



# one point zero

Mankind's Greatest Challenge: A Good Life within our ONE Planet's Means

## 'Carbon Trading': WHY needed? It's NOT 'The New Zealand Way'

As the government is no doubt acutely aware, '**Carbon Trading**' is fraught with many problems, and history has shown that it is the *soft way* of *optically* trying to achieve *difficult goals*. Avoiding the transformational 'discomfort' necessary to deliver long lasting, high integrity outcomes. Further, the great potential for deception, corruption, and the need for high administration / audit costs is all very unattractive.

As such, it is not only ineffective but also, in its distraction, it would be delaying of NZ being able to deliver urgently the much needed and urgent '**Authentic Success**'. (This dire authenticity, particularly needed in the 'The World's, deepening Climate Change crisis'.)

## 'Carbon Trading': The 'Safety Valve' that NZ and the World don't Need

Further, as the Government would know: New Zealand is one of the best positioned nations to affect the necessary reductions in NZ sovereign biocapacity demand, to meet a One Planet world.

The developing 'pressure to solve the chronic, Biocapacity Deficit, is the source of vital energy for action. '**Carbon Trading**' is like adding a Safety Valve, that takes the pressure off nations doing the vital, 'difficult stuff'. In the case of nations that have huge carbon deficit problems, like the UK, US, China, and most of the leading developed world countries, '**Carbon Trading**' is often THE only way to a Zero Carbon, or lower carbon Goal.

These heavily biocapacity indebted nations, need to make urgent and much more significant transformations to their socio- economic systems. These 'Big Player' interventions are vital if 'The World' has any hope of addressing Climate Change and the *chronic Biocapacity Deficit*.

Inspiring (and policing) these nations to take appropriately serious intervention is paramount for achieving Global Goals. Providing 'the lead' for them to use potentially ineffective '**Carbon Trading**' options for solution is counterproductive to this international imperative.

## **Pragmatism: Managing the Risk?**

Maybe the '**Carbon Trading**' option has been included as a pragmatic strategy option for the possible (likely?) scenario where other nations are renegeing on their emission reduction commitments: Through '**Carbon Trading**' mechanism, NZ's could still achieve its stated goal, while minimising disproportionate turmoil / disadvantage for its economy and people? (versus the renegeing nations.)

## **Reducing 'The NZ Challenge', Move accountability to where it Belongs.**

However, a better strategy is to reduce the size of the Zero Carbon challenge through the move to a '*Consumption*' based, method of account, as outlined below. This 'reduced challenge' should then be totally avoid needing the Carbon Credit, 'back pocket', option, and meeting a morally defensible goal with minimal disruption risk.

I'm sure the Government is aware that on a 'Consumption' basis, *New Zealand is virtually Carbon Neutral* today. The Government would well know, that it's the export agriculture products related emissions, and the 'subsidised tourism' footprint emissions, that puts NZ in Carbon Deficit.

Beyond trade balance issues, in a world where biocapacity is in direly scarcity, and the unconditional requirement is for humanity to live within that biocapacity, that's not fair! As 'we' all know: Currently we need these sources of foreign based income to keep the economy in balance and provide jobs, etc. This need for those dollars shouldn't compromise the biocapacity accounting, and allocation of demand and responsibility for its consumption to the source of the consumption. This is moving from '*Territorial*' based accounting to '*Consumption*' based accounting.

The '*Territorial*' basis for reporting Green House Gases seriously disadvantages New Zealand, and by accepting this metric, the challenge to achieve a 'Zero Carbon' status, the '*Territory*' basis of accounting makes it more significant and difficult.. (vs a '*Consumption*' based accounting approach.)

## **The Real Solution**      Leading The World to the '**Ultimate Goal**'

The preference as stated in many other submissions is to move away from a 'Carbon based Goal', as NZ's highest level, '**Ultimate Goal**', for its Climate Change focus. Zero Carbon is not what NZ needs: In the chronic **Global Biocapacity Deficit** situation we find ourselves in, this neither for the best of NZ, nor what The World desperately needs from NZ

NZ must replace a Carbon metric with a **Biocapacity Demand** linked metric and then setting a relevant, nation standard (goal) for the chosen metric. One that is totally aligned with a *Global 'One Planet Living'* goal. By necessity this will incorporate, global '*Biocapacity per capita*' linked standards.

Through progressively reduction of these per capita standards, the biocapacity consumption demand of all NZ's residents, will then be 'fairly' managed to the meet the sound, global imperative. This '*Fairness*' both from a global 'inter nation fairness', and an 'inner nation', individual fairness, within NZ. Further, using this approach, reduction in biocapacity demand, can be managed strategically and at 'a pace' that comprehends NZ's national priorities.

In this 'empowering context', of moving accountability for biocapacity demand closer to the ultimate consumer, it is paramount that the Government moves to a '*Consumption*' based metric as soon as possible.

### **Behind 'Carbon Trading': The Values: Conflict with 'The Kiwi Way'**

No matter what the chosen '**Ultimate Goal**' for NZ, '**Carbon Trading**' is a way of buying one's way around 'the problem', without dealing upfront with the hard truths and associated realities that inevitably return to expose the unaddressed, 'Root Problem'.

*This is this surely is not 'The Kiwi Way'.*

*In Conclusion: In ALL the above there is absolutely No Basis for supporting 'Carbon Trading' being part of the NZ Government's Climate Change mitigation strategy,*

## **PS: Government Intervention in an 'Unhealthy Carbon Trading'**

As the Government is no doubt aware: The market for 'Zero Carbon' Rated, Carbon Offsetting, initiatives is booming in NZ (and around the world). Yet almost without exception, these initiatives are creating a culture of "I pay, and I can continue to emit, and without any guilt".

Further: Most of the carbon 'trading credits' are (supposedly?) used to plant forests, creating the bad mindset that one's high emission footprint culture can continue, provided 'sufficient of one's money' goes to planting forests!

It maybe pertinent to note that even if every m2 of arable land on the planet was suitably forested, 'we' would still need some 3.5 times that area of forest to sequesterate the current amount of Green House Gas emissions!

So, while as much forest as possible is needed globally: Even the maximum, 'ever possible' forest, will not avoid the inevitable mission reduction activities, which are essentially 'human behavioural' linked. We need initiatives the 'Stop' the high emission behaviour, and much of this is a 'Way of Life' problem, not and infrastructure problem

### **Howard Fairbank**

[www.one-point-zero.com](http://www.one-point-zero.com)

Tel.: UK: +44-777-1357-199 NZ +64-212090486

skype:howard.fairbank

**Without Nature We are Nothing..!**

  
**one point zero**

Mankind's Greatest Challenge: A Good Life within our ONE Planet's Means