

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday 8 February 2022 17:18  
**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.**

Dear Minister Ryan and the Government,

I'm the parent of an 8 year old boy and an 11 year old girl.

I'm terrified by the prospect of the future they are facing.

That is a normal human reaction to have once you've actually listened to climate scientists about what the planet is going to do to us if we don't cut our emissions.

I don't think there is much that I can say here personally that will influence how you're going to act on the carbon budgets.

I want you to listen to the scientists and stop listening to the economists and special interest groups.

I want you to honestly and truthfully do enough to reduce our fair share of emissions in line with the Paris Agreement target of 1.5 degrees C.

- The UN says emissions reductions of 7.6% are needed on global average each year until 2030 for a chance of staying below 1.5C- and that assumes achieving massive "negative emissions" later.
- Your Government promised 7% in the Programme for Government.
- The Climate Change Advisory Council (CCAC) has proposed less than 6%
- 7% = Budget of 468 MtCO<sub>2</sub>e to 2030 (-27 compared to (CAC proposals)  
7.6% = 454 MtCO<sub>2</sub>e (-41)
- Even these are much too large. To do our fair share and comply with the Climate Act we need MUCH SMALLER budgets! Excluding speculative negative emissions, our fair share of the global budget for 1,5C is set to be used up 3 years from now!

It feels as if we've been told there's a tsunami on the way and engineers have told us we need defences built to a certain height. Instead of building those defences, the government has told us 'we're hoping the tsunami won't be as bad as the experts are saying so we'll build our defences only half as high as needed'.

I understand that emissions reductions of 7.6% would mean enormous changes for people, but most people haven't a clue what's coming if we fail to achieve them.

How many of you I wonder actually understand what's coming?

The government has done an appalling job of trying to explain what's needed and WHY - there has been some attempt at explaining what's need but very little effort on WHY it's needed.

There's no way anyone is going to make or accept the cuts needed, in the space of time we have, without a massive focus on the WHY. Even if the WHY is scary. Covid was scary, but we rallied. We can do it again.

People should understand the our planet is already warming, that people are already dying because of OUR pollution and that our children's generation will face a future of unimaginable catastrophic weather events, wars over dwindling resources, and a horrifying global humanitarian crisis. All caused by the gasses we're emitting TODAY.

I refer you to Prof. Kevin Anderson's contribution to the joint\_committee\_on\_environment\_and\_climate\_action on Jan 12 2022:

**We must start with some self-reflection, which often is quite challenging for us. I am not blaming anybody here more than myself but we are where we are because of 30 years of collective lies**

and delusion. It is 31 years since the first IPCC report and 29 years since the UNFCCC. We have a choice. We can make that 32 years since the first IPCC report, or 33 years, and carry on with lies and delusion, or we can start to say that we should look at the challenge we are actually facing. That concerns the impact of climate change; it is not about temperatures or reduction rates. We are interested in impact because that is what will hurt us. We can be honest about that. We can say it is fine to have the other budgets and aim for an increases of 3°C to 5°C. We can tell our children that and explain to them at breakfast that it is what we are doing because it is the best we can achieve politically. That is an honest position and it has integrity.

We would have to live by that, however, and cannot pretend we are delivering a target of an increase of 1.5°C or 2°C when the budgets are more aligned with increases of 3°C to 5°C. Let us have integrity on the matter and say we cannot deliver if that is the case, and people will have to live with increases of 3°C to 5°C. It is an honest position and I have no problem with that as long as you do it honestly.

[https://www.oireachtas.ie/en/debates/debate/joint\\_committee\\_on\\_environment\\_and\\_climate\\_action/2022-01-12/2/](https://www.oireachtas.ie/en/debates/debate/joint_committee_on_environment_and_climate_action/2022-01-12/2/)

I want you to make the cuts necessary to stay below 1.5 degrees C, or if not be bloody honest about what we're facing if we don't do it.

Kind Regards,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted contact information]

[Redacted line]

This electronic mail transmission and any accompanying documents contain information belonging to the sender which may be confidential and legally privileged. This information is intended only for the use of the person or entity shown above. If you are not the intended recipient any disclosure, copying, distribution or action taken based on this information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error please advise us by return e-mail and delete the transmission