

I am writing to follow up on my submission to the initial draft report, and comment on the new draft report.

Congratulations on a significant piece of work. However, I feel that it would be more effective if it gave more consideration to the need and possibility of personal action to contribute to the low-emissions economy. While it is clearly a matter of opinion as to whether it is appropriate or possible for change to come from consumers, I think it is important that the alternative views be discussed.

For example, you say: "The Commission's issues paper of August 2017 observed that "the shift from the old economy to a new, low emissions, economy will be profound and widespread, transforming land use, the energy system, production methods and technology, regulatory frameworks and institutions, and business and political culture" (p.1). At this point in the inquiry process, after an extensive period of research, engagement and analysis, the Commission finds nothing to alter that view."

I think it does New Zealand a disservice to pretend, as I think you are doing, that the shift to a low emissions economy can occur without a conscious contribution by consumers. The underlying suggestion, by putting everything down to transformation of 'land use, the energy system, production methods and technology, regulatory frameworks and institutions, and business and political culture' says to consumers: "don't worry, we've got this, you just carry on consuming".

While Mike Hosking claims that "I am not giving up a sirloin with peppercorn sauce for climate change" (The New Zealand Herald, 6 June, [https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c\\_id=1&objectid=12065256](https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=12065256)) it is not clear that he is part of a majority.

In Environmental Research Letters, July 2017, a study is reported into the methods by which individual people could reduce carbon emissions. The four key actions are: having one fewer child, living car-free, avoiding airplane travel, and eating a plant-based diet. <http://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1748-9326/aa7541/pdf>  
Seth Wynes and Kimberly A Nicholas 2017 Environ. Res. Lett. 12 074024

It is an inconvenience for New Zealand that widespread uptake of two of these four key actions could be hugely damaging to our economy. If the Productivity Commission was to promote consuming less dairy and meat, even though this would also be consistent with better health outcomes; and to promote taking fewer airplane trips, one can imagine that the commissioners would soon expect to find themselves out of a job because of the impact on agriculture and tourism. But I think it is incumbent on our commissioners to be courageous, and at least broach the subject of the possible need for consumer action beyond the traditional changing of the lightbulbs.

The draft report says on page 384: *'Increasing the density of urban areas, combined with good public transport and accessibility, can reduce vehicular travel and emissions. But intensification of this nature has proven difficult to accomplish and runs counter to the living preferences of many New Zealanders.'* By using this as a logical reason to not promote new planning rules, suggests to me that the Commission expects life in future to be consistent with the current living preferences of many New Zealanders.

The transition to a low carbon economy is not about living lifestyle as usual. It will hopefully be about an orderly adjustment to a new reality, in which we will all need to consume in a different way. It is a transition we must start sooner rather than later, because if we leave it until later it will be anything but orderly.

I implore you to be brave and call us all out on the need to take personal action, and adjust the final report to provide some very clear recommendations as to things we could do. My submissions contained at least one relevant example.

Kind regards

Paul Minett  
Trip Convergence Ltd  
+64 21 289 8444