

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



Copy of your submission

Contact information

Name Matthew Polson

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?

That we lead by example as we have in the past. These three objective are full of mitigations and escape clauses. "fair", "managed", "long term" all offer 'success' without effort. Someone in NZ will believe zero change is a fair and ambitious contribution to a domestic audience.

What is wrong with definitive statements? The current government will not be the government answering for failure in 2030. Be ambitious, someone else will answer for your failings

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?

Listen to the scientists for a change. It will be hard, but give it a go. They actually have data.

58% of our 1990 levels

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?

Quite a lot. It will require large changes in the farming industry. Some of these changes are not known yet, so research will be required to find them. Sell these solutions to those that produce the other 99.8% of the emissions. Personal travel must be supplied with alternatives, living far from work/school must be made socially unexceptionable. This will require workplaces to move, not people (let's face it, this means out of Auckland)

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?

The most likely to occur, with the present attitude, is surely none. Energy efficiently at the house is the best answer but this will never happen as it does not help growth. In fact it decreases it and no government can support that. More renewable production at the point of use will help, but as the current government has sold the electricity sector (or 49% of it) this would decrease profit and be pol;politically unacceptable. I have trouble saying this but maybe Muldoon was right, we need energy security. Carbon sinks are a short term solution, 30-50 years is not the scale we need to think on. This was a 200 year problem coming, short sightedness wont help now

Summary

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



Ministry for the
Environment
Manatū Mo Te Taiao

Copy of your submission

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

Aim high, be ambitious, back the scientists/engineers. They have done it before, but it took hard targets and money up front. Look at the response to NOx level restrictions. The (funny) thing is, over all it saves money. Hard, unpopular restrictions on NOx saved money and lives from atmospheric contamination. Not that any NZ government had a hand in that, we just reaped the benefits of other governments controls on production

Other comments

6. Is there any further information you wish the Government to consider? Please explain. Think I have covered all my points