read it and that you also look at the movie of the same name. The book and film show how the ideology of free market fundamentalism, aided by a too-compliant media, has skewed public understanding of some of the most pressing issues of our era – like climate change. I'm reminded also of the BBC hard talk in 2010 when Mr Key spoke to the presenter and he said something like - well, you can say that but for every research point that you bring up I can come up with the opposite. This quote was repeated by a Republican Senator called James Hinton. My understanding is that he is a climate change denier and he repeated pretty much word for word what Mr Key said. So the question I've got is when we've got some sort of governance when making government policy we need some kind of understanding of why there's so much system immobility and an understanding about these other forces at work, so the recommendation I've got for you is to try and make people aware about this. When you're talking to politicians, that you take back the anger and frustration from the grassroots, and what these people are saying, and the fact that the government is not listening to what people are saying. I've just got a tongue-in-cheek recommendation that when you take our words back to the government just put the image of a ponytail on it.

Ministry panel: Well ladies and gentlemen we're getting near the end, we've probably got time for a couple more before we hand over to Guy to make some closing comments

52. **Child** It says in the consultation document that target will make households "less well off" how may I ask will households be less well off if they have just been saved from a disaster?
53. I feel humbled by the young people in this room and their passion. It's fantastic. But I did think I just wanted to comment on who in the Department of the Environment thought that a picture of Auckland up the front was appropriate? It might be the sunset on it.
54. **Male.** I'm speaking on behalf of myself. My first comment is that the government is seeking views on New Zealand's post-2020 climate change contribution. Inconveniently, post 2020 and other government will be in charge and we know that that government will just ignore anything that was decided five years earlier because incompetent people were in charge five years earlier, who didn't know what they were doing. In my dreams I would really like to see take decisions that are binding for the government that is in charge now because we can't wait five years. Our contributions have to start right now. I say in my dreams but this is the only option that is responsible for our society.

55. Kia ora katou I am [REDACTED] I don't see any reason why you should be winding up on us. I'm well aware that it costs quite a few thousand dollars to bring you here to meet us, and we are all here, and unless you are really in a hurry to rush off, if you want to pack up and go, go. Does anyone else want to pack up now? Otherwise please do us the courtesy of not winding up until we've all had our say. Because in the end you're being paid by us. Well I don't know if you can give answers that short but – we are a small country, but when you take in our exclusive economic zone New Zealand very quickly becomes a very big part of this world. We are in control of a huge amount of ocean. We have a voice. I know my daughter said at the UN that we have a voice. We actually stand for something and we have to get that message to the government that being a global citizen and having land around us and that ocean that's quickly acidifying – we have a voice. I'm a mum and I agree with everyone who has said that the future prospects for our children are terrifying. I would like to put to our government that, rather than talking about economic costs now, that they go forward for 30 years, turnaround and look back from what that world is going to be like at two, four, 6° warmer, in terms of food, of water for our children. Turnaround and look back the other way and say - whatever it costs, we have to do it.
56. I'll be quick. When I was in Warsaw at COP two years ago and I wrote about this issue of intergenerational equity. A lot of people in this room have talked about this principle and said that I'm young, and I do have kids because they might have a very bad life. What I asked the New Zealand government negotiators when I was there was will you put this in your agreement and they said flatly, no. We came back last year – again, no. Countries in South America, countries in the EU and others have said yes. I want to know why would New Zealand not support the principle of intergenerational equity when it essentially is the face of the entire negotiations around climate change? Why would it not?

Ministry panel: Well ladies and gentlemen I'm prepared to go on a little bit longer. We can't stay here all night. We're getting a bit tired actually. Okay we'll go for a bit longer.

57. I'd just like to comment on the fact that it's not just us 300 people here, there are many people who couldn't make it. I only found out about this meeting about half an hour before it started. It wasn't widely advertised. Many people won't even know that it's happening. Many people have other commitments, children, long work days and other things. It's not just us. It's many many more people.
58. Hi I'm [REDACTED] and I speak for myself and perhaps for the human race as well. I was really concerned about global warming way back when I saw that ancient film the Inconvenient Truth. Anyone seen that? It was a long time ago. I've done a lot of engineering and biology and I understand both sides of the equation. What really concerns me in the last eight years or so is the very lack of adoption of the new technologies we have, windmills, solar water heaters, electric cars. It's all available. Why don't people take it on? My main concern is that it's not an even playing field right now. Current technology is not paying for all the costs. There's a cost for burning coal. There's a cost for many of the other energies

that they don't have to pay for. So when is the government going to make it an even playing field? Bring on this new technology because it can't compete right now. That's my question. Make an even playing field.

59. I'm [REDACTED] Some years ago, about 30 years ago I watched a film about the post-apocalyptic world, about the experience of nuclear war. I remember feeling physically sick. I actually threw up during that film. That film was about a post-apocalyptic world. What would a film about a post climate change world look like? That's what we need to ask ourselves. 30 years ago New Zealand led the world with its antinuclear stance. We are the only nation in the world which is a nuclear free zone. I want to say this: this time we need to show that we are leaders on climate change. Let's get a target really well established. Let's go for no carbon dioxide emissions by 2050, if not earlier, 2040. Let's go for it. The corporates have had their day! They have dictated to us for too long how we should live, what we should produce. We live and die by the power. This time the people are speaking. The grass roots are fractious, and are speaking. Let the ministers hear this: if you are the Ministry for the environment, show it in Paris. That's my message for tonight. I want to make sure that my nieces and if you, who live in Australia, will have a world with breathable air and which will be an environment in which they and the children will be able to live.
60. My name is [REDACTED] and I'm speaking in a personal capacity. First of all I'd like to say that I appreciate the position that you civil servants are in coming here and fronting the government's policy position and I note that no government MPs or ministers are here tonight to receive feedback from Dunedinites. As it is the government's position that you're here fronting is a position contrary to overwhelming scientific thinking. But thank you very much for being here and for taking our feedback back to the Minister. Two points: First one is how the heck are we expected to participate in this consultation, particularly, how can we adequately ask the question about costs that we are prepared to take on to reduce our emissions when this document does not refer to the costs of not taking action? The second point is that there is no point in us setting a target, there is no point in us even going to Paris and stating our intention if you don't put together a plan to meet that target and reduce our emissions. There's no point. No point in setting that target if we don't have a national framework to support communities like Dunedin to take action and to reduce our emissions.
61. [REDACTED] I am a little less angry this time. We hear talk about the economic advantages of switching to low emissions and taking advantage of new technologies and we hear about jobs on oil rigs which once again is not true. Very few people work on them and very few people get jobs there, whereas renewable energy infrastructure, and all of the infrastructure changes that we must make as we look forward is extremely labour-intensive. This will be like the Christchurch rebuild times 100 if we do go and try to build a renewable infrastructure, and there will be jobs that last a long time. They will potentially have skills that we can export to other countries. So to be paying subsidies and giving away millions of kilometres of coastline and coastal sea beds and Victoria forest Park etc etc etc to the oil and coal companies for a measly tiny sum of royalties if they find anything while we carry all of the risk and cleanup costs for environmental damage. So we need to go forward and start

building wind turbines, solar, light rail like they have in Germany. Half of Germany's power can be created from rooftop solar. We can do that easily. We have the resources. We have the land. If any country can do it we can do it. And by not doing it we're not only sending a really bad message to the world as the country who could best do it, we're also just being lazy and ignorant. The government has to stop taking handouts and big donations from oil companies that line their pockets. They actually have to work for the people. We pay them and we pay you.

62. Hello my name is [REDACTED] and I speak for myself. I am a policy analyst and I work in the environmental sector. I beg all of you to make a submission. They can hear us but they can't ignore a written submission. It only needs to be short but please make a submission. A quick couple of points: I need leadership from you guys – leadership internationally. We want our ministers to go back and say this is important. But we need leadership locally too. You go back to the Minister and say it's not good enough to start undermining efforts to put railway into Auckland. It's not good enough to support those economic models that support the sale of electric engines and replace them with diesel. We need leadership today. We need our ministers to recognise that most of us are happy to compromise some of our own comfy lifestyles for the future of our kids and their kids. We're going to have to get out of our cars. But a lot of people are going to need leadership to make that happen. We can't keep doing things the way that we do in them. The models we've used – and I've looked at that economic analysis – that's another matter. The models we used have got us into the position we are in today... The models need to change; the analysis needs to change. We can't keep pursuing this narrow model, because it isn't working. And I know it's not comfortable, we know it's not comfortable. I like my car and it rains in Dunedin but we need to change. I'm really begging you to try to knock some heads together now. We have an energy strategy that encourages extraction. It's about optimising the value of our resources. And I think everyone will agree with me here – if the whispers are true – we might be about to sign a document that takes away our ability to protect ourselves, our ability to impose costs on Shell. And if that is true, of course none of us know do we? If it is true, you need to shake some sense into these guys. Talk to them about risk, not the risk to their pockets but the political risks, the social risks of not changing the way we do things. Please, I've got kids. I don't want my comfortable life to go away but, hell we've got to do something now.

63. **A quote from [REDACTED]** “Previous generations did not know about climate change and its costs. Future generations will be powerless to stop it. It's down to us.”

64. Another attempt at question from [REDACTED]: What's happening between now and 2021? – not answered by the panel.

Mike, from Ministry panel: All right now thank you ladies and gentlemen just a couple of things on administration then I'll hand you to Guy in a minute to wrap up. You may not be entirely satisfied with Guy's wrap up but we encourage you to stay and chat with us if there are any matters that are particularly worrying you. From me I want to say first of all thank you very much for your forbearance and patience and for being here this evening. Thank you for more or less sticking to my rules. Um, look,

we hear clearly your calls for stronger leadership and I'm sure Guy will touch on that but as the lady down here just said, please make sure you make a written submission as well, um, there's nothing like the written word and we really need to support what you've said by making a written submission. So thank you very much and I'll hand over to Guy.

Guy Beatson *Um, I want to add my thanks to Mikes'. Um, people in the room tonight brought their heart and soul to this meeting. You brought passion to this meeting, you brought concern, you brought anger and, um, hopefully not directed at us but um, we've taken that too and also, importantly many people in this room brought hope. And the important thing about this that we will take back as the premier issue that you've raised with us as the seriousness of this issue.*

I want to pick up five things, they're not the entire things that were talked about tonight but they seem to be some of the most important. The first piece of advice that we will take back to the ministers is, your view and others up and down the country actually, about the significant costs of inaction and they need to be better reflected as the decisions are taken on this important issue.

The second big thing is that there are benefits to action and they need to be better reflected in those decisions as well, including the ability of New Zealanders to innovate and use new technologies, and the benefits for health, um, in terms of reducing greenhouse gas emissions and importantly the potential to grow our competitiveness through that.

Many of you have talked about more leadership from government. You've said New Zealand needs to be a leader again. Some of you have expressed disappointment at not being a leader, particularly around leadership that has been shown around nuclear free, ANZAC and the like. And implicitly in that I think, nobody said this specifically, but there's an implicit thing in there about New Zealand influencing bigger countries to also take action and secondly that there needs to be some leadership from the New Zealand government in terms of supporting Pacific Island countries.

Some of you, many of you talked about cross party leadership and consensus. That's needed on these climate change issues that there needs to be more stability moving forward. But I heard from many of you also that actually there needs to be a community consensus too, a community consensus that extends to the people beyond this room.

And lastly, um, and I think importantly for many of you here tonight, um, there's a message that you want us to take back, that New Zealand's contributions should be at least -40 by 2030 and some of you believe seriously enough that it's more than that and that it's more like six or 7% per year, not only in New Zealand but also internationally.

Mike's indicated that we will also talk about the process from here which I will now do. Um, we are going to take all of the submissions that we get by 3 June as well as picking up all the themes from the 15 public meetings and hui we that we held up and down the country to formulate our advice to the ministers. Um, we'll be doing that post 3 June. I want to provide an assurance that the ethic of the public service is to provide free and frank advice. That is the basis on which the Ministry for the

Environment operates. If you want to see the views of government departments about some of the issues that people have talked about tonight go and look at the briefings to incoming ministers that we put together and released towards the end of last year and you'll see the view from the Ministry for the Environment and other agencies. And I would urge you to do that from some of the comments this evening. Um, ministers have said to us that they – the Minister for Climate Change Issues has said to us they intend to table New Zealand's intended nationally determined contribution in the middle of the year, um, that will be sometime between June and August um, that will be sitting alongside other developed countries like Australia. From there, the United Nations framework Convention on Climate Change in October will take all of the intended contributions tabled by all of the countries that have tabled them and they'll work out how to calibrate them so they are on a common basis and they will sit that against the 2° warming target that was agreed at Copenhagen. That analysis and those intended contributions will be taken to the Conference Of the Parties (COP), that's the big climate change meeting in Paris in December and hopefully there will be an agreement, at least a framework agreement for climate change as well.

*Um, some people have talked about what happens in terms of domestic policy, um, as a result of looking at what happens with the intended contributions there will be further advice from officials about domestic policy and the Minister for Climate Change Issues has talked about a review, among other things, of the Emissions Trading Scheme to be started this year. Um, the focus of that will be to make sure that those policies will be calibrated against the intended contribution that New Zealand puts forward. So thank you very much I'll hand back to Mike to finish off. **Mike** Thanks Guy. You're welcome to stay behind to have a chat with us. Thanks very much again it's much appreciated thank you.*