

## VANGRI Submission

Vigilantes against no good reason for inaction (VANGRI) undertake independent policy advocacy and special interest projects designed to address the causes of climate change and assist adaptation to climate change.

We are a growing collection of young professionals concerned at the inadequacy of the local and international response to climate change risk. Our generation will inherit problems created by decades of environmental neglect fostered by dysfunctional political cultures and socio-economic policy around the world.

Climate change poses unprecedented threats to our livelihood and the lives of billions of people around the world. It will also challenge Australia's traditional reliance on raw materials as a source of income as the world moves away from emission intensive electricity generation and materials.

Our submission reflects the need for unprecedented action to address an unprecedented threat and reflects the undercurrent of distrust and apathy our generation feels towards its government. Before responding to specific questions, we would like to comment on the framing of the issues paper. It states:

*"The Victorian Government has been at the forefront of Australia's efforts to have a strong and effective global position on climate change. Now that Australia is adopting the policies that Victoria has long advocated, we can enter a new phase of climate change action in Victoria."*

We believe that self congratulation is premature and that jockeying for recognition on climate leadership is both vain and misleading. Successive Victorian governments have overseen the continued use of the worlds most emission intensive and inefficient brown coal power stations, the latest incarnation involving integrated drying gasification combined cycle technology. The great hope appears to be that Australia will export this technology to the world, however by the time it is commercially feasible, it is unlikely to be viable. The advice of Australia's own co-operative research centre for clean coal is that solar thermal will be cost competitive with conventional black coal by 2015. Victorian and Federal Governments past and present appear unwilling to take the advice of independent experts preferring to listen to the chorus of vested interests that have created and profited from what must surely be considered the greatest threat to human civilisation since its embryonic development over 10,000 years ago.

Meanwhile, Victorian government attempts to harness the benefits of energy efficiency in industry and the home have been piecemeal and feeble. Building standards and planning strategies have been ill conceived and poorly implemented. We remain heavily dependant on fossil fuel based transport.

*"The ratification of the Kyoto Protocol and the introduction of a national emissions trading scheme by 2010 means we can now turn our focus to preparing for the consequences of changes to our climate and our response to these changes."*

This statement affirms the glib approach to climate change policy in this country, as though ratifying Kyoto and introducing emissions trading means all that is left to do is worry about is adapting to climate change.

Australia's emission reduction targets do not reflect global equity concerns and the responsibility we have to the world for historical level of emissions. Our industry

development policies and programs do not reflect the urgent need to develop competitive, clean technologies for deployment both at home and abroad. Furthermore, emissions trading is championed as the key mechanism for driving emission reductions, yet its fundamental apparent strength is that it does this at least cost. Championing cheap solutions for mitigating and managing a problem such as climate change wrecks of irresponsible leadership. This is not the time to be looking for cheap fixes.

Emissions trading also relies upon carbon offsets. Offsets are the key to driving cheap abatement. If the example of the EU ETS is anything to go by, it's a case of be careful what you wish for. They have been cheap, and they have been nasty, and they have been ineffective<sup>1</sup>.

Australia stands out like a sore thumb on the international map of climate change villains and can expect to bear the brunt of developing world anger as water and food shortages exacerbated by climate change take effect. Yet the Victorian Government's attitude appears to be 'we've done our bit for mitigation'.

*"There will be impacts that will hit certain industries, regions and communities harder than others. We must prepare now for the impacts, share the risks and position ourselves for the enormous opportunities."*

We concur with this sentiment and emphasise the need for swift effective action.

*"As expressed by Professor Garnaut in the Interim Report from his Climate Change Review, our challenge is to "end the linkage between economic growth and emissions of greenhouse gases".*

We believe this should be thought of as an objective, rather than a challenge. The challenge is much more complex and no Australian government leaves VANGRI confident it has either the understanding of the challenge or the will power to take it on.

The challenge is local and global, but we cannot control global efforts, we can only contribute to them and shape them through our vision and actions.

Our immediate challenge is to turn the Australian Industry Ship around, despite all its momentum and vested interests forging down a path completely contrary to the required objective.

We need to radically re think how we develop policy. We believe this requires the following fundamental tasks:

- Recognition that GDP is an inadequate measure of the health of the economy
- Recognition that GDP growth is an inadequate objective for the economy

We also need to radically re think how we use our taxation system to create incentives and disincentives within the economy.

Once we have our own backyard in order, we can begin to lead the transformation required by other economies around the world. Until we can demonstrate competence on these issues, our role on the international stage will be that of bench warmer.

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://pesd.stanford.edu/publications/a\\_realistic\\_policy\\_on\\_international\\_carbon\\_offsets/](http://pesd.stanford.edu/publications/a_realistic_policy_on_international_carbon_offsets/)

*“We understand the challenges, and as with the significant productivity reforms of the last decade, Victoria will be at the forefront of the economic and environmental reform”*

We find such ambit claims on productivity reforms troubling. If the reference is to privatisation of the electricity market, we find the claim misleading. Once money is printed, like energy, it is neither created or destroyed. It merely changes hands, changes form, gets put to good use or gets wasted. Privatisation doesn't save money or create productivity, it changes the money trail path. Our electricity may cost relatively less to deliver today than before privatisation, but those costs now get lost to overseas investors, investment banks and fund managers, instead of ending up in the hands of government and its employees.

There is no coincidence that the privatisation/de-regulation drive around the world correlates with an explosion of luxury goods and services, a widening gap between the rich and the poor and an explosion of irresponsible debt instruments used to gear up private investments in assets – the very assets governments have been so keen to get off the balance sheet.

Citizens will pay twice as this mess unravels.

The simplistic productivity line also ignores that privatisation of electricity markets may have reduced the cost of energy supply, but it has delivered a disaggregated energy market where the benefits of energy efficiency, demand management and distributed generation cannot be captured by any one player in either the energy industry or the property industry, the result being two decades of lethargy on these critical emission reduction strategies and an impending 20% increase in real energy costs due to an explosion of network costs as a previous fat network has been run to the bone. It has also eroded the base of critical skills in power systems analysis and engineering and exacerbated the political difficulty of restructuring our energy industry away off its dependence on brown coal.

We now find ourselves in the bizarre situation of designing efficiency trading schemes, complicated and costly in their design, that will be paid for by energy consumers, delivered through 3<sup>rd</sup> parties on behalf of retailers, who will take a slice of profit on the way. We find ourselves unable to leverage distributed generation because monopoly network providers are not disciplined or incentivised effectively by regulation. We find ourselves unable to rapidly implement cost effective direct load control measures to address peak demand because distribution company incentives are not aligned to do so. And we find ourselves pressured to compromise on an emissions trading scheme because the very generation assets we sold to private industry will be made worthless by any meaningful carbon price.

The attitude of this government and is typified by its aggrandising on ‘progress to date’. It highlights spending in excess of \$400M on a range of activities designed to clean energy supplies and adapt to climate change, the vast majority of which has been concentrated on developing and proving ‘clean coal’ despite forecasts it will not be cost competitive with a host of renewables by the time it is ready to roll out.

Meanwhile the latest State budget indicates over \$650 million on new and upgrade roads in outer suburbs and \$360 to improve the Monash-CityLink-Westgate freeway, collectively over \$1billion dollars spent on roads.

It then congratulates itself on \$4.9billion in water infrastructure projects – including a desalination plant that entrenches demand for emission intensive baseload electricity

and water pipeline projects necessary because of extrem drought conditions brought on by the problem our governments have ignored for decades – climate change. The insult is made worse to think the government plans to invest in wind power to make the plant ‘carbon neutral’ instead of energy efficiency – choosing a pay-pay strategy ahead of a win-win strategy for consumers.

The remainder of our submission responds specifically to questions asked in the issues paper in relation to 10 proposed strategic directions.

**“The 10 proposed strategic directions are:**

**1. Positioning Victorian industry to capitalise on the new jobs, new technologies and new markets that will flow from the transition to the low carbon economy.**

- *What are the international, national and local opportunities that may emerge from the transition to a low carbon economy?*

The most important point to be made here is that cost borne by being a first mover are essential if Victoria and Australia are to benefit from the transition to a low carbon economy. The opportunities are easy to see because they are happening around the world and Australia is missing out.

The classic example of this fundamental point that has not been realised in Australia is that of General Motors and Toyota. General Motors killed the electric car, Toyota found a way to make electric hybrids sexy, affordable and the must have for every A list celebrity. Today, Toyota could lose half of its annual profits at the casino and still buy GM with its spare change. The full story is obviously more complicated, but the attitude to innovation underpins the comparison.

Also, a long while ago, Germany bit the bullet and set aggressive targets for renewable energy generation. Their tool of choice was a comprehensive feed in tariff scheme which guarantees payback rates across a suite of renewable technology types and sizes. Australia went for a weak, cheap, mandatory renewable energy target which lets the big energy retailers buy greenpower as cheap as they can from the market. In Germany renewable energy jobs went from around 160,000 to 240,000 last year with around 40,000 in the solar industry alone. Their feed in tariffs are estimated to have delivered net economic benefit in excess of 6 billion Euros.

Meanwhile Victorian and Federal Governments are dawdling on an MRET expansion and have failed to realise the benefits of a comprehensive feed in tariff that, if designed well, supersedes mandatory targets. FiT create investment certainty and leave room for beating targets, not just meeting a minimum target.

Supply side opportunities:

A CRC research study into clean coal found that solar thermal generation is likely to be cost competitive with traditional coal fired generation by 2015. CSIRO have also found that by 2050, distributed generation could supply as much as 1/5<sup>th</sup> of the national energy demand (80% being solar) with brown coal (with carbon capture and storage) phased out by 2025.

In the interest of positioning Victorian industry to capitalise on these emerging technologies, the Victorian Government must ensure that clear incentives are in place for their development and deployment. Critically, the Victorian government

must work to build the manufacturing capabilities needed to take new technologies designed in Australia, to be manufactured in Australia.

Technologies such as solar thermal and small scale solar generation will benefit from rapid market growth internationally. The Victorian Government must consult with developers of key solar technology, such as David Mills, Origin Energy (siliver cells), DYE solar etc ... to determine what barriers exist to their development and deployment in Australia. We should also look to the German model for lessons.

Distributed energy also poses a significant opportunity in local and international markets. Distributed energy will challenge traditional centralised supply options around the world. Supplying energy with intermittent, but predictable generation technologies creates complexity and challenges for network management.

The EU has launched a program to develop and deploy technologies required for grid stability with high levels of distributed energy penetration (<http://www.eudeep.com/>) . Such efforts will shape and change the way energy is supplied and managed around the world, particularly in rapidly developing economies such as China and India who will not be as burdened by legacy centralised supply infrastructure.

The Victorian Government must consult across these industries to identify barriers to high levels of distributed energy penetration and the likely technology development opportunities it will create.

Demand side opportunities:

Energy efficiency in commercial buildings is likely to be the big demand side opportunity. The latest IPCC reports highlight commercial buildings are both the biggest users of stationary energy and have the best opportunities for efficiency gains.

The UK and French Governments are leading the way for residential homes with the UK legislating all new homes by 2016 to have emission free cooling and heating while the French will require all new homes from 2020 to be net energy producers. Such legislation will drive technology and system development with cross over benefits for the commercial property sector.

Demand side opportunities will also emerge around managing peak loads and integrating storage technologies to support intermittent energy supply. For instance CSIRO are doing work around appliance synchronisation to manage peak loads

- *How can Victorian companies capitalise on Victoria's advantages in areas such as innovation, skills and infrastructure in the global shift to a low carbon economy?*

A good start would be recognising we have no such advantage, we are behind the game, and to start consulting with companies directly on what needs to be done.

- *What are the barriers and what support will be required from government to access the opportunities arising from the global carbon market?*

The main barrier at this stage appears to be Victorian governments backing winners in the coal industry and ignoring everyone else. So an honest evaluation of government to date would be the best start.

- *What are the current and emerging skill requirements and how might they be best addressed?"*

Skill requirements will be across industries/technologies mentioned above. High demand for electrical engineering, systems engineering in particular. To address this you need to ramp up education and training in these areas and build better linkages between industry and education. Furthermore, skills in the area of social change management and environmental sustainability will be critical in ensuring that business, government and community are engaged and equipped with the knowledge required to address the issue of climate change.

## **"2. Supporting an ETS with complementary measures that smooth the transition for the Victorian economy (including the built environment and transport infrastructure).**

- *What opportunities exist for low-cost emissions reductions that may not be driven by a carbon price alone? How can the Victorian Government ensure that these are fully exploited?*

Firstly, we don't believe the pursuit of low cost emission reductions should be a priority. We must move away from the focus on cost and start to recognise significant benefits that may come from higher cost emission reductions.

There are many non financial barriers to implementing low cost emission reductions. Barriers include split incentives (landlord tenant), information asymmetry – particularly incomplete product information (10 star ratings will help). The Victorian government must ensure that property owners have sufficient incentive to invest in efficiency upgrades to existing building stock.

Operating cost for many appliances are relatively small compared to upfront purchasing costs. Consumers tend to discount future scenarios heavily. You need to address up front costs to incentivise the right purchase choice, you can't rely on increasing operating costs. This can be done by valuing appliances based on the network capacity they will use at peak times. For instance a 2kW air-conditioner may cost \$6,000 in network and generation infrastructure to supply, but \$500 in a store. A more efficient 1kW system that does the same job may cost \$2,000 in the store, but only \$3,000 for supply and network infrastructure. By better reflecting the true cost of appliances up front, consumers will be better able to make decisions about efficient/inefficient appliances.

- *The Victorian Government is committed to fostering science, technology and innovation in Victoria. Are there areas of the innovation system that need further support from the Victorian government? How should this be delivered?*

Innovation will continue to get lost overseas if there is not a good framework for developing local technologies. This has been the major issue stopping Australia benefiting from local innovation. Essentially, the innovation system requires the financial support equivalent to the risks associated with the problem – climate change.

- *Are there innovative techniques for government and business to share risk in technology development that will accelerate the uptake of breakthrough technologies?*

We believe the government should look at a massive ramping up of institutions such as CSIRO and co-operative research centres.

You also need to address market design issues. For instance, feed in tariffs, if used properly, can drive the entire renewable energy industry from innovation to implementation. Australia has failed to realise this.

- *Are additional measures to reduce emissions justified in case an ETS fails to deliver its promised abatement?*

Yes, emission trading schemes have not proved themselves to be efficient or effective at reducing emissions. In particular the EU ETS has also encountered significant issues with offsets. Offsets are typically regarded as essential to emissions trading because they allow emissions reductions in parts of the economy that can do so at least cost. However an offset is typically measured relative to an increase in emissions that would have otherwise occurred without the being able to sell the offset. Projects in China and India have been able to cash in on the offset market, gaining credits for projects that would have occurred with or without the ability to trade the offset  
([http://pesd.stanford.edu/publications/a\\_realistic\\_policy\\_on\\_international\\_carbon\\_offsets/](http://pesd.stanford.edu/publications/a_realistic_policy_on_international_carbon_offsets/))

In short, we probably shouldn't use an ETS, let alone rely on it. We need complementary measures.

- *What changes to how we live across our cities and towns are we willing to accept? Urban form, building design, streetscapes, street layout, mix of densities, the way we deliver energy and water services, and where we can develop may all need to change. What are the essential elements of what we want to maintain as we adapt our settlements to a low carbon profile?*

Government needs to take a leadership position. Instead of asking us what we would accept, the Government should be educating us on the changes that NEED to happen and selling use the benefits of the change.

We are only willing to accept changes that are sufficient to address the problem. Incremental change in response to a dysfunctional democracy is insufficient.

The essential elements of any functional city or town should be retained including: access to low cost, low emissions transport; integrated land use and transport planning; integrated land use and community activity centres etc

- *How can we promote the growth and development of public transport, encourage a shift to low emission transport forms and provide a flexible transport base for our community?"*

**BUILD IT AND MAKE IT RUN ON TIME. PEOPLE WILL PAY FOR A GOOD SERVICE. THEY DON'T USE THE CURRENT SERVICE BECAUSE IT IS DYSFUNCTIONAL.**

#### **“4. Ensuring the continued security, efficiency and affordability of Victoria’s energy supplies by encouraging low-emission and renewable energy options.**

- *In the context of the ETS, how can the Victorian Government provide certainty to investors in both the energy sector and wider economy?*

Establish a shadow price for carbon (refer to OFGEM) for decision making on policies, programs, infrastructure investment. This shadow price should be based on the social and environmental benefits of reducing emissions, not the marginal cost of abatement that an ETS will establish.

By pricing emissions based on the marginal cost of abatement, major infrastructure decisions will be made with a low price of abatement today. But as we move up the abatement cost curve, these investments may quickly become redundant.

- *What are the key barriers that exist, which hinder the deployment of low emissions technology? Are there barriers unique to Victoria?”*

You need to make it cost effective and you need to ensure that one party can capture all the benefits of implementing a technology. Split incentive issues have held back significant deployment of efficiency in the commercial and residential property sector. For renewable energy this means a feed in tariff for all technologies (NOT JUST SOLAR) as per the German model. For energy efficiency, this may require a comparable system where a landlord receives an annuity for making a certain type of investment.

You also need to address incumbent monopoly power, particularly for distributed generation where network business have the power to block competitive energy supply options offered by distributed generation.

An implicit barrier is tax incentive which encourages speculative investment and/or unproductive investments. This is most clearly demonstrated in the property sector where debt has been increasingly used to finance speculation on property rather than capital upgrades. For a good discussion of these issues go to <http://www.debtdeflation.com/blogs/>. The fringe benefit tax on vehicles is another good example where tax incentives motive unproductive and wasteful behaviour.

These sorts of issues are an implicit barrier to clean energy and efficiency in that they divert finance away from where it could be better spent.

#### **“5. Assisting households to adjust to the rising costs of electricity, fuel and other commodities.**

- *What is stopping people from realising opportunities to reduce their energy use and save money?*

Gas and electricity have traditionally been regarded as low user, low involvement products. Generally, consumers have a poor understanding of operating costs of appliances and structure of energy industry. Whilst energy rating label schemes have driven improved efficiency in appliances since their inception, relatively low energy supply costs mean consumer purchasing decisions are more influenced by upfront retail cost, aesthetics or sales pitch. Price impacts from ETS may drive consumers to consider more efficient purchasing and behavioural change

measures to reduce consumption, however the Victorian state government can play a key role in assisting all households to manage this transition. Given the low user, low involvement nature of gas and electricity use, the Victorian state government has a responsibility to educate consumers (beyond the black balloons campaign) on opportunities to reduce their energy use through a diverse range of communication channels – education in schools, community group initiatives, mainstream media etc.

In addition to this, for low-income households market barriers such as capital cost or housing tenure (e.g. rental or state owned properties) prevent households from implementing energy efficiency measures. Furthermore, schemes and rebates subsidising energy efficient products exclude low-income households who do not own their own home.

A combination of improved and more extensive use of appliance labelling and minimum standards for housing efficiency of new and existing building stock would assist households in reducing their energy use. Mandatory disclosure in the ACT requires all real estate is advertised with an energy rating label. A more stringent version of this scheme led by the Victorian state government would assist in increasing awareness of energy efficiency opportunities. At a minimum the Victorian State Government should liaise with the ACT Government about the measured results of mandatory disclosure and its impacts and benefits.

- *How can we develop the capacity of individuals and households to reduce their energy bills through energy efficiency measures and behaviour change?*
  1. Provide incentives in the form of rebates and subsidies at point of sale.
  2. Educate to inspire to change
  3. Take it out of their hands through a mandatory roll-out of energy efficiency – this may seem extreme but would arguably create economies of scale and drive down costs of appliance upgrades/building retrofits etc. Command and control can be more efficient than the market, although Government appears to have no faith in its capability to deliver so favours market approaches.
- *What mechanisms should the Victorian Government adopt and advocate at a national level to ensure that socially-disadvantaged communities and households are supported through the transition to the ETS?*

Whilst preliminary modelling has been undertaken by the Brotherhood of St Laurence on the economic impacts of an ETS scheme on low-income households, no comprehensive assessment or measurement of low-income housing and energy consumption has been undertaken to date.

The Victorian government must recommend that this be undertaken, to ensure that socially disadvantaged communities and households are assisted in the most cost effective and equitable way.

The Victorian state Government should advocate that this comprehensive assessment be undertaken at a national level prior to the introduction of the ETS.

## **“6. Increasing our knowledge about climate change impacts and adaptive needs and possibilities.**

- *Where are the largest gaps in our climate change knowledge in Victoria?*

We believe the biggest gap in our climate change knowledge is understanding what level of emissions constitute a safe environment

This is poorly understood at both a community and government level, and is reflected in existing policy responses and emission reduction targets, and the community response to those targets proposed.

The latest science suggests current emissions levels have already taken us into dangerous climate change and that we will need to significantly reduce the level of greenhouse pollution to manage climate risks. We believe a safe climate would see emission levels at around 325ppmCO<sub>2</sub> and/or 375ppmCO<sub>2e</sub>.

- *What are the sources of information on the impacts of climate change that you are aware of and use?*

VANGRI use the following sources for information on the impacts of climate change:

- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
- BOM
- CSIRO
- NASA GISS
- UK Met office
- Reputable scientific journals
- Independent task specific research undertaken by reputable business consultants

Sometimes for a laugh we read stuff put out by the IPA or the Productivity commission

- *What changes, limits or risks are we, as a community, prepared to accept to minimise future risks?*

This question is indicative of the current backward approach to climate change mitigation. Instead of thinking of what we have to sacrifice, we have to think in terms of what we have to gain. New industries, technologies, and ways of organising our community should excite with hope for a new and better future.

The Government has the key leadership role in shaping and selling this vision for the future. The community should not be asked to make sacrifices for climate change. There are countless opportunities for social, economic and environmental gain while mitigating risks of climate change.

Decentralised energy, food and water production can create supply efficiencies, bond communities, reduce risks of climate change and build resilience to the effects of climate change. Energy and water efficiency in our appliance can reduce the costs of supplying necessary goods and services. Better building design, infrastructure planning and public transport can all provide significant benefits for the community while mitigating risks of climate change.

We just need the political will and vision to realise this.

- *What is needed in your community for people to change their everyday practices to reduce climate change impacts?"*

Re think and re shape attitudes, values, priorities – less booze hounds and car hoons, more eco warriors and innovators

## **“7. Increasing the climate change resilience of the State’s regions and communities.**

- *Where are the state’s most vulnerable regions, communities and individuals to climate change?*

We are kind of disturbed a question like this appears on a community consultation. This type of question is best answered by Australia’s leading scientists and research agencies. We recommend CSIRO as an initial point of contact for a scientific analysis of the state’s most vulnerable regions, communities and individuals.

- *What groups and communities may need particular assistance in developing new skills?*

We believe agriculture may be particularly vulnerable. Small scale agriculture can be relocated to urban areas (make use of desalination water glut) – get farmers to train urbanites on food production, get suburbanites active and reduce obesity by getting them outside and doing some physical work in the garden. These groups may need government to end TV broadcasts during the day time to facilitate such activity.

Sectors of business community who are currently employed in carbon intensive industries, e.g. coal and resources sectors, will need assistance in developing new skills. There will be no shortage of low or zero carbon industries requiring these new skills in the global economy. It is our choice as to whether those jobs are in Australia also – get cracking!

- *Beyond uncertainty of impacts, what are the factors in Victoria’s vulnerable communities currently standing in the way of adaptation to climate change?*

Public awareness of the impacts, particularly understanding of the impacts of dangerous climate change. Also mobility of assets and sunk capital. Its not always easy to change what you do or do what you do in a different location.

- *How can the Victorian Government effectively respond to the increase in the frequency of extreme events (such as drought and bushfire) that climate change will bring?*

Plan for resilience in infrastructure (decentralised water and energy, closed loop systems and systems for resource recovery)

- *How can the Victorian Government better assist our regions to make the link between better understanding of economic impacts and actions to address key impacts?*

Provide concise, well researched information to our regions on the impacts (economic, social and environmental) of not taking action as opposed to the benefits of taking action.

Education of communities has to be active. You can't stick information on the web or TV, expect people to find it and act on it. The information needs to be digested so it gets translated into values, attitudes, priorities and ultimately action.

#### **“8. Assisting our natural assets and ecosystems to deal with the pressures and challenges that climate change will bring.**

- *What natural assets are most vulnerable to climate change?*

This type of question is best answered by Australia's leading scientists and research agencies. We recommend CSIRO as an initial point of contact for a scientific analysis of the state's most vulnerable natural assets.

- *What are the existing barriers (eg. competing land use pressures) preventing us from building the resilience of these assets and ecosystems?*

Existing barriers preventing Victorians from building the resilience of natural assets and ecosystems primarily stem from perverse, short-sighted state and federal government policy and regulatory mechanisms that throw good money after bad. Some examples include the approval of the desalination plant, dredging the bay, extension of generation capacity of Hazelwood powerstation – the dirtiest in the country, recent decision to go for 'clean brown coal' and failure to implement 2030, massive disproportionate funding allocated to clean coal, weak and poorly designed feed in tariffs – just to name a few.

- *How do we ensure that no perverse environmental outcomes occur through encouraging emission reduction in areas such as forestry, agriculture and geosequestration?*

You could start by not chasing bogus emission reductions schemes through forestry, agriculture and geosequestration.

If that fails, ensure policy is developed through effective bureaucracies. This might involve consulting AND LISTENING TO environmental policy experts, locally, nationally and internationally.

- *How can we use increased awareness in climate change to build upon current initiatives such as BushTender, which encourage land-holders to improve their management and protection of native vegetation?*

Probably by increasing awareness – is this a question?

- *How will the role of Parks, Reserves and other protected areas change?*

You will need to turn over public parks for productive purposes – i.e. food production. Stop watering for aesthetics. Start watering to feed the nation.

- *What opportunities are there to contribute to carbon sinks through enhancement of Melbourne's green wedges and establishment of bio-links throughout Victoria's rural landscape?"*

We think you may have just named two of them

**“9. Supporting Victorian individuals and communities to get active on climate change.**

- *What are the most appropriate ways to provide further assistance for existing climate change action groups?*

Maybe vote them into office so they can get involved in decision making?

- *What are the options to develop new networks to support places or regions to set their own agenda for tackling these future challenges?*

They are doing this because the State and Federal Government is failing them. If you took effective action, they wouldn't need your support.

- *What are the elements of community capability that most need strengthening to cope with climate change?*

Capable Governments

- *How can the community contribute to infrastructure investment and decisions which impact on Victoria's carbon footprint?"*

In theory we are meant to vote for Governments who do this in our interest but this does not appear to be working. Perhaps we need a new model for democracy.

**“10. Ensuring Victoria continues to play a proactive role in global efforts to address climate change.**

- *What role would you like to see Victoria play in demonstrating global leadership?*

Need to stop thinking in terms of least cost and starting thinking in terms of long term benefits. Need to reframe the mindset for public policy and investment decision making.

- *How can the Victorian Government expand its partnerships with other governments to ensure that practical collaboration takes place and that lead to tangible climate change benefits?*

It is strange that the community is being asked this. Surely this is for the Victorian Government to work out? Isn't it already happening? Can we have our tax money back?

- *The Victorian Climate Change Bill will provide us with the opportunity to position Victoria as a leader in the national response to climate change. What should be the key elements of the Bill?*

Set an emission reduction target – zero emissions by 2020

Set an industry development target – no jobs employed in coal fired generation, all jobs transferred to renewable energy industry

Set an export revenue target - \$INSERT BIG NUMBER HERE generated from Victorian developed/designed/manufactured products/systems/technology that reduce emissions by 2020.

Ultimately any bill will count for nothing if it is not followed through on. Get cracking!