Consultation on setting New Zealand’s post-2020 climate change target
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Objectives for the contribution

Do you agree with these objectives for our contribution?   Yes

1b. What is most important to you?
This is mean having to choose but;
costs and impacts on society are managed appropriately

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?
Our economy is agriculture based and this affects our emissions. This co-relationship is an insurmountable burden in the short term because of the lengthy periods required for research on the reduction of methane emissions. And as well, the nature of our topography requires high transport carbon dioxide emissions. We should be developing rail transport for our agriculture products but that won’t happen soon. These 2 factors - the need to reduce biological methane and transportation carbon dioxide have us in a bind. What comes first? Set a target based on what we can manage now or a target based on what we think we can manage with the required changes? We have to set a target now so I guess our present situation dictates the level of target we set.

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 would be a reasonable reduction in annual household consumption?
Please remember that many people fall below the average HH consumption - I’m on $19500. Whatever is decided the impacts would have to be distributed across different income groups. A reasonable reduction in HHC could be $1300 but then I go further into deficit. There is a huge income inequality in NZ society I can only think of all the families living in poverty. If I had heaps of money I would say $1400 per annum.

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?
The continual planned reforestation of harvested trees AND planting of permanent indigenous trees AND education for biologically healthy soils AND composting home refuse are important - very very very. The 1st 3 are carbon sinks and the last will reduce methane. Many many people throw their HH refuse in the general rubbish bag. Biologically healthy soils retain carbon and are very very effective as a carbon sink but not many people think about the biological health of their soils.
Summary

5. How should New Zealand take into account the future uncertainties of technologies and costs when setting its target?
This is a tricky one. As mentioned above NZ has a lopsided case to offer. Why cant the Govt make more rail ways eg the rail to Marsden Port? Think of all the trucks off the road!!! But then the big firms wont have be able to use their trucks so the Govt sides with them. Think of the more immediate things to do eg planting/ refuse use, stop people using so much electricity, using tree waste products, making cycle ways AND THEN think how uncertain is the timing of all those wonderful research projects/how many years away for results and then make a decision. If we knew the costs of doing the immediate possibilities to reduce our emissions then maybe we could factor in all the uncertainties - too hard a question for me.

Other comments

6. Is there any further information you wish the Government to consider? Please explain.
Can Tim Grosser please present NZ in a more favourable light? I am not sure enough about the aid that we can give to other countries that can give us credits but it sounds like a good idea.