

Six big decisions – data from haveyoursay.climatechange.govt.nz

1. These six questions aligned with some of the key judgements Commissioners made in preparing our draft advice:
 - Q1 The pace of change: Do you agree that the emissions budgets we have proposed would put Aotearoa on course to meet the 2050 emissions target?
 - Q2 Future generations: - Do you agree we have struck a fair balance between requiring the current generation to take action, and leaving future generations to do more work to meet the 2050 target and beyond?
 - Q3 Our contribution – Do you agree with the changes we have suggested to make the NDC compatible with the 1.5°C goal?
 - Q4 Role and type of forests – Do you agree with our approach to meet the 2050 target that prioritises growing new native forests to provide a long-term store of carbon?
 - Q5 Policy priorities to reduce emissions – What are the most urgent policy interventions needed to help meet our emissions budgets?
 - Q6 Technology and behaviour change – Do you think our proposed emissions budgets and path to 2035 are both ambitious and achievable considering the potential for future behaviour and technology changes in the next 15 years?

Submissions and supporting data

2. Of the 15,000+ submissions we received approx 4,200 submissions were made in the consultation portal haveyoursay.climatechange.govt.nz
3. In designing the portal, we aimed to provide options for submitters to engage in the process at three different levels. Submitters could simply tell us the “one big thing” they wanted the Commission to hear, they could respond to the six big questions as covered in this paper, and they could provide us more detailed feedback against each of our draft recommendations.
4. Here is a breakdown of the three levels and the average percentage of users who responded:

<i>Total portal users = approx 4,200</i>	
The one big thing	58%
Six big questions	45%
Feedback on specific draft recommendations	18%

5. In the consultation portal, very few submitters completed all three of these of the levels available to them, which demonstrates the value in providing multiple ways for New Zealanders to engage with our draft advice, however the data should be treated with caution as it was not gathered as part of a statistical survey.

6. Given the resource and time constraints on the Commission and the subsequent “mission critical” approach taken to delivering our first advice package, we prioritised producing an updated evidence report over a detailed summary of submissions.
7. The Commission is committed to fair process and providing Aotearoa access to our decision-making processes, so we will publicly release all the submissions we received, regardless of their format. We will also release supporting data (e.g. submitter profile information).
8. This data helps to quantify the feedback the Commission received from submitters. However, it represents a small subset of the total submissions received (approx 2,000) so is an incomplete data set which may misrepresent what submitters told us or imply more weight should be given to the results than was intended. The questions were never intended as a “vote” but a way of gathering insight to help direct our final analysis process. The subset is also not a random sample so will be more biased towards those with strong views.

Responses to the six big decisions

Ambition and pace of change

In our online consultation portal, we asked submitters two questions that related directly to the ambition and pace of change of the draft emissions budgets.

The table below shows the results. Of those who answered this question most indicated that they thought our proposed budgets did not put Aotearoa on track to achieve the 2050 emissions targets. This was also the case when answering the question on the ambition and achievability of the budgets. These numbers are not statistical surveys of public opinion so should be interpreted with caution.

Q1: The pace of change: Do you agree that the emissions budgets we have proposed would put Aotearoa on course to meet the 2050 emissions target?	
Option	Response
Strongly agree	2%
Agree	9%
Neutral	5%
Disagree	17%
Strongly disagree	10%
Do not know	3%
Not Answered	54%
Q6: Technology and behaviour change – Do you think our proposed emissions budgets and path to 2035 are both ambitious and achievable considering the potential for future behaviour and technology changes in the next 15 years?	
Option	Response
Strongly Agree	3%
Agree	9%
Neutral	5%
Disagree	18%
Strongly Disagree	8%
I don't know	2%
Not Answered	55%

Equity and fairness

Question two focussed on equity and fairness, and how we strike the right balance between the burden on current and future generations.

The table below shows the results from our online portal. Of those submitters who did answered this question, the majority indicated that they thought our proposed budgets did not strike a fair intergenerational balance. These numbers are not statistical surveys of public opinion so should be interpreted with caution.

Q2: Future generations: Do you agree we have struck a fair balance between requiring the current generation to take action, and leaving future generations to do more work to meet the 2050 target and beyond?	
Option	Response
Strongly agree	3%
Agree	7%
Neutral	4%
Disagree	18%
Strongly disagree	13%
I don't know	1%
Not Answered	54%

NDC and compatibility with global efforts to limit warming to 1.5C

We asked submitters a question about the compatibility of the NDC with global efforts to limit warming to 1.5C.

Many of those who answered this question thought our changes were not ambitious enough, and a smaller number agreed with our changes. These numbers are not statistical surveys of public opinion so should be interpreted with caution.

Q3: Our contribution: Do you agree with the changes we have suggested to make the NDC compatible with the 1.5°C goal?	
Option	Response
Strongly agree	5%
Agree	7%
Neutral	3%
Disagree – our changes are too ambitious	5%
Disagree – our changes are not ambitious enough	23%
Do not know	2%
Not Answered	55%

The role of forestry and carbon dioxide removals

We asked submitters whether they agreed with our proposal to establish new native forests to provide a long-term carbon sink. Of those who answered this question a substantial proportion agreed with the proposal and a smaller number disagreed. These numbers are not statistical surveys of public opinion so should be interpreted with caution.

Q4: Role and type of forests – Do you agree with our approach to meet the 2050 target that prioritises growing new native forests to provide a long-term store of carbon?

Option	Response
Strongly agree	16%
Agree	20%
Neutral	3%
Disagree	3%
Strongly disagree	2%
I don't know	1%
Not Answered	55%

The role of government

In our draft report, we proposed a policy approach based on three types of government interventions: action to address barriers, pricing to influence investments and choices, and investment to spur innovation and systems transformation. In our online consultation portal, we asked submitters to indicate which of these government interventions they thought were important.

Many submitters indicated that all three types of policy intervention were important. These numbers are not statistical surveys of public opinion so should be interpreted with caution.

Q5: Policy priorities to reduce emissions – What are the most urgent policy interventions needed to help meet our emissions budgets (select all that apply)

Option	Response
Action to address barriers	32%
Pricing to influence investments and choices	33%
Investment to spur innovation and system transformation	34%
None of them	3%
Not Answered	55%