

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Climate Contribution](#)  
**Subject:** Submission 3681 - Part 2  
**Date:** Wednesday, 27 May 2015 4:09:20 p.m.

---

Climate Change Consultation Contribution  
[climate.contribution@mfe.govt.nz](mailto:climate.contribution@mfe.govt.nz)

Ministry for the Environment  
PO Box 10362  
Wellington 6143

25 May 2015

Marlene and Gary Ware

[REDACTED]

ph [REDACTED]

Dear Sir/Madam

**Re:** *New Zealand's climate change target: Our contribution to the new international climate change agreement: Discussion document.*

### **Submission from Marlene Ware**

Thank you for making a contribution towards this international agreement. Climate change is happening and is one of the greatest challenges facing our future. All countries need to do their bit. We are a small country but per head of population, our carbon footprint is very high. These are our requests.

- Aim high. The New Zealand Government needs to set strong targets for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.
- For sufficient impact, these targets must be set in law and supported by all political parties.
- Until now we have seen words without actions. Our targets should be accompanied by a list of actions which will mean that be actually achieve them.
- The MfE discussion document provides costs per household of meeting emission targets. It says the cost of making a 5% reduction will be about \$1,270 per year per household, and the cost of making a 40% reduction will be \$1,800 per year per household. I urge you to go for a meaningful reduction like 40% which isn't actually all that much more expensive. And the cost analysis doesn't take into account the opportunities to improve economic growth, create jobs and boost the

economy through low carbon policies, as well as savings individual households can make through things like fuel savings. These benefits are articulated by the Global Commission on the Economy and Climate and should be worked into a New Zealand context. If voters were told about the benefits as well as the costs, they would be more likely to support a strong target. This has already happened in California.

- The economic analysis in the MfE Discussion Document does not include the cost of doing nothing, both to the economy and to households.
- Protected permanent natural forests are huge stores of carbon . New Zealand should push for their recognition in terms of climate change credits. This is fair to third world forests with large areas of rainforests and would be an incentive for them to lessen their destruction. It would also profit New Zealand and would be an incentive to increase pest control to make our forests more healthy, store more carbon by reducing the degradation caused by pests, promote biodiversity and benefit tourism and our 'clean green' image.

Marlene and Gary Ware