

13 November 2021

Tasmanian Climate Change Office  
[climatechange@dpac.tas.gov.au](mailto:climatechange@dpac.tas.gov.au)

**Submission: Climate Change (State Action) Amendment Bill 2021**

In preparing this submission we have read the Jacobs Independent Review, the Tasmanian Government Response to the Independent Review of the Act, the draft Bill, and Tasmanian Policy Exchange's "A blueprint for a climate-positive Tasmania". Our response is structured in the sequence the amendments to the Climate Change (State Action) Amendment Bill are listed.

***Part 1 – Objects of the Act***

We support the consolidation of the current objects of the Act, from 10 to 5. We concur with the rationale of making the Act better at guiding effective climate action, and evaluating the effectiveness of the Act.

***Part 2, Division 1, clause 5 – Tasmania's emissions reduction target***

We support the target of net zero emissions being legislated for 31 Dec 2030, to make Tasmania's the most ambitious target of Australia's states and territories, and one of the most ambitious jurisdictions in the world. This is a feasible and tangible time horizon and allows for business investment certainty, to take advantage of low carbon opportunities. Importantly, it also aligns with the scientific consensus on the level of emission reduction needed to limit warming to 1.5C above pre-industrial levels.

***Part 2, Division 1, clause 5A – Climate change action plan***

We support the legislated requirement for the Minister to prepare an action plan at least every five years, with the triple aim of reducing emissions, building resilience (adaptation) and managing risks/taking opportunities.

We note subclause (d) refers to the latest and best available science, and (e) refers to consultation with industry, business, research institutions and a broad range of the Tasmanian community.

The success of working together to solve problems based on science was clearly demonstrated in the Tasmanian Government's response to COVID-19.

To help the Minister deliver the best plan for Tasmania, we suggest an independent advisory committee would help embed this science-led approach to tackling the climate crisis at this level of government, whilst also considering economic, social and other relevant factors. A potential skills base for this committee could comprise up to 10 members with experience in, or knowledge of, the following:

- (a) climate science;
- (b) climate change policy;
- (c) human health;
- (d) financial investment, economic analysis and forecasting;

- (e) energy production and supply, technology development and diffusion;
- (f) ecology and natural resource management;
- (g) regional development, industrial relations and business competitiveness;
- (h) social services;
- (i) agriculture, and
- (j) infrastructure and natural disaster management.

We also suggest at least one member of the committee must have a climate science background, and one member must have a climate policy background. We also suggest a gender diverse membership, with at least one Tasmanian Aboriginal member.

It could also make sense to draw members from the various sector-based working groups (as foreshadowed in page 17 of the Tasmanian Government Response) to be on the committee (in a similar way to Local Government, as Councillors often have various sub-committee roles).

***Part 2, Division 1, clause 5B – Statewide climate change risk assessment***

We support the legislated requirement for the Minister to prepare a risk assessment at least every five years, with the first due by July 2022.

***Part 2, Division 1, clause 5C – Sector-based transition planning***

We support this measure, as a way of customising the emission reduction task for specific sectors. We note that for sectors like Industrial processes and agriculture the options to maximise meaningful emission reductions are both difficult and complex, and are likely to require a distinct set of mechanisms to successfully achieve. Therefore the partnership approach of Government and industry working to identify where policy (or funding) can have the most benefit, while minimising the risk of adverse economic or social outcomes while making this transition.

Making Ministers responsible for the development of these plans for sectors of which they have oversight is a good move. We agree with the five primary sectors nominated, and allowing for additional sub-sectors to also develop plans.

We note that Recommendations 3 (principles to guide climate action) and 4 (relevant policies and strategies informed by climate change) of the Independent Review did not make it into the draft Bill. We understand the Government's rationale being that these measures will be addressed through a whole-of-government policy framework. The list of considerations did not explicitly mention Treasury guidelines but we think they should. Examples include Better Practice Guidelines, Treasurer's Instructions and Procurement Principles. It is critical that the measures identified through the above action plans and risk assessments have the follow-through at a procurement level. Otherwise there is a risk the desired outcomes of the legislation (and associated plans) may be stymied through continued use of benefit-cost analysis or weighted evaluation that doesn't properly account for emission outcomes or climate risk.

We thank the Tasmanian Government for taking the time to seek community and industry input – and for increasing the ambition of the legislation. As parents, we try to explain the ramifications of climate change to our children, while not burdening them with a sense of despair. This Bill offers us hope that there will be a near-term legislated commitment to maintain our net zero status, with a coordinated approach across the relevant industry sectors.

Yours sincerely



**Ben and Pen Clark**