

Dear Secretary of Senate Select Committee,

I am asking you to consider the following points when making your decisions about the Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS) :

1. Whatever scheme that is put in place must ensure that we achieve real cuts in GHG emissions of 50 to 70 % by 2020 and 80 to 90% by 2030 based on 1990 levels. Without deep cuts we cannot hope to avoid dangerous climate change, and it could be argued that we are already too far down this path already.

2. If the scheme is based on permits, none of these should be 'grandfathered', all should be auctioned initially without any kind of price ceiling, and all should have a definite lifespan. Permits should be issued with varying lifespans from 12 to 48 months, allowing industries with high adaptive capacity to purchase shorter term permits and those with less adaptive capacity to purchase the longer term permits, which should also be much fewer in number than the shorter term permits. Annual auctions would allow the progressive adjustment of emissions reduction through fewer permits.

3. Any revenue that may be raised through the scheme should be targetted at facilitating adaptation and mitigation of climate change impacts, both here and abroad. It is clear that the devastating impacts will fall disproportionately on the those populations with the least resources available to fund adaptation.

4. Offsets need to be closely monitored, with industry forced to make up for any claims which are made and then found to be false or innacurate .This will help to ensure that all offset schemes actually deliver. There needs to be some kind of ongoing proof and insurance. For example if trees are used for instance and later destroyed through a wildfire, the resulting reduction or change in carbon sequestration capacity needs to be accounted for in offset claim adjustments ( remembering that the likelihood of extreme wildfires will increase as time progresses because of the latency already forcing climate change) .

5. Penalties must be imposed on noncompliance or disceptive behaviour. Industries will adapt if clear parameters are imposed and there is sufficient will and resources to prosecute.

We owe it to ourselves to restructure, adapt and mitigate to the highest possible extent as quicly as possible. Every effort made in mitigation will need to be matched by a similar effort in planned adaptation. We cannot escape the effects that have already been put in train due to past failure, we must take every opportunity to ensure the survival of both human and environmental systems based on evidence already available with a view to the worst case scenarios as these become evident.

Yours sincerely,  
Kathleen Wood