

Submit on Clean Car Consultation - closes 20th August

Question	Suggested response	Why (short version)	Why (Long version)
1	Yes	to ensure imported vehicles are efficient	It means that all manufacturers would be incentivised to bring in efficient models into the country whereas at present they bring in less efficient models than they are forced to sell elsewhere as we presently don't have any standards
2	No	Should be European standard not weak Australian.	We need a really rapid response to the climate crisis that is coming at us much faster than expected. I am concerned that this might not be a strict enough target for people to only be able to buy environmentally friendly vehicles. The standards should be at least as strict as European standards rather than be based on environmental laggards Australia.
3	Not Sure	Efficient Vehicles cost more to develop and build and so cost more to buy, however a lot of people will switch to a similarly priced but perhaps smaller vehicle and so not be paying any more.	Because more efficient vehicles are generally more expensive to develop and build and so cost more to buy. However this will be counteracted by people switching from buying a cheap gas guzzler to a similarly priced but more efficient vehicle that may be smaller or may not have 4WD capability that they rarely used anyway. So although vehicle prices may go up, that does not mean the cost that people have to pay for a vehicle will go up as they with to a smaller 2WD vehicle.
4	Yes	-	I trust the people writing this here, but am not in the motor trade so can't really comment on this
5	No	All imports should be to this standard so if you are just bringing in 1 car it must be a relatively low emission car. There is no excuse for allowing high pollution cars into the country in a climate emergency.	Why should single vehicle importers be exempt from standards for vehicle imports? Why should we allow high polluting American gas guzzlers or ridiculously polluting 2 seater Italian "sports" cars into the country to pollute the planet? In a climate emergency new imports of such brazen pollution should not be allowed.
6	Multiple targets	Fleet targets allow heavy polluting vehicles to be imported which we shouldn't do.	With a fleet target companies can bring in appalling polluters as long as they balance them out with some low emission vehicles. But we shouldn't allow appalling polluters.
7	No		We should have done this years ago, this is a climate emergency we need to act like our house is on fire. We should have an immediate adoption of this, but have dispensation for those vehicles for which there is no low emission option currently available - e.g. off-road capable 4WD utes for farmers and rural contractors only.
8	No	Weight bands should be replaced with accommodation level bands - eg same emission levels for all 4 seaters. A 3 tonne Rolls Royce should not be allowed to pollute any more than any other 4 or 5 seater just because its heavy.	No it should be in terms of accommodation or capability provided. If someone buys a 3 tonne Rolls Royce that seats 4 or 5 people, why should it have higher emission level allowances than lighter 5 seaters? The bands should be in terms of accommodation provided not weight otherwise you are incentivising heavier vehicles. Likewise why should 2 seater Lamborgini's have higher emission levels than other 2 seaters simply because they have massive heavy engines? However something needs to be in place for vehicles capable of towing heavy loads and having off road capability for those that really need that.
9	No	It should be a standard - so you can't buy your way into being a high polluter	

10	No	It should be a standard - so you can't buy your way into being a supplier of high polluting vehicles.	
11	No	Banking and Borrowing yes if based on accommodation provide rather than weight, but Grouping no - we have to stop the import of high polluting vehicles.	Whilst I support the "Banking" and "Borrowing" of emissions proposals as long as they are related to accommodation provided not weight bands, I reject the grouping proposal - We are way past the time of allowing the import of high polluting vehicles - this simply has no place in the climate emergency.
12	Yes	Average of 2 years under limit is the relevant thing.	If they have a new vehicle or series of new zero or low pollution vehicles coming in the following year that combined put the average of them under the limit set, then the nett environmental effect is the same as if they had middling pollution vehicles available both years.
13	No	Importation of high polluting vehicles needs to be banned	We are way past the time of allowing the import of high polluting vehicles - this simply has no place in the climate emergency.
14	No	Importation of high polluting vehicles needs to be banned	We are way past the time of allowing the import of high polluting vehicles - this simply has no place in the climate emergency.
15	Yes	Its appropriate	
16	Yes	Its appropriate	
17	Yes	Its appropriate	
18	Yes	We shouldn't be importing old polluters	
19	Yes	Its appropriate	
20	Yes	<p>No real carbon charge at present is a market distortion, this feebate scheme goes some way to correct that.</p> <p>General Comment that you have given no place else to put:</p> <p>Max fees should be a % of cost rather than a flat fee: \$3k fee is not going to stop someone buying an expensive polluter</p> <p>Waiver for farmers and rural contractors who genuinely need off-road capable 4WDs and for which there is presently no low emission alternative.</p>	<p>In the absence of a realistic price on CO2 emission and other pollutants from fossil vehicles we need to incentivise zero (and initially low) pollution vehicles whilst making high polluting variants relatively more expensive to buy. The new vehicles we buy today will be running around polluting still in 15 years, we need all new vehicles to be low if not zero emission.</p> <p>However I don't accept the maximum fees for a high polluting vehicle should be capped at \$3000. For someone buying an expensive polluter like a Rolls Royce or a Lamborghini \$3k is going to make no difference in their buying decision whatsoever. Instead it should be a percentage of the sale price. And it should perhaps be capped at 30% of the sale price of the vehicle.</p> <p>Thirdly you need to incorporate some waiver of these charges for those who genuinely need a vehicle for which there are no realistic low emission alternatives - and presently that is off-road capable 4WD utes for farmers and rural contractors. Currently a lot of tradespeople have them unnecessarily when an electric van that is readily available would do just as well. And a lot of townsfolk have 4WD double cab utes that are rarely if ever taken to areas a 2WD vehicle or smaller 4WD vehicle couldn't handle, this needs to stop. But farmers and rural contractors who genuinely need these vehicles should be given a waiver on this. I think it would be a good sign that you are listening to rural folk if you weaved them from the scheme on an annually reviewed basis, but at the same time ratcheted up the whole scheme to bring it in sooner and harder - to Euro emissions standards. - Sorry I couldn't see where else these overall comments should go - please don't ignore them.</p>

21	No	Should be at lower Euro levels	No it should be lower - it should be at European levels not climate laggard Australian levels.
22	Yes	Only if it is bought in in 2020. This is a really lax target that is completely inappropriate for some years in the future	
23	Yes	People are very price sensitive in capital costs of vehicles	
24	Its practical as is	We need to rapidly move to a zero emissions fleet - the emissions levels of the bands need to be ratcheted down quickly and annually.	
25	Yes	It would support buying near new vehicles rather than brand new. Its the emissions of the imported vehicle that are important, not whether its brand new.	It would support buying near new vehicles rather than brand new. The nearly new ones are already made; buying second hand has a lower environmental footprint than buying brand new. Its the low emission vehicles that we are incentivising - whether they are brand new or second hand, they are still a new import into the country: there should be no difference
26	Yes	As long as the band is not too wide	As long as the band is not too wide: It should be narrow enough to encourage people to move up a band to get a rebate
27	No	Zero band need to be centred on Euro Standard emissions no lax Australian ones.	The bands are set way too polluting and coming in a year too late. It needs to be in place next year and the zero band needs to be centred on Euro emissions standards - its a climate crisis, our house is on fire, we can't leisurely drive into the future doing just a bit here and there - we need a rapid transformation in vehicle emissions. They have been our biggest emission growth for years, the emissions from motor vehicles are going to be doing their dangerous warming in the atmosphere for years (unlike ruminant methane). We can't muck around on this.
28	Yes	Its practical	
29	Yes	Its practical	