

## Questions to guide your feedback

Your submission may address any aspect of the discussion document, but we would appreciate you paying particular attention to the questions posed throughout and listed in this form. You may answer some or all of the questions. To ensure your point of view is clearly understood, you should explain your rationale and provide supporting evidence where appropriate.

### Contact information

Name	Ellen Schindler
Organisation (if applicable)	
Address	[REDACTED]
Telephone	[REDACTED]
Email	[REDACTED]

### 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 the above objectives for New Zealand's contribution.**

The problem with the first objective is the process. How do you fairly, transparently and with accountability measure the opinion of international and domestic audience? If the Auckland public consultation meeting held 18<sup>th</sup> April is anything to go by, the process of the National Government is deeply flawed in accuracy, transparency and accountability. The themes that were recorded on the night were not available to the public or have any accountability to the public. I watched the official note taker not taking notes during key contributions from the public, and the summary that was read out at the end of the meeting wasn't an accurate representation of the public.

The second objective is worded in a leading manner as there is no mention of the costs and impacts of not acting. This is the key factor that this issue needs to be assessed against. The costs of a 40% reduction target for example (as provided in the discussion document) are tiny compared to what we would face if hit with large storms, sea level rise, climate refugees, loss of productive farm land, tropical diseases and so on. Much more importantly the impacts of climate change result in huge threats to wellbeing both for our people, for our Pacific neighbours and for people in other nations.

### **1b. What is most important to you?**

The most important objective is the third, however using the wording of “long term” doesn’t express the necessary urgency of immediate action to reduce New Zealand’s GHG emissions.

A timely threat to any objective is the Government signing up to the TPPA where we would lose critical autonomy to have policies aligned with our intended transition to a low emissions world and environmental protection.

This issue needs to be addressed and managed across political parties with long term co operation, strategies and an external accountability strategy. It needs to last longer than any single party in government and not become a political football.

The costs of reductions can be done with many initiatives that - while some people may be adverse to them at first - actually improve quality of life. Also, if we delay taking action it is likely our emissions profile will worsen, making it harder and more costly to take action. Clearly it is far more cost effective to take action now than to become even more dependent on industries and practices that contribute to climate change.

Many of the technologies for reducing our emissions (or providing carbon sinks) are already available. There are several ways to manage farms, for example, that ensure carbon rich soils, which would help mitigate the atmospheric carbon produced by agriculture. These technologies would not only improve our emissions profile but would also make our products more sustainable in the long term, both for our own people and for people in countries with a less productive agricultural sector.

Technologies for sustainable transport are also numerous: electric vehicles (particularly trains and buses), electric bicycles (which would eliminate the only substantial physical barrier to cycling in cities such as Wellington and Auckland – hills), and better infrastructure for public transport, walking and cycling. The only fundamental barrier to these is the ideology that people are entitled to drive fossil fuel propelled cars with complete discretion and at low cost on publically funded roads. I understand this an extremely deep rooted ideology, but there are many, many organisations (including ourselves) who would be very pleased to work with the government on promoting discussions about the way of life we aspire to as New Zealanders and how transport fits into that. I strongly question the construction of new roads, and strongly support substantial investment in the alternatives outlined.

## **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?**

I believe that a “fair” target should be on a per capita basis, not in relation to our “special circumstances”. Every country has “special circumstances”. I suggest our circumstances are seen as leadership opportunities, not as reasons for us to set a less ambitious target than other nations.

It may well be possible that dairying, *on the scale and with the intensity* we currently operate, is no longer viable in a low emissions world. We would be much better off taking measures to address this now, as part of our climate change plan, rather than waiting until some point in the future.

Our good performance on renewable energy, could be improved even further with energy efficiency, and with much greater support for localised and domestic solar production and wind turbines. We are world leaders in renewable energy, and the need to consider our GHG emissions is an excellent opportunity to build on that.

On a more general level, NZ has a relatively robust economy and we have a well educated, creative and innovative population. This helps put us in a position to lead by example and set a strong target.

## 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 do you think would be a reasonable impact on annual household consumption?**

I do not believe this question is the best one, given that our target should not be set by what is “manageable” but by what we *must* manage if we are to mitigate climate change. The cost of a 40% target seems to us to be extraordinarily low given the far, far greater financial, social and environmental costs of not taking strong action now. It is the absolute minimum we should consider and only if it results in us achieving what we need on a per capita basis as outlined earlier. I am puzzled however, as to why this cost is assumed to be evenly spread across households. The necessary actions will need to be taken by the government, business, city councils and the agricultural industry (for the most part). Any “costs” should be born primarily by emitters. Many positive actions to improve our emissions profile also result in *savings*. For example sustainable forms of transport are generally cheaper overall – cycling and walking are much cheaper than driving. Domestic solar panels and better insulation reduce the electricity costs of households. Given that strong leadership could also improve our image overseas, this is likely to make our products more attractive to overseas buyers.

From another angle, this question could ask what are the “appropriate costs for failing to take strong action” and ask if these are reasonable. This brings us to a request for a *full and detailed plan* that shows the source of our emissions and carbon sinks, and provides a breakdown of the ways in which we could improve our profile. I feel such a detailed analysis is essential, and will help us move from the question of “cost” to the question of how best to organise ourselves to take leadership on climate change and protect our people and the biodiversity of our ecosystems.

I also feel that we should not be relying on overseas offsets. I believe there are many ways in which we could reorganise ourselves to have a very favourable emissions profile and it would be very unwise to rely on buying carbon credits from other countries. For example I am fully in favour of protected areas of native forest that would provide carbon sinks and help with biodiversity.

**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?**

As methane production is the largest cause of New Zealand's GHG emissions that is the area for the biggest opportunity to create innovative solutions. Create a Government funded think tank of cross generational innovators and experts from science, computer technologies and creative industries to solve this problem. New Zealand could be a world leader and innovator in this area. The Agricultural industry could be subsidised to transition to organic farming methods and for converting pasture to protected areas of native forest to create carbon sinks on their land.

I am in favour of a thorough plan to rehaul our transport sector and suggest that we do not build new roads but use that money for public transport, cycling and walking initiatives, including promotion of electric bicycles. Bicycles are of course highly popular in many sophisticated European cities with similarly socially progressive aspirations and a strong premium on the health and wellbeing of their citizens (as we have too).

Another area not considered is attention to our built environment, including requiring all new buildings to meet emissions targets, strengthening the push to insulate older houses and other buildings, and requiring all public buildings to meet ambitious targets for energy efficiency.

## Summary

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

Future uncertainties should be taken into account by primarily cutting emissions through strategies that are controllable – including efficiency and reduction targets in government enterprises and industry.

## Other comments

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

I would like to see a series of national discussions hosted by schools, universities, cities and other regional authorities to consider how we can meet these challenges. Businesses should be involved in these discussions as they can be great leaders in new, sustainable innovations and will no doubt rise to the challenge of supporting NZ's identity as a leader in this field.

There could be policy written to obligate Ceo's of large companies to be accountable to all stakeholders, including the environment and communities that they conduct their business in, not just the shareholders who get dividends paid out to them.

None of the initiatives suggested address getting people together to work out how they can contribute and what lifestyle changes they foresee could help us meet an ambitious target. NZers are well known for getting behind causes. For example, in water shortages people generally want to play their part – this could also be the case with climate change.

## When your submission is complete

Email your completed submission to [climate.contribution@mfe.govt.nz](mailto:climate.contribution@mfe.govt.nz) or post to Climate Change Contribution Consultation, Ministry for the Environment, PO Box 10362, Wellington 6143.

**Submissions close at 5.00pm on Wednesday 3 June 2015.**

# Setting New Zealand's post-2020 climate change target

## Submission form

The Government is seeking views on New Zealand's post-2020 climate change contribution under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

You can have your say by making a submission using this form or using the online tool available at [www.mfe.govt.nz/more/consultations](http://www.mfe.govt.nz/more/consultations).

For more information about this consultation:

- Read our [Consultation on New Zealand's post-2020 international climate change contribution web page](#)
- Read our discussion document: [New Zealand's Climate Change Target: Our contribution to the new international climate change agreement](#)

**Submissions close at 5.00pm on Wednesday 3 June 2015.**

## Publishing and releasing submissions

All or part of any written submission (including names of submitters), may be published on the Ministry for the Environment's website [www.mfe.govt.nz](http://www.mfe.govt.nz). Unless you clearly specify otherwise in your submission, we will consider that you have consented to website posting of both your submission and your name.

Contents of submissions may be released to the public under the Official Information Act 1982 following requests to the Ministry for the Environment (including via email). Please advise if you have any objection to the release of any information contained in a submission and, in particular, which part(s) you consider should be withheld, together with the reason(s) for withholding the information. We will take into account all such objections when responding to requests for copies of, and information on, submissions to this consultation under the Official Information Act.

The Privacy Act 1993 applies certain principles about the collection, use and disclosure of information about individuals by various agencies, including the Ministry for the Environment. It governs access by individuals to information about themselves held by agencies. Any personal information you supply to the Ministry in the course of making a submission will be used by the Ministry only in relation to the matters covered by this consultation. Please clearly indicate in your submission if you do not wish your name to be included in any summary of submissions that the Ministry may publish.

## Questions to guide your feedback

Your submission may address any aspect of the discussion document, but we would appreciate you paying particular attention to the questions posed throughout and listed in this form. You may answer some or all of the questions. To ensure your point of view is clearly understood, you should explain your rationale and provide supporting evidence where appropriate.

### Contact information

Name	Ellen Schindler
Organisation (if applicable)	
Address	██
Telephone	██████████
Email	████████████████████

### 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?**

- Yes
- No NO, we need to do better! The current govt cost and impact on society is short sighted, we need to invest more now to not be punished on many levels, including the worst, our degrading environment, in the near future!**

**1b. What is most important to you?**

To protect the environment, to progress green economy and products including small scale and household energy production, to make the worst offenders pay the most, even if it means that

they have to close down. new clean energy and products should receive the subsidies and research money the old bad offenders are now given.

## 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**      **We need to do better than anybody else**

## 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 do you think would be a reasonable impact on annual household consumption?**      **It depends on how this is distributed, if the biggest polluters pay the most and not the least, this should cover a fair bit. If creative green jobs are created, these will contribute to GDP and if people are helped to make savings otherwise by reducing their unnecessary dirty plastic consumption reducing council rubbish rates etc, the additional financial impact could be easily balanced towards neutral.**

**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?**

- Fuel and energy efficiency can reduce costs to businesses and households.
- Our high level of renewable electricity generation creates opportunities, including greater use of renewables in other sectors, through the use of new technology (for example, use of electric vehicles in transport – see box 9).

## Summary

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

Be bold and understand that renewable energy including small scale production needs to be rewarded and incentivised in order to encourage it, this will pay in the long range. positive investments need to be encouraged, legislation by govt need to provide incentives and remove barriers, then the sector will be able to rise and create wealth on many levels, not only financial wealth. There is just as much uncertainty in coal (slumped in 2014/15 and solid Energy is closing mines) and milk (Fonterra's milk payout slumped and may more, pushing new milk investing farmers over the edge) - all these are just as big risks taken and seem to fail now and still are defended as the best ever!

## Other comments

6. Is there any further information you wish the Government to consider? Please explain. **GOVT need to work with people not against them, help people to invest in eco, green energy, products & services and help people to achieve behaviour and habit changes that lead to a decreasing waste of energy and all associated resources including natural resources. One example is the energy buyback scheme of the current power companies, Meridian and Contact (let alone the others who don't even pay anything for privately exported PV power but sell it for their regular price) have dumped the buyback prices to a mere 1/3 or less of the price they sell the energy back to other customers. This is not an incentive and a total disaster for the people who had faith in a fair power scheme and have been spearheading local and private energy production PV systems. In the contrary, 15-20 years ago the German govt legislated for a fair payback price for PV owners and this resulted in many private households investing in small scale PV, sending Germany to the world's top of PV solar energy production. We need a govt that leads this charge for NZ!!**

## When your submission is complete

Email your completed submission to [climate.contribution@mfe.govt.nz](mailto:climate.contribution@mfe.govt.nz) or post to Climate Change Contribution Consultation, Ministry for the Environment, PO Box 10362, Wellington 6143.

**Submissions close at 5.00pm on Wednesday 3 June 2015.**