

Submission to Tasmania's Draft Climate Change Action Plan

Firstly, thank you for considerable consultation bringing together a robust draft. And for reaching out to take submissions and feedback at this stage now. At a time when the IPCC has outlined all the science, it is good to see that a lot of the draft plan is aligned.

1. Do you agree with the proposed vision and goals for the action plan? Which goals are you most supportive of? Are there any other goals that should be considered?

Regarding the vision - this is all encompassing

The goals -

Having 'net zero emissions or lower' is flawed, as for one we are a net zero state already, so this is not giving any impetus to progress climate action over the length of the Plan. The use of the word 'lower' is not specific enough for this Plan. There needs to be a clear marker of to what degree our state will be net positive. This figure needs to be arrived at carefully, being mindful of pragmatism, the fact that technology gains are exponential, and that the drive from the community and the support from the federal government is accelerating towards a desire for significant change.

I see here four omissions from the goals.

- There should be one there supporting industries to reduce their emissions
- There needs to be one about supporting the construction industry to have standards that are energy efficient, tied to supporting retrofitting of existing homes and businesses.
- Though the circular economy is mentioned further in the draft plan, I feel it needs a goal outlined to ensure it is valued appropriately
- There needs to be one supporting Tasmanians to have access to behavioural choices which support addressing consumption and the energy and resources demands tied to purchasing.

The underlying principles are solid. The one principle I am unclear about is why sustainable development and social equity are lumped together. I would consider these to be two separate concerns. Yes they are linked, but then so are all the other principles. Keeping them as individual principles can ensure they are both given the importance they both deserve. Sustainable development is critical in a way that is mindful of our planet. Social equity is important to ensure that there does not become discrepancies in the availability of choices to energy across our society. Energy poverty is the risk here.

The principle of community engagement should make particular note of collaborating with the indigenous communities of lutriwita who have been expertly managing the fire risk of this island for 60,000 years.

2. Will the three priority areas -

(1) information and knowledge

(2) transition and innovation and

(3) adaptation and resilience, help Tasmania achieve its legislated 2030 emissions reduction target, and its vision for action on climate change? Are there other issues not covered by the three priority areas?

I like the way the complexity of this matter is broken into three distinct areas. My only concern is that the draft talks of the 2030 emissions reduction target, and as mentioned above, this has been achieved, so this line is outdated. Which is a good thing, but the plan needs to reflect Tasmania's progress and a new ambition.

3. Will the key actions under Priority area 1 help support decision making for you and your community or organisation? What types of projects should be supported under the final action plan?

This is great as it considers information in various contexts.

Point 1 - The government having access to projections is important. Connected to this is an assurance that there is regular sharing of the state's emissions. This is part of the Plan's implementation, but I also believe it is information that should be a key action in this first priority area.

The whole of government approach is a wonderful ideal, but I feel the Plan needs to outline exactly how this is going to happen. It would be great if it stated that all current and potential future laws, acts, processes and procedures are put through a greenhouse gas emissions impact assessments. And importantly, there is appropriate changes to the state's legislation that considers such audits, to ensure that changes happen. The Plan needs to clarify exactly how this much needed concept will truly deliver changes to mitigating our emissions and preparing us for the needed adaptations.

Research, particularly on the use of aquaculture to bring changes to agricultural emissions is a good start here.

Other points talk to the importance of literacy around climate risks and action, which is fundamental to supporting our communities to make changes. My question here is why schools are being singled out. Research suggests that across the community, it is younger people who are best versed in the issues. School education is relevant, but how is the plan to develop climate literacy for other groups in society. Engaging Farmers for Climate action has been another avenue, but there needs to be the use of various media to bring the key messages to broader audiences.

There are other ways to improve communities' literacy, such as through advertising campaigns the government could support, to explain to the community why the Plan is important, why it requires the use of funding, and the benefits to come out of it.

Projects could promote informal literacy development by engaging networks that are already embedded in the community. This could include supporting groups with the financial resources to extend their reach into their local communities. I am aware of, and I presume they can easily be accessed to check their capacities, organisations such as Clarence Climate Action, Climate Action for Hobart, Tasmania Climate Collective, Climate Action Launceston, as well as nationally connected bodies such as 350.org and Climate for Change. Projects supporting these groups to work across Tasmanian society to ensure literacy for all of us improves, will bring a groundswell of support for the aspirations of the Plan.

4. Will the key actions under Priority area 2 support Tasmania to achieve its 2030 emissions reduction target and continued emissions reduction across Tasmania? What types of projects should be supported under the final action plan?

There is a lack of key actions under this priority area, surprisingly considering mitigation of GHGs is critical. There is a need to be more depth and clarity as to how the Plan will deliver true reductions in emissions.

- TRANSPORT - Electric cars are clearly becoming both more important in their role in reductions, but also in their price. Supporting community uptake, not just in the government fleet, but with all vehicle sales will be needed. The stamp duty waiver is helpful, but except for a few Tasmanians the prices of these vehicles remain out of reach, and more significant financial support would help us magnify the uptake of eVs.

Until we all have electric vehicles, reducing cars on the road is important. How can the government increase car pooling for people, and progress public transport such as a ferry on the Derwent from Bridgewater to Blackman's Bay. Similarly the use of hubs where people park and ride buses should be built, following models in other densely populated urban regions such as in the UK.

There is also no mention of electric bicycles. The advantages of cycling over driving is relevant from the perspectives of both the health benefits and traffic congestion. Many people in Tasmania's cities are reluctant to cycle due to the hilly nature, and subsidising uptake of electric bikes would facilitate the multiple gains from this mode of transport.

- WASTE - The circular economy is intricate and there are many ways to support this. Repair cafes are run on limited resources, and projects supporting them to market their usefulness, and have the resources to do their work is needed. The CE also means reducing consumption of new goods, and there is no mention how we will start to look at this as a society. FOGO bins are being used more, which is great, though there remains many businesses and apartment complexes where there are no FOGO bins available to access, creating issues with the goal of reducing methane emissions from landfill sites.

Supporting recycling is important, however there remains an issue that the hard recycled plastic infrastructure produced is not taken up as much as expected. There needs development of this market through facilitating state departments, local councils and private business to increase use of these products
There is also lacking any plan to address the disposal of fluorinated gas appliances. The leaking of these gases at the end of life of fridges, air conditioners and the like is an easy option to reduce the GHG footprint of our state.

- ENERGY - With energy, we love the 200% target by 2040
And the hydrogen facility at Bell Bay will be fantastic also.
Changing government facility boilers off fossil fuels is also great news. It would be good to add to this support to some big industry use as well. Norske Skog at Boyer would like to transition off their need for coal and getting them onto our renewable electricity grid should be prioritised.
Support for low income households to move to solar should similarly be an action area. Concession card holders are already given minor levels of support, but this should be extended to home owners on below average wages.
Supporting efficiency upgrades in public housing is good news. This also needs to be greatly expanded to again support lower household income families being supported to improve insulation to their homes. Clearly some Tasmanian's are able to extend their finances to make their homes more energy efficient, more easily than others, and so while not being needed for everyone, this opportunity should be available to a greater proportion of our community.
Tasmania can look at following W.A.'s lead with developing renewable energy localised circuits - <https://www.wa.gov.au/government/announcements/project-symphony-paving-the-way-our-brighter-energy-future>
Research has shown that biofuels are not carbon neutral, and supporting this into the energy mix will be less helpful than other projects as discussed above
- IPPU - Industry does bring ideas to reduce emissions, and the aluminium smelting is a current example. The government needs to ensure that in line with the recently released IPCC report, coal mining and use in developed nations is ceased. This means working with Cornwall Coal to not expand its operations in Fingal Valley. This will be tied to supporting Boyer paper and Railton cement plants gaining adequate access to our renewable energy sources to the extent that coal is no longer part of the Tasmania energy mix
- LULUCF – Forest logging is now required to transition away from, including native forests. Sustainable pine logging is important to employment, and eucalypts is as well, but to truly reduce our footprint, the communities relying on forestry logging need significant support to find new ways of sustaining themselves. Throughout the history of this nation there have been various industries come and go, and now native logging needs to be a thing of the past. Bringing recycling industry and tourist industry opportunities can smooth these changes

Supporting land owners in a project that incentivises reforestation of bare land can have impacts on overall emissions, as well as improve the health of the land.
Does there need to be a project supporting moving from wood heaters to other forms of heating

- AGRICULTURE – Investment in scaling up the seaweed industry is a major project of benefit here

Absences in the Plan:

- FOOD – There is no mention of the value of food in reducing our emissions. Food waste after purchasing is a major cause of emissions in developed countries, and we should be looking at the various ways that this can be reduced
Emissions related to food also includes promoting plant based diets. For example all government functions could be catered with plant based diets only. This has two benefits of reducing the emissions involved in the event itself, as well as promoting the value of us considering this diet.
- BUILDING STANDARDS – There is a large volume of information regarding the importance of housing standards in addressing emissions. This needs to become a part of this Plan. There are multiple advantages, and many sources to support this work. The government has the ability to make a major shift in the state's emissions by enforcing potentially a seven star rating as the bare minimum in new builds, and fostering similar ideas in any retrofits, which again a project could subsidise for certain families.

5. Will the key actions under Priority area 3 build resilience and support adaptation planning across Tasmania? What types of projects should be supported under the final action plan?

This is such an emerging field, the government needs to be accessing expertise on this. Including from scientific institutions and the traditional cultural knowledge of burning practices.

Does the state need to have a disaster fund set up to cover future catastrophes, which we know will occur?

6. Are there other ways the government could make its action on climate change, and progress towards meeting its targets, more transparent and accessible?

Anyone who has been involved in the consultation phases till now, and then sharing ideas with the draft Plan, should be provided with the final plan, and with any annual reports of Tasmania's emissions.

Last year's federal election made it clear that transparency and equity of access to decision makers was a major issue for Australian society. This has led to change in legislation

regarding donations to political parties. It would be wonderful if Tasmania followed with similarly having a cap on political donations, and was having these disclosed in real time. This will allow transparency when considering if there are businesses that may have agendas running counter to climate action gaining preferential engagement to governance.

Tasmania should look at divesting all its finances away from financial institutions that continue to fund fossil fuels. This can include supporting the local Bank of Us and My State Bank, as well as working with an investment portfolio mix which aligns with cleaner industries and businesses. This involves the assets and pension funds of the Tasmanian government and its employees. This can ensure that funds are moving away from polluting industries, to those that are solution focussed on climate action

Des O'Shaughnessy