Submission form: Consultation on the Sustainable Biofuels Mandate

The Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE) and the Ministry of Transport (MoT) would like your feedback on a proposal to increase the use of sustainable liquid biofuels in New Zealand to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from transport. Please provide your feedback by **5pm, 26 July 2021.**

When completing this submission form, please provide comments and supporting explanations for your reasoning where relevant. Your feedback provides valuable information and informs decisions about the proposals.

We appreciate your time and effort taken to respond to this consultation.

Instructions

To make a submission you will need to:

- 1. Fill out your name, email address, phone number and organisation. If you are representing an organisation, please provide a brief description of your organisation and its aims, and ensure you have the authority to represent its views.
- Fill out your responses to the discussion document questions. You can answer any or all of these
 questions in the <u>discussion document</u>. Where possible, please provide us with evidence to
 support your views. Examples can include references to independent research or facts and
 figures.
- **3.** If your submission has any confidential information:
 - i. Please state this in the email accompanying your submission, and set out clearly which parts you consider should be withheld and the grounds under the Official Information Act 1982 (Official Information Act) that you believe apply. MBIE and MoT will take such declarations into account and will consult with submitters when responding to requests under the Official Information Act.
 - ii. Indicate this on the front of your submission (e.g. the first page header may state "In Confidence"). Any confidential information should be clearly marked within the text of your submission (preferably as Microsoft Word comments).
 - iii. Note that submissions are subject to the Official Information Act and may, therefore, be released in part or full. The Privacy Act 1993 also applies.

How to submit this form

4. Submit your feedback:

- i. As a Microsoft Word document by email to energymarkets@mbie.govt.nz with the subject line: Consultation: Sustainable Biofuels Mandate
- ii. By mailing your submission to:

Consultation: Sustainable Biofuels Mandate Energy Markets Policy Building, Resources and Markets Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment PO Box 1473, Wellington 6140 New Zealand

Submitter information

MBIE and MoT would appreciate if you would provide some information about yourself. If you choose to provide information in the section below, it will be used to help MBIE and MoT understand how different sectors view the Sustainable Biofuels Mandate proposal. Any information you provide will be stored securely.

Your name, email address, phone number and organisation

Name:	John Gifford		
Email address:			
Phone number:	Withheld under section 9(2)(a)		
Organisation:	Gifford Consulting		
name or other that MBIE and MBIE and Mebsite(s), we submission of	The Privacy Act 1993 applies to submissions. Please tick the box if you do <u>not</u> wish your name or other personal information to be included in any information about submissions that MBIE and MoT may publish. MBIE and MoT may upload submissions and potentially a summary of submissions to the website(s), <u>www.mbie.govt.nz</u> and/or <u>www.transport.govt.nz</u> . If you do <u>not</u> want your submission or a summary of your submission to be placed on either of these websites, please tick the box and type an explanation below:		
I do not want my submission placed on MBIE's website and/or MoT's website because [insert reasoning here]			
Please check if your submission contains confidential information			
and <u>have sta</u>	ny submission (or identifiable parts of my submission) to be kept confidential, ted my reasons and ground under section 9 of the Official Information Act that I , for consideration by MBIE and MoT.		

How the Sustainable Biofuels Mandate would work

1.	Do you support having a GHG emissions reduction mandate?			
	⊠ Yes	☐ Yes, with changes	□ No	☐ Not sure/No preference
	Please explain y	our views.		
	This is a good approach as it is directly targeting the correct outcome – which must be to lower the concentration of CO2 in the global atmosphere. Though I agree that this approach will add complexity to the compliance regime. However, there are good examples from the international literature on how this can be done and administered. The use of RINS in the US essentially uses a GHG emission approach.			
	statistics from E more than 75% emissions (June	7 T	enewable ethanol reduced (I is one of the best tools for org/press-release/eu-ethan	ol-sets-new-record-for-
2. Do you support the proposal to require certification of lifecycle emissions of biofuels so Zealand using international standards?			issions of biofuels sold in New	
		☐ I agree in part	☐ No, I don't agree	\square Not sure/no preference
	Please explain y	our views.		
	This is a logical approach. But clear guidelines will be need to ensure that this works effectively and has integrity. Although ISO LCA Standards are appropriate – further guidance will be required to allow these to be operationalised at a regular commercial scale.			
3.	Do you support	applying the Sustainable I	Biofuels Mandate to all li	quid transport fuel?
	☐ Yes, I agree	☑ I agree in part	☐ No, I don't agree	☐ Not sure/no preference
	Please explain y	our views.		
	Ultimately, the answer to this is yes – but in the short term it may be advisable to focus on blends for gasoline and diesel and renewable diesel. There is a wealth of experience for these fuels and minimum risk to the current vehicle fleet probably up to around 15% fuel blends. Renewable diesel can be a direct substitute for fossil fuel derived diesel and blending restrictions do not need to apply. A focus on these fuels would also contribute mostly to the domestic transport GHG emission reduction in the short term.			
4.		d initial emission reduction what should they be?	on percentages for 2023–	2025 appropriate for New
	☐ Yes, I agree Is there anything	☑ I agree in part g you would like to tell us	☐ No, I don't agree about the reason(s) for y	☐ Not sure/no preference our choice?
	The proposed e	mission reductions are very	modest and should be achic cess and to demonstrate th	evable by all importers of fuel. at GHG emission reductions can

increasingly relevant – so the sooner we start to get our heads around how to do it the better. Renewable carbon is going to be needed for many materials other than just fuels for transport energy!

5.	Do you support having single GHG emissions reduction percentages across all fuel types, or do you favour separate reduction percentages? Why and how many separate percentages would you suggest we have?				
	☐ Yes, I agree	agree in part	☐ No, I don't agree	☐ Not sure/no preference	
	Is there anything you wo	ould like to tell us ab	out the reason(s) for you	r choice?	
	before it has had time to categories first, diesel an to decrease within a rela infrastructure to hydroge (SAF) – and there are ma	demonstrate its real d gasoline blends and tively short time fram enate plant and anima ny global initiatives co	I renewable diesel. The cost e as larger existing oil comp Il oils. There is a lot of press	y. Focus on the priority fuel of renewable diesel is likely vanies use existing ure to also address biojet e. Let's see where this is at in	
6.			ion percentages being set a 2024 and 2029 respectiv	for 2026–2030 and 2031– rely?	
	☐ Yes, I agree	agree in part	☐ No, I don't agree	\square Not sure/no preference	
	Is there anything you wo	ould like to tell us ab	out the reason(s) for you	r choice?	
	industry. Once again, the	important thing here	narket should be beneficial in a start the process and so the sooner we get on wi	learn. Remember, our	
7.	18 :	Do you support the proposal that biofuel producers must be certifed against an established sustainability standard to count towards achievement of the emissions reduction percentage?			
		agree in part	☐ No, I don't agree	☐ Not sure/no preference	
	Is there anything you wo	uld like to tell us ab	out the reason(s) for you	r choice?	
	This is a critical element of the proposed biofuels mandate. Refer to my response to Question 1.				
8.	 Do you support having a Zealanders about biofue 	•	government information ble Biofuels Mandate?	campaign to inform New	
		agree in part	☐ No, I don't agree	\square Not sure/no preference	
	Is there anything you wo	ould like to tell us ab	out the reason(s) for you	r choice?	
	The second control of the second seco	of this renewable carb	ansition to renewable carbo on for transport fuels. The s !		

9. Do you support the labelling proposal that informs consumers about specifc biofuels at the point of sale?

	✓ Yes, I agree	☐ I agree in part	☐ No, I don't agree	☐ Not sure/no preference
	Is there anything	you would like to tell us	about the reason(s) for y	our choice?
	public awareness	s of the role of renewable t	ormation campaign propose ransport fuels and the role t carbon (i.e. from fossil fuels	
10.	maintaining acce	5/4		biofuel producers face in feedstocks? Do you have any
		☐ I agree in part	☐ No, I don't agree	☐ Not sure/no preference
	Is there anything	you would like to tell us	about the reason(s) for ye	our choice?
	dependent on ca sources i.e. fossil carbon. Unfortur sources of energ its emissions for is effectively as b	orbon for liquid fuels and m I fuels), though by 2050 the nately, we can not largely d y by using electricity. If NZ materials offshore to other	does not decarbonise its eco r jurisdictions where new lov o not meet quality certificati	urced from non-renewable th to renewable forms of owever, we can decarbonise onomy, it will effectively export w carbon technologies exist. This
	integrated developments. Our resup to date informatechnologies. Ru waste utilisation through the econenergy efficiency until such time the Methane from an	opment of fuels, chemicals wiew of the global literatur nation on many research a nning in parallel with the d policy that supports efficienomy. There needs to be a c. Carbon is going to have to hat we can efficiently extranaerobic digestion (or other	nd development and comme eployment of technology wi ent use of all carbon captured shift to carbon use efficiency to be regarded as relatively so ct it from the air (or water) to er waste sources) will also be	scales that work for our iffordconsulting.co.nz provide ercial scale applications of such Il be changes to land use and d by biomass and passing
	the price of New industry. This state dependent on characteristics are either prohibite an absolute rethe economy car of land) – but sur	Zealand supplies of animal atement fails to consider the neap fossil fuels (which is the dis largely not going to be all by this time. It is going to bited, reduced significantly, equirement for NZ bio-bases bear to remain viable. This	I tallow and vegetable oil be at the existing economics of ne problem we are trying to able to be used beyond 205 be hard to have your cake a or priced out (through emis ed feedstock producers to pr	using current supplies is totally solve with the introduction of 0. Especially, if we are going to and eat it as well! If fossil fuels isions pricing) then there would rovide materials at a price that on effects (for example the value

How could the Sustainable Transport Biofuels Mandate be implemented?

11.	Do you think the minimum threshold for compliance of 10 million litres of transport fuel in a calendar year in New Zealand is appropriate? If not, what level would you change it to?				
	☑ Yes, I agree	☐ I agree in part	☐ No, I don't agree	☐ Not sure/no preference	
	Is there anything yo	ou would like to tell us a	bout the reason(s) for you	ur choice?	
	[insert response he	ere]			
12.			ng a supplier's GHG emiss		
		☐ I agree in part	☐ No, I don't agree	☐ Not sure/no preference	
	Is there anything yo	ou would like to tell us a	bout the reason(s) for you	ur choice?	
	[insert response he	ere]			
13.	Do you think the annual reporting regime, including its offences and fines, is practical and appropriate?				
	☐ Yes, I agree	☑ I agree in part	☐ No, I don't agree	☐ Not sure/no preference	
	Is there anything you would like to tell us about the reason(s) for your choice?				
	[insert response he	ere]			
14.	Do you support the performance of fuel suppliers being published to enable consumers to reward the industry leaders in reducing GHG emissions?				
	☑ Yes, I agree	☐ I agree in part	☐ No, I don't agree	☐ Not sure/no preference	
	Is there anything yo	ou would like to tell us a	bout the reason(s) for you	ur choice?	
	[insert response he	ere]			
15.	Will the proposed penalties encourage fuel suppliers to achieve the required emission reductions? If not, would level should they be?				
	☐ Yes, I agree	☑ I agree in part	☐ No, I don't agree	☐ Not sure/no preference	
	Is there anything yo	ou would like to tell us a	bout the reason(s) for you	ur choice?	
	[insert response he	ere]			
16.	. Do you support the proposal for fuel suppliers to defer achieving their emissions reductions for years 1 and/or 2, in full or in part, to the following year?				
	☐ Yes, I agree	☐ I agree in part	⊠ No, I don't agree	☐ Not sure/no preference	

	is there anything	you would like to tell us	about the reason(s) for ye	our choice?
	[insert response	here]		
17. Do you support fuel suppliers banking any surplus emissions reductions in a year and using it to reduce the percentage needed to be achieved the following year?				tions in a year and using it to
	☐ Yes, I agree	☐ I agree in part	☑ No, I don't agree	☐ Not sure/no preference
	Is there anything	you would like to tell us	about the reason(s) for ye	our choice?
	[insert response	here]		
18. Do you support fuel suppliers borrowing for shortfalls in emissions reductions in a year, and making the shortfall up the following year?				
	☐ Yes, I agree	☐ I agree in part	⊠ No, I don't agree	☐ Not sure/no preference
Is there anything you would like to tell us about the reason(s) for your choice?			our choice?	
	[insert response	here]		
19. Do you agree with the proposal to allow trading through the use of entitlement agreements?				
19.	Do you agree wit	h the proposal to allow	trading through the use of	entitlement agreements?
19.	Do you agree wit ☐ Yes, I agree	h the proposal to allow to all		entitlement agreements?
19.	☐ Yes, I agree	☐ I agree in part		☐ Not sure/no preference