Submission on the Tasmanian Government's Draft Emissions Reduction and Resilience Plan for Government Operations

If Tasmania is to be a climate leader, then it needs leadership from its government.

March 2026

About Climate Tasmania

Climate Tasmania is a group of concerned professionals who have a diverse range of expertise, spanning scientific, health, energy, social and policy aspects of climate change. Our aim is "To provide timely, independent and authoritative advice to Tasmanian business, government and community leaders on climate change and appropriate policy responses."
Details of the members of the Climate Tasmania board and expert advisers are available at www.climatetasmania.org/members/

Postal: PO Box 3095 West Hobart, Tasmania 7000
Telephone: 0427 355 951
Email: climatetasmania@gmail.com
Web: www.climatetasmania.org

Summary

Climate Tasmania welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Draft Emissions Reduction and Resilience Plan (ERRP) for the operations of Tasmanian government departments and agencies. Because government operations are by definition under the government's control, an Emissions Response and Resilience Plan for government operations is an opportunity for the Tasmanian government to shine: to show what real climate leadership looks like. The draft ERRP is not just a missed opportunity; it is an abdication of responsible leadership. Based on the evidence of this draft ERRP, if Tasmania becomes a climate leader it will be despite Tasmania's government, not because of it.

In outline, the draft ERRP is:

- Incomplete, because much of the government's activities (the GBEs and government owned corporations) are not included;
- Superficial, because most potential positive outcomes are vague and uncertain;
- Lacking in leadership: if this is all that Tasmania's government expects us to achieve, then history will mark us as being part of the climate problem, not leaders of the solution;
- Devoid of urgency, timelines and targets;
- Lacking in accountability: the plan is so uncertain that no one will be able to be held accountable for its failure; and
- Weak on resilience and adaptation.

We use the phrase "government entities" to include departments, agencies, GBEs, and government owned corporations, as the draft ERRP should cover all government entities.

Climate Tasmania's analysis of what is needed to reduce the Tasmanian government's emissions shows that the fundamental problem is simpler than the draft ERRP assumes. This results in unnecessary complexity, which is a problem because:

1. Tasmanians looking to their government for guidance on what they themselves can do will be let down. The subliminal message from the draft ERRP is that without input from (presumably expensive) consultants and the use of (also presumable expensive) software, progress is impossible.
2. Because the government has over complicated what is needed it has spent money on actions which will not directly reduce emissions.
3. The government will be failing an essential leadership test: it will not be demonstrating to the people of Tasmania what an excellent emissions reduction program looks like.

Climate Tasmania's alternative approach offers the following benefits:

1. More of the available budget for emissions reduction will actually go to reducing emissions.
2. The reduction in emissions from government entities will be more certain because of the improved accountability and governance in our approach.
3. Tasmanians will learn from their government what they can do themselves to reduce their own emissions.
4. Because of (3), Tasmania's emissions will reduce more rapidly[1].

[1] This assertion is based on the substantial number of Australians who want to take action on climate change, but do not know what to do. The webinar presentation at https://youtu.be/g0mELN0zgtU has evidence for the assertion.

Postal: PO Box 3095 West Hobart, Tasmania 7000
Telephone: 0427 355 951
Email: climatetasmania@gmail.com
Web: : www.climatetasmania.org

1. The missed opportunities in the draft ERRP.

1.1 Introduction.

The Draft ERRP follows the Tasmanian government's philosophy evidenced in their approach to the Climate Change (State Action) Act and in the previous Emissions Reduction and Resilience Plans: to not require anyone to do anything. Climate Tasmania finds this approach to be extraordinary, particularly when applied – as it is here – to the government departments and agencies the government controls.

Climate Tasmania's assessment is that the current philosophy represents an abdication of both responsibility and leadership which a majority of Tasmanians would not support, were they aware of it. The philosophy is also the opposite of the government's promotion of its "strong plan" for Tasmania's future during the last election campaign.

1.2 Urgency.

There is no expression of urgency anywhere in the draft Plan. The absence of targets and timelines gives the impression that the government can just pretend to tinker around the edges for a while and perhaps make slow incremental change. Section 3 of this submission is a direct copy of a section on urgency, targets and timelines we wrote in our October 2024 submission on the draft ERRP for the Energy sector, and also in our submission on the draft ERRP for the Industrial Processes and Product Use sector. Clearly our thoroughly referenced and science-based input to both these draft Plans was ignored. Section 3 ends as follows:

> *Because the Tasmanian Emissions Reduction and Resilience Plans are intended to run from the end of 2024 until the end of 2029, the Plans need to guarantee reductions in that range if Tasmania is to justify its climate leadership claim. If reductions are less than 28% then Tasmania will not have been a leader, it will have been part of the problem.*

If we take as a starting point consultations within government, beginning in November 2024, preparation of this plan is now well into its second year. While this may be an acceptable standard based on past practices, the rapid advance of global heating over the past three years says otherwise.

The consultation draft government operations ERRP draws attention to the conclusion of the AR6 Synthesis Report of 2023 which "makes it clear that we need to act now", before citing the AR6 finding that "global temperatures are now 1.1˚C above pre-industrial levels and are likely to reach 1.5˚C above pre-industrial levels in the early 2030s".

Since the release of AR6 in late 2023 we have had three very big alarm bells, one for each year's temperature data. The first was a massive spike in the global surface temperature in 2023, followed by an even warmer 2024 – despite the fact that the 2023 El Niño warming influence was waning – and another surprisingly warm year in 2025, which without an El Niño event had also been expected to be cooler but turned out to be the third warmest on the 175-year record behind only 2023 and 2024.

Reflecting a rapidly changing outlook, last year's UNEP Emissions Gap Report[2], "Off Target", found that the multi-decadal average of global temperature rise will exceed 1.5°C "at the latest, in the early 2030s". Post-2023 scientific analysis strongly supports that position with the added emphasis that the multi-decadal benchmark may be already obsolete and that shorter-term averages may need to be applied. In such a case the 1.5C threshold, while not yet crossed, would be imminent.[3]

As UN Secretary-General António Guterres said in his message on the 2025 UNEP Emissions Gap Report, "the path to a liveable future gets steeper by the day". To repeat: by the day. It's that urgent.

1.3 What will the draft Plan definitely achieve?

No certainty.
The draft Plan is all about opportunities for emissions reductions, and is very short on actual reductions that will definitely be realised over the five years of the Plan. There is no certainty about what reductions will definitely be achieved.

Action is mainly voluntary.
The verbs used in the draft Plan are mainly "train", "consider", "explore", "leverage", "make available", "support" and "develop". Nowhere are "require", "regulate" or "mandate" to be found, although "ensure" and "report" are used in the context of emissions reporting, and "include", "review" and "update" in the context of policies, plans and guidelines. This is consistent with the Act, whose only requirements are on the Minister, and not on any other party. It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that apart from reductions required by the federal government's Safeguard Mechanism, emissions reductions in Tasmania are voluntary. This approach is clearly not in alignment with the required urgent, rapid and sustained reductions discussed in previous Climate Tasmania submissions and in section 3 of this submission. Put simply, the risks of worsening climate disruption are now too high for voluntary emissions reductions alone to be sufficient.

No numbers.
The draft Plan has no numerical estimates of what reductions in emissions the Plan will bring about.

When the most recent amendments to the Tasmanian Climate Change Act were before the Parliament, Climate Tasmania recommended an amendment requiring Emissions Reduction and Resilience Plans to include numerical estimates of the reductions the Plans would achieve. That recommendation was intended to ensure that the Plans contained substantive concrete actions and not just discussion of "opportunities". Amendments to require numerical estimates in the Plans were moved in both Houses of the Tasmanian Parliament, but were defeated when the government undertook to provide numerical estimates of emission reductions in the Plans. Details, including Hansard extracts, can be found in Jack Gilding's excellent account of the Parliamentary debate on the Bill to amend the Climate Change (State Action) Act.[4]

---

[2] 2025 UNEP Emissions Gap Report https://www.unep.org/resources/emissions-gap-report-2025

[3] Andrew King, Liam Cassidy (2025): 'Earth is already shooting through the 1.5°C global warming limit, two major studies show', The Conversation, 11 February 2025 https://findanexpert.unimelb.edu.au/news/99440-earth-is-already-shooting-through-the-1.5%C2%B0c-global-warming-limit--two-major-studies-show

[4] *2022 Changes to the Tasmanian Climate Act*, a Climate Tasmania report by Jack Gilding, available at https://www.climatetasmania.org/wp-content/uploads/CCA-2022-amendments.pdf

No timeline.
As well as there being no emissions reduction estimates, the draft Plan does not include a timeline for achieving any of the actions the draft Plan does envisage. Timing is extremely important: earlier emissions reductions achieve a greater reduction in total emissions to the atmosphere than do the same emissions reductions happening sometime later. Total emissions determine the warming.

The government's 2030 deadline for transitioning its light vehicle fleet to electric and the very slow progress so far is an example of the timing problem. Currently, it appears that the plan is to delay most EV purchases until very close to 2030, which means that emissions from burning petrol and diesel will continue for several years longer than if the government made the majority of its EV purchases well before 2030. The emissions implication of the late timing is worse than it appears, as delaying the switch to EVs also delays the availability of second-hand ex government EVs on the market in Tasmania, which will increase the amounts of petrol and diesel that will be burned by other Tasmanians.

1.4 Leadership and accountability.

Opinion polling has consistently shown that a significant majority of Australians are either concerned or very concerned about climate change, and climate distress is having an adverse impact on mental health, particularly amongst younger Australians[5].

In addition to polling showing the high level of concern about climate change in Australia, there is polling showing a widespread lack of understanding of the practical steps needed to slow down the deterioration in our climate[6]. A further complication is the disinformation environment faced by most Australians who do not rely on news outlets which have high journalistic standards for information on climate change. A final concern is the decline in trust in governments to solve major problems.

Leadership.

All of the problems described in the above paragraph require leadership from the Tasmanian government if we are to contribute to reducing the risk of ever more dangerous climate change. The things the Tasmanian government needs to do to show the necessary leadership are:

1. It needs to speak clearly, directly, and often about the need to shift as quickly as practicable from petrol, diesel, gas, etc to clean energy in response to the climate risks that Tasmania faces.
2. The government's actions – for all government entities – need to "speak louder than words" so that all Tasmanians can see that the government is doing what it said it would do.
3. The government's emissions reduction efforts must be completely transparent.
4. The government needs to set clear targets and timelines for the emissions reduction efforts of its entities. The timelines need to include interim targets to ensure that early progress is made.

[5] See, for example https://www1.racgp.org.au/getattachment/f7d2b750-0387-4708-8112-e8a2ba920447/Understanding-and-managing-psychological-distress.aspx article reprinted from AJGP Vol. 52, No. 5, May 2023.
[6] The webinar presentation at https://youtu.be/g0mELN0zgtU – originally prepared for climate groups prior to the last federal election – reviews the polling showing the level of concern and how few Australians understand what actions are necessary.

5. The government's messaging on climate change must be clear, simple, direct, and devoid of spin, technocratic language[7] and partisan considerations.
6. The government's climate actions must not only be based on expert scientific advice, they must be seen to be so based.
7. The government's emissions reduction efforts must always consider fairness and equity. For example, the wellbeing of Tasmanians relying on government supplied social housing should be a priority for actions which build resilience
8. Government Business Enterprises and government corporations must be required to do what is being required of departments and agencies. The alternative will fail the "pub test".
9. The Tasmanian government and all government entities must take climate change into account when it makes decisions that might increase emissions or reduce resilience or be a barrier to adapting to the adverse impacts of climate change.

Above all, the government needs to embrace the axiom that doing what everyone else is doing is not leadership.

Accountability.

The government hires senior people to run its entities. These people need to be held accountable for the climate activities they are responsible for in the same way as they are held accountable for, say, budget management. The draft ERRP is silent on the issue of accountability.

1.5 Resilience and Adaptation

1.5.1 Resilience

While the word "resilience" occurs 51 times in the draft ERRP, the only obvious references to actually increase resilience was a commitment to discuss the development of resilience plans with departments and agencies after the finalisation of the ERRP.

1.5.2 Adaption

The draft ERRP treats adaptation as separate from emissions reduction and resilience building, when a large body of work from the IPCC and elsewhere indicates that many adaptation actions can also contribute to emissions reduction and climate change mitigation. Not considering adaptation in the context of emissions reduction risks maladaptive outcomes, noting that many sectors and communities are already adapting 'autonomously' to the current impacts of climate change.

[7] Examples of such language are "decarbonisation", "reducing emissions", and "fossil fuels". The importance of language is covered at length in the presentation linked to in footnotes 1 and 6.

1.6 Unnecessary complexity in the approach to emissions reduction.

Analysis of the emissions reduction task: introduction.

This analysis looks at the big picture of Tasmanian Government operations: there may be a few exception cases which are outside the mainstream and are not covered by this analysis[8]. Any such cases do not justify making the emissions reduction tasks of the mainstream more complex in order to accommodate those outliers. The emissions pie chart on page 16 of the draft ERRP shows the sources of emissions covered by the draft Plan, and suggests that emissions from any other sources are minimal.

Emissions are measured (or estimated) for two reasons:

1. For the purpose of emissions reporting to the Tasmanian Parliament and people and to the Federal Government's national inventory for reporting through the UNFCC process. Here the complexity is unavoidable and outside Tasmania's control, and the criticism of over complexity is not applicable: this activity needs to continue unchanged.
2. For the purposes of measuring progress with emissions reduction work. An essential program such as reducing emissions relies on "what is measured is managed", and it is in this area that we think the approach is too complex.

Analysis of the emissions reduction task: Scope 1 emissions.

Scope 1 emissions are defined in the draft ERRP as:

> *All direct emissions from the activities of an organisation or under their control. Burning of fuels, driving cars owned by the organisation.*

These are the pie slices for "Fuel - stationary and transport" and "Natural gas" in the pie chart on page 16 of the draft ERRP. The rules for calculating these emissions are defined each year by the federal government's NGA Factors handbook[9]. While the formulae in the Handbook can look complex, for the fossil fuels (petrol, diesel, gas, etc) there is a commonality: all of the emissions calculations involve taking the amount of fuel used (such as litres for petrol or diesel, MJ for natural gas) and multiplying those numbers by one or more factors which do not vary – they are independent of the amounts of fuel used[10].

Therefore, the task of reducing Scope 1 emissions is all about reducing the amounts of fossil fuels used.

Analysis of the emissions reduction task: Scope 2 emissions.

Scope 2 emissions are defined in the draft ERRP as:

> *Indirect emissions from electricity/heating/cooling purchased and used by the organisation.*

The pie chart on page 16 shows that emissions associated with Tasmania's grid supplied electricity is the largest component of the emissions from the departments and agencies. This seems counter intuitive, as Tasmania is said to have mostly renewable electricity from its grid. The emissions

[8] For example, the government may own some ruminant animals in a research flock.
[9] The 2025 Handbook can be downloaded from https://www.dcceew.gov.au/climate-change/publications/national-greenhouse-accounts-factors-2025
[10] The calculations for diesel look complicated because the factors used in the multiplication can vary slightly depending on the type of engine the diesel is used to fuel.

calculation is a simple multiplication: the electrical energy used (in kWh or MWh) is multiplied by a emissions factor for the Tasmanian grid calculated by the federal government. Therefore, the Tasmanian government has two ways it can reduce the calculated emissions from its use of electricity:

1. It can reduce the amount of energy (kWh or MWh) used from the grid, and
2. It can work to reduce the emissions factor for the Tasmanian grid.

Reducing the amount of grid electricity used. The draft ERRP does mention a number of ways of doing this, such as increasing the efficiency of electricity used (e.g. by improving insulation and by installing LED lighting), and by installing PV on government buildings, thus reducing the amount of energy drawn from the grid. The needed shift from petrol, diesel, gas, etc to clean energy has the potential to run counter to attempts to reduce the amount of grid electricity used by government entities. Climate Tasmania's firm opinion is that electrification to reduce the use of fossil fuels is more important for the climate than is reducing the amount of grid electricity used.

Reducing the emissions factor for the Tasmanian grid. There are two possible ways of achieving this, and as the details of how the calculation are done are not known to Climate Tasmania, one of these is speculative. The two ways are:

1. By reducing the quantities of fossil fuels used to generate electricity for the Tasmanian grid. Diesel is used by Hydro Tasmania to generate electricity in the Bass Strait Islands to firm the on-island solar and wind generation owned by Hydro Tas. Gas is also used when the Tamar Valley Power Station is operated during periods of low rainfall. Hydro Tas has an economic incentive to continue to reduce the amounts of diesel and gas it uses. The recommended development of Energy Transition Plans by all government entities will require Hydro Tas to reduce its diesel and gas usage.
2. By working with the federal government to explore ways to refine the calculation of the impact of importing electricity from the mainland via Basslink. However, given the continuing progress being made to reduce the emissions intensity of the mainland grid from which Tasmania imports electricity, the impact of imported electricity on Tasmania's calculated Scope 2 emissions will diminish over time.

Therefore, for Tasmanian government entities apart from Hydro Tasmania, the Scope 2 emissions reduction task is all about reducing the amounts of grid electricity used, which needs to be balanced against the need to electrify all existing fossil fuel uses.

Analysis of the emissions reduction task: Scope 3 emissions.

Scope 3 emissions are defined in the draft ERRP as:

> *Indirect emissions which are not included in scope 2, that occur within an organisation's value chain.*

Scope 3 emissions can be problematic because of the difficulty of deciding what emissions to include and what to exclude. In addition, an entity's Scope 3 emissions are someone else's Scope 1 or 2 emissions, so if everyone measured all three Scopes, there would be a lot of double counting.

The draft ERRP considered just one set of Scope 3 emissions: those from air travel. The draft also included a passenger-km number, which was almost certainly multiplied by a factor to arrive at

the emissions estimate. The word "estimate" is used because many factors determine the emissions arising from any flight, including:

- The type of aircraft and its engines;
- The weather on the flight e.g. the mix of headwinds and tailwinds;
- How many other passengers and freight the aircraft was carrying;
- If the aircraft was carrying excess fuel (additional to the statutory minimum excess);
- Time spent taxiing and waiting to take off;
- If the flight was direct or involved intermediate take-offs and landings;
- Delays from air traffic control once in the air; and
- The class of travel.

The only factors subject to the control of the government entity paying for the flight are the passenger-km involved and the class of travel, the latter being governed by government travel guidelines.

Climate Tasmania agrees with the decision to focus on emissions from air travel as the Scope 3 emissions to track at this stage. As the Tasmanian government's approach to reducing emissions from its operations evolves, additional Scope 3 emissions should be included for reduction. Section 2.3 includes a mechanism for doing this via the government's tendering and purchasing processes by extending a process initially established for all government entities.

2. A greatly improved ERRP.

2.1. Introduction.

This section of the submission describes Climate Tasmania's vision of what a strong, detailed and comprehensive Emissions Reduction and Resilience Plan for the operations of Tasmanian government entities would look like. Essentially, this section is our recommendations.

2.2. Reducing emissions.

The analysis in Section 1.2 of this submission shows that in all three Scopes, some kind of activity data drives the emissions accounting, whether it be litres of petrol, kWh of grid electricity or passenger-km of air travel, and so on. Climate Tasmania's suggestion is very simple: since this activity data both drives the emissions accounting and therefore must be captured by the government entities, from the perspectives of the entities, why not just track the activity data as the "measured" part of *what is measured is managed*?

2.3. An integrated plan.

Overview: leadership is key. The things the Tasmanian government needs to do to show the necessary leadership are:

1. It needs to speak clearly, directly, and often about the need to shift as quickly as practicable from petrol, diesel, gas, etc to clean energy in response to the climate risks that Tasmania faces.
2. The government's actions – for all government entities – need to "speak louder than words" so that all Tasmanians can see that the government is doing what it said it would do.
3. The government's emissions reduction efforts must be completely transparent.
4. The government needs to set clear targets and timelines for the emissions reduction efforts of its entities. The timelines need to include interim targets to ensure that early progress is made.
5. The government's messaging on climate change must be clear, simple, direct, and devoid of spin, technocratic language[11] and partisan considerations.
6. The government's climate actions must not only be based on expert scientific advice, they must be seen to be so based.
7. The government's emissions reduction efforts must always consider fairness and equity. For example, the wellbeing of Tasmanians relying on government supplied social housing should be a priority for actions which build resilience
8. Government Business Enterprises and government corporations must be required to do what is being required of departments and agencies. The alternative will fail the "pub test".
9. The Tasmanian government and all government entities must take climate change into account when it makes decisions that might increase emissions or reduce resilience or be a barrier to adapting to the adverse impacts of climate change.

Putting the opportunities discussed in Section 1 of this submission together with the leadership requirements results in the following detailed plan:

1. Tasmanian government entities[12] be required to report the quantities of each of the fossil fuels they purchase into a database maintained by Recfit.
2. The reports need to be made every quarter.
3. The database maintained by Recfit must be online and public so that all Tasmanians can see how well each government entity is progressing with their shift from petrol, diesel, etc to clean energy.
4. The database must have a graphing function so that a graph of the use of each fuel by each entity over time is just a click away.
5. The database (and associated reports and graphs) must, for each entity, include amounts of grid electricity purchased every quarter and passenger-km figures for air travel.
6. Each entity must develop an Energy Transition Plan with a primary emphasis on reducing its Scope 1 emissions to as close to zero as possible and as quickly as practicable. The Energy Transition Plans should have formal government approval and be subject to scrutiny by Parliament (for example, through an Estimates style process). The Plans must have targets and timelines, with interim targets every two years.
7. Approved Energy Transition Plans must be publicly available and easy to access (for example, through the Recfit online database).

[11] Examples of such language are "decarbonisation", "reducing emissions", and "fossil fuels". The importance of language is covered at length in the presentation linked to in footnotes 1 and 6.
[12] The use of "entities" throughout this submission is as we defined earlier – all departments, agencies, GBEs, and government owned corporations.

8. The most senior manager of each entity must have the timely achievement of their Energy Transition Plan as a component of their performance management/performance bonus arrangements.
9. The Recfit database must be designed to allow private companies to also report their fuel use data, Energy Transition Plans, etc on the database. This extension should be ready for use within 12 months of the full implementation of the database for government entities.
10. The government's tendering and contract award and management process should be amended to ensure that companies tendering for contracts above a defined threshold must sign up to reporting their fossil fuel use into the database as if they were government entities. Progress with reducing fuel use would become a performance measure included in tender selection criteria.
11. Each of Tasmania's defined community refuges should be fitted with solar systems and batteries allowing them to provide shelter, cooking facilities and other amenities and device recharging, all for multiple days during a grid outage.
12. The Tasmanian government must identify climate change adaptation options and pathways for Tasmania that build resilience and contribute to emissions reductions.
13. The Tasmanian government and all government entities must take climate change into account when it makes decisions that might increase emissions or reduce resilience or be a barrier to adapting to the adverse impacts of climate change.

3. Urgency, Targets, and Timelines.

The remainder of this section is directly copied from Climate Tasmania's October 2024 submissions in response to the draft Emissions Reduction and Resilience Plan for the Energy Sector and the draft Emissions Reduction and Resilience Plan for the IPPU Sector.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has told us that emissions reductions need to be "deep, rapid and sustained"[13]:

Continued greenhouse gas emissions will lead to increasing global warming, with the best estimate of reaching 1.5°C in the near term in considered scenarios and modelled pathways. Every increment of global warming will intensify multiple and concurrent hazards (high confidence). Deep, rapid, and sustained reductions in greenhouse gas emissions would lead to a discernible slowdown in global warming within around two decades, and also to discernible changes in atmospheric composition within a few years – IPCC AR6 (2023) Synthesis Report SPM

IPCC's Working Group III expanded on the need for deep, rapid and sustained emissions reductions as follows[14]:

C.3 All global modelled pathways that limit warming to 1.5°C (>50%) with no or limited overshoot, and those that limit warming to 2°C (>67%) involve rapid and deep and in most cases immediate GHG emission reductions in all sectors. Modelled mitigation strategies to achieve these reductions include transitioning from fossil fuels without CCS to very low- or zero-carbon energy sources, such as renewables or fossil fuels

[13] IPCC Assessment Report 6, 2023. Synthesis Report, Summary for Policy Makers.
[14] IPCC Assessment Report 6, Working Group II, Summary for Policy Makers.

with CCS, demand side measures and improving efficiency, reducing non-CO2 emissions, and deploying carbon dioxide removal (CDR) methods to counterbalance residual GHG emissions

Both the IPCC and the UN Environment Program have looked at the emissions gap: the difference between pledged emissions reductions under the Paris Agreement and those needed to meet the Agreement's objectives to limit warming. The IPCC's summary is[15]:

A substantial 'emissions gap' exists between global GHG emissions in 2030 associated with the implementation of NDCs announced prior to COP26 and those associated with modelled mitigation pathways that limit warming to 1.5°C (>50%) with no or limited overshoot or limit warming to 2°C (>67%) assuming immediate action (high confidence). This would make it likely that warming will exceed 1.5°C during the 21st century (high confidence). Global modelled mitigation pathways that limit warming to 1.5°C (>50%) with no or limited overshoot or limit warming to 2°C (>67%) assuming immediate action imply deep global GHG emissions reductions this decade (high confidence)

The UN Environment Program's 2023 Emissions Gap Report: Broken Record[16] explores the emissions gap highlighted by the IPCC in considerable detail. The Foreword by Inger Anderson, Executive Director, United Nations Environment Program observes that:

Progress since the Paris Agreement was signed in 2015 has shown that the world is capable of change. Greenhouse gas emissions in 2030, based on policies in place, were projected to increase by 16 per cent at the time of the agreement's adoption. Today, the projected increase is 3 per cent. However, predicted 2030 greenhouse gas emissions must fall by 28 per cent for the Paris Agreement 2°C pathway and 42 per cent for the 1.5°C pathway.[17]

The Paris Agreement provides for each signatory state to set their own emissions reduction targets, known as Nationally Determined Contributions, or NDCs. The Emissions Gap Report therefore considers whether the current set of NDCs will be sufficient to meet the goals of the Paris Agreement. The Executive Summary reports on the emissions reductions needed to be achieved by 2030:

To get to levels consistent with least-cost pathways limiting global warming to below 2 °C and 1.5 °C, global GHG emissions must be reduced by 28 per cent and 42 per cent respectively. [18]

and

Again, these findings underline that immediate and unprecedented mitigation action in this decade is essential.[19]

The material in this section reveals what emissions reductions need to be achieved if the world is to be on track to achieve the goals it set itself when the Paris Agreement was reached. The emissions reductions needed by 2030 range between 28% and 42% less than business as usual. Because the Tasmanian Emissions Reduction and Resilience Plans are intended to run from the end of 2024 until the end of 2029, the Plans need to guarantee reductions in that range if Tasmania is to justify its climate leadership claim. If reductions are less than 28% then Tasmania will not have been a leader, it will have been part of the problem.

---

[15] IPCC Assessment Report 6, 2023. Synthesis Report, Summary for Policy Makers, Box 1, Table 1.
[16] United Nations Environment Programme (2023). *Emissions Gap Report 2023: Broken Record – Temperatures hit new highs, yet world fails to cut emissions (again).* Nairobi. https://doi.org/10.59117/20.500.11822/43922. Also available at https://www.unep.org/emissions-gap-report-2023
[17] Ibid page XV
[18] Ibid page XXI
[19] Ibid, page XXII