

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



Copy of your submission

---

## Contact information

Name Mark Belton

Organisation (if applicable) Permanent Forests NZ Ltd

Address PO Box 54, Lyttelton

Telephone 027 229 1483

Email mbelton@permanentforests.com

## Objectives for the contribution

Do you agree with these objectives for our contribution? Yes

1b. What is most important to you?

NZ's target must be fair and equitable.

Average per-capita emissions will need to halve from c. 8.0 t CO<sub>2</sub> eq/annum by 2050 to stabilise GpitaHG gas levels at 450 ppm or 2 deg temp rise.

This means NZ's per capita emissions will need to be reduced to about 25% of current levels...if we are to be fair and equitable!.

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?

NZ should aim to reduce its net emissions by 40% by 2030. We need to match the EU's reductions.

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 way of putting this question. What about the benefits of an ambitious emissions reduction programme?

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?

We should be aiming a reducing net emissions, and looking for actions that co benefits for sustainable development of the economy and sustainable improvements to the environment.

We need to to support and encourage afforestation that leads to high levels of sequestration and maximise environmental and economic co benefits.

We also need to press on with GRAAG, and be pragmatic about the long timelines to get major results

We need to go for 100% renewable electricity, and use of biofuels and electricity for the transport and industry sectors

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



Ministry for the  
**Environment**  
*Manatū Mo Te Taiao*

Copy of your submission

---

## Summary

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

We can mitigate risks by having diverse programmes ....where initiatives which deliver co benefits are accorded extra support

## Other comments

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

The potential for afforestation needs more robust analysis and fuller engagement from Government NZ needs more diverse forests. Current thinking is too narrow...focused on radiata plantations for timber with carbon storage as a temporary byproduct.

Permanent forests have far greater carbon storage capacity...for example normal aged radiata forests harvested on a 25 yr cycle store about 400 t CO<sub>2</sub>/ha, whereas radiata and other species grown for 50 years can store.1600 t CO<sub>2</sub> /ha.

We need to be careful to not unleash another 1.5 million ha of radiata onto our marginal high erosion risk hill country. I this happened NZ would end up with about 25% of its cultural/productive lands in radiata, which would be over the top...

We need to encourage long term afforestation with diverse permanent forests, to reduce bio-security/disease risks, and to maximise biodiversity and water and soil conservation co benefits.

The ETS is currently NZ's key mechanism for reigning in carbon emissions. It depends on a meaningful and assured carbon price driving change toward greater carbon efficiency across the economy. To date the ETS has been a complete failure, Perversely it has rewarded GHG polluters by creating arbitrage opportunities through carbon trading with junk ERU's.

The ETS is a Government construct, and Govt is incapable of out-smarting business interests. We know that if carbon pricing is to do the job, it has to be at a meaningful level.

Pricing need to be > \$20/t, and certain to increase, to start and sustain the journey toward a low carbon economy.

Global economists say the carbon price need to rise to US\$150-200 /t CO<sub>2</sub>.

If the ETS is to be retained it needs a floor price (eg \$15/t), and constrained supply going forward.

Much simpler and honest, and transparent to have a carbon tax instead of the ETS, or in combination with the ETS.

If NZ is to reduce its per capita emissions to 25% of current levels courageous interventions will be required.

We are overdue in getting started.