

New Zealand's Climate Change Commission was modelled largely on the UK Climate Change Committee, and our first set of advice on emission budgets and the direction of policies to meet them will need be finalised early next year. Alongside this advice, our Climate Change Minister has requested that we also provide advice on two issues relevant to New Zealand's climate change policies and targets:

- The level of cuts to emissions of methane that might eventually be required of New Zealand as part of a global effort to keep warming to 1.5 degrees
- Whether New Zealand's Nationally Determined Contribution under the Paris Agreement is compatible with keeping warming to 1.5 degrees (and if not how it should change to become compatible).

To help inform our advice on these questions, we would like to contract you to do a short report on global pathways consistent with keeping warming to 1.5 degrees, and the tradeoffs and choices available within those pathways – particularly as they relate to long-lived vs short-lived gases. It would likely be 1-2 weeks work over the next 4-8 weeks, and would draw heavily on existing analysis.

Is that something you are interested in discussing with us further, and would you have availability to do it?

If you are interested in hearing more about it I will be happy to send you some more detailed information and perhaps we could arrange a video call to discuss it.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED] | Principal Analyst

W [climatecommission.govt.nz](https://climatecommission.govt.nz)

[UNCLASSIFIED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, 2 July 2020 2:35 pm  
**To:** 'Piers Forster'  
**Subject:** RE: [UNCLASSIFIED] Potential work for NZ's Climate Change Commission  
**Attachments:** Science advice commissioning.docx

[UNCLASSIFIED]

Hi Piers

Thanks for that response. I've attached some more details of what we're looking for and trying to achieve with it. In a nutshell we have a lot of parties with different interests telling us "the science says methane needs to get to X%" when that figure is in fact associated with scenarios and choices around what we would have to believe or value or tradeoff about the world and the future. What I'm trying to do is simply elucidate those values and scenarios to associate them with pathways, particularly for methane so that rather than simply arguing about a number in isolation we can say "if we believe or value X, Y and Z then we get to this for methane. If we believe or value A, B and C we get to this different figure." In that circumstance the Commission can then more transparently advise on methane targets and compatibility with a 1.5 degree pathway.

Have a look and see if it could be possible given your existing commitments. I'll likely get in touch with Richard and/or Jan as well and see how they're placed. A collaboration between you could be an approach that works.

Kind regards



[REDACTED] | Principal Analyst

W [climatecommission.govt.nz](https://climatecommission.govt.nz)

[UNCLASSIFIED]

---

**From:** Piers Forster [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 30 June 2020 2:12 am  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: [UNCLASSIFIED] Potential work for NZ's Climate Change Commission

Hi [REDACTED]

Thank you for the approach. I think there are lots of subjective views out there on the topic of methane and it is important you try and get a balanced objective views. I would like to try and help but it is hard for me realistically to carve out any time. Have you approached Jan Fuglesvedt at CICERO or Richard Millar who works with me at the UK CCC, both would do a good job. The three of us could maybe work together to reduce the workload on any one of us. ...

So please send more details, but I am afraid I can't promise to be able to help  
Piers

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 28 June 2020 23:38  
**To:** Piers Forster <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** [UNCLASSIFIED] Potential work for NZ's Climate Change Commission

[UNCLASSIFIED]

Dear Professor Forster

I hope you are as well as is possible given the current global situation. My name is [REDACTED] – I am working at New Zealand's Climate Change Commission. I wanted to sound you out about your availability and interest in a piece of work we'd like to commission to be done over the coming months on pathways and tradeoffs involved in the world keeping warming below 1.5 degrees.

New Zealand's Climate Change Commission was modelled largely on the UK Climate Change Committee, and our first set of advice on emission budgets and the direction of policies to meet them will need be finalised early next year. Alongside this advice, our Climate Change Minister has requested that we also provide advice on two issues relevant to New Zealand's climate change policies and targets:

- The level of cuts to emissions of methane that might eventually be required of New Zealand as part of a global effort to keep warming to 1.5 degrees
- Whether New Zealand's Nationally Determined Contribution under the Paris Agreement is compatible with keeping warming to 1.5 degrees (and if not how it should change to become compatible).

To help inform our advice on these questions, we would like to contract you to do a short report on global pathways consistent with keeping warming to 1.5 degrees, and the tradeoffs and choices available within those pathways – particularly as they relate to long-lived vs short-lived gases. It would likely be 1-2 weeks work over the next 4-8 weeks, and would draw heavily on existing analysis.

Is that something you are interested in discussing with us further, and would you have availability to do it?

If you are interested in hearing more about it I will be happy to send you some more detailed information and perhaps we could arrange a video call to discuss it.

Kind regards



[REDACTED] | Principal Analyst

W [climatecommission.govt.nz](https://climatecommission.govt.nz)

[UNCLASSIFIED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, 19 October 2020 11:49 am  
**To:** 'Piers Forster'; Jan Sigurd Fuglestad  
**Cc:** Millar, Richard  
**Subject:** RE: [UNCLASSIFIED] RE: Draft outline  
**Attachments:** Forster Fuglestad Millar NetZero-NZ-report-DRAFT\_V1-REVISION\_AR.docx

[UNCLASSIFIED]

Hi all

Here's the review feedback from Andy (he said he was fine with non-anonymous feedback). Most of his comments are around the framing of the impact of methane and its relationship to temperature. He's put edits and comments in track changes.

As I mentioned the other week – where you think he's correct it'd be good to incorporate his feedback if time allows (but am aware time may not allow). Where you disagree on the substance, then just saying so should be sufficient. And if any suggested direction is out of the scope of this work then feel free to say so.

Hoping to get you feedback from the other reviewer shortly.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

[UNCLASSIFIED]

---

**From:** Piers Forster <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, 12 October 2020 12:36 am  
**To:** [REDACTED] Jan Sigurd Fuglestad  
<[REDACTED]>  
**Cc:** Millar, Richard <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Re: [UNCLASSIFIED] RE: Draft outline

Hi [REDACTED]

Sorry for making you wait until Monday your time. Here is our revised draft. I hope this is helpful and we are happy to revise again as needed. Good luck with your own deadlines.

Best wishes

Piers, Richard and Jan

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Sunday, 11 October 2020 at 01:33  
**To:** Piers Forster <[REDACTED]>, Jan Fuglestad <[REDACTED]>  
**Cc:** "Millar, Richard" <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** RE: [UNCLASSIFIED] RE: Draft outline

[UNCLASSIFIED]

That's rough Piers. Thanks for pushing through to get it finished. I really appreciate it.

(I can only sadly join you in working this weekend – I usually wouldn't but our deadlines are approaching)

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

[UNCLASSIFIED]

---

**From:** Piers Forster <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Saturday, 10 October 2020 12:15 am  
**To:** [REDACTED] Jan Sigurd Fuglestad  
<[REDACTED]>  
**Cc:** Millar, Richard <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Re: [UNCLASSIFIED] RE: Draft outline

Hi [REDACTED]

Sorry for delays. This is just a heads up that we haven't forgotten you and will work on the paper at the weekend to get to you by Monday. It's a sad state of affairs I know – especially as it probably our last taste of freedom as we are expecting restrictions to come back next week...

Best wishes  
Piers

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Monday, 28 September 2020 at 04:48  
**To:** Piers Forster <[REDACTED]>, Jan Fuglestad <[REDACTED]>  
**Cc:** "Millar, Richard" <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** RE: [UNCLASSIFIED] RE: Draft outline

[UNCLASSIFIED]

Hi Piers, Jan, Richard

Thanks very much for the draft. I figure that my idea of something to be ashamed of is a bit lower than yours - that report looked to be pretty good to me. :) Happy to have a bit of internal review though before we put to external reviewers. I'm getting a couple of others here to look it over and I'll aim to get you some consolidated feedback in a day or two.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

[UNCLASSIFIED]

---

**From:** Piers Forster <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Saturday, 26 September 2020 7:37 am  
**To:** [REDACTED] Jan Sigurd Fuglestad  
<[REDACTED]>  
**Cc:** Millar, Richard <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Re: [UNCLASSIFIED] RE: Draft outline

Dear [REDACTED]

Sorry we are overdue on our homework and especially so considering time zones. Please find our first draft attached. We are still a little ashamed of it, hence they made me first author. Life got in the way this week with house moving and car crashes... We want to make sure it meets your needs though, so we wondered if a quick internal review was worthwhile before going for the external review? This way we could do any extra analysis you may want and get it reviewed as well..

Thanks in advance and best wishes

Piers

Released under the Official Information Act