

From: andy tulloch [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, 3 June 2015 2:07 p.m.
To: Climate Contribution
Subject: Submission 11584

Submission on NZ's Contribution to Climate Change, June 2015

I submit that New Zealand should aim to reduce CO2 emissions to at least 40% below 1990 levels by 2030

The consultation document indicates the government will attempt to make us slink away from our obligations. As a wealthy country with plenty of easy options to reduce our fossil fuel-CO2 emission we have an obligation to be in the lead pack, striving to do at least our share. If we can't cut our fossil fuel-CO2 emissions to < 50% of today's rate (7.2 tonnes per capita), we *won't* be doing our share (global average 4.5 tonnes per capita per annum)

The statement that it's hard to bring our emissions down as we already have a high degree of renewable energy makes no sense. Why is our per capita CO2 output so high if we have easy access to cheap renewable energy? How about changing the focus from roads to electric rail... while we can still afford it! The current government refuses to give people personal choices around transport-related emissions.

Statements such as "...NZ's ...emissions are less than Australia and the US" are embarrassing. "We're such a small country, our emissions are tiny...". But we take great pride and earn international respect as world leaders in rugby, yachting, and global leadership in addressing climate change has the potential to earn huge respect, and economic benefit far out weighing those of the former. We could really do with some "statesmanship".

It is critical that NZ political parties can reach a cross party agreement on action. Is climate change less important than Superannuation? I believe that a government who does not attempt this (Helen Clark did her best) will be treated with derision in future years.

I am a research scientist with some expertise in understanding global Earth processes.

Andy Tulloch
Roslyn, Dunedin