

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



Copy of your submission

Contact information

Name Daniel Schwalm

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?

* An ambitious contribution sounds about right. A contribution that sets the highest possible standard and demands the highest possible contribution by all other countries must be the aim.

* Any money spend on reducing global warming, no matter how high the numbers may be, is an insignificant number compared to the cost of any 0.1 degrees warming not prevented from happening. It is impossible to spend too much money. We can save costs by taking a stance strong enough to encourage other countries to agree on higher standards, though. We therefore cannot afford to show the slightest sign of reluctance.

* We cannot afford to settle with low emissions. The long term aim is carbon neutrality.

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 must support the highest standards offered by other countries. To show our strongest support, we should agree to meet the highest offer. If Europe offers 40% below 1990 than we should go with this number.

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?

Given that the effect of a temperature rise of 2 degrees will be catastrophic, a household expenditure of 10% of the income to prevent that from happening would not only be a bargain - it would be a steal. Given an estimated average household income of ~\$85,000 in 2027. Household costs of below 10,000 would be a no-brainer. With estimated costs of \$1,800 per household for a 40% target there is no need to think about a target anything less than that.

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?

In the order: energy, ... transport, agriculture, waste. could contribute reductions between 10% - 20% down from current levels by 2030.

This can be further offset by forestation.

It is obvious that for high targets we will have to buy certificates from overseas.

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



Copy of your submission

Summary

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

All obligations that we cannot fulfil by our own efforts must be met by buying certificates from overseas. This is an acceptable policy only for high targets better than 10% below 1990.

Other comments

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

I am terrified to recognise that all current governmental communication refers to the catastrophic 2 degrees margin as an acceptable long term target.

We cannot agree on a long term target of global warming just below 2 degrees! At that level most people in the world will not be able to cope. We cannot allow a temperature rise of more than 1.5 degrees. I demand that this shall be the maximum number that we have to postulate in all communication - and act accordingly!

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Climate Contribution](#)
Subject: Submission 6929
Date: Friday, 29 May 2015 8:57:36 a.m.

Submission on Climate Change Contribution Consultation

I ask you to adopt a minimum target of a 40% reduction in net emissions below 1990 levels by 2030 – the minimum contribution required to keep us under 2 degrees global warming.

The Government consultation document treats action on climate change as a cost, whereas failure to take action is actually the cost. Treasury found that if New Zealand continues on its current trajectory of increasing emissions, the cost to taxpayers of even a modest 5% reduction target will be up to \$52 billion. The more we lower our emissions the more we will reduce this cost.

Climate change is a threat to our economy and the things it most depends on, like tourism and farming. Our agricultural nation depends on a stable climate. Our farmers will suffer increased droughts and damaging storms and profits will suffer.

Responding to climate change is worth our while. The New Climate Economy Report released in 2014 by a team of internationally renowned economists, led by Lord Nicholas Stern, found that countries can improve their economic performance while cutting emissions. The Chair of the Bank of America, the head of the OECD, the World Bank, the Vice Chair of Deutsche Bank, and many others, endorsed this finding.

I request that you stop downplaying our responsibility for climate change saying New Zealand is too small to make a difference. It's not in our national character to sit on the fence and watch others get the job done.

It's time for us to do the right thing again. We were the first to give women the vote. We stood behind our Pacific neighbours in rejecting nuclear testing. Now's our chance to create a climate plan that New Zealanders can be proud to stand behind, and that starts with a target of reducing emissions by at least 40% by 2030.

Other Comments:

I support all of the above without compromise. In addition I need to make it clear that the target of 40% emissions reduction by 2030 can only be seen as an intermediate target on our path towards becoming carbon neutral as a nation as quickly as possible. While reaching this aim will certainly take a couple of decades longer, we must show how serious we are in our attempts. New Zealand is in a pole position and can reach this aim far easier than most countries in the world. This demands us to accept a leading role in defining a fast pace. We cannot settle with anything less than -40% at 2030.

Daniel Schwalm
[REDACTED]

Referrer: action.greens.org.nz