

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



Copy of your submission

Contact information

Name Eleanor Ross

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?

i) I agree with objective 1.

ii) I think objective 2 needs to be considered differently.

Obviously, climate change is going to have a massive cost in the long-run. By taking the short-term approach of minimizing cost per household based on current scenarios, we risk two things:

? deferring the problem, ultimately leading to a much greater impact (and cost) in our future

? missing the opportunities we have now to think big and find the opportunities presented within the problem of emission reductions

o Generations X and Y are ready to embrace these challenges

o Embracing the challenge of carbon zero is 'on-brand' for NZ, both as a supposedly 'clean, green' destination of great natural beauty, and as a site of innovation – both in the sense of complex technologie, and smart yet simple 'number 8 wire' thinking

o New Zealand has an opportunity to show leadership both in the actual target set and the action plan put in place to achieve it

iii) I agree with the principle of objective 3, but disagree with one aspect of the second paragraph of objective 3's explanation.

It is likely that the competitiveness of some CURRENT New Zealand businesses will necessarily be affected by any legislation that enables bold change.

That is not to say, however, that New Zealand business will suffer in the long-run.

Thus, I would agree with objective 3 if the 'es' was removed from businesses.

(b) What is most important to you?

It is most important to me that:

i) New Zealand seeks to inspire other countries not only with ambitious targets but also with exciting plans to achieve them – plans that demonstrate a readiness to make big, bold changes to legislation, our economy and our way-of-life.

ii) New Zealand embraces the opportunity within this challenge.

iii) New Zealand calls for a global zero carbon target, and walks the talk by committing to a pathway towards zero

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



Copy of your submission

CO2 emissions by 2050 or earlier.

In terms of the logistics of ensuring our success in meeting the targets we set, it's also important to me that:

i) we put in place a New Zealand climate law that holds the government accountable for reducing emissions, and an independent Climate Commission.

ii) we establish a cross-party climate working group and an ongoing programme to engage meaningfully with New Zealanders on climate change solutions.?

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?

How will our contribution affect New Zealanders?

3. What level of cost is appropriate for New Zealand to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions? For example, what would be a reasonable reduction in annual household consumption?

I don't believe that framing up the cost in terms of reduction to annual household consumption represents a bold, innovative way of approaching the problem of emissions reduction.

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?

I support a focus on reducing transport emissions.

This could include focusing on:

? how individuals get from A to B

? reduction in the distance we expect our products to travel

? reduction in our expectations of consuming imported products

Summary

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

Other comments

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

Let's assume our technologies for emissions reduction (especially bio-technologies re methane) are going to kick butt. Let's assume that we're going to find ways to offset costs through smart thinking. Then, let's legislate in ways that help enable these assumptions to become realities.