

I respectfully submit the following points to the inquiry:

1. The goal of a $<2^{\circ}\text{C}$ maximum increase is in itself immensely ambitious. How that can be achieved needs to be mapped with precision while clearly stating what such an increase would entail in terms of weather events. The easy-going approach that is suggested by the lack of detail in the Direct Action Plan discloses a disconnect in the minds of its proponents and the gravity of that which is being considered.
2. In the absence of this precise detail there is no probability that the stated $<2^{\circ}\text{C}$ ceiling will be achieved.
3. Tremendous difficulties are present in the measuring of the proposed projects to reduce emissions against the pre-existing emissions levels of the project proponents. Of equal concern is the assessment process wherein the routine refurbishment of equipment by commercial energy users attracts government dollars. In effect, a government subsidy for what may be normal business practice.
4. The 'auction' process entailing a race-to-the-bottom is severely lacking in effectiveness. It represents a disincentive to invest in the sector as too much uncertainty exists between the process of identifying a project, bringing it to fruition (or at least the necessary preconditions in place to have it proceed), and successfully winning the 'auction'.
5. In the absence of government dollars, the race-to-the-bottom model relies on the idea that innovation and cost minimal changes go hand-in-hand. In practice this is seldom the case. Initial high-value investments in innovation are usually only repaid over the long-term. There are countless examples but certainly the solar panel industry is a case in point. In light of the aforementioned uncertainty attached to the auction model investment dollars are crucial. The cheapest option is unlikely in practice to be the most effective.
6. The distinction that Australia's emissions are too insignificant is an arbitrary one. When measured on a per capita basis it is certainly not the case.
7. The abolition of the Climate Change Authority is in direct contradiction to the identification of a $<2^{\circ}\text{C}$ ceiling as worthy. Such an ambitious goal must (and ultimately will be) guided by an Australian governmental organisation.
8. The sheer number and speed with which renewables have been taken up indicate the public ownership of goals to fix the problem. What is lacking is an acceptance on the part of governments, both Labor and Liberal, to lead.

There is much that is bizarre about this present state of affairs. The coalition government acknowledges the problem; quibbles over the causes; disowns responsibility on the basis that we are too small to matter, yet sets a goal of a global limit of $<2^{\circ}\text{C}$ that can't possibly be attained.

Patrick James Hockey