

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday 27 December 2021 17:03
To: CARBON BUDGET CONSULTATION
Subject: Consultation on Carbon Budgets



CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

A Chara,

I wish to draw attention to some aspects of the Technical Document which I feel require closer scrutiny.

In order to keep this communication short I will get straight to the point.

Table 1-1 page 18 shows that Agriculture is responsible for 22.3 out of 68.3 MT CO2 Equ in 2018 (33%)

Table 1-2 page 19 shows that Agriculture contributes 33% of total GHG Emissions 2018

Missing from the report are the following considerations:

See:

<https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/3217494/13394938/KS-EI-21-001-EN-N.pdf/ad9053c2-debd-68c0-2167-f2646efeaec1>

page 43, GVA % by sector 2020

services 57.6
industry 39.2
construction <5 (approx, taken from the figure)
agriculture, forestry, fishing <5 (approx, taken from the figure)

and on page 45 Employment by sector %

services 78
industry 12
construction 8 (approx, taken from the figure)
agriculture, forestry, fishing 5 (Approx, taken from the figure)

These figures show that however we might consider ourselves to be still an agricultural nation, that is very far from accurate.

A substantial part of our emissions problem is caused by a small part of the economy's GVA and by a small fraction of the employment work force (the agricultural sector).

The argument is used that Irish agriculture feeds 40 million and is less bad than others agriculture, such as Brazil, but is it fair in democracy that the majority should have to subsidise the more CO2 intensive activities of a small sector of the economy, on the basis that we are "less bad" than competitors outside of the state? This argument has not been applied to the cutting of turf so why Beef production?

If you calculate the GVA per Tonne of CO2 or the GVA per employed person these numbers look even more stark.

By all means farmers should be compensated for loss of income, BUT they should be compensated on the basis that their reductions in emissions are in proportion to the fact that they are 33% of "the problem". The fact that 33% of the problem only contributes around 5% of the GVA, should mean that cutting agricultural activity should represent "low hanging fruit" in terms of the cost of compensation required from the rest of the economy.

This is NOT intended as a slight on farming. It is an attempt to bring some reality to the idea that in 2021 there are still "sacred cows" in Irish agriculture.

Clearly there is politics at play here and it should be stopped.

Le meas

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the sender.

--

This email has been checked for viruses by AVG.

<https://www.avg.com>