

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Climate Contribution](#)
Subject: Submission 10189
Date: Monday, 25 May 2015 9:20:22 a.m.

THIS PAPER HAS TOO MANY UNSUBSTANTIATED NON-SCIENTIFIC STATEMENTS TO BE CONSIDERED A SERIOUS DISCUSSION PAPER ON SCIENCE – IT IS AN OPINION PIECE ONLY.

CO2 IS INCORRECTLY DEFINED:

CO2 is not a pollutant gas or a major driver of 'Global Warming - Climate Change' - water vapour is the main driver and any claim to the contrary is not science based.

We do not need to do anything to reduce our future atmospheric CO2 emissions that have increased from 290ppmv in 1980 to 400ppmv in 2015, as this increase has produced only beneficial results to our world.

Show me the raw data that proves otherwise - (a computer projection is NOT acceptable).

This increased anthropogenic CO2 has had an unexpected beneficial action by growing all 'green' plants, trees and food at a faster rate - up to 35% faster. This increased vegetative growth has been measured by satellite over the last 30 years and proves only beneficial results to our world with no detrimental outcomes - any claim to the contrary is not supported by real world data, is propaganda, or computer generated projections which are not science based.

Although CO2 has steadily increased over the previous 18.5 years and will continue to increase, this has NOT increased our world temperature as measured by the most accurate RSS microwave sensor, which shows NO temperature increase for this period - any claim to the contrary is not supported by real world data, is propaganda, or computer generated projections which are not science based.

Adverse weather, hurricanes, tornados and flood frequency and intensity are currently less than the 100 year average and are not increasing - any claim to the contrary is not supported by real world data, is propaganda, or computer generated projections which are not science based.

Sea levels have increased slightly from natural expansion from warming water, but it is impossible to mitigate this natural 1.3mm per year rise and it is not causing any measurable effect to our coastal land or adversely affecting any of our associated Island nations (sinking tectonic plates are not caused by 'climate change') - any claim to the contrary is not supported by real world data, is propaganda, or computer generated projections which are not science based.

The ice mass combined for the Arctic and Antarctic is not melting at any abnormal rate and is now greater, than 10 years ago - any claim to the contrary is propaganda, or computer generated projections and not science based - any claim to the contrary is not supported by real world data, is propaganda, or computer generated projections which are

not science based.

Now to answer most of the questions posed:

What does climate change mean for New Zealand?

New Zealand has not warmed by the claimed 0.9°C since 1900 and any slight warming from anthropogenic Climate Change, stopped as shown in the RSS trend line through 1996 to 2015.

No action is required.

What is an ‘intended nationally determined contribution?’

New Zealand should follow the Chinese response to the Obama initiative - pretend to support it as a sop to our EU trading partners and actually do nothing to further damage our economy.

What are we doing to reduce agricultural emissions?

Our main gas emission methane, has less than 0.000064% world effect so we should do nothing - (culling the sacred cows in India would have more effect and still show a zero benefit).

Use of carbon offsets and forestry sinks to meet targets

Another useless recommendation. Carbon credits benefit only the banking industry and speculation. Forest trees should be grown to produce wood, not tie up CO₂ (incorrectly called Carbon which obviously does not cause runaway ‘global warming’ as evidenced by no warming for 18.5 years).

The price of carbon (more correctly defined as CO₂)

As we have no substantiated problem (only inaccurate computer generated IPCC projections), we do not need a price to solve a non-existing problem by taxation. This adversely and disproportionately affects the poorest citizens of NZ.

Emerging technologies to reduce transport emissions:

The only sensible suggestion in this discussion paper - just as long as we do not tie up productive farmland to produce bio-fuels but use only waste tallow.

We should defiantly NOT invest \$42 million taxpayer \$ in biofuel research - if the producers cannot make an economic return without taxpayer funding, then bi-fuel production should be rejected.

Summary:

Under the ‘precautionary approach’, it is not cost effective for New Zealand to achieve any meaningful CO₂ or Methane reduction and the proposed actions will achieve no measurable result.

In the unlikely event that any future action is required, it will be more beneficial to mitigate at that time.

SUBMITTED BY:

Rex Sellar (WS Engineer)

Telephone –

Sent from Windows Mail