



Australian Government

Department of Infrastructure, Transport,  
Regional Development, Communications and the Arts

# New Vehicle Efficiency Standard

## Impact Analysis Consultation – Individual Responses

**Privacy:** I agree for my response to be published with my name withheld

**Number of responses:** 3561

Identification Number	What is your name? (optional)	Please rank the proposed options in order of preference (optional):	Briefly, what are your reasons for your choice? (optional, 500 words)	Do you support the Government's preferred option (Option B)? (optional)
1359810	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Investments in clean technology NOW will save a lot of money in the long run because removing polluting vehicles from our roads will have widespread health benefits for all citizens.	NULL
1359811	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is an urgent threat, and we need to accelerate the decarbonisation of transport quickly and efficiently. The cost difference between option B and C is relatively superficial in the context of the wider budget expenditure. At a time of higher concern about the cost of living, Option C will deliver the most benefits to Australian households. Let's lift the ambition, and who cares what Murdoch thinks!	No
1359814	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to move as quickly as possible to energy self sufficiency due to escalating environmental and geopolitical risks.	NULL
1359824	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is the best but still does not go far enough	No
1359827	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We come so late to this we have to be more ambitious!	Yes
1359832	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We needed to do this decades ago. The second best time is now, and the most action is best. Net savings projections also support this. Saving the planet goes hand in hand with saving money	Yes
1359841	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Cost. We can't afford as tax payers the investment.	No
1359842	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To stop being a laggard and start being a leader in vehicle efficiency.	Yes
1359843	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are behind and need to take serious steps to make a difference as quickly as possible	No
1359853	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe that quick and effective action is vital. Australians will benefit from greater choice of vehicles and fuel savings	No
1359859	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As we are one of the largest RHD markets for many of the vehicle types popular in Australia (esp utes) an accelerated transition here will support transition in other RHD markets especially.	Yes
1359861	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	With Rising costs already out of control we need a softly approach.The Government and personal budgets are already stretched. The newer technologies have not been checked for longevity, affects of hevier Vehicles with batteries on the road and the cost of increased wear and tear on trhe existing roads which may cause standards of roads to be rewritten. The affects of the of the power required on our power grids, nor a standard on how the new grid will operate with the new electric cars.	No
1359864	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are far behind and need to take urgent action on climate change. The cost of delays to action are enormous, and increasing every year. I want my children's future to be safe.	Yes
1359865	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has been behind for too long and needs to catch up quickly.	Yes

1359868	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1359871	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	More tough regulation - I fear the flexible option could fall to nothing if either a transport authority, lobby group, or party faction starts raising concerns.	No
1359873	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1359875	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 2nd	Accelerating too quickly for Net Zero pushes extreme costs down the average Citizen. Everything is so expensive these days, I cannot afford an increase to my costs which have already increased this year. Just look at what is happening in the EU at this very moment, mass farmers protesting the Bloc's Net Zero legislation, because they are losing their livelihoods for the governments to be able to say \We will hit our targets\. Utter Hogwash. Let's not follow the same strategy as them.	No
1359878	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to move quickly and can afford the costs	Yes
1359880	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Some things are worth paying for	No
1359890	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Electric vehicles are not the solution, for Australia to take this up we are going to have to increase mining of precious minerals at a considerable amount, which in itself will contribute to greenhouse gases, the current electricity infrastructure can't keep up with the demand now let alone if everyone in inner city want electric cars being recharged in high rise complexes. I feel this is a lazy policy just appealing to city people and is just going to result in expensive car prices.	No
1359892	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1359896	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to invest in infrastructure but at the same time limit the cost of doing so by not putting \all eggs in the one basket\. We should not place all our attention on EVs now as most of the electricity used to charge them is from burning coal. We should transition to hybrid vehicles instead of EVs until 2030. We need to sort out Lithium ion battery recycling before fully committing. Also hydrogen fuel cell and internal combustion engines should be given a chance between now and 2030.	Yes
1359897	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The cost-benefits are nigh on identical to the mid option, but we reduce emissions far more quickly, as per our international obligations	No
1359899	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Our small input is not worthwhile compared to the major polluters like China	No
1359907	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Implementing the hardest and fastest fuel standards will increase supply and decrease prices. By catching up as quickly as possible, less people will be impacted by bad air quality, the nation will be more secure and less reliant on other nations for fuel. Also, the sooner that this is implemented, the sooner more second hand cars will enter the market in Ernest. At this time, we need to get as many people off petrol, diesel and hybrid so that the cost of living pressures can limited.	No
1359913	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Any adoption of fuel standards should be as ambitious as possible with the minimum being in line with other global leaders such as the European Union. Anything less would not only indicate to manufacturers that Australia is all words and no action, manufacturers will still choose to offload dirtier cars and hold back on delivering their cleanest models. Also, if anything but the strictest standards are implemented, Australians will not benefit the most from the new standards.	No
1359917	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We must progress this now, but there is a political context to be navigated. I would prefer option C but am a realist.	Yes
1359919	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must get diesel and petrol vehicles of are roads as soon as possible.	NULL

1359921	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Emissions need to reduce quickly. It is not just to tackle climate change but also to improve air quality.	Yes
1359926	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I think we should bite the bullet and just go for it. The sooner the better. This is something that should have been done years ago and we are very very much behind other countries.	Yes
1359929	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to seriously curtail the emissions that our cars emit if we want to be serious about climate change. We are way behind the OECD on this (sans russia) and we NEED to catch up. This is from a moral standpoint. From economics, surely it's a good thing as we'll all be less dependent on oil countries, and save a lot at the bowser (or not need to use it at all). I am most supportive of option C, but option B is the most pragmatic. A is awful and we'll end up like the US with their huge utes.	Yes
1359930	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cost-benefit ration not far off option B. C would lock in change faster so less subject to change with future changes of gov't. less subject to being wound back if gov't changes.	Yes
1359931	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1359932	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	I think that the free market should just do its thing and a lack of a fuel efficiency standard is a good thing. However, if the government doesn't want to drill and refine more oil domestically to keep up with domestic demand then sure implement the fuel efficiency standards. But I would prefer incentivizing and encouraging more drilling and refining domestically for the domestic market.	No
1359933	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is the fast and stricter option and should be supported. We are in a climate emergency and have delayed way too long in getting these standards in place. Slightly higher costs and significant increased benefits justify the more rapid approach. This will hasten the delivery of a wider range of BEVs to Australia	No
1359943	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	More overall long term benefits for the population, with lower vehicle maintenance, fuel & health costs with option C or at least B.	NULL
1359944	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I support what the Albanese government is doing here, but want the fastest transition away from big oversized dirty petrol and diesel cars as possible, toward a fully electric future with cleaner air and quieter streets and less emissions. We need to stop being the dumping ground for the worlds dirty vehicles.	Yes
1359946	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to move as quickly as possible to implement more stringent vehicle efficiency standards. We lag at the back of the developed world and have seen more than 20 years inaction by successive governments.	No
1359948	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are already way behind the rest of the world on this sort of policy, we need to do it now for our economy, our health and the environment.	No
1359950	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Significant effort is needed to meet our COP commitments	No
1359954	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	You have waited too long, we need to act now. The Australian Government and DCCEEW know the 1.5 degree target is no longer achievable. The value of carbon you have used is ridiculously low, the ATAP value is constant at \$60 over the appraisal period. If you used an alternative value the benefits of acting fast would be even greater.	No
1359956	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Faster realisation of benefits means faster benefits to the nation.	Yes
1359957	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	We are so far behind	Yes
1359958	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	We need to get moving on this	Yes

1359959	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	It's important to do	Yes
1359960	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	It's important to our air quality	Yes
1359964	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1359966	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Strong action on climate change to do good for people and planet. Having a greater selection of cars that are available in other countries would be great be great too.	Yes
1359968	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Obvious cost benefit and associated net savings	No
1359974	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do something about climate change, the technology is already there, let's incentivise it	Yes
1359980	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The figures from the BC analysis show a higher net benefit from pursuing Option C. Although, under this option, electricity costs are forecast to increase by \$8bn, motorists will be far better off by saving \$22+ bn otherwise spent on liquid fuel. With additional investment in increasing electricity supply through battery storage investment and improvements to grid capacity, costs will be lowered further. It clearly makes financial sense to invest big in this green technology which we know works.	Yes
1359981	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Need to catch up	Yes
1359982	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	It seems on balance to be the most sensible way of going forward, balancing the stated outcome of achieving less fuel usage with reasonable timelines of introducing the new standards.	Yes
1359984	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce emissions as quickly as possible and encourage people to buy zero emission vehicles.	Yes
1359985	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to move quickly to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and option C is clearly the best choice. Also aligning our emissions standards with those of the US and Europe means move vehicles will be available to consumers. Our reliance on foreign sourced oil is a national security risk and reducing our reliance on foreign oil is important.	No
1359990	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Better reduction of greenhouse emissions	NULL
1359992	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia must have standards in line with the rest of the world. And it's the best choice for the environment.	No
1359994	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I do not support opinion A. It does nothing to help.	Yes
1359995	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to stop climate change as fast as possible or the economic impacts in the future will be tenfold compared to the increased costs of the fast option.	NULL
1359999	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes

1360004	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This changes are well overdue, need positive action as this should have been in place years ago.	Yes
1360006	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I think we've spent decades behind the rest of the world and it makes sense to implement a plan that will make us world leaders asap.	Yes
1360007	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1360009	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have to move faster on reducing CO2 & lowering the cost of living	NULL
1360011	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are already to far behind on this to delay any more	Yes
1360013	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need fast action on climate change now.	Yes
1360015	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should be ambitious and aim for a fast transition.	Yes
1360017	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Get it done as quickly as possible, it is for the best	Yes
1360018	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have to act now and act bravely on the climate crisis	No
1360019	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Why have we waited so long to do anything at all? Just look at the benefits of doing something that might be meaningful (and option A isn't). Why are we modeling this scheme on USA targets? We should be aggressively chasing the current best standards especially as this won't impact existing vehicles. Q5 is problematic. Yes I agree that something should be done but I don't agree that Option B is my preferred solution so I'm basing my answer to Q5 on my ranking in Q3	No
1360021	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As a scientist and engineer in life cycle assessments, time is so critical. The urgency of transitioning is so great, and the consequences so severe, we are deluding ourselves that we have time to waste. Other parts of tax policy are perversely incentivizing the uptake of SUVs and 4x4s. This is a low pain way to reign in these tax breaks for utility vehicles without telling people that you are, and grandfathering those who have got them	NULL
1360026	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want to replace my current car soon, as it is getting old. I want a choice of good, low emissions options. Right now the choices are poor. Climate change is a crisis issue, we need action ASAP.	Yes
1360028	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1360029	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do more to address climate change and slow down our emissions.	Yes
1360030	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1360032	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce emissions, catch up with the rest of the world and bring better vehicle choice to consumers.	No

1360033	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1360034	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1360035	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We've wasted decades, we've started too late and need to catch up. Australia is seeing the effects of Climate Change daily and still aren't doing enough to meet our obligations under the Paris agreement. Time to take it seriously, the younger generation deserve as much.	No
1360038	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want to see the greatest benefit in the reduction of emissions as quickly as we can manage	Yes
1360044	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need a new vehicle efficiency standard with serious benefits. Option A has hardly any benefits compared to the other two options.	Yes
1360045	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must make up for lost time with the previously loosened emissions under the previous government. Further, to send the strongest possible signal to legacy automakers. Option C will have the greatest attention grabbing impact for them. As a final note, please DO NOT INCENTIVISE HYDROGEN as a fuel, as it only provides another way for us to remain 'hooked' at the pump. Domestically sourced electricity is the best way to reduce the outflow of this type of money from Australia.	Yes
1360047	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1360049	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1360054	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1360055	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Shouldn't be trying to beat US/EU, but match them. Option A is pathetic.	Yes
1360060	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must act now to slow climate change induced environmental impacts	NULL
1360061	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is obviously the cheapest option. Saying that Option A has the lowest cost is neglecting the opportunity costs involved. I don't understand why the Government would choose option B when option C clearly has a higher net benefit.	Yes
1360062	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1360064	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is a laggard in respect to fuel efficiency. Only the most urgent change will produce an effect which is required for environmental and international trade benefits.	Yes
1360065	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1360067	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The benefits exceed the costs far greater. The government will need to ensure its messaging is clear, concise and meaningful to the individual in order to get ahead of opposition messaging.	Yes

1360071	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change mitigation has been too slow in Australia, we need to speed things up.	Yes
1360076	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	It's absurd that we are so behind on this. When the healthcare costs are included doing nothing is costing us as individuals and as taxpayers.	Yes
1360078	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Health problems from vehicle exhaust is already a major issue and a cost to our economy.	Yes
1360080	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Australia needs fuel efficient vehicles to reduce pollution and reduce our cost of living.	Yes
1360083	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	While Option C does not have the strongest benefits cost ratio, it has the highest net benefits over the designated term (which is not stated). Yes, it has higher costs, but will have a higher benefit to public health, emissions and seemingly moves towards an EV model which will help lower emissions if we can also move towards renewable energy and away from coal/gas. I still do support Option B with the little information given and would need further explanation over who stands to benefit.	Yes
1360085	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Order of total benefits	Yes
1360086	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Need for urgency in reducing emissions; pull forward fuel savings faster	NULL
1360087	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should have done this years ago.	NULL
1360088	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change	Yes
1360092	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Flexibility & benefit to cost ratio	Yes
1360096	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We're behind. We need to catch up as quickly as possible.	Yes
1360097	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce vehicle emissions as fast as possible, plus greater fuel cost savings for motorists and greater choice of vehicles.	NULL
1360099	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Need to take fast action on environment. Catching up to other countries means feasible	No
1360101	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1360102	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Savings and reduction I emissions	Yes
1360105	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL



1360108	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1360109	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1360110	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need action on this area	Yes
1360114	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C provides the best environmental & health outcome.	NULL
1360115	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate crisis, ambitious action is needed now and Australia has been decades behind the rest of the world alongside Russia with it's lack of fuel efficiency standards. The fact that option A even exists is a complete joke and testament to the power of lobby groups and vested interests in this country.	NULL
1360119	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1360121	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to take reducing car climate inputs as quickly as possible and Australians should get to save money by increased efficiency cars sooner rather than later	Yes
1360123	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cheaper to fuel a vehicle and a healthier environment to live in as fast as possible - as if there is another choice!	Yes
1360125	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	everyone wins from more efficient vehicle. Option b is a compromise which may assist the sell and coming battle with the lovely AU media and opposition for the sake of opposition	Yes
1360126	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	There can not be further disruption and increased costs in the future until government show they can manage and govern more responsibly than they are now.	No
1360127	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to catch up with the rest of the world's leading countries as quickly as possible. The current situation is shameful. Where is the mandatory EV transition option? Option B is supported only in the event that Option C does not have overwhelming public support.	No
1360128	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	This option appears to be a good place to start change.	Yes
1360134	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want Aus transport to transition away from fossil fuels to evs *urgently*	Yes
1360135	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Let the free market be the decider of what the public want, forcing manufacturers to comply with such a tiny market as Australia's will have them not bother to sell anything to us.	No
1360137	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are already behind the game. We need to catch up for time lost under the previous government	Yes
1360138	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need the fastest transition possible	Yes

1360141	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Because no matter what you believe this will drive up vehicle costs not down. The slowest method sees less of an impact to me.	No
1360142	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	B seems to be the most sensible approach with the best cost benefit ratio.	Yes
1360143	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1360144	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1360151	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1360153	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1360154	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fastest move to reduce emissions	Yes
1360155	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B seems the right compromise to deliver benefits at acceptable costs as reflected by the highest BCR.	Yes
1360156	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1360158	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have no time to waste. I understand that option B might be perceived to be more palatable politically, but we have to do all it takes to transition as quickly as possible. It might be quicker if Labor stopped taking bribes, I mean donations, from the fossil fuel lobby.	NULL
1360160	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Strong & quick implementation	Yes
1360163	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Environmental and costs	No
1360166	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe Australia needs to move as quickly as possible to reduce transportation GHG emissions.	Yes
1360167	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Best outcome for consumers & the planet.	Yes
1360168	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Highest abatement and net benefit must be the priority	Yes
1360171	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We're already behind the world. We need to go fast and hard to catch up.	Yes

1360176	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1360177	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce emissions as quickly as possible	NULL
1360178	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Flexible	Yes
1360181	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has put off introducing these standards for such a long time, we are now well behind the rest of the world. Option C should be selected because for an estimated extra 10 billion cost over option B, it will deliver a NET 10 billion more than option B would have.	No
1360182	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is lagging behind the rest of the world, an ambitious policy and targets is required to ensure an appropriate response to reducing CO2 emissions to mitigate climate change.	Yes
1360185	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to achieve change and reduce emissions, however it should be done in a way which is practical for industry. Options B is likely to achieve this.	Yes
1360190	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need as quick as possible a transition to fuel efficient vehicles. Australia needs to stop being the world's dumping ground for the most fuel inefficient vehicles. Cars, buses, trucks etc will soon become the biggest emitters of carbon without it these new standards. Choose the best option for the environment and do not be swayed by the car industry and other organisations whose sole motive is profit not the environment.	No
1360196	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	For a minor cost difference why wouldn't you shoot for the stars.	Yes
1360199	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1360200	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Rapid emissions reduction should be the highest priority goal	NULL
1360202	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must move faster than we currently are to reduce our emissions. Option a. Is simply unacceptable. I would support either option b or c with a preference for c. I believe any initial investment benefits our future.	Yes
1360210	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option A is ineffective and basically a do nothing option. Option B provides both consumer and environmental benefit quickly, with flexibility in the implementation.	Yes
1360211	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Faster acceleration of efficiency standards means more models of fuel efficient vehicles will be available for everyone	No
1360212	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia's national fuel efficiency standard has been lagging behind for years. The new standard is urgently required to address climate change by reducing greenhouse gas emissions, reducing air pollution and noise impacts and preventing Australia from becoming the dumping ground of non-electric cars. NSW has been leading the way with incentives to encourage uptake of electric vehicle cars. Other states should follow.	Yes
1360214	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	To create genuine consumer choice for low and zero emissions vehicles in Australia and to help Australians save money on fuel and energy, whilst also achieving health and environmental benefits. It is also important to send a message to foreign automakers that Australia is no longer a dumping ground for their most inefficient and high polluting vehicles. It is my sincere hope that the government is not captured by the fossil fuel car lobby and is able to pursue genuine reform.	Yes
1360215	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do something about our fossil fuel use as soon as we can. Climate change is going to have a huge impact on our lives, much more than it already has.	NULL

1360216	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Most benefits (within narrow confines of BCR methods)	Yes
1360218	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1360219	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C provides the greatest benefit, in the shortest amount of time, to the most people. The significantly higher benefits of Option C far outweigh the slightly higher costs (as compared to Option B). Option A is a false choice that essentially maintains the status quo and is not worth entertaining or discussing.	NULL
1360227	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This action is imperative and urgent. The extra cost of option 3 will be easily recovered from just the healthcare costs avoided.	Yes
1360229	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Greater consumer benefit more quickly	Yes
1360230	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is already seeing the impacts of climate change, we have no time to waste. The sooner we can take steps to reduce our CO2 emissions the better. Citing higher costs as a reason against option C is I feel somewhat simplistic, what about the costs of the consequences of climate change worsened by acting too slowly? Also Australia is already the dumping ground for dirty, inefficient vehicles, the fuel costs to the public, higher healthcare costs as a consequence of air pollution?	NULL
1360231	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As Australia has not acted on fuel efficiency standards for so long there is no other option but go for C. This provides this provides the greatest benefit to future generations. Like the electricity grid, this transition took place this only accelerated.	NULL
1360232	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia and the world needs to transition to a low emissions future as quickly as possible if we are to have any chance of staying below 2C change. there is not much difference in the benefits cost ratio between the two and its something that will need to happen anyway.	Yes
1360233	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As we are already far behind the rest of the world on this, option C makes sense.	Yes
1360234	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Efficiency standards have been delayed since 2008, we need to move faster to catch up with the rest of the developed world	No
1360237	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need a fast start on this. Fuel efficiency is important esp for new car buyers. It would help cost of living.	Yes
1360238	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fuel cost savings which benefit consumers, reduced emission which benefit the climate.	Yes
1360240	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are way behind and need to act rapidly. Why not go as quick as possible as well as introduce far greater support for active transport options, public transport and electrification of transport and dump dependency on fossil fuels as soon as possible	No
1360241	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	A strong effort needs to be made in this space, I prefer option B, middle of the road as it's of significant benefit to the community with hopes that it would cause less ire in the media.	Yes
1360245	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We're so far behind the rest of the world we need to catch up quickly to avoid becoming a pollution dumping ground for manufacturers.	Yes
1360247	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is already lagging far behind in fuel efficiency standards which has enabled car manufacturers to dump their low efficiency cars here and has led to higher costs and higher pollution. We can't afford to wait for the car industry to do the right thing. This has to happen now - and is only brining Australia up to the standards other countries have enjoyed for years.	Yes

1360248	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1360249	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Since Australia hasn't done anything for the last 15 years and with the latest IPCC report, we no longer have the timeframe to enact a slower change. The vehicle technology costs shouldn't be that high as we are only catching up to other countries, so the vehicles already exist. The manufacturers just have to start importing them.	Yes
1360251	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option A provides Australians with the best option to save money, have greater choice of vehicles, and also positively impact the environment	Yes
1360252	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The BCR in option 3 is similar to option 2 and the total benefits are significantly higher. We are in the midst of a climate emergency and we have waited too long for the FES as it is.	Yes
1360255	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have an opportunity to not be the slowest moving country in the developed world on climate action, we should always strive to take it.	Yes
1360256	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Do it once, do it right. We only have one planet. Also, don't separate LCV. People will buy commercial vehicles for personal use because of side-effect incentivisation.	No
1360259	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	People will balk if car purchase cost rises too steeply and may resist change to better choice	Yes
1360260	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I think action is urgent	Yes
1360261	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1360262	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1360265	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are lagging behind on climate change action. We have to get serious.	Yes
1360266	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to be moving to a less CO2 emissions as quickly as is practically possible. I would actually prefer Option C - however understand that the motor vehicle industry dies need to be able to adapt understand	Yes
1360269	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Costs!!! We need cost savings now not in a decade or more. The overall net benefit is better & more importantly, EVs are grossly expensive at the moment! We've been waiting for years & are already a decade behind in getting cheaper EVs. The longer you drag out the NVES the longer it will be before people can afford to buy an EV! We are not going to meet our target at your current rate of opening new & expanding old fossil fuel projects.	No
1360270	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1360271	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want improved air quality and to mitigate climate change.	No
1360272	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change	No

1360274	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are way behind in efforts to reduce emissions, especially in the vehicle sector, and need to catch up ASAP. We are quickly becoming a nation of big, polluting SUVs that is unsafe for the environment and also pedestrians. PLEASE make sure that there are measures in the final policy to prevent selling bigger cars to get around the requirements, like in the USA.	Yes
1360275	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	A faster transition will provide more choice for consumers sooner and lower vehicle emissions faster.	Yes
1360276	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has lagged the world for far too long on vehicle fuel efficiency. For health, environment and cost, we should be aiming for the best outcome	No
1360279	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The sooner the better, and we are lagging behind most other nations	No
1360285	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should have been already in option B by now but because there's no regulation on petrol using cars, we are far behind the rest of the world in dealing with the climate crisis.	Yes
1360287	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C delivers the greatest emissions cuts with a marginal reduction in the benefit-to-cost ratio (BCR). The modelling was completed using a 7 percent discount rate, which is not really appropriate for climate policy. If a more appropriate social discount rate of 3-4% was used, option C would likely achieve the highest BCR.	Yes
1360288	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Be aligned with other countries. Climate is important. Saving is important	Yes
1360289	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Long periods of inaction now require the first step to be the largest. Option C is still respectful to the super profits that have been enjoyed by the fossil fuel industry over the previous years.	No
1360298	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I think we should move quickly to bring about change. Get it done. We've waited too long	Yes
1360299	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We're all dying from the emissions from ICE vehicles, time to be as good as possible as fast as possible.	NULL
1360300	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have been waiting too long already for these standards to be introduced.	No
1360306	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option A is really a non-option; a do (next to nothing option). Option B send to offer the greatest 'value' and if not corrupted by car companies finding loopholes should help Australians (finally) get access to more fuel efficient cars at ab reasonable price. This will deliver financial benefits to motorists and environmental and health benefits to us all.	Yes
1360311	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's time we had cleaner air and cleaner vehicles like most of the rest of the world. The fact that we don't is an indictment on the previous government.	Yes
1360312	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1360318	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have wasted a decade by doing nothing. No choice now but to fast track	Yes
1360326	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because we are so far behind on this, we need to act as quickly as possible. Pandering to business interests lobby groups and driving policy around compromises with them is bad for Australia's interests and results in poorer policy outcomes. One does not ask the fox his views on hen house security policy development.	No

1360330	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has been lagging behind for years. It's definitely time to catch-up ASAP.	No
1360332	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option B is the pragmatic one, and will be the least amount of resistance, however Option C is what we should be doing. Reducing gas guzzlers and saving Australians and the economy \$ through reduced fuel imports. Too many pickups on the road!	Yes
1360335	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Best for environment, best nett benefit	Yes
1360337	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The long term benefits for our children are likely not included in this analysis and far outweigh current downside.	No
1360342	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 2nd	I don't believe that the current policies will actually lead to a reduction in CO2 emissions.	No
1360343	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1360347	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is one of the few developed countries in the world without proper fuel efficiency standards. Option C is the best so that we can make up for missed time. We are a small market compared to the US and Europe, and manufacturers there have had years to make the necessary production adjustments etc to comply. The argument that they need time to comply to aggressive standards in Australia therefore doesn't stand up to scrutiny.	Yes
1360348	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Faster to get to the desired outcome, better for the environment and would seem better for the wallet.	Yes
1360349	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As a country already experiencing major impacts from Climate Change we need to act now and act fast to reduce emissions. Option C provides the most benefits for climate but also the most health benefits, financial benefits and productivity benefits. Option B is OK but not ambitious enough. Option A should not even be considered.	Yes
1360350	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option c has the potential to speed up the decarbonisation of the transport sector, benefits the public who choose to purchase more fuel efficient vehicle models most and more quickly, and is likely to upset the fossil vehicle dealers the most.	Yes
1360355	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Can't believe we are still having these conversations, option A to move as quickly as possible in line with International Energy Agency recommendations	No
1360356	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The sooner we take action the sooner we see benefits. The cost may be higher initially but the long term benefits of option c far outweigh the costs. I want my future children and grand children to grow up in a world where they can see fields, and trees, and breathe clean air. If that means a more expensive world for me for a little while then I can live with that	NULL
1360364	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australian needs to transition as quickly as possible, and I would anticipate all three options will experience inevitable delays despite the government's best intentions. Therefore, I believe the Government's position should be as ambitious as is possible.	NULL
1360368	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to catch up to the world on emission and efficiency standards. Already the market is getting flooded with inefficient vehicles that appear safe, look cool, but fundamentally push us backwards.	Yes
1360370	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	appears to be optimal approach	Yes
1360374	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 2nd	The policy is flawed because EV's also have a carbon legacy that is not governed or counted along with additional carbon emissions each time they are charged using non green energy which is Australia occurs most of the time.	No

1360375	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1360376	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1360377	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reducing emissions is the most important factor, and reduced consumer costs is an additional benefit	Yes
1360379	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1360381	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Better FES will help Australians - we should have done these YEARS ago.	Yes
1360384	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Financial	No
1360385	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is so far behind the rest of the world, we need to move ahead in taking action and catch up	Yes
1360387	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	I think that once again the average person will suffer for the woke few these vehicles are what runs this country not an electric hatch back you will take good manufacturers out of the country as we are to small a market for them to warrant the cost	No
1360390	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Although the cost may be higher, the abatement will as a whole result in larger cost savings for the government and the nation overall.	NULL
1360391	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1360393	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1360395	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Vehicle manufacturers have had almost 2 decades to make cars and light vehicles that meet or exceed these fuel standards. Moreover, they already have vehicles that meet these requirements which they are selling to European and USA customers so there's no reason for a slow start.	Yes
1360398	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This is something that should have been done 20 years ago	Yes
1360399	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Imperative to rapidly decarbonise road transport fleet	Yes
1360402	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want to pay less for petrol and want better efficiency	No
1360403	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We cannot afford top dally. Climate change will kill us all if we don't do our utmost. Cost is relative. Only accept option B because anything is better than Option A.	No



1360410	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Brings us inline with other nations	No
1360411	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As a person who commutes using active transport one of the few unenjoyable aspects of my daily travel is being exposed to the exhaust gasses of the vehicles around me. It's no good trying to promote active commuting if that is negatively impacted by the harmful effects of vehicle emissions. We've been waiting too long, make it happen fast for the health of our future generations.	Yes
1360414	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1360415	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	EV incentives will be much faster - if it's cheaper to buy and use a EV then Australia will make the obvious decision.	No
1360430	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I think the climate is telling us that perhaps we don't have time for option B.	Yes
1360431	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1360432	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Emissions must be cut urgently. Also, if we go slowly, we will become the dumping ground for manufacturer's dirty cars that they can no longer sell in EU or US but we still have a government that lets them in.	No
1360434	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Get our government out these ridiculous agreements. Renewables are the cost of the planet are not renewable. No WEF WHO UN agreements, not one of us asked to be dictated by globalists	No
1360435	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Given the current economic climate and Australia's landscape, Option C would be detrimental to the every day Aussie, particularly those in rural and regional areas.	No
1360436	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Why do we send so much money? \$39 Billion in fuel costs overseas every year when we could invest in our electricity infrastructure and fuel our own economy	No
1360451	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Do not support either one as for industries which require vehicles for outback and certain trades will not be able to access sufficient technology in vehicles such as utes. Smaller vehicles with smaller engines become less reliable for heavy loads there this is only suitable to people who dont use their car for crucial purposes	No
1360453	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is no planet B. We're the dumping ground for the gas guzzling rejects.	Yes
1360455	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The benefit difference is created than the cost difference and will make Australia go faster to minime energy cost and pollution production	Yes
1360458	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C has a similar cost to benefit ration to option B but delivers a much greater overall benefit. Looking at the incremental benefit between options B & C, the ratio is 2.5, so moving from option B to C delivers a strong positive benefit.	Yes
1360461	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C has the biggest benefits to Australians and still has a great cost benefit ratio.	Yes
1360466	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cost of delay is more important than just cost alone. Poor track record of climate action over last 20 years fuels public distrust of gov. Fast start option c) would demonstrate gov commitment to exceed rather than merely catch up at some point in next 10 yrs.	No

1360477	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Benefit cost ratio is achievable	No
1360478	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B is most favorable because it combines ambition with feasibility, offering a strong policy framework that allows flexibility for suppliers. This approach minimizes potential high costs while incentivizing infrastructure investment, ultimately delivering notable environmental benefits and cost savings for Australians.	Yes
1360490	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 0th	This is the most sensible and achievable option.	Yes
1360491	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	Option B truly represents a good compromise between ambitious (and necessary) goals, costs, and feasibility.	Yes
1360496	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need an ambitious model	Yes
1360500	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Let's get going on this important issue	Yes
1360503	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	Australia needs a smooth transition. Most people won't have the means to change rapidly	Yes
1360515	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Need to balance the rate of change with a reasonable target - yet a target that makes tangible difference	Yes
1360535	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has already wasted a lot of time debating. Need to move fast to save our future.	Yes
1360542	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Although I'd love us to go as fast as possible I think the higher cost makes it less acceptable to a majority of people, especially in the current economic situation, so favour B.	Yes
1360548	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reduction in transport emissions has multiple positive benefits aside from assisting with reducing overall carbon emissions. These additional benefits relate to improved health outcomes such as reduction in respiratory disorders & the other being less environmental pollution.	Yes
1360549	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to encourage manufacturers to ship low emissions and no emissions vehicles to Australia ASAP	No
1360554	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	A cleaner and healthier environment for all living creatures and the environment in general is what I and millions of others desperately want.	Yes
1360561	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to quickly reduce our CO2 emissions. It is highly likely this year the Earth will reach an increase of 1.5 degrees in temperature.	No
1360565	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1360569	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is happening faster than expected and we must make every effort as fast as we can.	Yes

1360571	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	It's the government's preference so it might be achievable. Also, i like that it is considered/designed to be flexible	Yes
1360572	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to move to EV technology as fast as possible to curb emissions and set a clear direction for all industries to adopt safe, renewable, efficient and planet-friendly energy solutions.	Yes
1360576	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Time is running out to reduce carbon emissions and climate change is taking quite a foothold— and now impacting everyday lives!	Yes
1360581	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Too much time has already been wasted in reducing emissions. We need to go hard and fast. Option B is better than nothing but needs to be implemented sooner than projected	No
1360583	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Meeting/matching the rest of the OECD is at least something we should aim for. While it would be great to pursue option C, the costs to benefits are probably too much for now with cost of living pressures and the current media and political environment.	Yes
1360589	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1360621	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C has a stronger Benefit to cost ratio with better outcomes.	Yes
1360626	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	delivers best fuel cost savings to australians	Yes
1360628	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is impacting the globe already. We need to have very stringent vehicle efficiency standards as soon as possilbe.	Yes
1360633	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The country is so far behind we need to get there as fast as possible. Option A is pointless and benefits big oil.	No
1360637	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is real, and having better options for higher efficiency and zero emission vehicles that are cheaper because of market competition is exciting to me!	Yes
1360638	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I don't like the 1st option; I don't have as much faith in the 2nd option as in the 3rd one.	Yes
1360639	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The sooner we move to more efficient vehicles the better. Every little helps reduce the carbon footprint.	Yes
1360649	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I am of the view that it is necessary for a rapid transition to occur in order for Australia to meet scientifically backed emissions reduction targets. my view is that we should transition as quickly as possible to ensure that our industries have an advantage by being in the vanguard of green technologies.	Yes
1360653	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	save the planet and get ris of polluting vehicled	Yes
1360655	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Can be offset with financial incentives for EV's and Hydrogen	Yes

1360669	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I really would love to see Australia work toward more sustainable vehicle usage to slow the Climate Crisis. I think that Option B is the most realistic way to get there without Australia fighting against the changes. Option C then follows as if that can go through comfortably that would be amazing and then Option A is not acceptable.	Yes
1360676	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option C is best but may carry political risk so I choose option B	Yes
1360684	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1360685	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We actually need to be better then USA standards and match EU standards	NULL
1360687	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	achieveable without too much hassle	Yes
1360689	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Unless Light Trucks are included with Light Vehicles (cars) in this new efficiency standard this will not work. Pickup truck and SUV's (like Toyota Landcruisers) are used as cars but classified as light trucks because of their size. Manufactures will only increase weight and size of cars to reclassify them as Light trucks. To avoid this loophole, light trucks should only be able to carry max.3people.(ie Vans and utes)	NULL
1360692	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Concern that climate change is already underway and its now about minimizing the extent to which change will continue to occur.	No
1360693	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We're so behind, we need to catch up for lost time	NULL
1360694	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cost effective and fast	Yes
1360696	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We can't waste any more time.Do it now	NULL
1360703	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	It is vital we catch up to the more progressive countries on this	Yes
1360719	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1360725	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B is the most practical	Yes
1360731	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I think it's very important that SUVs are counted as passenger cars given their growing popularity and that the majority of them are used for this purpose. I also think it provides a balanced approach between the other two options, whilst still being ambitious and reducing emissions levels quickly as we need to do.	Yes
1360732	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Your pollution is killing people and the environment	No
1360738	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	LNP have delayed this for a long time	No

1360743	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 0th	NULL	Yes
1360746	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Achievable, less likely to further alienate groups who think no change is required	Yes
1360749	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	To do this, it need to move the industry along at a fast enough pace to have affect, but not cost too much that it would be prohibitive.	Yes
1360757	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1360760	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1360762	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I think the most expensive option will put people off however, I think we need to catch up to other jurisdictions and not allow Australia to be a dumping ground for high emissions	Yes
1360777	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The quicker we move away from fossil fuels the better. The ICE vehicle manufacturers have got way with dumping their \,DIRTY\, inefficient vehicles in Australia for long enough!	No
1360786	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is a large land mass and we will continue to have reliance on private vehicles, we should do all we can to reduce harm from the private vehicle fleet to ensure its continued viability.	Yes
1360788	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1360792	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has a huge amount of catching up to do in vehicle emissions standards, so we need to act assertively and quickly. We have been a dumping ground for vehicles with poor emissions standards for far too long.	Yes
1360795	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We must act rapidly to greatly reduce emissions and pollution, if we are to have a viable and healthy future.	Yes
1360797	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	About the environment and my grandchildren	NULL
1360801	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need urgent reductions in CO2 emissions, as soon as possible. Models 1 and 2 cater to legacy auto continuing to provide Australian's with higher emitting vehicles than Europe or America. We need legislation with no concessions for vehicle weight and reducers.	No
1360804	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need swift action	No
1360805	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Global reliance on fossil fuels wrecks havoc on health, the environment, and climate. Transitioning to renewable electricity from solar and wind is urgent. We must electrify transport, promote clean electric vehicles, and break free from fossil fuels for a cleaner, healthier future.	Yes
1360810	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes

1360812	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	A fast transition is the most appropriate way to improve our long term climate and health outcomes.	Yes
1360817	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1360822	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1360823	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Provides the largest net benefits, will go further towards shielding Australia from oil price volatility and import vulnerability and is the most effective in terms of reducing transport emissions.	Yes
1360826	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 1st	We are already on the back foot. And instead of leapfrogging to the fastest possible transition we would be lagging if we chose Option B. Please go with C and only C.	No
1360827	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fastest transition makes sense given Australia is an outlier in emissions standards among its developed economy peers.	No
1360830	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Should be paired with a matching gov owned energy infrastructure. solar+ batteries to reduce charging costs. This is long overdue. Fast charging should be competitive. Expanded slow / cheap reliable charging (ie tesla wall connectors) should be considered as well.	No
1360832	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There are more benefits and it happens in a quicker timeframe. Reducing the climate impacts, health impacts and financial cost to citizens and bring access to contemporary models of fuel efficient vehicles. Australia is a climate laggard and this could show the world we are serious and at the same time expose us to new markets as ev and hgen technologies are improved.	Yes
1360835	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Highest benefits available, right thing to do, faster adoption	No
1360838	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B is a good compromise. It gets the job done (eventually) while providing time for change.	Yes
1360845	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1360850	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1360851	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	More thorough framework for the future of cars and helping address climate change.	Yes
1360852	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I am voting for the gov's preferred option so that people have time to adjust. We've known for years that this is the right thing to do. As well as the benefits mentioned there is also the noise factor, it is wonderful when an electric car glides by. I honestly can't wait until this is implemented.	Yes
1360853	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is the biggest have ignored the for decades because their jobs and not cause the electorate pain.	No
1360854	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To reduce the pollution levels experienced near our roads and to provide cleaner air for our children to breathe. Also to reduce the import of energy and transition to a fleet of vehicles that can run on energy produced in Australia (electric vehicles)	No

1360855	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	This is an achievable option which will not cost too much to implement.	Yes
1360857	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to take the fastest possible action to avoid the worst aspects of climate change. I support a fast start to try and catch Australia up to most of the rest of the developed world	Yes
1360858	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is so far behind with regards to energy efficiency standards and the reduction of greenhouse gases that it is imperative to make every effort to introduce robust standards as soon as possible. The benefits in the long run will far outweigh any short term impacts.	NULL
1360860	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	1. There's no time to waste, we must reduce emissions of GHG's urgently. The state and federal governments have recognised this at an overall level, but without policy like this action will be limited. 2. Car manufacturers have had a free ride on the Australian public for too long. They have had ample time to develop to Euro and other standards and in many cases already have the vehicles and engines to meet. 3. A slow-roll through options A or B give time for opposition and dilution.	Yes
1360862	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B has benefits that head in the right direction without too much hardship.	Yes
1360864	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1360866	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option c has the biggest benefit for relatively not that much additional cost completed to option b.	Yes
1360870	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1360877	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The time for climate action is way past. Governments have ignores the science for decades. They had no appetite to inflict pain on the people but now we have no choice, we all have to bear some pain to stop destroying the planet.	No
1360881	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are already 50 years behind the leaders. We need to bite the bullet and make a difference ASAP.	No
1360885	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	It's a significant step without pushing too hard at the commencement.	Yes
1360892	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should strive for the strongest possible standards to reach net zero as quickly as possible , as we have been lagging behind the rest of the world already	NULL
1360896	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are so far behind the rest of the developed world in this regard that it is vital we act decisively and quickly now. There is much catching up to do, to not only provide savings for motorists, but reduce our emissions and improve our highly vulnerable liquid fuel energy security. Please go hard now!	NULL
1360898	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Seems to have most benefit and keep flexible	Yes
1360913	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1360914	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	The climate can't wait.	Yes

1360918	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The problem is massive and urgent and requires maximum action asap	No
1360922	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to protect the planet and remove the need for fossil fuels to run our vehicles	Yes
1360924	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We are long overdue to align with the rest of the world.	Yes
1360928	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs this urgently! Why has the government waited so long - lobbying by the petroleum companies and ICE car manufacturers?	NULL
1360931	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The faster we get there , the better for the environment and also so health. Exhaust fume inhalation is toxic and linked to a number of health conditions.	No
1360932	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This is a crisis and the solution is available	No
1360937	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Better overall	Yes
1360947	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want to see ev exceledated but also be the most beneficial to Australians	No
1360951	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are already behind, so drastic measures are required to catch up	Yes
1360958	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are literally killing off this planets lovable ecosystems. Cost is no longer a consideration.	Yes
1360960	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Cost benefit	Yes
1360961	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Although option 3 is the best, Option 2 will propbably have more support from parlamentarians, and is more likely to be voted for.	Yes
1360962	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1360978	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B looks a more measured approach which gives consideration to achievables vs cost	Yes
1360980	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to be moving in the forward direction on all fronts to combat our impact on the planet and environment	NULL
1360995	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Tried B for 1st, B 2nd, B 3rd VIZ: Benefit cost ratio, Benefits, Costs. Results should read Option B 1st 2nd 3rd ? Not working correctly?	Yes



1360997	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We are very much beholden to external decisions here. Yes we can aspire for option C to become the choice however we are a very small market, of limited appeal for being RHD and with our own set of ADR... It is pretty clear legacy auto is struggling with EV and so our choices become Tesla and Chinese, maybe some Korean models. Encourage/incent Tesla to build out the SC network across Australia before moving too fast here.	Yes
1360999	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I want to see more climate friendly vehicles available in Australia - I'm waiting for there to be a Prado equivalent. Also keen to reduce fuel usage costs.	Yes
1361008	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have wasted the last 20 years, as industry and others delay, delay delayed, so we may as well adopt world-leading EU standards asap. Manufacturers are forced to meet EU standards anyway, so we may as well piggy-back off those.	Yes
1361010	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The quicker we move the quicker we can clean our environment	NULL
1361012	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I support this choice, specifically not choosing option A, because I don't think Option A is acting in accordance with the climate emergency we are facing. Further, it will not have as much benefit for communities.	Yes
1361018	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 2nd	I would think the majority of car manufacturers are already doing this.	No
1361020	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1361026	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	industry altering - this will change the way OEMs design and distribute fossil fuel burner devices to citizens - the industry will find the available loopholes - so regulate the most aggressive targets	Yes
1361033	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because Australians deserve better and to have the best EV charging infrastructure in the OECD Region	Yes
1361039	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want my daughter to have a planet to live on	NULL
1361042	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	It's costing us money to be inefficient	No
1361046	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are years behind most of the world on this. We need to catch up as fast as possible. Let's be bold now.	NULL
1361051	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The planet needs the greatest emissions reductions in the shortest possible time.	Yes
1361053	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is at a tipping point we need speed to action	Yes
1361054	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Best benefits cost ratio	Yes
1361055	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	highest Net benefit exists for fastest transition.	No

1361061	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Maximum benefit as fast as possible	Yes
1361063	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are currently trailing behind the world in taking steps to mitigate the effect of climate change, we are paying more at the petrol pump when people are struggling to make ends meet & due to our current sloppy standards car manufacturers can off load cars here that other countries won't accept.	NULL
1361068	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Faster implementation	No
1361070	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1361072	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to stop polluting cars coming to Australia but there will always be compromises. Option B provides for this. How about banning SUVs in capital cities like Paris :)	Yes
1361075	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to be aggressive, so Option C is best. I actually wish there was an Option D: same as Option C but it only allows higher exemptions for utes used exclusively for business purposes. Thus utes used primarily for family purposes should be more heavily penalised.	No
1361079	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	It provided time to manufacturers to catch up	Yes
1361080	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As economies of scale improve rapidly, costs will decline. Also hybrids are a waste of time and money. ICE manufactures may fail in the next 2-4years due to rapid global transition, let's not have Australians left behind.	Yes
1361084	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Electric cars are the future, so why delay the future.	NULL
1361085	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1361088	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1361089	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Clearly, option C is the urgently-needed priority that will most benefit the environment and thus this country and all its inhabitants and the wider world, and will thus be more cost-effective in the long term. The government needs to cease being short-sighted and stop subsidising and supporting fossil fuels and take responsible action; here: select option C.	No
1361090	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We can't afford to fall behind the rest of the world. We should be striving towards improving. The more we lag behind the longer we remain the dumping ground.	No
1361092	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is well behind other countries when it comes to implementing fuel efficiency standards. Plan C has the greatest net benefit and the greatest environmental benefit.	Yes
1361093	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Reduce costs, reduce CO2, better cars	Yes
1361098	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to act now. Climate change is a worldwide emergency.	Yes

1361102	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's too late to do anything other than the most aggressive option. Australia needs to catch up...you cannot catch up slowly!!	NULL
1361105	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Its too darn hot already long term globally	Yes
1361112	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	A rapid transition is required to reduce co2 and air pollution levels as quickly as possible for the sake of my grandchildren's health and future environment	Yes
1361113	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The sooner this nation converts its vehicle fleet to renewable energy, the better.	Yes
1361115	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are already so far behind! We need to sprint to catch up. We should be WIRKD LEADERS in solar and battery manufacturing. Why are we not using our own minerals to make batteries for EVs on global scale??	No
1361119	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I understand climate science	Yes
1361120	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Best solution for Australia to transition us to a hetter future.	Yes
1361121	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1361122	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need the most practical option for reducing CO2 emmissions	Yes
1361124	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I have a Tesla	No
1361125	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to be part of the global change. We also need better options for the national vehicle fleet sooner.	Yes
1361127	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce greenhouse gases as quickly as possible	Yes
1361128	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is already so far behind the rest of the world, we need the most aggressive approach to get ahead of the rest of the world - we should be more ambitious than just trying to match the US regulations. Supercredits are a bad idea and would undermine the proposal. We're one of the least densely populated developed nations in the world, we are unfortunately forced to drive a lot, so we need the highest possible standards so we can get the most efficient vehicles.	No
1361130	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Quick reduction in CO2 emissions is essential in terms of environment and health benefits. Cost should be a last consideration as future cost benefits will accrue and more importantly better health outcomes achieved.	No
1361133	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	Yes
1361134	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 0th	NULL	Yes

1361136	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	NULL	Yes
1361137	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Provides the fastest transition	No
1361139	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Given that Australia has been slow to adopt emissions standards, targets for emissions and the urgency to do so the most rapid changeover is the best. There will be flow on benefits from the transition not reflected in the summary above. The sooner emissions are cut, the sooner all of the benefits can be enjoyed by everyone.	No
1361141	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1361144	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Brings us in line with US and EU, and forces car companies to bring in better car choices, not just the leftovers that other countries don't want.	No
1361147	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1361151	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to cut emissions from the transport sector as quickly as possible. We've already gone way too long without a standard, it's time to catch up	Yes
1361152	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Way overdue	Yes
1361158	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to speed up the process of introducing EVs into Australia. The benefits to the consumer (both new and second-hand), pollution reduction, clean air in our towns and cities and cost of running a car are enormous	No
1361162	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1361163	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are so far behind rest of world, only an aggressive proposal will catch us up.	Yes
1361171	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Efficiency makes sense for the Australian consumer. See fuel savings table. Approx 85% of countries have efficiency standards. Australia's poor standards mean we are a dumping ground for inefficient vehicles.	Yes
1361182	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1361183	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Simple, time is running out for planet earth...and I have grandchildren	No
1361184	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Let's be a leader and show the rest of the world how's it's done creating a sustainable future for generations	No
1361186	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to get emmissions down as fast as possible, it will still be a challenge but We Have to do it. We should have been doing this years ago and now we need to catch up as fast as possible.	Yes

1361187	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to get this in place as soon as possible, not only for the environmental and health benefits, but to ensure that Australia doesn't become a dumping ground for inefficient ICE vehicles.	Yes
1361189	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1361192	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	If we are going to introduce any standards let's introduce the one with the most benefit to our environment.	No
1361193	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B allows us to reach the net zero deadline with the least cost to consumers	Yes
1361194	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have waited too long to address issues surrounding climate change. Our car market already has the worst emissions standards of the developed world. The costs of further delay in disaster relief and health costs are unacceptable. We must act decisively now.	No
1361199	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1361200	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to make a fast start to renewable future for all Australians. We have all of the resources that can deliver a cleaner planet for future generations, while the people of Australia will prosper for years to come leaving a legacy for future generations. The future is EV, not Hydrogen	Yes
1361203	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C provides the biggest savings and fastest transition to sustainable transport.	NULL
1361212	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1361214	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1361217	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Highest net benefit and fastest way to meet global expectations. Got to run hard!	No
1361218	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce emissions quickly, been waiting too long for this.	Yes
1361223	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The benefits are worth the cost. We will all benefit from the health benefit and the greenhouse gas emission reduction so it's worth pursuing as we are a wealthy country. Other policy, such as tax reform, can be pursued to help low income earners adapt to increased transport costs, if required. Whilst I strongly prefer option C, option B is clearly miles better than option A.	Yes
1361227	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	NULL	Yes
1361231	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Australia 100% needs emission targets for cars, it is one of the last countries to not have any and car manufacturers end up releasing their worst performing cars here!	Yes
1361236	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes

1361237	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Speed id of the escence.	No
1361238	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to begin moving in the right direction and being with or ahead the rest of the world. The risk is we become the dumpling ground.	Yes
1361248	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1361257	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Government needs to be aggressive as other markets embrace EV's.	No
1361259	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has been lagging behind all developed countries in seeing fuel emission standards. For such an advanced nation it's time to correct this lack of action.	Yes
1361262	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Ideally I'd my preference is option C, as I think we need to act quickly to slow global warming. It would probably require help for the financially disadvantaged. If that was available, I'd go for option C. I would like to see emission compliance tests as part of the pink slip inspections. These tests have been used in Europe for decades and resulted in cars that cause unnecessarily high emissions to be repaired or taken off the road and not tolerated.	NULL
1361266	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 0th	NULL	Yes
1361268	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1361270	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to stop pandering to corporates and get on with the huge job of transition. We are already too late - everything needs to accelerate now.	No
1361273	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1361276	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	It is high time to take action. Govenments pushing in the right direction are highly needed.	Yes
1361277	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Save the planet	Yes
1361281	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Balances costs and benefits while still delivering sustainable outcomes.	Yes
1361283	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to act as soon as possible. There don't seem to be that many differences between B and C, and this move will encounter resistance, so we might as well take it a tad easier.	Yes
1361285	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1361286	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to transition to a low carbon future ASAP	Yes

1361296	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia should be the green energy KING of the world. We have the natural resources. I am sick of fuel guzzlers clogging our streets and ears and lungs.	Yes
1361303	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1361304	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to catch up with the rest of the world with its emission standards, this standard now also presents an opportunity to be a leader in reducing emissions.	Yes
1361306	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Reasonably ambitious targets with time for the industry to adjust.	Yes
1361307	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As Australia is lagging the rest of the world, we need to act quickly to catch up. That's why I selected C as the best option.	NULL
1361313	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option c delivers the most benefit to the public and helps lower emissions fastest	No
1361314	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 0th	Stronger policy on emissions reduction and cost	Yes
1361319	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is time to act, there is no time to be cautious or delay. We are already decades behind on vehicle emissions, let's catch up fast and give our kids the best chance of a future where climate change effects are minimised.	Yes
1361321	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1361325	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1361326	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1361331	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Transportation emissions must be reduced as quickly as possible. Car makers are seeking to stall to protect their interests rather than what is best for society in the long term. Option C will see us catch up to the rest of the planet in a shorter period	Yes
1361333	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The technology is ready and the need is great, from both from a climate change and national security perspective.	Yes
1361338	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is critical that we act decisively to minimise the impacts of climate change before it is too late.	NULL
1361342	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	Yes
1361347	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 0th	Flexibility with new and moving infrastructure seems important at the beginning, with the sight to increase once reduce faster when old tech has been decommissioned.	Yes

1361348	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C, and I don't support option A. Bring us into line with rest of world. Start some positive action on climate change, can't keep having 'unprecedented' events	Yes
1361351	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Need to move fast and I prioritise improved health outcomes and environmental outcomes.	Yes
1361354	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to adopt the option that delivers the greatest CO2 reduction, as quickly as possible. The cost of not achieving significant CO2 reduction in terms of climate impact to our society is far greater than the cost of change. The car companies have already had more than enough time to change and have let us down by their resistance to it. Australia is a long way behind the rest of the developed world on this and we need to get back on track.	Yes
1361361	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B is more achievable compared to option C.	Yes
1361364	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Transition has to be done as fast as possible. We have dawdled and wasted too much time already getting these new standards through!	Yes
1361367	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Heralds the 2030 new energy economy of mass clean and cheaper energy.	No
1361368	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The government needs to pull its finger out and catch-up with the rest of the world.	No
1361369	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C may reduce demand for larger vehicles such as large SUV and encourage purchase of smaller, lighter weight and often more aerodynamic vehicles that use less fuel. Option B may give a credit for large heavy vehicle and a debit for a small light sedan which isn't the aim if trying to reduce CO2 emissions in total.	Yes
1361370	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I want the fastest practical solution implemented	Yes
1361373	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I can't believe we didn't do this decades ago	Yes
1361382	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1361384	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	No
1361388	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is most effective in reducing emissions, which is of critical importance.	No
1361389	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This is something we should have done years ago.. we're way behind, and Option C gets us there faster	Yes
1361390	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is lagging behind other countries in terms of electrification and use of renewable energy. We need to substantially accelerate our pace.	No
1361395	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is important for me that we urgently transition to green energy solutions.	No



1361402	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1361403	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1361409	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Society has to act as quickly as possible to reduce emissions to mitigate as much climate change as possible. Whilst Option C is a hard choice in practical terms, we should aim as high as we can - and the technology exists now to provide for vehicles that exceed the requirements of Option C.	Yes
1361411	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1361417	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Australia badly needs to catch up on emissions standards. We have been held back way too long. Option B helps do this with some speed, good payback and without over shocking the economy. The likely noise from self interested fossil fuel parties and climate deniers needs to be called out for what it is	Yes
1361420	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Health benefits, maximum reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and costs for the owner.	No
1361421	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1361422	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Need for no voluntary options	Yes
1361431	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Why not? We are already behind leading countries like China already. Best option is to get on with it as we sat on a hands for too long. We need that direction from gvt so industry can start to prepare not sitting on fence.	No
1361433	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Critical, that greenhouse gas emissions are reduced, we only have a short number of years before we reach a global tipping point.	No
1361437	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are behind the rest of the world on this and we need to catch up fast.	NULL
1361438	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This option best supports increasing EV availability and reduce carbon emissions.	NULL
1361446	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1361451	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The fastest transition will have the best environmental impact	Yes
1361452	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is urgent to change our behaviour	NULL
1361461	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There are enough good ev's around the world that can be brought to AU and supply the market. This will drive down the cost of cars and make them cheaper than ICE cars.	No

1361466	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Time to stop subsidising big oil. Just get on with it.	No
1361467	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Essential immediate action required!	Yes
1361468	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1361471	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Before it's too late.	NULL
1361472	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have no time to waste to make this transition. Costs may be higher up front but mitigating the long term impacts is the most sensible option for our environmental and monetary futures.	No
1361476	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need the transition to be as quick as possible.	No
1361480	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	vehicle emissions results in many early deaths of Australians, as well has health impacts on children and is a known source of cancer.	Yes
1361484	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1361485	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Urgent need to act on climate change	Yes
1361486	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must act as quickly as possible to address climate change.	NULL
1361496	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are not currently going enough	Yes
1361504	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1361507	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1361511	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	CO2 abatement as quick as possible.	No
1361517	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have already delayed action for too long, we need to move as fast as possible right now	Yes
1361522	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	Too many complaints from lobbyists if go too fast, especially Aust chamber of auto industries that is stacked by Japanese recalcitrant a car reps. Also, big 4 Japanese manufacturers and right wing media push back	Yes

1361523	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need stronger standards. It is unusual that this has not happened earlier.	Yes
1361524	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1361529	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Car manufacturers are currently dumping high emission cars in Australia. We drive an excessive number of SUV vehicles already. What's also needed is better public transport options and streets that are safer for walking and cycling.	NULL
1361530	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are the 2nd last OECD country to implement emissions standards (behind Russia) we need to accelerate the implementation and continue the process unhindered by the fossil fuel industry.	Yes
1361535	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1361539	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1361545	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Urgency with climate change	Yes
1361551	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B seems a sensible. pragmatic and realistic approach. Option A is a non-starter... Option C might alienate some people and this would be counter productive.	Yes
1361553	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has been very lazy in approach to this issue so far, strong action now needs to be taken to make up for lost time. While the cost benefits analysis makes a compelling case for Option B, we have an opportunity to be more ambitious. Congratulations on taking a step forward after so many years of coalition backpedaling, let's make it a big step. I don't support option 1, this is basically a flat line option which leaves us forever behind the rest of the world.	Yes
1361561	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	1. Greatest abatement, 2. \,Catch up\, with USA etc, 3. (in my opinion) risk of not enough time for vehicle industry to adapt is not large and such adaption happening overseas already, 4. Drives BEV uptake hardest / BEV manufacturers are already responding in Australia (eg BYD)	Yes
1361565	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Moving away from low efficiency vehicles as soon a possible is the best outcome.	No
1361577	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	it looks to be the fairest	Yes
1361616	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1361645	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Smoother transition	Yes
1361656	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Better benefits	Yes
1361713	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option 1 is realistic and more likely to be implemented compared to Option C which would attract objectors.	Yes

1361751	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Biggest environmental and health benefits. There is no time left to waste on environmental protection.	No
1361835	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are already so far behind, we need to move as fast as possible and we do not have any time to waste.	NULL
1361859	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1361949	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1361959	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is the biggest threat to human life this century. We should prioritise survival over potential missed profits. Not everyone will die during the climate crisis, but people are already dying from it. Even option C may be too little, too late.	No
1362045	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1362088	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	needs to done to protect the future of the planet	No
1362145	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I would also love to see more restrictive vehicle size (particularly width) as well as weight so the efficient motors don't have to move as much	Yes
1362172	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Although Option C is likely to produce the best outcome for tackling climate change, I recognise that the implementation cost is an important factor in choosing which option to implement. It's essential that Australia launches a vehicle efficiency standard as soon as possible. Taking cost into account gives us the best chance of implementing this policy.	Yes
1362182	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1362195	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	CO2 emission reduction should not be a target. Agree with reduction of emissions of other harmful particles that come out of vehicle exhausts.	No
1362224	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This standard is long overdue. The impact of climate change must be addressed ASAP.	Yes
1362240	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We live in a market that has lagged behind others for decades in terms of efficiency and it is costing everyone. In addition to this, because of the lack of BEV options in Australia and the slow uptake, malicious propaganda around the 'danger' of EVs has had a chance to take root. Option C gives the greatest low emissions options.	Yes
1362250	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Climate change is killing us.	Yes
1362252	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The sooner the better. Way overdue.	Yes
1362269	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to get away from fossil fuels asap.	No

1362298	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	Faster the better	No
1362314	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1362315	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1362344	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1362355	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to invoke every measure to reach net zero as quickly as possible	Yes
1362363	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	We need to act in accordance with the scientific consensus, we are in an emergency which requires us to act as such.	Yes
1362370	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fast aggressive change should happen now. The health and environmental benefits will outweigh the costs in the long-term.	Yes
1362380	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The quicker we transition the better the benefits. Slower transition will have greater cost in the long run.	NULL
1362410	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B is the most sensible in the circumstances, evidence based, and brings us into line with others in the market. I fear as a small market we would disadvantage ourselves by going beyond what the US or EU is doing.	Yes
1362417	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	there is no vehicle capable of doing what my current one can in terms of range and towing capacity. There is no infrastructure in place and the territory government cannot be relied upon to deliver a cost effective solution.	NULL
1362428	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	My preference would be to go with an option somewhere between B and C as reading the white paper clearly shows option A as too slow to clearly and demonstrably accelerating reductions compared to B and C. Unfortunately, scenario C shows a marginally lower cost v benefits analysis so reluctantly, option B or something slightly more aggressive than B appears the best option.	Yes
1362435	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We absolutely need to hit emissions reduction targets by 2030. The planet is dying - what could be a more important use of funds??	Yes
1362451	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	NULL	Yes
1362480	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option B and C were close but I preferred option C because of the greater health and environmental benefits.	Yes
1362488	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C maximises benefits, particularly greenhouse emission reduction and lowest government costs. The difference is substantial, with Option A totally inadequate, while Option C betters Option B by a lot: 7.83/27.97/74.22 MT abatement. The higher penalty rate is more likely to influence decisions while fewer large pick-up trucks (eg RAM, F-150) improves road safety.	Yes
1362527	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want the fastest conversion to electric cars. We are way behind the world and the climate crisis is increasing rapidly. We need strong action.	Yes

1362545	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	If the government has set CO2 targets and option C is the only way to meet or beat them, then isn't it the governments duty to spend a bit extra on achieving that goal? I generally support option B also.	Yes
1362550	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I think we need to convert to solar power and electric vehicles as soon as possible. Fossil fuels are destroying our planet and economy and need to be phased out immediately.	NULL
1362554	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	The government has failed to provide any unbiased proof of environmental benefits for any of the options. For reliable EV charging Power Stations are required for charging, which in Australia are primarily coal fired. Where is the evidence that these coal fired steam turbine engines are more efficient and have less environmental impact than internal combustion engines.	No
1362556	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reducing CO2 emissions and keeping our planet liveable should always trump costs. Money is no good to us if we are all dead.	Yes
1362572	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Historically we fall short of goals, so we should aim big and go hard for the eventual failure to meet the proposed targets.	No
1362594	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1362600	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We've had a slow start from the beginning. Its time to actually do something	NULL
1362657	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Despite what the report says, the price of new cars will increase and this hasn't been taken into consideration at all. Comparing US car prices to Australian car prices is laughable given the complexity in selling cars on the Australian market compared to the US market.	No
1362738	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Given we are in a climate emergency it is vital that all measures are taken to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. More EV's will also improve grid reliability and reduce electricity as vehicle to grid becomes commonplace in 2025/26. There should be no fear in the Commonwealth going beyond US or EU standards, as all this will result in is manufactures better cars being offered in Australia. We should ban all ICE cars above \$70,000. No low-income households will be impacted by this measure.	NULL
1362793	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	The proposed pathway B appears the best fit for balancing action with costs, as this approach will reduce the risk of Australians being hit with substantial costs for manufacturer's to develop compliant vehicle offerings. Although this pathway also appears to unreasonably incentivise the selling of larger vehicles which exacerbates existing social and road safety issues related to larger and heavier passenger vehicle sizes. This aspect of the proposal should be revised.	Yes
1362795	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B will move Australia in the direction we need with enough bite to make it a meaningful move. It will stop the petrol car lobby from continuing to import the world of the petrol guzzlers into Australia and encourage the importation of more electric cars.	Yes
1362805	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Middle option in cost. Best BCR score.	Yes
1362833	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	The cost difference between Option 1 and Option 2 seems too great	Yes
1362845	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe that we should do everything possible to mitigate the climate crisis, so the strongest model is my preference. However, the second model still appears to be a good option. The opportunity to get cleaner, more efficient cars into Australia also is a compelling argument for a strong fuel efficiency standard, with likely positive health and local environmental impacts. I am however concerned about the proposal potential incentivising car makers to sell larger cars.	Yes
1362866	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to aggressively transition away from fossil fuels and transition to the use of sustainable energy, both on the grid and with transport. The government should be taxing the fossil fuel incumbent more heavily in order to support the transition to renewables. Norway's special petroleum tax significantly increases the tax burden on its oil and gas sector, reflecting its strategy to maximize the societal benefits from its fossil fuel resources while encouraging renewables.	Yes

1362872	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should have started phasing out fossil fuels decades ago	Yes
1362876	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to aim for the maximum reduction in Co2 emmissions. Lets do it right the first time round as Australia has been lacking fuel standards for a long time and we need to take into account the years of inaction due to Scom . Climate change is not going away but in fact getting worse as we head to the point of no return. We should always set the bar high so that we can collectively work towards a high standard.	No
1362878	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is accelerating at a blistering pace putting our entire ecosystem in jeapoardy. We need to transition to renewables + batteries both on the grid and at commercial and residential buildings. We need to transition to BEV's at a much faster rate, taxing fossil fuel incumbents at a much higher rate to fund the transition and provide incentives to renewable providers. Norway does this and they have 80% market share of BEV's. Australia could really benefit given it's lithium resources.	Yes
1362880	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1362883	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As a country who is one of the largest producers of Co2, and one of the slowest to uptake electric vehicles and green energy, it is an embarrassment on the world stage that it has taken this long and a fast start is sorely needed to catch up to modern standards of sustainability	Yes
1362887	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C gives the best benefit in terms of dollar cost.health benefit and fuel saving. Lets reduce our fuel dependance on the middle east countrres which are mainly authoritarian countries.	No
1362895	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	clean air	Yes
1362898	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1362938	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 2nd	The preferred government option is basically made up of unicorn farts. If they would release the modelling so I can make an informed decision that would be good. But they won't because they know it is nonsense.	No
1362957	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	\Trust me, I am here from the Government to Help You\, - Canberra Public Servants & Federal Politicians live in their own Fully Isolated Glass House Chamber, inured to the problems of everyday Australians, as shown by the Voice Vote for YES in ACT 62% vs rest of Australia NO 60% - Total Disconnect from Australians & Reality of Life	No
1362976	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Transition needs to happen fast. The cost in health benefits is major let alone the peoples lives it will save. We have a beautiful country that needs less CO2	Yes
1362982	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Net benefits still outweighs the costs, the cost of our earth and current climate crisis should be the highest priority	Yes
1362984	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1362988	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	One overall caveat I have is that we should be looking at overall emissions (and not overall emissions per weight) so that we aren't pretending bigger cars are worse than smaller ones - and incentivising accordingly. Overall I prefer option C because we should be aiming to be amongst the leaders in developed countries for fuel economy and minimising pollution, a very quickly moving to phase out new fossil vehicles.	Yes
1362993	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1363004	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to transition as quickly as possible. There has already been significant delays due to Government inaction.	Yes

1363014	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	My nearest \,main\, centre is Kalgoorlie which is 240kms away. None of the above options will provide reliable transport. The most likely outcome will be older vehicles being kept on the road which will nullify any of the purported lowering of emissions. Many others will be in a similar situation.	No
1363029	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	With cost/benefit ratio similar between options B & C, and net benefits substantially better for option C, the latter is the better choice. We need to pursue aggressive emissions reductions to reach net zero, and there are so many benefits that come from vehicle electrification. Technology will move quickly.	Yes
1363030	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Clock is ticking. Pollution fight will cost much more in the future.	No
1363033	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Faster reduces political risk, as long as it is fast to start so noise dies down before election cycle. I am waiting for EV choice and V2H and quite willing to pay a short term cost for long term benefit.	Yes
1363035	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fastest response	NULL
1363063	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Good policy.	Yes
1363072	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Its going to happen faster than Govt. Thinks. The market will set the pace, not the Govt.	No
1363080	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	EV is just a better driving choice for anyone in a city, helping our struggling health budget a lot.	Yes
1363083	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	A free market for vehicle development is the most effective way to provide individually tailored motoring choices AND. Drive efficiencies across the total lifecycle of the vehicle. Government standards and interventions have only made these two criteria harder to achieve and the new proposals are another step change in massive restriction.	No
1363089	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is so late to implement fuel standards we need to make up for lost time	No
1363094	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's the largest and quickest net benefit, bringing us into line with other countries goals. Higher costs are offset by benefits.	NULL
1363096	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I cycle next to the road over Anzac bridge. The fumes are horrible. I suspect anything we can do faster will generate even more savings faster	Yes
1363103	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Due to the delay in implementing NVES we need to implement the standard quickly.	Yes
1363104	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are sonfar behind, we desperately need to catch up. Auto manufacturers and oil companies have had enough profit to last multiple lifetimes, it is our turn to take care of people instead. We need cleaner air and energy independence.	Yes
1363109	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C reflects the need for catch-up after the appalling inaction of the Morrison government. It is desperately needed to force the car industry to make up for lost time and bring in more fuel efficient vehicles immediately, particularly a bigger selection of electric ones. I fear that a powerful lobby will once again sabbotage a crucial initiative. 2.5 billion dollars saved by opting for option B should be set against the massive costs already imposed by climate change. Be brave!	Yes
1363121	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	NULL	Yes



1363129	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Good benefits, limiting cost impacts	Yes
1363131	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Agree with government's approach. Not bound to this forever - can always revise after a reasonable initial period	Yes
1363138	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Health and environmental benefits	Yes
1363154	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1363163	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Don't need somebody's bright idea that's going to cost me money	No
1363165	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Greater savings.	NULL
1363177	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Due to the fact that this is achievable yet still strong and ambitious as well as being the preferred option by the government it is therefore the most likely to be rolled out. We need this done! I want to get on board with the option that is most likely to be achieved. Great work!!	Yes
1363184	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	No
1363188	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B seems sensible, except for the adjustment based on vehicle mass. Incentivising manufacturers to seel heavier cars is ludicrous and counter productive. It makes vehicles more polluting and more damaging at every point in their life cycles.	Yes
1363190	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Not a choice. Just get on with it.	Yes
1363201	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1363211	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	No time to waste	Yes
1363216	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Electric cars are the future of the economy, and the sooner we put active effort and funding into shifting the focus from petrol to electric, the better it will be for everyone. Petrol cars need to be phased out as soon as humanly possible to avoid as much climate damage as possible. The cost now is far, far outweighed by the benefit of the future.	Yes
1363227	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Quit wasting time, rip the band aid off and accelerate I stead of supporting legacy.	No
1363234	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are so far behind global standards we need an aggressive policy of fuel standards introduced. The size of cars on the road has only increased compounding this issue over time.	Yes
1363240	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is upon us now and has been for many years. Time is running out. For my grandchildren and great grandchildren I beg you to do something now!	No

1363248	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1363252	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Health benefits are simply greater, fuel savings are greater	No
1363257	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1363265	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1363269	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I believe that climate change is upon us and quickly reaching the point of no return. The time for talk or useless posturing is well past, and serious methods of abatement must commence now.	Yes
1363291	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The technology already exists to achieve the goals. There is no point in delaying. The sooner we start the sooner we will get the benefits.	No
1363297	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1363300	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I'm extremely concerned about the effect CO2 emissions are having on the environment and what world that would leave for my children. I also don't think we are factoring the true cost of running a high carbon emission world today. I understand it will be a higher initial cost to move fast but the believe not moving fast will cost us far more in insurance, cost of food due to extreme weather events	No
1363301	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Causing the absolute least disruption to civilisation to satisfy mindless and unsupported drive!!	No
1363303	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to go as fast as we possibly can on this. We are years behind.	No
1363311	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate Action Now please.	NULL
1363316	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1363318	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1363321	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is the existential issue of our time. We must do act rapidly and ambitiously to reduce emissions from transport.	Yes
1363342	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1363361	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	It seems to be a good medium requirement; something needs to be done.	Yes

1363369	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	<a href="https://theconversation.com/a-deeply-troubling-discovery-earth-may-have-already-passed-the-crucial-1-5-c-warming-limit-222601">https://theconversation.com/a-deeply-troubling-discovery-earth-may-have-already-passed-the-crucial-1-5-c-warming-limit-222601</a>	No
1363382	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are facing a potentially catastrophic global heating emergency, there is no time to loose. Australia has lagged behing for so long on VES that it's time we did some heavy lifting.	Yes
1363384	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have a climate emergency on our hands and we are far behind	Yes
1363388	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is no time to waste: be bold, be ambitious, don't waste any more time doing what we know needs to be done.	NULL
1363395	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Act now, save the planet and life on earth! Stop fossil fuel subsidies, no new coal or gas projects. Put the money saved thereby, into the fastest possible transition to Net Zero or better. And REMEMBER to help the poorest while doing so.	NULL
1363396	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are lagging behind and we need to get on with it for both health and climate reasons. There is no reason for delay.	No
1363411	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	We need to urgently transition to a low-carbon world given how bad climate change is. After so many years without fuel efficiency standards, Australia has the opportunity to rapidly catch up and move ahead of other countries to cut CO2 emissions in the fastest way possible!	Yes
1363415	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We do not have time to waste to reduce airborne pollution, waste heat, and fuels that accelerate global warming.	Yes
1363416	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	Any leeway that might have existed in bringing in a slower transition has been lost through decades of inaction by successive governments. If a more rapid transition is not undertaken now, the benchmark of limiting global warming to 1.5C will be utterly lost and 2.0C will become the norm. If the government thinks Option C is expensive now, wait until food chain collapse and environmental refugees become a regular feature of global politics where mitigation will have to be measured in trillions.	NULL
1363418	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we have been lagging behiind for far too long. We need to get on with it as fast as possible	No
1363424	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Clearly, this is a faster way to get polluting ICE cars and trucks off the road and enhance the uptake of EVs and renewable energy. Option C will also enable Australia to reach its targets faster for reduction of emissions. In addition, Option C has by far the greatest total benefit in dollar terms, mostly in savings associated with not having to import billions of dollars worth of oil every year. Option A is not worth doing and Option B is a yet-another sop to the fossil fuel and car industries	No
1363425	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Because we need to keep emissions as low as possible to ensure a healthy planet for our children and all those who are to live on Earth in the future.	No
1363426	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Scientists today have released \,sponge\, data from the Carribbean which shows that we have likely already exceeded the 1.5 degree increase in global temperatures. This is catastrophic for humanity. We need to move to significantly reduce our carbon emissions today. There is no more time to wait. Option B is not good enough.	No
1363427	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Australians (government and everyone) need to get their act together on Climate Change. Its too late now for a slow transition, we have known about climate change for well over 30 years.	No
1363437	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There have been too many delays	NULL
1363440	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We're a long way behind the world, and we deserve efficient, cheaper vehicles that aren't fuelling global warming. Car companies have had plenty of time to catch up. I want my next car to actually work and not cost me thousands more in petrol!	Yes

1363447	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have a long way to catch up to USA & EU - they will continue increasing their standards so we need to go hard & fast to catch up so our market doesn't get left behind and stuck with stranded poor standard combustion cars	No
1363449	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to address climate change as much as possible. Our lowered rainfall, increased heat waves and bushfires here in Perth and increased bushfires, droughts, storms and floods around Australia and the world call for this. I don't want to lose any more species or habitats and I Want us humans to be able to keep living on our planet into the future. Even if we act seriously now we are on track for an increase of more than 2° in spite of wanting to limit it to 1.5°. We need to act seriously now	No
1363455	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 0th	It is a balanced response & most likely to be accepted by the community & succeed	Yes
1363457	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There has already been a significant delay, we should aim to lead the way, not continue following the US or EU. Let's incentivise a fast transition.	Yes
1363465	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C not only provides the greatest benefit for the cost, but there is more benefits to this than what is measured simply through money (Climate Change, human/emotional costs and environmental costs)	Yes
1363467	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Sooner these standards are brought in the better for our environment	No
1363470	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1363475	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1363476	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	renewable is better in every way	No
1363479	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1363491	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Continued reliance on high fossil burning vehicles as the cost effective option for suppliers can see more long term damage to our country than vehicle affordability	Yes
1363494	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate change crisis and need to take action urgently	NULL
1363512	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to take the fastest option available to reduce CO2 emissions	No
1363544	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I think the cost financially for option C is nothing compared to the cost climate change is going to have.	Yes
1363581	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1363582	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Better long term outcome	NULL

1363584	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1363665	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	This whole thing is idiotic. Do nothing at all.	No
1363666	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Ensure rapid transition to vehicles with lower emissions	No
1363707	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Gives greater benefit than option b at a relatively small increase in price ie \$46.49 to \$58.75	No
1363709	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The faster the better as Australia is playing catch up on the matter of vehicle fuel efficiency standards	Yes
1363751	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Option D. None of the above. Doing nothing is the best course of action.	No
1363785	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is so important for the planet that we move as quickly as possible to reduce emissions	NULL
1363851	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Environmental concerns	No
1363858	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1363881	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1363888	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Electric cars are the future and Australia has an abundance of free solar to tap into.	Yes
1363914	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1363947	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1363974	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate emergency, we need to take the fastest, strongest, most efficient action now	Yes
1363989	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Need to hurry with this	No
1363992	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I would like to go with option C first but fear that various political players will weaponise this just as the previous federal government did a few years ago, saying \,they want to take away your weekend\,. I am concerned that anomalies do appear to incentivise car manufacturers with heavy LCM to sell more of these over their sedan type vehicles.	Yes

1364010	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The net benefit of Option 3 is highest of the three, and although the net cost of Option A is low, so are the net benefits.	NULL
1364014	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1364046	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1364062	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The fact the government is even opening this can of worms up to the public is a disgrace! Show some courage, so what's right and flick the switch now! Why do you need the general public to have a say - it is sooo political this entire affair. We can't continue to call ourselves a "1st world country" yet our policies are still in the stone ages (or way behind the rest of the developed world).	No
1364074	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	humanity needs to eradicate global warming	No
1364095	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B seems like a good choice to enact change in a balanced way so as to not frighten the horses.	Yes
1364109	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	More rigorous standards are long overdue. We don't have time to waste, we need to be ambitious, therefore option C is the only option that should be entertained.	No
1364135	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1364137	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1364144	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Some of the costs incurred with C might be too onerous for people to accept, and may cause a delay in the public uptake.	Yes
1364199	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we need to stop people drying from toxic vehicle fumes, it will save a lot of money going into health and hospitals to look after people from old unsafe cars.	Yes
1364202	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to play Catch-Up because the COALition Government has been asleep at the wheel for 9 years.	Yes
1364215	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1364222	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Longer term economic benefits. Especially health impacts on aging population	Yes
1364223	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is so far behind when it comes to positive climate policy that it is embarrassing. If anything the policies we have now and our obsession with dirty energy and the prioritisation of profits over the environment is ludicrous. We should ONLY be investing in renewable energy sources. People, animals and the environment need to come before profits.	NULL
1364244	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	C sends an unequivocal message that we take this seriously. However, we should learn from other countries and simultaneously limit the growth of vehicle sizes which is a loophole. Larger vehicles cause road safety issues, and greater embodied carbon and resources.	Yes

1364247	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1364277	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	If we do not decrease our abhorrent CO <sup>2</sup> emissions I will have to choose not to have children.	No
1364297	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australians suffer too much from lagging behind in fuel emission standards.	Yes
1364298	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have a lot of catching up to do - everywhere	Yes
1364310	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I would like a robust and effective target that achieves the climate goals	Yes
1364317	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Electric vehicles are cheaper to own and run than equivalent fueled vehicles and are necessary for Australia to have a competitive economy.	No
1364323	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1364334	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have delayed targets and need to catch up. We also need to accelerate availability of fuel efficient models	Yes
1364346	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1364407	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have to act on climate change as fast as possible - we are already behind developed countries in regards to car efficiency standards. We need to catch up.	No
1364410	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1364417	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has been behind the rest of the world in terms on Environment Protection and Climate Change action. Anything other than the fastest possible way will never catch us up and bring us in line with what is needed for our and our children's future.	No
1364432	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We are very late to this issue, so this rules out A. Given where we are starting from, unfortunately C appears to be too aggressive.	Yes
1364434	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is no time to lose - Australia is already so far behind the rest of the world that we risk being left behind as a dumping ground for last century's technology while the rest of the world moves on. At the same time the planet is heating rapidly and this will impact severely on our children's future freedom and ability to live full and happy lives.	No
1364443	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must move faster on climate change.	No
1364445	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It will promote the uptake of electric vehicles in both the private and commercial sectors. The commercial sector would have the highest impact, because they use the heaviest vehicles. Subsidies for purchase of EV's or incentives to scrap your old petrol car help to accelerate the process. Australia is known to be one of the worst per capita polluter in the world. Choosing option C would improve the overall ranking and image of Australia in the Global economy.	No

1364453	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to aim to be globally leading and competitive in order to attract the biggest range of low emissions vehicles. The climate crisis means we need to act as fast as possible.	Yes
1364481	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Whilst it is a small way towards making significant change to our climate crisis, option c, which makes the fastest changes, gives the best chance at doing something for mitigating some of the effects of climate change	No
1364486	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1364487	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Action is needed NOW on fuel emissions and reliance on fossil fuels	No
1364514	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The earth is already 1.5 degrees warmer. We must reduce emissions quickly to avoid catastrophe.	Yes
1364518	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Need to encourage more efficient vehicles to Australia and reduce greenhouse emissions.	Yes
1364530	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	While the ratio maybe better with the government version, the faster version is not that much more expensive and seeing as we are lagging anyway better to get on with it than limp around trying to please everyone	Yes
1364531	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I believe that the benefits of emissions reduction far outweigh the costs, but I know that much of the Australian population may feel worried or scared about changes to the norm. I believe option B will allow Australia to walk the middle path and experience as little disruption as possible, whilst still taking a firm stance and introducing meaningful Standards that result in lowered emissions	Yes
1364545	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1364556	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate emergency is real and requires urgent action. Large high-emission vehicles are a disaster for the environment, a hazard to public space and utility and a serious threat to public safety. Larger vehicles are responsible for an increase in pedestrian and cyclist deaths.	Yes
1364567	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to address this issue urgently as climate change is an emergency. We have lagged so much behind the EU for way too long.	No
1364572	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to make up for so many years of inaction on vehicle emissions and climate change.	NULL
1364574	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	climate change	NULL
1364581	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Becoming a leader in action against climate change by going with option B, will be massively beneficial moving forward and will give Australia a strong position for further positive change.	Yes
1364587	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to get with the times and embrace more environmentally conscious forms of personal transport if we insist on being a country that values personal transport.	No
1364591	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Option B and C are far too strict on the large 4x4 vehicles (both passenger and commercial) that many Australians rely upon as family/lifestyle/work vehicles. Option B and C force manufacturers to rush the development of new technologies for these vehicles on a relatively short time-frame, which poses the risk of quality/durability/reliability shortcomings on a large scale, potentially endangering lives. A rapid increase in electrification will be disastrous for our ailing energy network.	No



1364592	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I understand the Science and have known about climate change since the 1980's well overdue for action. Age 66 have children and grandchildren.	NULL
1364599	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	No
1364600	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1364613	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1364618	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option A provides literally no benefit, and should be ignored. Option C may be a little too costly.	Yes
1364625	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The slowness of Australian governments in the adoption of efficiency standards has resulted in Australia being a dumping ground for inefficient vehicles, and has impacted our response to climate change. We now need to take the fastest route and catch up to world leaders.	No
1364627	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want there to be a future. Plus the more money invested early on will lead to changes that make things cheaper in the future (so your budgets will be off).	NULL
1364641	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1364644	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	I don't care about the cost, I want the government to deal with emissions yesterday.	No
1364647	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Clear advantage in benefits for a moderate cost. Car manufacturers have had lots of time to prepare already. However the move to larger vehicles could slow this policy, just like efficiency. Standards have been gamed in USA by using LCV loopholes. There needs to be a combined target	Yes
1364648	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act on the climate crisis ASAP	Yes
1364649	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate crisis	Yes
1364650	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Gimme that 15 minute city, disincentivise car usage being as common as it is.	No
1364659	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The projected increase in benefits in dollars outweighs the projected additional cost in dollars in favour of option c over option b.	NULL
1364662	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The fastest transition is necessary for Australia. We are too far behind in too many ways including public opinion. We will remain behind the EU and others unless we are prepared to go further from the outset	Yes
1364672	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes

1364673	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Large OEMs need to take more action to bring more fuel efficient vehicles to Australia. The focus of being forced to buy an EV is incorrect, it just sets the conditions for the range of vehicles OEMs can import to Australia. Utes and SUVs will still be available given the average CO2 can be met by each OEM	Yes
1364681	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to transition as quickly as possible	No
1364682	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	Most robust and likely more effective	No
1364692	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has dragged it's feet for far too long on this issue. It is also living with worsening impacts of climate change. Cost is not a good enough reason to avoid implementing Option C. We simply don't have the luxury of time to delay addressing this long-overdue situation.	No
1364730	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1364762	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cleaner air is of the utmost importance.	No
1364774	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce emissions faster as we're in a climate crisis, including limiting the sales of large SUVs.	No
1364784	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Australia already has around the most expensive vehicles in the world. Any option will make it worse, but at least Option A will cause the least pain.	No
1364787	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Most favourable cost-benefit that is actually likely to succeed given recalcitrance of fossil/legacy car lobby	Yes
1364790	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Big inefficient cars require more road space more parking space and are more dangerous .	No
1364794	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C provides the fastest route to using less petrochemical imports and assisting in lowering atmospheric CO2 and dangerous particulates. It will have a higher positive impact. What's not to like?	No
1364801	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is the fastest route, we need to do things urgently. Our younger generation need to know we are taking serious action. It has the highest cost benefit ratio	No
1364806	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1364807	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must transition as soon as possible reducing emissions irrespective of measurable costs. Ambition is needed.	NULL
1364823	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We aren't acting fast enough on climate	No
1364857	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia should press ahead even faster. This is not only to reduce car emissions but to also reduce increasing vehicle size. Getting hit by a car is leading cause of death for Australian children. Bigger cars mean more children will be killed.	No

1364882	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have been behind for too long, we should aggressively seek abatement wherever we can. I am concerned about the possibility that increasing the weight of cars will allow car-makers to do less and not bring smaller models to Australia. This loophole should be closed.	Yes
1364971	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1364973	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate emergency- no time to wate	Yes
1364975	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1365004	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change must be tackled with the most aggressive approach	Yes
1365020	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	WE have to do everything we can to ameliorate climate change as we're nowhere near being able to stop it	No
1365062	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Better restrictions on credits which are often used as loopholes to evade actual change. Large SUVs need to be considered as passenger vehicles because that is how they are used in metropolitan areas.	No
1365083	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C provides the greatest net cost benefit. It also delivers the greatest reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, which is the principle rationale behind the proposed legislation. Further, rapid transition to eCars will further incentivise take-up of residential solar, with further associated CO2 emission reductions. There may be initial inconveniences, but people will adapt behaviour and soon forget (like banning free single use plastic shopping bags).	Yes
1365101	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to stop being a dumping ground for dirty petrol cars that other markets won't accept - it's an embarrassment and makes us look bad internationally. We need option C as part of an economy wide green transition that happens as fast as possible, regardless of the cost.	No
1365112	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is the preferred option as efficiency standards should have already been introduced so we are playing catch-up. Moreover, the benefit cost ratio for option C is not far from option B but provides faster results.	Yes
1365115	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate emergency! We must act as fast as we can. We are a single income family and have already purchased two BEV's and have reduced our operating costs by \$6,000 per year in reduced maintenance and fuel costs. We are able to charge at home via solar and have reduced our carbon footprint by over 7Tonnes per year (for our household), if we can do it then others can easily too. We really need a strong fuel efficiency standard so that global EV companies bring the cheaper models here.	Yes
1365119	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reduce air pollutions, reduce fuel costs, reduce maintenance! Note I do recognise that many industries will still require existing fuel and diesel based vehicles, such as farming etc.	Yes
1365120	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The Benefit to Cost Ratio for Option B and C are very similar and yet Option C has the best reduction in GHG emissions. We need to act fast!	Yes
1365123	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has lagged long enough, we used to be on the forefront of energy technologies. Our health, our climate can't wait while we take our time. 20 years ago was the time to choose option B, our only option now is C.	No
1365153	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Enough with your climate crisis bullshit! There's no climate crisis! We will not agree to move to electric vehicles they are nothing but a fire hazard! We will not be controlled we will fight you!	No
1365168	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Although option 3 is more expensive, I believe it will work out cheaper in the long run and it's important that we are ambitious about our emissions targets.	Yes

1365170	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis is already upon us and we need to act with urgency.	NULL
1365179	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is too late to take the cost effective option.	No
1365180	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to catch up with the rest of the world, and quickly. Even the USA is ahead of us with fuel efficiency.	No
1365189	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act fast in a climate emergency! Also, other countries have loopholes that encourage larger vehicles, please ensure this addressed so we don't exacerbate road safety problems.	Yes
1365200	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we don't have any options if we kill the whole planet.	No
1365203	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option A is best in my view but unlikely to be achieved. Option B is achievable and consistent with elsewhere. Option A would demonstrate a lack of intent.	Yes
1365204	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Increased health and greenhouse benefits.	No
1365214	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Importance to climate and population health.	No
1365218	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Time is against us and we are coming from behind. We need to make deep inroads to cutting carbon emissions in the transport sector and this is a good way to achieve it. For the relatively low extra cost over option B, option C delivers more than double the extra benefit and will achieve reductions faster which is key to success in meeting the Paris agreement which is fast disappearing in our rear view mirror - IF option C is not enthusiastically embraced.	Yes
1365221	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1365226	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is a serious societal issue. This Option C is the best option to combat this issue. Option C will also push for further models of electric cars to be imported to Australia at a faster rate. Electrification of transport also provides further energy security to Australia by decreasing our reliance on Oil imports while also making the cost of travel cheaper in the long term.	Yes
1365228	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because Option C should have been implemented decades ago. Australia COULD have been world leaders in renewable technologies. And ... this is NOT about 'beating' the EU or the US. Can we please drop that as a strategy? This is about saving the planet & providing a viable, sustainable life for our kids & grandkids, not padding the pockets of the fossil fools running the fossil fuel industries.	No
1365236	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	No time to waste in taking action on global warming	Yes
1365247	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Benefits of increased electrification are likely to overshoot, drawbacks of fuels are likely to overshoot expectations as well.	Yes
1365260	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need more action to bring us in line with the best in the world. We should be a leader in this but we are a distant straggler.	NULL
1365263	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes

1365266	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate emergency	No
1365274	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Most effective - no time to waste.	No
1365277	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe the net benefit for option C will be higher when taking in a wider range of factors.	No
1365284	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Removing toxic particles from the air should be priority at any cost	NULL
1365289	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1365304	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1365305	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1365308	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1365310	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is so far behind the rest of the world there is no need to go slow.	Yes
1365311	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1365317	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1365321	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1365323	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia lags major markets in these standards and much stricter requirements needed to hit mandatory net zero targetd	NULL
1365324	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is very behind and needs to catch up as fast as possible. This is a transformative opportunity for us to lead in this space. We must be aggressive & ensure there are not policy loopholes to be exploited.	Yes
1365331	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Considering what is happening in the global climate and really the limited time we actually have to try and rectify it a faster approach in my view is better. Although Option B is my 2nd choice.	Yes
1365335	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C provides leadership and a faster transition to the future. This will encourage car makers to provide the most efficient models to Australia. This will further drive down prices on vehicles and save people money with fuel/	No

1365336	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C will have additional benefits likely not included in the raw numbers, like a smaller increase in global temperature. A smaller increase in global temp like 1.5 degrees versus 2-3 degrees will have a significant impact on many factors. Rapid policy change can help mitigate these circumstances. But Option B is preferred to Option A, even if Option C isn't chosen	Yes
1365350	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Consideration of the high BC ratio for option C and the significant benefits to health and environment, a faster transition is the best option. All movement towards energy independence for Australia is desirable. There is a high degree of urgency for the improvement of a healthier environment and reduction in adverse environmental impacts. Considering the cost of option C compared to option B, for the small increase in cost, the long term benefits are worth the additional cost to expedite.	No
1365352	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	significantly higher benefits for marginal increase in cost	Yes
1365360	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1365361	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Faster and greater net benefits serve the environment, people and economy. We need to move quickly given the lack of progress on environmental issues in recent decades. The very best that can be said in most, if not all, cases concerning the natural world is that we have found a reasonable compromise. This has demonstrably not worked in the area of environment, climate and the natural world. Option C moves us there quickly and results in greater net economic benefit. Really, what's not to like?	NULL
1365363	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The sooner health and environmental benefits can be delivered to Australians, the better.	NULL
1365366	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reduce running costs, local air pollution and global warming gases	NULL
1365377	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are a very wealthy country. Given that we are behind the global move to have an emission standard, I support the choice to accelerate the transition to low carbon transport. Option C is my preference.	NULL
1365382	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1365384	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1365396	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act fast to combat global warming	Yes
1365408	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1365409	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is already a laggard in this field, we should be leaders, here is that opportunity, this is not a time to be timid (no matter what the clowns at The Australian or on the opposition benches may say).	Yes
1365413	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate emergency, cost savings, health benefits, national independence and resilience to oil supply shocks	NULL
1365415	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	improving public health and environmental conservation. both save taxpayers money in the long run.	Yes
1365417	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	given the uptake of large SUVs in recent years, much needs to be done now to ensure Australia reaches its environment targets. We can implement fast and expensive solutions now for a quicker return.	No

1365430	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To make up for LNP negligent behaviour as much as possible needs to happen. Large utes need all tax rebates and benefits to be cancelled and new taxes added to large fossil fuel reliant vehicles.	No
1365449	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1365451	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1365456	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want the cleanest, most efficient vehicles, available as soon as possible.	Yes
1365458	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	No point wasting time	Yes
1365464	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I contend that recent announcements such as that from CATL regarding battery cost reductions and technology improvements will mean that the BCR for Option C will actually be significantly more positive than the government cost analysis suggests. Also the traditional OEM's need a very strong signal from Government as a number of them are still not focusing sufficiently on the transition to BEV's. They are not offering compelling BEV options to consumers and blaming lack of demand.	NULL
1365465	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	Yes
1365466	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Highest net benefit, greenhouse gas emissions saving and health benefits	Yes
1365469	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Should have been doing more, earlier and am simply staggered this has taken so long. I expect the usual nonsense about tradies and their right to have huge twin-cab utes will swing towards option A or none so wanted to have my say.	Yes
1365476	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are so far behind we need to go straight for the best option regardless of cost because the benefit is still higher than the other options. Long term planning not short planning which ends up costing more .	No
1365481	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1365486	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Maximise Health Benefits, Maximise overall benefit	NULL
1365491	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1365498	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As a percentage cost the difference between the government's preferred option B and the fastest start in option C is just over 1.3% in overall costs. This is negligible and we need to get on top of reducing our overall emissions to benefit our future as quick as we can..	No
1365510	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1365511	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Greatest reduction in having to breath in toxic fumes.	NULL

1365514	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This Australian Government needs to demonstrate too Australians and the world that it is serious about reducing Greenhouse gas emissions, The decade of inaction and denial of climate science by the previous Federal Governments for political purposes, now means the race to reduce Greenhouse Gas emissions, must speed up, fast.	No
1365516	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Effectively countering climate change requires strong and immediate action, and Australia is a laggard.	No
1365518	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1365529	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C has the greatest absolute net-benefits.	No
1365533	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1365536	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This is a good thing.	NULL
1365542	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need the fastest possible option ro make Australia actually help to save the planet. We have waterproof much time getting this set up already .	No
1365547	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Always follow the scientific evidence -option C is clearly the best	No
1365549	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1365550	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Urgency in bringing down emissions, simple and easy way to do so plus saving drivers thousands. Win Win.	NULL
1365554	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C sets aggressive CO2 reduction targets, achieving 77% reduction for passenger vehicles and 74% for utes and vans by 2029. It includes flattened limit curves with break points, encouraging production of lighter, more fuel-efficient vehicles. Comprehensive classification of vehicle types ensures accurate emissions assessment. Offers credit banking and trading without pooling for flexibility. Adopts generous supercredits for cleaner technologies.	No
1365556	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Balanced view	Yes
1365557	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to put our foot down on the transition to fully electric. In the long run we will all be better of. Dragging our feet only exacerbates the problem we are stuck in.	No
1365558	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Manufacturers should bring in more efficient petrol engines for large SUVs (like the Landcruiser) and utes. Currently the overwhelming majority of these vehicles are powered by diesel. With the new standard I hope to see the phasing out of diesel in these large SUVs and utes -- just like in America where fuel efficiency standards are high.	Yes
1365560	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This requires urgency, based on environmental and health grounds. No OEM manufactures in Australia but there is a very active lobby group based around mainly Japanese OEMs who stand to lose the most. All OEMs selling cars in Australia have already had to do this for other markets. This is yet another example of a foreign owned industry in Australia prioritising profit over the benefit to Australian citizens. The above electricity and battery replacement costs for B and C are also questionable.	No
1365561	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate emergency and have probably already exceeded the 1.5C threshold. So, there is no time to lose. We can still stay below 2C but only with substantial action now to put the required systems in place within this decade.	No



1365566	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1365567	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	It's wise to plan for a balanced progress for such big changes. If the emissions limits are reduced drastically, car manufacturers will put smaller engines into large body cars, with double turbo-chargers, which will cause premature oil leaks and engine issues. Cars with less emissions will have higher repair costs in the long run because labor costs are very high. Once large body electric cars have sufficient range (750+) and charging stations are plenty, people will switch to them.	Yes
1365568	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We in Australia are years if not decades behind other nations. We can't continue the wait and see approach. If we are not aggressive, a) the industry will still prefer other countries to serve and b) climate will get a lot more worse than where we are already. We must act now.	No
1365570	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I am an early adopter, I have been supplying and installing stand alone Solar, Wind, Battery systems for 50 years in remote areas. I have had Solar and Battery backup for personal use for 20 years, we need to cut back on pollution 1, to do that we must adopt CLEAN GREEN Based solutions now, or we will find ourselves left with unreliable power sources, which will increase unemployment, with workers sent home because of the lack of power to power machinery, lights etc.	No
1365571	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	To minimise effect of climate change	No
1365573	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The costs to the planet and our country are escalating so fast due to the impacts of climate change. It is obviously very difficult to calculate exactly how much each emission source contributes to this. I feel we must transition as fast as possible. By sending these signals to the market and the world, the market will adapt and respond. I do not believe the cost impact has any merit based on past reports. Appropriate support should be given to those who need if there are cost impcts	No
1365575	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We have started from behind and need to catch up	Yes
1365577	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	get away from our reliance on oversea oil	Yes
1365580	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	sooner the better	No
1365587	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The faster we reduce motor vehicle emissions, the faster we will reach emissions targets, as well as save the huge financial cost of imported petrol and the dependency on often unstable nations that it causes.	No
1365588	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce car pollution as quickly as possible - this is the air that we breathe!	NULL
1365591	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	I support Option C but with the 2025 target deleted and the 2026 target bought forward. All three options above essentially say the present emissions are acceptable till 2026. This is unnecessary. The manufacturers are selling the required vehicles to meet the 2026 target overseas now. We do not need to wait till 2026 to see a real change here.	No
1365595	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to catch up to the rest of the world quickly to help limit climate change impacts	Yes
1365596	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The sooner we tackle climate change the better.	No
1365599	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	The fastest route to reduce emissions is the most preferred. We are facing a more costly path if we do not reduce emissions quickly.	Yes

1365604	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Desire to have Australia catch up quickly to global best standards	NULL
1365607	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1365609	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Need a fast transition and provides the biggest net benefit	Yes
1365616	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1365618	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1365633	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It will improve Australia's air quality in the shortest time. It is not just global warming which is an issue, but all the other things that are worsened by dirty air. Health care will benefit as will schools and kindys near roads	No
1365634	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	We're already so far behind already. We need to get cracking before it's too late.	No
1365635	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce emissions as quickly as possible.	No
1365637	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to get this done: Option C will bring the good changes sooner than the others, bringing more efficient cars, with associated fuel cost savings and very significant reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and pollution generally, not to mention the associated health benefits. We have a lot of catching up to do.	NULL
1365642	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is behind the rest of the developed world and really needs to accelerate this transition to catch up and do our part	No
1365643	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1365644	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C has the highest benefit in all categories, Best fuel savings, best health benefits, best greenhouse gas emissions and best reduced vehicle maintenance costs. Therefore it would be completely illogical to choose any other option than Option C.	No
1365648	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Whatever we can do to slow down climate change is the best and cheapest method.	No
1365656	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is serious, let's stop with the incessant talk and delay, and get on with making the needed changes.	No
1365658	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1365660	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	growth in sales of EVs is increasing exponentially each year as is the options of EVs in the market. Stop wasting time and move to Option C asap for the sake of our air quality.	No

1365664	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The quicker we cut co2 emissions the better for our health and the climate.	No
1365672	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is imperative that CO2 emissions are reduced as soon as possible to save the planet for our descendants. It may cost a little more now, but will save much more in the long run.	NULL
1365674	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Greatest net benefit for Australians. Need to be as ambitious as possible, given we are starting from inexcusable status.	No
1365681	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We're running out of time	No
1365682	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	While option c is preferable, option b is probably more realistic. A popular step in the right direction is better than a hopeful stride.	Yes
1365684	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It makes sense to go for the best, fastest option C, as the benefits far outweigh the costs	No
1365688	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	For relatively minimal additional cost, option C offers significantly better benefits off a set of relatively conservative assumptions.	Yes
1365695	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Changing their form of personal transport is one of the easiest ways that individuals can reduce their emissions, and Australians deserve to have a wider choice of low- or zero-emissions vehicles available to them. We should be brave, consistent with comparable countries and be prepared to do some heavy lifting to create a better planet and country for those who will follow us.	No
1365696	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must reduce our carbon emissions and have left implementing fuel emissions standards way too late already. We have a lot of catching up to do.	No
1365699	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Highest cost benefit ratio, and best chance of public and political approval	Yes
1365700	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Option A is best for low income earners who aren't getting the benefits of buying the new cars. Most people have to get some life out of the second hand car market.	NULL
1365701	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Health benefits.As a retired medical person this is MOST important	No
1365705	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's the option that gives individuals greater cost savings and provides the most benefits for the money. By aligning with EU amd California standards we get economies of scale.	Yes
1365708	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change needs to be addressed as quick as possible. This NVES is only a small step, but holding back on even this is pointless.	Yes
1365710	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1365715	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C would be the fastest way to reduce atmospheric pollution from vehicles and has similar cost benefit to option B.	NULL

1365718	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option A is too slow and not enough impact above status quo. Option B is VERY ambitious but hopefully not enough to be too disruptive.	Yes
1365722	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It will support a faster transition	NULL
1365727	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The real cost of low emission standards is to public health. Air pollution contributes significantly to deaths. The Government routinely allows more than a 1000 people to die per year because of air pollution in which fuel emissions is a major contributor. I reject Option B as a scandalous and unnecessary attempt to compromise with the fossil fuel industry and backward thinking car manufacturers. The economic benefits of Option C speak for themselves.	No
1365728	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I would prefer to focus attention on electricity generation rather than fuel efficiency standards as it's a much larger contributor to emissions in Australia. I agree with implementing a standard, but option C may be too disruptive.	Yes
1365730	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Need to catch up Australia to the rest of the world and swiftly introduce more efficient vehicles to the market, as there will be demand for it.	Yes
1365731	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Better outcome for environment, less foreign fossil fuel being imported.	Yes
1365738	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	New vehicle efficiency standards are well overdue in Australia. We should set the highest standards possible and ensure they cannot be rolled back by successive governments.	NULL
1365741	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have run out of time to have the luxury of considering any other option	No
1365743	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is a very late starter in setting a vehicle emission standard	No
1365744	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1365745	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Want best & fastest reduction	NULL
1365751	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We don't really have time to delay on this transition for the environment, and the benefits will actually boost the economy far more than even projections show at the moment. Option B is close but at this point we need to go all in.	Yes
1365757	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Our society and our planet needs and deserves as effective and rapid a response as we can possibly achieve. Option C is definitely achievable!	NULL
1365764	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because serious changes need to be made quickly to help the planet	NULL
1365766	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's time to put an ambitious standards in place after so many years of inaction,	Yes
1365767	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are already so behind where we need to be we should be ambitious	NULL

1365773	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is far far behind on emissions standards and this has hugely detrimental side effects like overly large cars that threaten the safety of pedestrians and Australian children.	Yes
1365780	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has been lagging in relation to vehicle emissions standards, this provides to opportunity to reverse that position. Electricity costs and battery costs will be part of the wider energy transition so the costs attributed to Option C are potentially overly conservative. Removal of the Fuel Tax Credit would help offset costs.	Yes
1365782	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1365783	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C would stimulate greater EV sales and further cut transport emissions.	Yes
1365784	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	We need to factor in health costs, something that is not being done in these economic comparisons, and understand the human cost to individuals that end up with one of a variety of health issues due to burning fossil fuels. For one of many estimates of this cost see <a href="https://www.abc.net.au/news/science/2018-06-27/climate-policies-ignoring-billions-in-health-savings-experts-say/9836894?utm_campaign=abc_news_web&amp;utm_content=link&amp;utm_medium=content_shared&amp;utm_source=abc_news_web">https://www.abc.net.au/news/science/2018-06-27/climate-policies-ignoring-billions-in-health-savings-experts-say/9836894?utm_campaign=abc_news_web&amp;utm_content=link&amp;utm_medium=content_shared&amp;utm_source=abc_news_web</a>	No
1365789	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1365790	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	ICE cars are just polluting our country	No
1365794	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is an important issue that should be addressed as quickly as possible	Yes
1365795	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Our new cars are somehow worse than new American cars, which is incredible, considering our roads are overall smaller and we don't even make heaps of money selling oil and petrol! these new SUVs and mega utes are child killing, cyclist killing, destroy our roads faster, and almost always have just as much or often LESS utility to their owners than a normal car like we used to have.	NULL
1365804	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1365808	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do as much as possible, now reduce carbon emissions.	No
1365812	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia finally needs to step up and take action on reducing car emissions. We are the last major country after Russia that has not introduced fuel efficiency standards. We need to go in hard to catch up.	No
1365813	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option B and C are both great options, it's important that Australians are breathing cleaner air. I believe that option C is the best as reliance on global fuel prices are reduced.	Yes
1365816	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1365820	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	A reduction in emissions and more efficient vehicles in Australia is imperative. Regardless of the immediate cost to individuals, it is a far more preferable option than doing nothing or enacting change on a slower scale only for a new government to come in and overturn and progress. The aim should also be to reduce the number of imported American 'trucks' which have horrendous fuel economy.	Yes
1365821	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to step up. It's awful not knowing whether my future will be plagued by the long term effects of climate change.	Yes

1365822	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to bring Australia inline with other developed countries and address our air quality. The technology exists and has been proven to be advantageous to improving our air quality. Picking children up from school and noticing the large numbers of parents leaving their cars running has been shown to result the air quality around our young people is some of the worst. Disgusting when we can quickly change this with restrictions on the high polluting vehicles being banned.	No
1365825	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B appears to be the most effective and achievable within a realistic time frame. Options A will bring about no material change, and I fear option option C is unachievable given Australia's EV charging infrastructure maturity. I also fear that option C could also open the flood-gates to cheap Chinese EV imports, thereby reducing the quality of EV's available to the Australian consumer, as well as jeopardise access to development of higher quality EV's by established vehicle manufacturers.	Yes
1365832	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	I strongly advocate for the implementation of strong vehicle emissions standards to address the pressing environmental and public health challenges posed by vehicular pollution. It is evident that our current reliance on fossil fuel-powered vehicles is contributing significantly to air pollution, climate change, and adverse health effects. Choosing the strongest option for vehicle emissions standards (Option C) is crucial in mitigating these detrimental impacts.	NULL
1365836	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Important to protect the environment, and provides a much better cost/benefit. Despite what the legacy auto industry is saying, this is totally achievable as seen in other countries	Yes
1365844	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1365845	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We're in a climate emergency L.	No
1365848	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I am fearful for my grandchildren future due to probability of catastrophic climate collapse. Transport is the fastest growing source of emissions in Australia. I lucky enough to drive an ev, we need to make efficient cars available to all and discourage heavy polluting vehicles except where there is no option.	No
1365851	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has already moved too slowly, option c is clearly best, option b is good if keeping votes is important (eg to get another term).	No
1365855	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has been a laggard for years. It's time for Australia to lead. Climate change is here already, and will only get worse through more dangerous and costly extreme events.	NULL
1365858	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe climate change is an urgent problem that should be addressed as quickly as possible. I am willing to pay more in the interests of positive action happening faster.	Yes
1365860	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Money spent now to accelerate the transition will more than be repaid with reduced costs, better health & efficiency improvements.	NULL
1365861	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Most co benefits and long term cost savings	NULL
1365865	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	For very little difference in the benefit-cost ratios for options B and C, option C will deliver much greater cuts in emissions by 2050.	Yes
1365874	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The sooner the better. We are talking about the environment and vehicles.	Yes
1365879	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We don't have time to take the slow option	No

1365882	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	I prefer internal combustion engines. mining of raw materials for batteries concerns me, disposal/recycling of spent batteries is an issue. More effort should be put into the development of sustainable fuels & hydrogen	No
1365885	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The world is burning clearly a worthwhile spend and I suspect your estimate of cost benefit is grossly inaccurate.	No
1365886	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I support a quick transition to a emission free future.	No
1365887	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B looks practical though Option C is more desirable, wouldn't consider Option A	Yes
1365890	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1365898	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Im ready to see change in the industry. More than that, we need it, but I do believe it needs to be rolled out in a sustainable, achievable way.	Yes
1365900	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1365902	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1365906	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C has the greatest benefits by far, while having costs only slightly greater than Option B.	No
1365907	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C provides a good middle ground where we can make tangible progress with benefits that can make an impact	Yes
1365909	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To limit global temperature rise, we need to reduce CO2 emissions as fast as possible. We can and should set an example for the rest of the world.	Yes
1365911	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1365912	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I have three reasons for placing ambition at the top of the list. Firstly, Australia is playing catchup and the benefits of higher ambition are clear, at marginal cost. Secondly society is running out of time to reduce emissions and this acceleration is to be applauded if implemented. Finally, we can do without the balance of trade costs of importing the transport oil/ fuel and enjoy the improved economic resilience and associated national security.	NULL
1365917	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to reduce green house gas emissions to meet climate change commitments by 2030. Better fuel efficiency requirements for vehicles may ease cost of living pressures.	Yes
1365918	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1365921	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	NULL	Yes

1365931	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Most rapid co2 reduction possible gives best chance of meeting climate goals. Does not give large SUVs a free pass as option A does which are already the most polluting cars doing the most damage alongside commercial vehicles.	Yes
1365932	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need urgent support and stop listening to the lobby groups	NULL
1365939	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The quicker the better.	Yes
1365940	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Gives the best cows to benefit ratio with a great enough impact to the environment	Yes
1365945	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1365948	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is lagging behind contributing to improved climate and environment. Option c helps get Australia back on track.	Yes
1365951	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1365952	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C has higher net benefits as well as higher benefits in all four categories. The benefits cost ratio of option C is in the same ballpark as option B, hence no reason to forego the clear higher benefits of option C.	NULL
1365956	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have a closing window of time in which to save this planet for future generations. If my grandparents were willing to fight and die for future generations' freedom, how could I not be willing to support measures to save my grandchildren's future? We have to act; it's a moral imperative.	No
1365958	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Until Australia brings its emissions policies into line or ahead with other countries we will be a step behind and hindered in the change over to non internal combustion powered vehicles. The wrong decision here could put us back years, the right decision could take us to an efficient cleaner future much sooner.	No
1365961	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want to breathe clean air when walking and riding a bike or waiting for a bus.	Yes
1365962	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1365963	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I believe we need to dramatically reduce vehicle emissions and I am aware that car manufacturers will be lobbying to reduce govt pressure to improve their vehicles - please don't give in. Government needs strong standards to force companies to introduce EVs and fuel efficient vehicles. With our long distances it is not only imperative for our climate to achieve this, but also to our hip pockets. I appreciate the cost benefit analysis which is why I choose B over C but it's a close call.	Yes
1365966	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has lagged behind the developed world on vehicle efficiency through government inaction for too long. It must set ambitious targets to drive climate-responsible choices from importers and buyers of vehicles.	Yes
1365970	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	More efficient and cleaner cars for the environment	Yes
1365972	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Effectiveness; Feasibility; Simplicity and scheme integrity; Scale of benefit. Please see submission for more detail.	Yes



1365975	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1365980	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Option A is the cheapest option. Our country is rapidly going into debt chasing unrealistic environmental goals.	No
1365981	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1365983	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Don't want to be dictated to by government pushing their own ideological agenda	No
1365986	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Be ambitious. I live in an area of Australia with high air pollution due to vehicle emissions, to the extent that on a cold morning you can 'taste' the diesel fumes! Worst, I know my young family is breathing this in with likely long term health impacts. This policy decision to accelerate remediation (fast start) means the world to me.	No
1365989	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Hit climate change hard	No
1365991	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1365993	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because the Nationals are against it, therefore it must be good.	Yes
1365994	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1365999	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe we need to take strong action on mitigation of harm from vehicles both for human and planetary health	NULL
1366000	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C would stimulate greater EV sales and further cut transport emissions. Setting a target for 2025 that is no better than 2023 means standing still for two years for no good reason. Starting meaningful reductions in 2025 instead of 2026 would have substantial benefits in reduced cumulative emissions and costs	NULL
1366016	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is presently well behind other progressive nations despite having the resources to be a world leader.	NULL
1366020	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1366021	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Faster transition away from fossil fuels will result in greater influx of affordable zero emissions vehicles	Yes
1366023	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1366026	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL

1366027	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to be moving faster	Yes
1366030	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Highest benefit to cost ratio, best long term outcome. We need to catch up with leading countries	Yes
1366031	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	WE need to act quickly. We are on the brink of runaway warming.	No
1366035	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Get on with it	No
1366043	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to take climate action as fast as possible. Any delays to the process will compromise our future environment.	No
1366045	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to accelerate emissions reductions with Option C providing the fastest transition.	No
1366046	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Staying consistent with the Paris agreement requires the most ambitious action across all sectors. The cost of not meeting Paris is very high and not well reflected in modelling.	NULL
1366052	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cleaner air makes for a better quality of life for all	Yes
1366057	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We've already left it too late and we need to catch up with what the science suggests.	Yes
1366058	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's time to be ambitious with the transition to clean energy. In doing so, we trust markets to be dynamic enough to adapt and thrive. Being more ambitious is a position that shows greater confidence and gives greater support to markets and businesses - we are putting in place the landscape they are going to need to thrive for the long term. It also eliminates the chance that we'll need to make further changes down the track, and every change is fraught with political risk.	Yes
1366065	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is so far behind on achieving climate goals, going hard and fast to catch up is the only way to bring things under control. Being \,flexible\, (option b) hasn't worked so far, why continue that way? yes, option c costs more, initially, but isn't it a false economy to take the cheaper option when the long term costs of climate change will leave the planet in a state in which humans can't survive.	No
1366067	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate crisis and speed is everything.	Yes
1366071	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This is the only response that comes to the scientific consensus.	Yes
1366083	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1366085	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must act now, we are already far behind of where we should be.	No
1366087	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1366089	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are way behind the curve already in Aus, let's try and catch up with or even lead9 for a change) the rest of the world in green energy and environmental custodianship	No
1366092	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Clean Air is important!	No
1366094	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is the biggest risk to the world and to my grandchildren. The science and evidence show that we must reduce carbon emissions from all sources asap. Therefore Option C is a no-brainer for me.	No
1366096	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need more efficient cars with bigger cost savings. We need faster action to reduce emissions.	Yes
1366098	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The time is now to make these changes. No more wasting time arguing and trying to score political point's. We have the cold hard facts, and yet 6years out from 2030 and we are not on target. This is urgent.	NULL
1366102	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Strong change without being overly aggressive. Balanced cost-benefit model.	Yes
1366104	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is the only one that is aggressive enough to reduce emissions as quickly as is needed. I don't think that car companies would have too much trouble meeting the reductions as they simply don't offer efficient vehicles in Australia in a lot of cases that are available elsewhere in the world. The 2 most popular vehicles in Australia either have a PHEV or Hybrid in 2025 or soon after so that shouldn't be a problem and having a fuel efficiency standard will make them cheaper	No
1366107	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I'd like to see Option B implemented until 2028, then a change to Option C beyond 2028. By that time Australian businesses will have a full understanding of what is required and will be ready to move to a more stringent and aggressive targeting profile.	Yes
1366108	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Less pollution	Yes
1366109	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because Australia has lagged behind most other countries in relation to the impact of vehicles and emissions in respect to health and climate that it needs to catch up. It will lessen the numbers of olderstyle, more unsafe and fuel wasting vehicles being dumped into the Australian market place.	NULL
1366111	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fix the climate	No
1366112	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1366118	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australian inaction has resulted in a large, polluting fleet. There is the opportunity to set genuinely ambitious targets that will both reduce emissions in fleet, but also reduce, at least temporarily, the number of new vehicles entering the fleet. Option C delivers the greatest benefit under all metrics and the additional cost involved compared to Option B should be tolerated to deliver the best outcome.	NULL
1366126	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Foreign sourced fuel is a potentially crippling weakness in Australia's transport security, food security and national security. There are also more direct reasons for wanting faster electrification of transport including cheaper cost per kilometre, much more responsive driving dynamics, much less servicing and maintenance, and much less pollution in our cities. I believe a fast start to emissions standards is required for Australians to take further opportunities for electrification seriously.	NULL
1366144	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have lagged behind far too long and need to move on this urgently	No
1366145	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is here. We need to act faster to survive.	Yes

1366151	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to catch up to other developed countries in terms of emissions reduction and EV choice. Option C is the best way to do that.	Yes
1366152	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	In my opinion even option C is not aggressive enough. Transport emissions need addressing asap along with encouraging a reduction in vehicle size	NULL
1366153	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to push back on industry laggards and ensure our collective health improvement and lowered emissions are achieved	No
1366156	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 0th	Option C will drive faster uptake of EVs and more rapid decarbonisation. Every part of Australia is at significant risk from the effects of climate change and we need to do all we can to minimise climate change effects. Option A is as good as a set of wet tissues and shouldn't have been put forward at all. Benefits in fuel savings to motorists is a plus, but climate change action first and foremost please. I support option C and can barely tolerate option B. Option A is bloody nonsense.	No
1366158	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Greater net benefit.	NULL
1366169	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Less talks, more actions !!!	Yes
1366177	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	because we need to take strong action om emissions and because Australia should have done this long ago - it's time to catch up	No
1366181	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The longer it takes to transition the more expensive it will be to manage on the long term.	Yes
1366184	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has been an abysmally slow starter in the transition. We must be ambitious especially as vehicles have a long life in Aust so we know that inefficient petrol/diesel vehicles will be around for more than a decade.	No
1366185	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1366190	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Benefit to society in the long term	No
1366194	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate damage needs to be halted now. There is no time to lose	No
1366195	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to decarbonise, and unless the goivernemnt sets aggressive targets the automotoive industry will drag out making any change	No
1366203	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1366204	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act now, the benefits of option C are obvious.	NULL
1366209	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C, while at a slightly lower benefit cost ratio than Option B (4% less), is much greater than Option A, and still provides significantly greater emissions reduction compared to Option B (30-40% more) or A (60-70% more). Option A has minimal changes to the existing trajectory and light penalties, and the least overall benefit cost, making it ineffective.	Yes

1366213	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C delivers the most benefits to Australian motorists, is easily achievable, brings us into line with world's best practice and has the biggest impact on reducing greenhouse gas emissions.	No
1366214	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Best cost/benefit ratio with acceptably low disruption of existing practices	Yes
1366222	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	By falling so far behind the curve on vehicle emissions regulation, the Cth has reduced the range of my preferred types of vehicles available (i.e. new technology, clean, small but fully featured) in favour of old tech, inefficient, oversized land-whales. Also, we've lost the best part of 20 years to ineffective, 'moderate' responses to climate change. I would prefer that the Federal Government get on with substantial regulatory change.	NULL
1366224	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	CO2 emissions must be reduce rapidly and the transport industry are a major CO2 emmitter. We have the technology to produce vehicles with Zero emmsions and we must more rapidly to this scenario.	No
1366229	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We're very exposed to oil issues and costs, and we need to derisk that and carbon emissions quickly	No
1366239	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1366242	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1366255	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	The NRMA described the new standards as "a responsible and achievable option" that would reduce emissions, save consumers money and increase competition. "Australia could not continue down the path of voluntary targets as it left us behind when it came to choice and the NRMA is strong advocates for choice so that motorists can buy the cars they wish to drive," said the NRMA chief executive, Rohan Lund. "A business-as-usual approach meant that Australian families and businesses were not benefit	Yes
1366260	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1366268	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Best cost/benefit ratio	Yes
1366272	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option A is nowhere near ambitious enough. Option B is adequate however the starting limit currently specified for all options (141g/km) is a farce and is effectivly deferring any action until 2026 which is unacceptable. The scheme needs to commence in 2025 with the limits currently specified for 2026.	No
1366279	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is lagging behind the rest of the world. With its plentiful resources in renewables, it should be a leader in decarbonising transportation, not a laggard. The faster Australia moves to EVs (for all vehicle types) the better off we are in terms of self-sufficiency (no longer reliant on external fuel imports). In todays age where shipping disruptions and wars are increasing, Australia needs to become fuel independent as soon as possible. Option C is the best way forward for this.	Yes
1366287	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do as much as we can as quickly as possible. Other countries have loopholes that encourage larger vehicles, please ensure this is addressed here so we don't cause road safety problems.	No
1366291	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The difference in cost benefit ratio is minimal btw B and C yet C clearly offers better longer term outcomes. We are too far behind already, it's a no brainer.	No
1366294	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce emissions as quickly as we possibly can. Plus option C will be cheaper in the long run, with more fuel-efficient cars on the road.	NULL
1366298	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must act to reduce CO2 emissions immediately	No

1366302	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The future wellbeing of my children, grandchildren, and those who follow.	No
1366304	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	I don't agree with any of the above but if I did, delaying this process as long as we can would be my preference. Again the Gov ignores the fact that lower income earners will never be able to afford this option as they have never brought a new car, and proposal will increase the cost of living e.g. fuel costs	No
1366309	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because we need to act fast to be able to make a difference to all of our futures.	NULL
1366310	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	My children. Environmental degradation and constrained resources have me worried about their future and health. Further it will help reduce vehicle size which will improve safety for people when they are walking or biking.	Yes
1366330	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	The sooner we change the better	Yes
1366331	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	If a country has a chance of trying to help avoid global warming then surely it makes sense to try and go all in considering the cost benefit ratio between options B and C are very minimal. Do it once and do it properly.	No
1366347	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1366396	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1366397	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Leave the vehicles alone and allow the consumer to decide.	No
1366400	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1366431	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Government intervention in response to climate change has hardly produced its promises.	No
1366433	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Too much pussy footing around. We need to move on this ASAP!!!!	No
1366434	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I think it's Tim me to get on with it. Ultimately people will make there own decision within this framework. Was there a consultation for introduction of compulsory seat belt wearing?	Yes
1366445	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cleaner air for all Australians. Insurance and Medicare will benefit greatly to clean air	No
1366447	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	EV sales and low emissions	No
1366452	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Faster transition means we save money	NULL

1366478	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The faster the better. It will take a long time for the existing ICE vehicles to disappear anyway, so the faster we transition to BEVs the better.	Yes
1366479	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Our current lack of action is embarrassing. I believe that I probably won't see any significant changes in my lifetime and I'd really like ot be wrong about that	No
1366481	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The quicker, the better	NULL
1366491	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	Option \,B\, sounds realistic	NULL
1366495	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe it is essential for Australia to introduce the most ambitious NVES that it can manage within sensible costs and regulatory bounds. Option C appears to deliver a desirable outcome with an appropriate balance of factors. Ambitious NVES will show Australia is genuine in its efforts to reduce emissions .	Yes
1366497	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	I along with many citizens cannot afford this accelerated expense. alternate solution needs to be sought.	No
1366498	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1366500	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	It's important to do our best to hit the climate targets, if we don't make the effort we'll pay for it big times further down the track.	Yes
1366505	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1366507	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has been a laggard in this area for decades. As a result the cars available here are high polluting and we are a dumping ground for manufacturers worst cars. We must move quickly to catch up and also to incentivise suppliers to provide us with more choice and less polluting vehicles.	Yes
1366511	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We do not have time to waste to reduce CO2 emissions. Adopting newer technologies faster will allow Australia to take advantage of more newer technological advantages faster.	NULL
1366512	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are always a laggard as we were with banning lead. The health effects will be significant. It will save money and help save the environment. The fossil fuel industry knew about global warming in1970s if not before and deliberately suppressed the information. They are still spreading misinformation about fuel efficiencies and they should not be listened to because they are masters of misinformation.t	No
1366516	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As one of the few remaining developed countries without a fuel efficiency standard, we are extremely behind as a dumping ground for the world's inefficient vehicles. In order to catch up to global competition and climate/emissions limits, we can't delay on a 'slow start' or a 'fast but flexible' option. We must accelerate with a 'fast start' option as the minimum, especially if it yields so much commercial value as well.	Yes
1366519	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	this is a major health, wealth, and environmental issue. the faster we move, the better it is for all people on all accounts. option c is the best.	Yes
1366525	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to move quickly to decarbonise.	Yes
1366533	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As a planet we don't have time to go slow on these sorts of changes. This should have been implemented decades ago.	Yes

1366539	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As Australia has had a very slow start in this arena there is a need to accelerate our response	NULL
1366548	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is a laggard on fuel efficiency	No
1366549	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should be leading the way and doing what's best for the environment. We'll never catch up and make an impact if we tiptoe our way there.	Yes
1366553	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1366559	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must address climate change with the utmost urgency.	No
1366561	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to move quickly and impactfully at this moment of the world	NULL
1366562	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to go hard for the sake of the climate. We are a wealthy country!	No
1366566	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	EVs are cleaner than ICE vehicles	No
1366568	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1366574	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Best cost benefit of all options	Yes
1366575	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has been subject to dirty cars from manufacturers for far too long. The car manufactureres should not have the say in what they provide, we need a gpvernment to take a firm stand and set strict targets for what will be the benefit of our people, planet and Australia's environment.	No
1366580	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe we should meet our CO2 abatement targets as quickly as possible and the costs dont seem prohibitive.	Yes
1366581	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	C is best for the country.	NULL
1366582	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Apparently the cost information provided in the table is not correct due to following reasons:1. In Option A battery replacement cost is given as \$0 and this is not correct as each EV needs battery replacement regardless of slow or fast start. 2. Proposer disposal of used batteries will incur huge environmental & financial costs to the country but that cost is apparently not included in this cost information.	No
1366586	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 0th	NULL	Yes
1366587	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The world is already heating up due to excess greenhouse emissions, too late to act 'slowly'. The earth will be uninhabitable, zero point in considering anything other than a fast transition. Money and profits will mean nothing.	No



1366589	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is no Planet B. There are no jobs on a dead planet. There is no upside to fossil fuels. Biting this bullet will bring huge reductions in the cost of health care through reductions on cardio- respiratory disease. Our cities will become cleaner and much quieter, which will have benefits to mental health too. While you are at it, Albo, end all subsidies to fossil fuels. They are indefensible.	No
1366596	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want Option C. Give me Option C. I want us to copy and beat Norway. I want to be able to breathe clean air as they will once they replace all their vehicles.	NULL
1366600	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should have done this years ago! A pity it just applies to new cars - why not *ALL* cars?	Yes
1366601	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1366604	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1366607	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need fast emissions reductions and to catch up quickly to standards in europe not the US	No
1366610	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	NULL	Yes
1366611	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	It is the fastest option option C	No
1366612	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have to act fast to reduce CO2emmissiins.	Yes
1366613	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are already experiencing the impacts of climate change. EVs are a part of the transition away from fossil fuels. We are so far behind on this weekend need to act quickly and avoid becoming a dumping ground for less efficient vehicles rejected from other markets.	Yes
1366616	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As Australia is already lagging behind other developed nations, we should be doing as much as possible to catch up and become a leader, rather than a follower, in clean transportation initiatives. Also, more investment is needed for clean public transport, for example the electrification and improved frequency / reliability of long-distance train services.	Yes
1366623	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1366628	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Highest BCR	Yes
1366635	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	urgency to get developed world standards and delay /reduce climate change	NULL
1366639	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The IPCC makes it clear: emissions must stop urgently	NULL
1366641	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The Air quality in Cities major arterial roads is unbearable. The smell of the exhausts and visible soot build up on homes next to these roads is evidence this has to change. Air quality monitoring station are placed close to parks or where there are breezes to clean the air. Higher fuel consuming vehicles should pay higher rego fees as these are usually heavier vehicles and put a strain on fuel reservers.	No

1366642	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1366643	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Stop caving in to vested interest, we all have a common interest... survival	No
1366645	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I believe option B would be best, as it would be the start to taking significant steps towards lowering pollution caused by vehicles, without rash decisions when it comes to spending	Yes
1366652	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The benefits of adopting a fast start means that benefits are brought forward. From the benefits to health can be brought forward then there is immediate positive effect. Ongoing drive down in CO2 emissions will help in the long run and help reduce the continuing decline in environment.	NULL
1366653	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	The need to address climate change is real and urgent. Australians need access to the widest possible range of new car options so that more people can afford an EV and have access to styles and features that appeal to them.	Yes
1366656	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Optional	Yes
1366663	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Greater reward	NULL
1366664	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1366665	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1366667	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Addressing emissions and climate chnge should be foremost in all world governments agendas if we are to have any hope of maintaining a liveable world. Transition should have been completed decades ago, and no further procrastination should be tolerated.	NULL
1366669	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change requires urgent action	NULL
1366676	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's what's best for cost of living, transport and the environment.	No
1366678	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1366679	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1366680	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Clean up whatever the cost. This is more important than any other policy area.	Yes
1366683	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Get emissions down quickly. Don't you realise the climate change is happening.	Yes

1366690	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Provides a significant benefit/cost ratio whilst not being seen as extreme by climate deniers and their ilk.	Yes
1366693	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1366701	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want this issue sorted so we can all implement action towards a truly clean and sustainable way of life. This planet cannot afford for us to drag our feet on this any longer. Fossil fuels need to be eliminated now. The fastest way to reach this target is now the only way if we want our future generations and the young people of today to have any kind of quality of life	Yes
1366710	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	US EPA recently recalculated Social Cost of Carbon - ie future costs of current emissions. Their central scenario was US\$190 per T CO2 (for 2020, 2020 dollars) increasing by US\$4 per year with inflation of 15% = approx \$235-240 2024 \$US per tonne. Failure to encourage a rapid move away from inefficient vehicles is likely to embed a lot of losses for current car buyers as the world is likely to converge on significant carbon prices/fuel taxes in future. .	Yes
1366711	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1366720	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to drastically change our approach to transport (and all carbon emissions)ensure CO2 emissions are reduced to protect us from global climate change	No
1366724	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Why faff about? The sooner we get to net negative CO2 targets the better. Mother nature doesn't care for costing. We will pay more the longer we delay. This is not hard to understand, think long term and get it done. Please price in the consequences of not acting on climate change. Very simple.	No
1366725	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Get on with it! Aus is lagging the developed world after years of inaction. Get rid of the luxury car tax, which no longer has rational justification with the demise of Aus car manufacturing, and only serves to inflate the price of mid-range priced electric vehicles. Manufacturers all have Euro compliant engines in other markets - there is not need for delay unless we want to remain a dumping group for substandard technology.	No
1366726	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1366734	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Logic & intelligence, something Human Beings are supposed to have, dictates the most effective action MUST be implemented ASAP, & NOT let dumb I.C.E. addicts create more global warming.	Yes
1366758	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1366763	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Overall benefits to environment, health and ongoing costs	Yes
1366767	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act much faster than has occurred to date.	NULL
1366770	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to get serious with this and all environmental issues, not lag behind as it usually does.	Yes
1366773	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1366796	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1366808	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are falling behind the other locations such as USA and Euro. Instead of being on the back edge of this we should be leading the way. Not only will this help the consumer it will also push OEM's to invest more in future technology with Australian consumers. It will also allow us to be at the forefront of vehicle emission designs.	Yes
1366811	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Best option in terms of reducing CO2 emissions in the shortest time	Yes
1366819	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Higher benefits realised sooner are better.	Yes
1366820	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The Benefit Cost Ratio is only marginally worse but results in significantly less CO2 emissions across its lifetime. The BCR doesn't internalize a lot of known externalities (eg Sound, National Security)	Yes
1366826	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	We need to progress. I already drive a hybrid and have done so for more than 10 years. I would prefer to stick with Option A because i have been doing my bit for a considerable time and if others had also done so, Option A would have been ok. But others havent done the right thing so we are now having to move it up to Option B. A pity really	Yes
1366841	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Too much time has been wasted on this issue. Standards should have been implemented at least a year ago so there has been plenty of time for everyone to be prepared. Do not like Option A as it does not include a Break Point. Why differentiate between PVs and LCVs? 2000 kg is heavy enough for a LCV. Do not like Supercredits.	Yes
1366843	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1366850	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	it's the correct answer	No
1366852	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fastest transition, and we are starting way later than we should have. There has been plenty of time to prepare for this.	No
1366856	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	A balance of continued practical utility against emissions reduction.	Yes
1366865	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	High B/C ratio, greatest benefits	No
1366866	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	There is no need for further reductions as Australia is a net negative CO generator at present. The China's and other 3 world countries are the polluters	No
1366878	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to be ambitious and set reaching targets - climate change is already here and it is devastating. The cost to consider should also include the cost it'll take to tackle wildfires, flood loss, food shortages, etc. that will be incurred the longer we delay reduction in emissions	Yes
1366894	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B seems to provide best overall benefits. However, I would like to see some sensitivity analysis around the breakpoints. The design does seem to incentivise the use of larger vehicles. Also I would like to see the scheme changed to measure based on WLTP or something better aligned to Australian driving conditions. NEDC does not reflect our conditions and may distort the outcomes. It would be better to incentivise vehicles with low drag coefficients. They cost no more to make.	Yes
1366898	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 0th	People respond better to things when they are gradually rolled out.	Yes
1366920	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Australia is unique with its vast land area and relatively small population, other then for inner city use Electric vegicles do not currently meet the needs of many in this country, option (a) is by far the most sensible approach allowing the open market to dictate consumer choice not harsh government legislation and carbon tax by the back door	NULL

1366922	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	There has been a lot comparison with US and UK markets in this paper, but those standards were put in place couple of years ago. Australia has just published this standard and ambition of 'bringing us to speed with US' is highly disregarding the Australian consumers and fleet on roads. You are not giving enough time to people to weigh options and no mention of losses/rapid depreciation of ICE/rapid Hybrids by 2029 as a challenge while mentioning 'saving costs' with EV.	No
1366926	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C isn't significantly more than Option B and the benefits far outweigh. It is tricky that said given we are a smaller economy, but that also presents a business and community opportunity.	Yes
1366932	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The difference in cost between C and B is predominantly electricity cost. This will be a higher incentive to increase investment in renewables. The CBRs are not that different between C and B. Option A is a waste of time and effort..	No
1366938	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's time to get real on helping this earth	No
1366947	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The benefits:cost ratio between B and C is marginal. We have lagged behind for way too long on our climate action. We should be taking every opportunity to accelerate our action, ambition, and influence.	Yes
1366948	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1366950	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1366951	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1366971	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C results in higher fuel savings which is perhaps the most important feature (aside from the GHG reductions)	Yes
1366972	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I think it is important to reduce CO2 emissions as soon as possible, therefore I prefer the option that achieves this. The cost benefit ratio is similar but the benefits are much greater.	Yes
1366973	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C for the quickest & most effective transition. We need to aim as high as possible to achieve our goal of reducing carbon emissions	Yes
1366974	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We don't have time to waste. It's not just climate change it's also reducing pollution and thus improving health and reducing the health bill from asthma to cancer. Personally that's enough of a reason. Also the expense difference between Option B and C is, in my opinion, so great that it's worth choosing a 2nd rate option.	No
1366987	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce vehicle emissions as fast as we can	Yes
1366989	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Looking at the cost to invest and returns calculated it would seem better to do it and move on. Why half ass it and stretch out the adoption timeframe.	No
1366990	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do everything to encourage a greater range of low cost EVs in Australia. I've now driven one and realise just how much better they are. We just need more EV options for people. To be honest, encouraging people to buy more combustion engine vehicles, by allowing a huge range to remain, is like encouraging them to pour their money down the drain.	NULL
1366993	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Please let the market and individuals decide what to purchase. Government intervention does not work and will drive up the cost of new and used vehicles.	No

1367003	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1367004	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Having an ambitious fuel efficiency standard on new vehicles is the low hanging fruit to reducing Australia's carbon emissions. What is often overlooked is the health benefits to be gained by having more efficient vehicles on our roads. Any strategy that incentivises the uptake of cleaner cars and trucks, is a win for everyone.	NULL
1367005	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is an existential threat with many unforeseen risks. There is no justification to delay cutting carbon emissions. If we can afford nuclear submarines we can afford to eliminate carbon emissions.	No
1367006	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	No time to lose	NULL
1367009	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is critical that Australia accelerates its pace of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Option C provides the greatest benefits for Australians at a slightly higher cost. Those costs, if impactful on persons of lower economic means, should be addressed through tightly targeted assistance schemes. But for other Australians, the increased costs are able to be paid and should be paid to maximise the benefits for all Australians.	No
1367010	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change has devastated Australia, and will continue to do so as emissions largely increase yoy. Try transportation is an area where the technology has matured enough that we can make a meaningful difference. Moreover, we will make ourselves less reliant on fossil fuel imports from bad actor nations. Option C is the better investment.	No
1367014	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1367017	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1367021	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The cost savings of choosing option b over option c do not justify having to wait longer to deliver on objectives, the dollar amount in comparison is very little. The government has a tendency to act slowly, they cannot afford to be slow now.	NULL
1367031	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Timing for waiting is over.	No
1367042	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia must work much harder as part of international efforts to prevent climate change	NULL
1367047	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C has the best cost/benefit ratio and will have the speediest effect on climate change. Australia and the world are behind in the battle to address climate change. Current wars can only be exacerbating the problem. Communities are already suffering from adverse weather events. Costs are already n	No
1367049	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are experiencing a climate emergency. It's too late to be conservative.	No
1367051	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Sooner the better	Yes
1367058	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want Australia to transition faster than Option B allows. We owe it to future generations.	No
1367064	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes

1367065	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1367067	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	You're trying to do it too soon. There are other issues affecting low, middle people & pensioners	No
1367070	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This needed to be done years ago, we now need the fastest option	No
1367073	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to catch up faster	Yes
1367075	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	evs are the future so we need strong standards to force manufacturers to send more evs at a cheaper price point. It would also encourage car makers to build electric utes . nations need to take the lead so car makers from japan toyota and mazda finally get the hint that the days of ice vehicles is coming to an end and they need to take some social responsibility in the fight against climate change. The fact is evs are a better car more efficient and cost far less to run. .	No
1367087	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are phenomenally behind the rest of the world in transitioning to low emission, safer, cleaner transport. Costs could in some cases be mitigated through improved promotion and legislative change encouraging active transport including presumption of fault where motorists hit pedestrians, cyclists and other active transport users. The collective effort to reduce emissions by Australia and other nations is insufficient and emissions standards would be an improvement.	NULL
1367090	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 0th	Urgent action is needed now. Building for active transport can deliver a multiplying effect which helps (a) reduce car use and costs (b)start bringing NSW to better align with +ve developments in many international cities	Yes
1367096	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We've wasted enough time already. They'll run scare campaigns no matter which option you choose, so you might as well pick the best one.	Yes
1367097	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	This is the only realistic option that does not impose unreasonable costs on car makers and buyers	No
1367099	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1367105	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1367107	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Please ensure that this legislation does not hold light commercial vehicles (such as utes and American pickup trucks) to a weaker standard than passenger cars. These vehicles are increasingly being used as passenger vehicles but with an outsized negative impact on the safety of other drivers and pedestrians. In the US, less stringent regulations on light commercial vehicles has resulted in the proliferation of dangerous and polluting pickup trucks as passenger vehicles, and we must not follow.	Yes
1367109	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Greenhouse gas emission reduction is urgent and should be weighted	No
1367112	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1367125	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes

1367132	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1367134	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1367135	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Playing catchup is never painless	Yes
1367138	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1367144	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	It's in our interest to move faster	Yes
1367147	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia lags much of the developed world when it comes to replacing fossil fuels with renewable energy. We should go hard and fast.	Yes
1367150	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is a climate crisis - let's act quickly if we care for our kids and planet	Yes
1367151	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to at least join the USA and preferably UK/EU standards so that Australians are treated equally to those nations in terms of quality of vehicles sold	Yes
1367158	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should be leading the energy transition, not playing catch-up. If we truly are the lucky country, it's time to use that luck to help lead the world.	Yes
1367159	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Best balance that brings Aus market which is very small into line with the rest of the world	Yes
1367160	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1367166	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1367170	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B has the best Benefits Cost Ratio	Yes
1367178	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because I cannot presently buy the EV I want because of lack of supply, which is not only disappointing (ie. a loss), it means I keep my ICE longer adding kms and reducing its resale value (ie. a loss) and I am not reducing my vehicle emissions which is a loss.	Yes
1367180	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate emergency	No
1367185	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	you need to make them stronger	No



1367193	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	environmental, we must clean up are city's.	NULL
1367201	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1367206	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Our planet is at risk, our health is at risk from fuel emissions, we have renewable power sources for charging vehicles, we just need to be able to join renewable power to charging infrastructure.	NULL
1367207	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	I think that though option A is a much cheaper option it will achieve parctically nothing but option C may make motoring completely unaffordable for a lot of people. Australia is a large but sparsly settled country with a few very large cities, with relatively long distances between them and many smaller regional areas. I live in regional Victoria and the nearest regional centre is around 50 km away. The nearest public transport is 15 km away. And there are many in similar situations.	Yes
1367210	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1367219	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want results now. Car dependency is already heavily subsidised. People need to realise the true cost of their car dependency in order to incite change	No
1367221	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	While Option C has greater upfront costs, the net benefits are the greatest across the 3. This will help position Australia as a global leader within fuel efficiency standards and emissions, and provide a sustainable future. Furthermore, using incremental B/C ratio analysis, Option C is preferable to Option B, where $(\$173.65 - \$142.95)/(\$58.75 - \$46.49) = 2.5$ , placing Option C as the best choice compared to Option B. Meanwhile, Option A has minimal benefit to Australia, and would put us behind.	No
1367223	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	the sooner the better...necessary to reduce impact on the planet for present and future generations.	NULL
1367234	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want Australia to increase its energy independence and to become less reliant on oil imports.	Yes
1367242	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is the problem of our generation, and we have an oppportunity to lead the world in demonstrating what's possible in charting the course of vehicle emissions to reduce Australia's c.20% emissions for this industry.	Yes
1367243	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	It is necessary to act now, with as much force as we can afford	Yes
1367246	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C has the highest benefits and puts Australia back on track to meet its climate obligations both globally, and to its citizens.	Yes
1367250	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fastest transition hitting CO2 emissions and the increased benefits out way the extra cost	Yes
1367256	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate crisis requires the most urgent action	NULL
1367257	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Time is running out. We have to move as quickly as we can to make the transition	NULL
1367260	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL

1367271	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is so far behind emissions standards so we do not get the choice of low emissions vehicles that other countries do. As a result we are a dumping ground for old low tech high emitting vehicles.	Yes
1367280	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is no Plan B - we need to reduce use of carbon as a fuel as rapidly as possible or else it will cost more in the long run.	Yes
1367281	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The uptake and cost of renewable energy as well as the uptake and cost reductions of EVs is constantly being under forecast and therefore Option 3 is more likely to deliver more value than even forecast here. This also has the added benefit of driving greater private investment and further increases the value across the global chain. easing	NULL
1367304	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1367307	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1367319	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Save the planet	No
1367335	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1367341	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	GET RID OF POLLUTION.	NULL
1367343	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I prefer not to live inside a toaster for the rest of my life.	NULL
1367352	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1367363	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	My main priority is to reduce CO2 emissions as quickly as possible	No
1367366	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Considering that Australia has no domestic vehicle manufacturing and all the technology to transition to the new standards already exists and is being used either in vehicles or cleaner fuels. there is no reason that C is actionable.	Yes
1367367	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1367369	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1367373	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Demonstrated superiority of Option B and despite lack of broader benefits of option C in relation to technologies and health and adverse consequences of environmental change	No
1367384	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This choice has the highest benefits.	No

1367385	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Time to get going	No
1367395	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The most cost-effective	No
1367407	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Looking at sea temperature tracking and given the risks of permafrost carbon emissions we may not have as much time as envisaged before climate change is cataclysmic.	No
1367408	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's important to be ambitious with targets. It is possible that they are not met, but by setting less ambitious targets there will be less pressure to make rapid change.	Yes
1367409	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We [the nation] need to take action now. Option B is a long overdue modest start, which hopefully the Crossbench politicians will support Opposition and Greens will have difficulty opposing	Yes
1367412	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1367417	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because we have to do more sooner.	NULL
1367419	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are catching up after years of inaction. We also need to show the world and in particular our pacific neighbors that we are serious about playing our part in reducing co2 emissions and working towards a sustainable future for future generations.	NULL
1367420	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1367424	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We no longer have the luxury of waiting. Haven't we done enough damage already ? It is time to cut down emissions as fast as possible. It is unfortunate that you have forgot to calculate the cost of not taking action early.	Yes
1367426	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Selected due to cost benefit ratio	Yes
1367429	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to get moving on this ASAP. We've lost a decade, we need to make that up by 2030.	Yes
1367436	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do more to slow global warming. Decreased fuel usage will diminish fuel excise collection and need to be replaced by congestion charges and/or road use	Yes
1367438	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The option I chose is the best for the environment/climate	Yes
1367443	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are so behind in our transition to a cleaner auto industry. Manufacturers are not selling their cleanest cars to Australia and we have far fewer options than most countries. The climate does not have the time or capacity to change slowly. We need to bite the bullet for the health and future of the next generation.	No
1367444	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes

1367448	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to make progress towards reducing the pollution of the passenger vehicle fleet in Australia, keeping in mind that cars purchased today will still be driving on the road in 12-15 yrs time. Going too hard though will generate too much opposition.	Yes
1367451	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have been such laggards on this.	Yes
1367456	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C delivers 30% more benefits than Option B, while the cost difference is largely due to higher electricity costs. However, the fixed assumptions on electricity costs are likely to be highly conservative, as EV purchasers are shown to be much more behaviourally sensitive to electricity pricing and will tend to charge primarily from home solar. Therefore the costs of Option C are largely overstated.	Yes
1367457	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Reasonably fast and less costly than option C.	Yes
1367460	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Domestic energy security. Cleaner air in urban areas.	Yes
1367463	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because we are in the middle of a climate emergency, and have lost quite enough time to stalling by the previous government. Australia is vulnerable to almost all negative impacts of climate change - fires, floods, cyclones, sea level rise and heatwaves. We can't afford half measures at this stage - we need to go hard. Hit the denier idiots with the science so hard they won't be able to mount a defence. \$10b in extra costs is an accounting error by government spending standards.	No
1367466	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	CO2 levels rising fast already causing global warming and increased severe weather events therefore everything that can stop this increase must be done. Also massive benefits for health with reduced lung disease, cancer, heart disease and dementia. Also will reduce pollution due oil exploration, transport and help balance of payments!	No
1367473	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	After a decade lost in moving towards clean vehicle technology and reducing CO2 omissions Australia needs to lift its game and again be a world leader The overall Net Benefits of Option C are the greatest of the 3 options.	Yes
1367477	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	best for environment	No
1367482	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Because it offers greater benefit for environment. Not sure how the government cannot support this option, when it also delivers the greatest financial benefit - seems you are not offering in the best interests of the nation.	No
1367487	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1367490	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The global warming situation is urgent. The cost of not cutting will be far greater than the calculations. We must take the most effective measures to reduce and subsidise who need it.	NULL
1367491	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce emissions and have cleaner fuel and cars as quick as possible	No
1367495	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I would like to see legislation that is future-proofed against a future incoming government seeking to wind back changes. Setting up a scheme with more aggressive targets will fast-track the introduction of higher-quality vehicles, establishing a market that will make it harder to lesson standards in the future as Australian drivers will develop affinity for the available product.	Yes
1367503	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1367504	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Greater benefits including health, reduced emissions and consumer costs	NULL

1367515	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Greatest net benefit should be the goal. And greatest displacement of imported oil and petrol. The national security and energy security benefits are priceless.	Yes
1367517	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are facing a genuine climate crisis and we need to genuinely address it. In the context of current government policies continuing with new fossil fuel developments and continuing fossil fuel subsidies, the fuel efficiency standard must go as far as possible (Option C) for people and the planet. Anything less is a betrayal of future generations of Australians. That said, thank you for taking a survey approach, and I hope it convinces you to do more than an arse-covering cop-out (Option B).	Yes
1367526	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Greater variety of cars available whilst also reducing Australia's emissions	Yes
1367552	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to catch up with the rest of the developed world when it come to transport. The future is electric and the sooner we get on board the better	NULL
1367555	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1367566	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	85% of worldwide vehicle sales are sold under a vehicle emissions standard. Australia needs to catch up ASAP.	NULL
1367573	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is so far behind the rest of the world in this regard that we need the fastest and most effective policy in place. However ,there is a greater cost factor in option 3 and I can see that theCBR is better for option 2 so I also support option 2	Yes
1367581	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate emergency & must treat it as such & do all we can for the health of the planet	NULL
1367590	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have wasted too much time already and we must provide the strongest incentive for some of the legacy car makers to change their behaviour. This in turn will encourage road users to change theirs.	Yes
1367591	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	This is the carbon tax by stealth, it will 100% drive vehicle costs and inflation up. Car prices go up, tradie can't afford a cheap ute for work, jacks up the prices of his labour and so on. In the middle of a cost of living crisis it is absolutely the wrong decision.	No
1367615	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have wasted enough time and tugged forelocks before the fossil fuel industry and Murdochs for too long, and the effects of climate change only get worse from here. Even Option C is conservative given all the earth science indicators and the government should be leading a discussion that not only positions Options B/C as reasonable, but float more and emissions-reducing urgent positions. For example, comparisons are made to the US market (a high-emissions joke), when they should be compared to active transport alternatives like PT, walking and cycling. There should also be significant effort towards mode shifting to such low emissions options which need fewer resources and yield greater health benefits, compared with the current \,buy a shiny new car and you've done your part\, model. Starting in the centre leaves you nowhere to go; it's a strategic communications fail. I will \,supported\, Option B below for the numbers, but it's really Liberal Lite. And haven't they done enough damage?	NULL
1367622	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Time to stop talking & move on with full commitment & implementation to improving our climate for all	No
1367637	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has lagged in this area for too long and we have been greedy. Mining=profit at the expense of our entire planet. We need to make it right and invest in the future of this planet.	NULL
1367644	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B supports a progressive and effective change without breaking the bank. Option C is better but may alienate some individuals or groups. Option A does very little to advance the goal of lowering the emissions in the required time frame.	Yes

1367647	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The sooner we start reducing emissions the better.	No
1367650	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to rapidly decarbonise our transport system and transition to electric cars that don't pollute our cities with particulates that cause serious health issues including death. For too long we have dithered and not committed to cleaner, more efficient vehicles. I live near a lot of major roads and every few days I wipe the soot off my window sill. My neighbour's children breathe these toxins in daily. It's time for cleaner cars and cleaner air. Thank you.	NULL
1367651	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1367669	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The sooner the better to accelerate achieving the emission target and the better for the environment.	No
1367670	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has left it more than late enough to take this essential action. It's past time to act for fewer emissions and cleaner air.	NULL
1367672	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Considering that this standard is relatively new in the Australian market, it's best to opt for a more cautious approach in achieving the intended goals. Failure to manage the risks (more probable with Option C) would discourage any further confidence by the Australian public. It's important to show that such standard will not sacrifice much of the Australian lifestyle. If implemented effectively (more likely with Option B), the public would realise the unnecessary of more oppositions.	Yes
1367675	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1367678	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to catch up with the world ASAP.	Yes
1367679	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1367685	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1367686	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has no local car industry to protect. Overseas manufacturers have proven they are able to meet vehicle emissions standards in other markets, and given Australia's small car market, there should be no issue with them meeting similar standards in Australia almost immediately.	Yes
1367697	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1367700	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	We need a more ambitious plan to transition to zero emissions transport system that directly discourages fossil fuel-intensive vehicle use.	No
1367709	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	A quick transition provides strong benefits to the wider community. I don't think the risk involved with a slower transition is adequately captured within the CBA analysis. The costs are measured against reaching our targets of 43 per cent emissions reduction by 2030 and net zero by 2050. If these targets move forward at all - which they are likely to do - then the option B will not be sufficient and end up being far more costly than Option C. In such a situation, the longer we have high emitting vehicle sales, and the higher the magnitude, the higher the risk of having stranded assets.	Yes
1367724	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We really need to take action on high polluting and highly inefficient vehicles on our roads. While it would be great to do option C, it is unrealistic to expect that Australians will want to adopt new standards so quickly and such a rapid adoption would largely see any subsequent government simply roll back the legislation.	Yes

1367743	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce emissions as fast as reasonably practical.	NULL
1367746	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I support option C given it produces the greatest net benefit, particularly in relation to emissions reductions and fuel savings. Where option C is not possible, option B is a very satisfactory outcome. Option A should not be considered given the net benefits are so minimal.	Yes
1367759	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The overall benefits to Australia of moving to a sustainable society should be accelerated to try and reduce the impact of the climate crisis caused by emissions	Yes
1367777	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is an emergency which demands immediate action. Norway has already achieved less than 10gCO2/km for new cars sold in 2024, much less than any of the options considered by the Australian government for 2030. Even disregarding greenhouse gas emissions, the analysis shows that the net benefits are greatest when we act fastest. Our cars are burning oil, burning our money and burning our planet. The faster we move to more efficient vehicles, the richer we will be and the safer our climate will be.	Yes
1367791	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Move more quickly, save more money	NULL
1367808	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are seeing more and more impacts of climate change. Every summer is worse. We have to set the strongest targets with the strongest measures AND reap the greatest benefits. Everyday people can only afford to do so much. Our elected government must stand for us and protect us.	Yes
1367817	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Vehicle technology costs, Electricity cost & battery replacement costs are exaggerated.	Yes
1367831	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The ecosystem of our planet is being destroyed, we need to act fast	NULL
1367833	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	WE keep delaying these proposals because of cost. The longer we delay the higher the cost. The time is now to take big steps to catch up to where we need to be.	Yes
1367835	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we need to transition quickly	No
1367848	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Lower carbon emissions	NULL
1367851	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Currently the Government provides tax benefits to ABN Holders to make the diesel 4WD ute tax deductible. Most of these drivers will rarely use these vehicles for their intended purpose, and could easily make do with a Van or maybe an eVan, Option B does not provide enough disincentive to remove these cars from our urban roads. Option B may provide the better cost benefit ratio but Option C provides the Highest Net Benefit, and will therefor provide a higher net return to the public	No
1367852	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need cars that are as cheap to run (use as little fuel) as other advanced economies	Yes
1367856	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are well overdue and need more aggressive targets now. Stop pandering to industry and govern for the people	No
1367860	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1367865	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Electric vehicle uptake is important for energy security and climate change mitigation.	Yes

1367871	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have let ourselves get so far behind the rest of the world, we need to catch up	Yes
1367872	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have let ourselves get so far behind the rest of the world, we need to catch up	Yes
1367873	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have let ourselves get so far behind the rest of the world, we need to catch up	Yes
1367880	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Greatest benefit, let's just do this	Yes
1367924	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The world is changing rapidly and if you hold onto the past with climate change looming you are spelling doom for not only australia but the world beyond , (australia will already bear the brunt of given how harsh weather here is anyway, it's foolish not to move forward as soon as we can) It's not an easy option with plenty of uncertainties, let science lead the way not economic fear mongering.	Yes
1367976	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1367983	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Get started	No
1368093	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	B is better than A because because it provides more benefits but public the gov are claiming it won't increase vehicle costs but this calculator shows it's a significant increase in costs even just for option B. Realistically the proposed option is not bad however lacks any consumer incentives like the EU or the US and I'm in the trade and what I know is that consumers will not by electric unless it's incentivised. We see that from the uptake in cars under LCT and leases.	No
1368120	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Let's get the maximum benefit as quickly as possible as it has already been too long comingg	NULL
1368412	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Benefits of EVs are not confirmed and there is a clear lack of confidence in hitting those targets and benefits. Current EV cars are not up to standard to compare with ICE or Hybrid vehicles and there is still much development in EVs in terms of range, durability, quality, and driver support before they can compete with the current ICE offering. A fast start puts drivers at risk, removes buyer optionality and will lead to increased prices over time.	No
1368568	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Terriffic health benefit and vastly increased savings on CO2/ vehicle maintenance.	Yes
1368577	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1368579	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should have stayed with electric vehicles a century ago, and never started burning petroleum to begin with.	No
1368615	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe it is important to aim higher rather than lower, there is benefits that can't be quantified, and the faster Australia can progress initiatives like this, the better for all of us. Australia is in a great position to be a leader in industries such as this, so why aim to be somewhere in the middle when we can take strides to be leaders and front runners. Inspire younger generations, foster interst in smart and progressive individuals from around the world, instead of having our younger generation leave, get people to come to Australia. Personally I will strongly support any developments for cleaner and cheaper alternatives for travel, I uprooted my life and moved from the Sunshine Coast to Melbourne with some of my strongest reasoning being the ability to use public transport, ride a bike around and use a car as little as possible, which has been successful. Thanks for reading and have a great day. Thanks, Josh	Yes



1368671	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1368682	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	There is no explanation on how much this will lower the earths temperature, so I can not fully understand the benefits to evaluate the cost.	No
1368723	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1368815	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to move as quickly as possible with Norway showing option C is entirely realistic and achievable.	No
1368878	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C will more equitable and enable more efficient cars with bigger cost savings, improve the environment via reduced air pollution, and also reduce health and transport costs for Australians.	No
1368919	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	B is realistic and best cost ratio	Yes
1368936	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The Nations inhabitants Health is more important than money.	No
1369008	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are decades behind Europe & USA! Get on with it!	Yes
1369030	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has waited too long to implement this legislation. No time to waste, we must catch up quickly. This will reduce local air pollution and create cleaner towns and cities to live in. I fully support Option C.	NULL
1369036	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate emergency and need to take strong action to mitigate the devastating impacts that we are already seeing with extreme weather and sea level rises. While option C is more disruptive and has a slightly lower cost to benefit ratio, we need strong and decisive action to minimise harm to Australians and the global population. The increased cost savings to all motorists are an added perk to strong action. While many car manufacturers are lobbying the government and claiming that they cannot meet the new requirements, the same companies are easily working within similar rules overseas. It is clear their only motivation is the desire to continue to dump inefficient, expensive and polluting vehicles onto Australians for their own monetary gain. We need the Australian government to advocate for the Australian people and introduce as strict as possible emission standards for the people, not for large multinational companies who have already abandoned Australia, both in their current vehicle range and from ceasing to manufacture here.	Yes
1369048	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have to act now, we are so far behind other countries if we choose option B there could be a change in government the time we make any progress then we be 5 steps back with no improvement	No
1369049	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	FES needs to be implemented asap and it needs to catch up as soon as possible, Australia has lagged for far too long. This country love affair with big polluting diesel utes don't just impact our climate action ambitions, these vehicles are incredibly damaging to our health. Tailpipe emissions are killing people far more than the annual roadtoll and this has to stop.	No
1369051	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is no reason Australia can't be a world leader in energy transition. Given that California (the 5th largest economy in the world) has banned the sale of any new gasoline powered/combusion engine passenger vehicles by 2035, we need to speed up our own transition to be ready for that change. Automotive manufacturers are transitioning at an increasing rate, and we risk being in a position where we will have no choice but to follow suit - so we may as well choose to lead and do the right thing for future generations.	Yes
1369072	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Biased wporing of option descriptions	Yes

1369096	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We face a crisis. Anything other than serious action to reduce carb n emissions is madness. Australis is absurdly far behind the world. We need serious action now, and any delay is unconscionable for us, our children and the planet	NULL
1369104	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NEED TO TOW AND COVER IN EXCESS OF 800KM PER DAY FORNWORK	No
1369158	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I will be healthier overall - be able to beathe more easily in urban and industrial area and unlike your car industry lobbyists, who would prefer lax liberals in power, I am a labour voter - better to keep your voters happy.	Yes
1369188	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Drives faster reduction on CO2, with vehicles more fuel efficient and increase of EV adoption	Yes
1369189	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Needs to be done ASAP. B is still an improvement on A however.	Yes
1369192	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fossil fuel indstry is making massive profits out of our poor fuel effiecency standards, which is only worsening our climate.	NULL
1369214	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1369226	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1369231	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As a nation we are too slow to respond and in the process miss out on opportunities and the ability to better influence outcomes.	Yes
1369246	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The fastest and strictest approach is my favourite. We have a long way to catch up and would prefer it to happen asap.	Yes
1369254	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to make significant changes around emissions immediately. There is definitely no longer time to wait for 'slow starts'.	Yes
1369259	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia should do all it can to reduce emissions. There is no reason why we should cointinue to accept detrimental emmissions damaging our health and deteriorating our living conditions in the rapidly approaching future.	Yes
1369298	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	It seems a moderate and fairer option , also I trust that government bodies would suggest the most reasonable & fair option. I also think we need to move with conviction to improve climate change a swiftly as is practical.	Yes
1369306	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Accrue the greatest net benefits, especially health benefits would lead to the quality of life improvements for all Australians that would be difficult to quantify. This option (Option C) also moves our country into a leadership position, rather than seeking to balance the risk and opportunity (Option B). Option A should not be considered, the status quo or doing essentially nothing is not an option, we cannot afford to do nothing not just from an environmental perspective but from an economic perspective. I see the move to more fuel efficient vehicles as a productivity improvement first, followed by environmental. When looked at this way it's very difficult to argue the status quo as the data just doesn't lie. Option A will likely be the preferred approach for businesses so they can sell out older models that other markets (like the EU and the US) will not accept due to their own efficiency rules. At the end of the day this is not in Australia's interest, neither short or long term. It is in our interest to move in line with these markets, the technology exists, and we must take advantage of it. Further more, given we no longer make vehicles in this country and with the cost of these vehicles being higher, the government must investigate removing or restructuring luxury car tax. At the moment this tax is an impediment to the take up of electric vehicles which are often above the thresholds, and creates resistance in the population to change due to additional costs associated with purchasing a vehicle.	NULL

1369310	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The health benefits alone should be a priority as people with better health are less dependant on government assistance and are more productive, thus making us all more productive , healthier and happier at home, work and play.	No
1369312	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We just need to get on with it now, not flaffing about.	No
1369330	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia's trajectory to net zero above pre-industrial levels is behind and to avoid a climate catastrophe all transitions must speed up. Transport is currently one of the highest sources of carbon emissions.	No
1369345	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I live in the inner city and i'm looking forward to breathing clean air!	NULL
1369347	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	concern about slow rate of emissions reduction in australia	NULL
1369368	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C provides greater benefits while not being exorbitantly more costly than Option B.	NULL
1369373	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1369375	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	You cannot be serious with these numbers, when there is an ev that can tow and do 1000km between recharges, then this plan may be viable. Australia has a lot different geography and usage than other countries, we should not be lowering ourselves to anyone else's standard.	No
1369376	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	A fast start is possible as we do not manufacture any cars and we should align ourselves with the strongest market initiatives due to our market being so small. We do not have to reinvent the wheel.	Yes
1369380	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Ev cars are not the answer they take too long to charge and if you need to battery replace the battery it is cheaper to buy a new car which means more land fill. Our power grid is not designed to power all the evs so we use diesel or petrol generators to produce power stations for the evs so what is the point if we are going to still burn diesel or petrol.	No
1369386	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is already lagging behind the rest of the world in efficiency standards and environmental policy in general. Taking a big step now will bring us better into line with emission reductions targets that we are not yet on track for.	No
1369391	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is embarrassing that Australia is only one of two developed countries not to have a fuel efficiency standard. The amount of CO2 being pumped into the atmosphere free of charge cannot be allowed to continue unabated. The options given should be considered a bare minimum. I was surprised that the cost of Climate Change was not included in the benefit cost analysis. The destruction of infrastructure through more violent storms, floods, droughts and fires needs to be quantified and not just politically left out. Climate Change is now already out of control and further delaying CO2 control and denying that it exists is nolonger an option. I believe option 3 is the only rational decision that can be made as we nolonger have the priviledge for further delay in tackling CO2 production.	Yes
1369407	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1369413	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The high net benefit of option C cannot be ignored, even though it may be politically unpopular with a vocal section of the community. Time to act is NOW. I only support the governments preferred option (B) in comparison to Option A.	No
1369426	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No

1369435	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1369439	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to catch up to the rest of the world so a fast start is preferred and it also has the greatest benefits	NULL
1369454	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option A has little benefit, Option B delivers most of the benefit with less disruption of Option C	Yes
1369462	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	poor infrastructure, cost of electricity outweighs cost of petrol so no savings, longevity of electric vehicles will create e-waste, still use coal power stations so what carbon emissions are be reduced if electricity use is increased	No
1369470	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I am very concerned about climate change and local pollution contributing to bad health.	Yes
1369478	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I think we have to be realistic in that we need to bring everyone along for the journey without pushback. Then if necessary the standards can be tightened quicker as needed	Yes
1369487	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is lagging behind and has done so for decades. If we are serious about emissions reductions we need a fast start and clear, strict rules. The government 's plan (B) is good but not good enough. We have to be ambitious and not be swayed by the lobbying industry.	No
1369489	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	We need these new standards to keep up with Europe and so Australia doesn't continue to be a dumping ground for ICE vehicles. I want to buy an affordable small EV with reasonable range but none are exported to Australia. A change in our emission standards would bring my dream closer to reality.	Yes
1369510	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	The Option B is overall good, but I personally don't recognise the need for making a carbon emission reduction by 60% in as short as 5 years. I think a 10-year timeline would be much more achievable. The policy should focus on forcing manufacturers to provide fuel efficient powertrains (for the current models), rather than forcing people to stay away from their loved SUVs and utes.	Yes
1369513	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Limit greenhouse gases as fast as possible	No
1369521	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act faster to get emissions in check	No
1369523	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are lagging behind many world nations and need to accelerate this transition as quickly as possible. Noting most plans don't go to plan due to industry taking a while to adjust + loopholes so if we select option C we will most likely end up with the results of option B. I appreciate statistics of BCR but this is something that will have an overall beneficial social outcome.	Yes
1369526	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1369531	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1369534	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1369541	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do as much as we can as soon as we can	NULL

1369544	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1369545	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is necessary to meet the challenges of rising carbon pollution of the atmosphere. Option B does not sufficiently meet the need or Australia's reduction target	No
1369546	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	australia must greatly reduce reliance on imported fuel. we are vulnerable .	No
1369555	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Being one of the wealthiest countries in the world, Australia can afford to put aside financial impacts in favour of doing the best we can for the earth. In fact, we have the responsibility to do more, in order to make up for poorer countries who cannot afford to contribute as much as us in decarbonisation.	No
1369556	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The world is already behind on reduce emissions to where they need to be, delays are inevitable so the fastest option is whats needed	Yes
1369557	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Save the planet	NULL
1369558	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Infrastructure is best established ahead of time, cf disastrous NBN deployment	Yes
1369559	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	It will give us less vehicles to choose. Some of the manufacturers will abandon Australia	NULL
1369564	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1369584	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	This is a long awaited and urgent move. It will accelerate emissions reductions.. The cost will be worth it.	No
1369585	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Long overdue , need to act immediately	Yes
1369593	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	This is rubbish? Governments should let markets decide	No
1369597	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	This is just another tax that will affect the people that can least afford it.Secondly people that have to tow require a vehicle that is bigger and therefore requires more power.Ev car do Not last nearly as long as a quality internal combustion engine.How many more taxes do we need!!!	No
1369600	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1369602	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Need urgent immediate significant change to reduce the climate change impact we are already experiencing	No
1369609	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Better for health (reduced particulates), environment and mitigate climate change risks.	NULL

1369614	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Action for climate change	Yes
1369616	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The faster we transition away from fossil fuels, particularly in the transport sector, the better	Yes
1369620	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are way behind the rest of the OECD on this. In addition, the tax incentives created by the Morrison government has pushed us in completely the wrong direction, encouraging the purchase of these oversized SUVs and 4-door utes. We need better energy and transport policies, and we need them ASAP.	No
1369625	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	If nothing is done to bring in the changes we will continue to deal with the planet heating up even faster .	No
1369627	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	It's going to make everything more expensive. Stop meddling in private industry and let the consumers make decisions on what cars they want to buy. We have a cost of living crisis and this is only going to make it worse. You have more important things to focus on than this	No
1369642	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are SO FAR BEHIND other jurisdictions in any sort of efficiency standards - the faster we improve our act the better for all of us - not just car owners,. And we MUST move as quickly as possible on greenhouse gas emissions - even the targets we imagine we might achieve are inadequate!	NULL
1369657	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Impact on Businesses and OEM's - understand the need to transition however car development is planned 3-4 years out. It is unreasonable to give a target of 2035 and then bring it forward 10 years. While I can appreciate the need to reduce emissions, has there been a feasibility study into electric in Australia? It's all well and good in Europe over small distances with the infrastructure but Australia does not have that. Electric is not the future of the automotive industry.	No
1369670	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We're already decades behind, we can't afford to waste more time	No
1369683	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option 3 will have more unforeseen hidden spin off benefits.	No
1370299	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to bring emissions down drastically as we are now seeing the impact of dithering.. The vast majority of OECD countries have C as the only option. We need to stop having policies dictated by corporate interests, rather than environmental concerns. Bringing in option C will bring emissions down dramatically and actively encourage the sale and purchasing of EVs. This will have an enduring impact both ecologically and economically as people will not need to spend so much on fuel and maintenance.	No
1370415	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need a greater choice of electric and low emissions vehicles available in Australia as soon as possible.	NULL
1370477	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370481	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Just seems the most sensible	No
1370483	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370484	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reduce emissions immediately for climate change.	No
1370485	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1370494	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370498	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370499	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370502	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	We have no choice other than to go in full scale now as every single typing point is being met and every action we take now to support the planet and all life upon it gives a little more chance to stave off the most catastrophic outcomes	No
1370503	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe the time to act is now. We don't have time to dawdle. The planet is burning and we need ambitious and rapid action (just like we were capable of during Covid)	No
1370504	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370505	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I already own a hybrid ev and want others to be able to in order to help save our planet	No
1370507	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370509	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To reduce air pollution asap.	Yes
1370512	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Maximise emissions reduction	NULL
1370513	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370515	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370516	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The faster we transition to clean energy via electric cars the better for heath and environmental reasons	No
1370521	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate cannot wait! Critical tipping points are already reached. The cost of option C is higher, but the calculation doesn't take into account the cost of climate change caused by CO2 emissions like forest fires, heat waves, water rise, etc. So, the real cost of option C is very likely to be lower.	NULL
1370525	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Avoiding the destruction of planet earth.	NULL
1370530	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1370532	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 2nd	NULL	No
1370533	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	NULL
1370535	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1370541	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1370542	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370545	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	No time to waste! Australia should lead the way, not lag behind.	No
1370548	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370551	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1370555	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate	No
1370558	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370560	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370561	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1370562	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The world can no longer afford to wait to introduce stringent efforts to reduce carbondioxide emissions	No
1370563	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370564	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370565	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to move as fast as we can. Option C is the best option for this.	Yes



1370569	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370570	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370571	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1370572	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have a serious climate emergency, option C is the only good option. It will most likely save money on the long run.	No
1370573	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Emissions need to be reduced as rapidly as possible	No
1370574	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1370583	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We cannot afford further delays in this matter.	No
1370584	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370586	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are running out of time. The sooner we reduce emissions the greater the benefits in the long run.	No
1370590	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Unrealistic the Clowns in the City's need to travel the out back (western QLD / Northern Territory) for instance EV powered vehicles won't suit	No
1370592	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370594	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Save the planet!	No
1370596	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Manufacturers have had years to change their practices. The government needs to send a strong message that change is needed, and option C is the only way to make real impact in a timeframe that helps the planet.	No
1370597	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	We do not have time to waste - just do it	No
1370600	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1370603	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	Climate change.	No

1370605	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370607	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370613	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to be bold and brave on the world stage. This'll show those Europeans how we do it down under by taking climate change seriously!	No
1370614	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1370616	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It should have happened years ago. Countries in Europe have implemented this (with the same brands of cars almost a decade ago. Australians have paid enough and have polluted enough. Transition NOW.	No
1370617	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1370618	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370619	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370621	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370623	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Just get it done,before it's too late.	No
1370627	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We cannot afford to wait. This should have been done years ago. Waiting will cost far more in the long run, as evidenced, e.g., by the rapidly rising costs of insurance which have been caused by catastrophic events occuring because of global heating.	No
1370629	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370631	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370632	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are already behind schedule, our world and our health cannot no longer wait	No
1370634	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	I don't want this change to impact my cost of living. Inflation is already crazy	No
1370642	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1370645	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370648	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1370649	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis demands urgent and rapid action. Australia, a country with one the highest carbon emissions per capita also has one of the highest motor vehicle per capita rates in the world. We need to act now, and fast, and assume our role in reducing carbon emissions. Australia faces great climate risk and should therefore be a the forefront of change.	No
1370652	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	A need for haste. We have dully dallied for 30 years and it is now urgent to stop. Companies dumping dirty vehicles in Australia.	No
1370653	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Global Pollution needs to be tackled, NOW	No
1370658	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This option is the best way to catch up to the rest of the worlds standards	No
1370665	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370666	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370667	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Something needs to done about climate change, and fast	NULL
1370671	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1370672	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370674	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370675	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370677	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to stop fossil fuels related projects as soon as possible and encouraging people to stop investing in fossil fuels projects	No
1370681	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	the environmental colapse	No
1370689	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to fast track all our responses the climate change and we need to becomes leaders and advocates in these spaces.	NULL

1370694	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370696	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Maximum benefit for the planet, less pollution and CO2 emissions	No
1370699	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are facing a climate crisis and Australia has been a laggard reducing our CO2 emissions so far. We need to do everything we can to reduce our emissions quickly.	No
1370702	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370703	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to maintain the highest standards and follow the lead of other nations in dealing with carbon emissions.	No
1370704	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370706	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	Saving the planet for the next generations	No
1370714	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1370716	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1370717	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C will drive down vehicle emissions quickly	No
1370718	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The sooner we transfer to better emissions control the better	No
1370725	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1370728	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	NULL
1370730	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Its the only economically viable option in the mid to long term.	No
1370736	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	More needs to be done, than option B, option A is pandering to the lobbyist from the polluting industries.	No
1370738	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The option C indicates the best benefits and best for the environment	No

1370740	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are running out of time. Baby steps like Option B are inadequate.	No
1370744	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370745	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370749	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Rapid reduction of climate change is highly desirable	Yes
1370750	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370756	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1370760	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1370771	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia should be leading the world	No
1370773	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370774	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	It is the best solution for climate crisis	No
1370775	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	No
1370778	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1370779	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need IMMEDIATE action, not action driven by lazy motor vehicle lobbyists.	No
1370781	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1370782	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Unless wet take urgent action to cut carbon emissions the floods, droughts and the damage that they cause to communities, farming and horticulture will only get worse.	NULL
1370783	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	We can expose Australia to high co2 emissions, poor vehicle standards and a slow transtion to a cleaner and healthier future.	No

1370791	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370792	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370796	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370797	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Globally we need to act as quickly as possible, it would be an opportunity for Australia to set the example and lead the way	NULL
1370800	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We can't keep stalling on making inroads into clean mate change- we need to act now	No
1370803	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370805	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370810	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370816	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	No time to waste	No
1370819	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370826	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 1st	Faster the better. Align with our US & EU partners	No
1370828	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is no planet B!	NULL
1370829	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	It's the fastest option - climate CRISIS.	No
1370834	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	A simple effective way of reducing pollution with its detrimental health effects while helping us to meet our climate change objectives. And drivers save money.	No
1370837	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	Climate change is cyclic, hence inevitable (in either direction). Changing things too quickly based upon a single issue mentality is just not on. If the estimates are correct, then B is the best option.	Yes
1370838	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's very simple why I made my choice. For the planet, Mother Earth.	Yes

1370840	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1370842	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370845	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There are too many huge utes and 4wd's on the road. It has to stop.	No
1370846	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I think we need to improve our emissions standards a lot and we don't need crap cars on ithe road.?	No
1370847	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1370848	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As far as possible to set a target - realistically delays will happen, but set an ambitious target	No
1370856	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As one of the wealthiest countries on Earth. If we cannot make the simplest of choices to save our planet that sustains us, provide cleaner air that we breath then we don't deserve to exist on this planet because we believe we own it and our needs are the only ones that count.	No
1370859	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	We have to act as fast as possible!	No
1370860	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must act as quickly as possible to reduce damage to our planet	No
1370864	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Total benefits are greatest.	No
1370867	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It makes sense to cut CO2 emissions fast, protect the environment, and slow down and stop climate change.	No
1370873	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act on climate change rapidly. Our country can be far more resilient if we don't have to rely on buying fuel from external countries.	No
1370878	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to lower our fuel emissions asap for the environment	No
1370879	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's time to stop the use of petroleum products as well as coal and other high pollutants	Yes
1370880	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is urgent. WE have to go hard. It also has the best BCR. It's a no-brainer.	No
1370886	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1370889	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1370890	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370894	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	the sooner the better	No
1370902	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act strongly and quickly. The destructiveness and dangers of climate change are here now. We really don't have time to compromise. I would support B if I'm not given a choice but it is suggesting we have time when we don't.	Yes
1370905	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	To get pollution diwn quicjly	No
1370907	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	a fast-acting plan is urgently needed	NULL
1370913	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370914	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370915	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As far as I can tell, urgent action to have cleaner air and to reduce atmospheric carbon compounds is seriously needed. Given the lacklustre government responses to date option C is the only option available. Dirty air and climate directly threaten health and food security.	No
1370925	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370926	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370931	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We don't have a planet to move to. So not doing this is destroying our children's future. We need progressive solutions not once again giving into polluting companies that seem fine with destroying our planet. Our planet. Not their planet	No
1370935	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370936	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's just sensible to prioritize immediate health benefits like we did with the move away from lead additives in fuel. Only this is more immediate in benefit. Then there's also the climate emergency which this Option C will help.	No
1370942	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370943	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Good for the environment	Yes



1370947	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Time is of the essence here	No
1370952	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1370953	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1370955	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It will provide the fastest transition to clean cars with an accelerated trajectory to beat emissions targets in Europe and the US.	No
1370962	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Politicians need to have an attack of brains.....we have to get rid of fossil fuels, read what reputable scientists have to say on the matter.	No
1370963	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	Allows suppliers time to build infrastructure and allows us to avoid extremely high costs	Yes
1370966	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1370968	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370971	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to start making changes, and making them fast!	No
1370972	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	It will quickly put Australia on track to beat the pollution targets in Europe and the US and still save drivers money.	No
1370976	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1370978	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370980	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The future of our health and the planet.	No
1370981	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Best for the environment and to keep our earth livable and to stop heating up our planet	No
1370982	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Something needs to be done now	Yes
1370987	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1370988	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Clean air	No
1370989	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Option C will provide the fastest transition to clean cars with an accelerated trajectory to beat emissions targets in Europe and the US.	No
1370990	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because our world needs all the help it can get as soon as possible.	No
1370991	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Climate change is the biggest threat to our planet	No
1370993	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Tackling climate change, cleaning our air, and saving money.	No
1370994	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The environmentally best option first, succeeded by the two lesser options	No
1370999	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The Climate Crisi	No
1371001	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Urgent steps must be taken to save the planet	No
1371002	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371004	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371006	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	fast co2 reduction	No
1371014	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	Yes
1371015	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371017	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It seems the smartest solution given where we are re climate change	No
1371019	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371022	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL

1371023	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Moving forward with solutions that take the problem seriously.	No
1371024	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371026	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C will provide the fastest transition to clean cars with an accelerated trajectory to beat emissions targets in Europe and the US.	NULL
1371030	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to fast track the reduction of greenhouse emissions. The option with the quickest response and the most benefits is Option C.	No
1371031	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The time to act is now, we're already behind. No more delaying by slow increments - we need bold action and FAST	No
1371033	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe in the longer term Option C will ultimately deliver the best benefits cost ratio, and it is already past the point where the most aggressive policies should be implemented to mitigate the worst effects of climate change.	NULL
1371034	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Cost v benefit	Yes
1371041	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Global warming will make Australia too hot	No
1371043	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is way overdue on vehicle emissions standards and there should also be an annual test to affirm the vehicle still meets the standard.	No
1371048	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C will provide the fastest transition to clean cars with an accelerated trajectory to beat emissions targets in Europe and the US.	Yes
1371053	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is way behind the rest of the world re vehicle efficiency standards. I believe the government's position is a pragmatic attempt to get legislation through the parliament. Drastically changing the status quo often ends badly, but someone has to change the public's mind re high emission vehicles. So if enough pressure is put upon Labour to go further through these petitions, great. But I think political pragmatism is always going to prevail to at least get something done.	Yes
1371054	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	We need to tackle climate change urgently	No
1371055	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B whilst not ideal is most likely to gain community acceptance as well as supporting Australia meet its climate goals and minimize the health impacts associated with the emissions of the petroleum in current use and the pollution from vehicles currently sold and in use.	Yes
1371059	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There needs to be swift action to limit the polluting effects of current usage. The Planet can't wait.	NULL
1371061	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371062	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is an must policy	Yes

1371065	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371070	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Greenhouse gas benefits are mispriced in this cost-benefit analysis - it is actually far more beneficial to reduce them fast, according to scientists. Taking option A or B actually has much higher costs than this study says.	No
1371072	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371076	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371077	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371078	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe that time is running out very quickly so, to make any real difference, option C is the only response. Especially if you want your children to enjoy our amazing planet after we've gone.	No
1371083	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	NULL	Yes
1371086	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371087	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371091	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371092	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to take action now. Stop Australia being treated like a 3rd World dumping ground by car manufacturers.	No
1371094	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I feel it is important to bring Australia in line with the EU and US, with regard to emissions ASAP	No
1371095	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371096	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	It is the only viable option.	No
1371098	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371100	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes

1371101	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	No time to waste	No
1371105	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Your costs don't include the (already spiralling) costs to the environment, climate and infrastructure due to inaction on climate change so far	No
1371108	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371113	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371115	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Better for the environment	NULL
1371116	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The situation is so critical for humanity that Australia choosing Option C would be a very good example for the rest of the world of a government providing leadership.	No
1371117	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 1st	Things need to change as quickly as possible in order to significantly benefit our planet and our health. No excuses!	No
1371124	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371133	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371135	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Fast start is the best	No
1371139	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Needs to be as fast as possible	No
1371146	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	It's better and more cost effective to be ahead of the game rather than playing catch-up later.	No
1371149	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371154	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371158	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reduce reliance on fossil fuels ASAP	No
1371162	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL

1371163	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is no time left to reduce climate change. Acting NOW is the best thing to do.	No
1371169	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Anything but option C will cost so much more in the long run -- it is our duty to protect the earth.	No
1371170	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371171	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1371174	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371176	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371185	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fastest lowering of emissions	NULL
1371188	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371192	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371193	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This Energy Efficiency proposal/initiative is decades overdue, and must be implemented forthwith. Australian working people have paid too much for too long regarding energy inefficient vehicles. Australian governments have been negligent in not following sooner the lead of the more enlightened European states. of	No
1371194	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371198	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371199	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371201	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371203	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371208	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As soon as possible. Should have been done years ago.	No

1371209	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Its an investment in our kids future. We've fiddled around for too long. There will always be opposition, even if you start slow, get over it.	No
1371216	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Better for the environment	NULL
1371217	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	A better option for Australian vehicle consumers	No
1371218	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Best option	No
1371219	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Greater emissions reduction and reduced consumer running costs	No
1371223	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to catch up to European standards	No
1371227	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	A more stringent plan is required to ensure that Australia is on pace with other OECD nations which have long had systems for reducing emissions and improving fuel efficiency. The Australian consumer market also favours larger vehicles, which pollute more heavily and will require more rigorous targets.	NULL
1371242	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371244	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Benefits clearly outweigh costs for option C. There is a lot more benefits like lower insurance premiums due to less climate change disasters. The modelling is very simplistic and I even find this survey disingenuous as fossil fuel companies have far too much influence and input.	NULL
1371251	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371252	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371254	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option A is not a choice for me. Option C - for highest net benefit is my choice. Comparison to Option B, 96.46 billion is a significant cost. But for the smaller add- 18.44 billion - additional for the added benefit and positive movement it is worth pursuing.	Yes
1371256	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371258	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371262	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is ridiculous that Australia is one of the few developed nations in the world with virtually no vehicle emissions standards or laws. We need to make up for lost time and push through legislation quickly and efficiently.	No
1371271	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	obviously preferable to adopt the most effective option	No

1371272	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have done nothing for too long. Do something quickly now	No
1371273	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371274	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Just get on with it. We are an international laughing stock. Only Russia has worse vehicle emission standards. FFS	No
1371275	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need fast, serious action.	No
1371278	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371282	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371284	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are out of time to \,take it slowly\,	No
1371285	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Better advantages vs disadvantages overall. Get the necessary futureproofing changes made fastest	No
1371291	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1371292	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Best for environment	No
1371295	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Don't waste time, get it achieved zero emission target fast and meaningfully.	No
1371298	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371299	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The world and her people cannot afford to wait.	NULL
1371305	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We don't have much time to turn climate change around, so things need to change as quickly as possible.	No
1371306	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371307	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The sooner we move on the better	NULL



1371308	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1371312	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371316	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Get rid of pollution	No
1371326	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to transition as quickly as possible. We are in a climate crisis.	No
1371327	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate crisis, biodiversity loss and pollution fight.	No
1371329	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371330	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to motivate manufacturers to seriously provide low emission vehicles at reasonable prices in Australia	No
1371336	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This needs to be put in place as soon as possible. No delaying tactics are acceptable.	No
1371338	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371345	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371346	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371350	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Greater benefit for marginal extra cost. Gets things done quicker so we can finally catch up with the rest of the world	NULL
1371353	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1371354	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must act fast and with concrete actions to tackle CO2 emission	No
1371361	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The best for our health, the best for our children future	No
1371369	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Energetic and trasport transition is a necessity	No

1371370	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Change has been too long coming.	No
1371371	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	emissions need to be reduced as much as possible	No
1371377	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371378	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Getting emissions down in all sectors as quickly as possible is the highest priority for the future	NULL
1371381	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1371382	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Need for speed but not at any cost. Good middle ground.	Yes
1371383	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cost to the environment	No
1371386	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371392	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371393	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It needs to be done asap due to irreversible climate destruction	No
1371394	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Need to limit emissions and get more electric vehicles here as quickly as possible.	Yes
1371403	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371408	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The science is clear: there is not enough time to do anything other than as much as possible, as fast as possible, at whatever cost. The cost of inaction and hesitation will be suffering and extinction.	No
1371410	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371411	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to help the environment quickly before it's too late.	No
1371413	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change	NULL

1371418	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371421	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371423	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has neglected its duty to ensure that vehicles used are as clean as possible for too long. Reducing carbon emissions is a priority.	No
1371425	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	The planet is in danger!	No
1371426	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371432	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	Environment	No
1371434	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Car makers need to stop dumping vehicles with bad emissions on us.	Yes
1371438	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This is merely catching up - the consequences of climate change are already with us.	No
1371444	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I have children. I want them to inherit a world as good or better than the one I live in. That's already not going to happen, so I want to do the best we can, as quick as we can.	NULL
1371445	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to rapidly reduce emmissions to reduce the speed of climate change.	No
1371448	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are lagging behind Europe and USA. We seem to be a dumping ground for inefficient greenhouse gas emission cars. We need to lead in reducing greenhouse gases. The very existence of the world as we know it is at stake. It id time for politiciansof all political persuasionsto lead by acting on scientific evidence..	No
1371449	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Love to see a government actually reacting to the emergency. Maybe everyone else will follow	No
1371453	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C should not even be considered. Australia is already dumping stock of the worlds most polluting vehicles. Australia still has potential to be world-leader, but it needs a Government that leads, not follows.	Yes
1371455	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The fastest transition to clean cars is the best option for community well being. The net benefits are better. it will save money and will improve public health.	No
1371456	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	We don't have time to waste to go slow	No
1371459	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	NULL

1371462	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371466	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371468	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to beat co2 targets much faster than we are currently doing	Yes
1371469	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act as quickly as possible because climate change is causing havoc throughout the whole world.	No
1371478	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371479	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	C is so close to B on many of the costs. It seems advantageous to make Australia a leader and go for it. The world is watching.	NULL
1371483	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to transition as fast as possible. Governments and business have spent the last 40 years avoiding the inevitable so now we have no choice but to act fast. I'll support Option B, but massively prefer Option C as Option B allows loopholes that car manufacturers will use to avoid/slow the process down. Bite the bullet guys and do what needs to be done	Yes
1371484	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is too serious not to do thi.	No
1371487	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are leaving everything to last minute, with regards to our environment	No
1371491	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1371496	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Time is running out, we no longer have the luxury of taking things slowly	No
1371497	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Australia has already wasted too much time. We need to improve the lives of Australians by saving their money and creating a ev or hydrogen car industry in Australia employing Australians and using our own natural resources.. We can also make and distribute fast charging stations	No
1371500	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is better for the planet to have more efficient, less polluting vehicles	No
1371504	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	The chosen option must also be feasible.	Yes
1371507	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371509	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Less pollution quicker	No

1371511	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Why on earth would we NOT opt for the most possible rapid improvement in conditions on our home planet? And we could start by NOT subsidising mining's use of hydrocarbons nor enabling their use of groundwater which has a replenishment rate vastly slower than that at which it is being used! Simple logic says let's follow the process which is a) Fastest (after DECADES of inaction & deliberate ignorance of fact); b) cheaper than the \,preferred\, & c) yielding greater financial benefits than B).	No
1371522	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371524	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371525	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Clean air is vital.	No
1371527	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371531	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371534	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371535	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need instant changes now	No
1371538	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	It all needs to be as fast as possible	No
1371543	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	C is the only reasonable option	No
1371544	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The earth needs drastic action. Australia could be a model for action.	No
1371545	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to act	No
1371547	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371549	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371552	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1371553	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	NULL	NULL

1371557	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	cleaner air done safely and swiftly	No
1371559	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We're starting behind everyone else - let's catch up eh? Car manufacturers have known this change was coming for a long time now. We know that and we know some have prepared for it. Those say they're not ready for it are either lying or incompetent. Let's clean up our act. Please!	No
1371561	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Environmentally better	No
1371562	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Whilst I'm not going to turn my nose up to plan B, I believe the faster option is the better choice. Australia is tired of slow plans that look like progress but is too slow to be in any way effective. It's time to shift gears and accelerate change.	Yes
1371564	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371570	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We only have one planet, it's about time we start saving it - NOW, not later. I love my kids, that's why..	No
1371574	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371577	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Net zero. The sooner the better.	Yes
1371578	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act fast, we have not been doing enough	No
1371579	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Prevent the climate emergency	No
1371581	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Save the planet. This is one small step and needs to be implemented as soon as possible!!!	No
1371583	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	the world is on fire	Yes
1371586	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There's no 'Planet B'.	No
1371587	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371588	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Need for urgent action	No
1371590	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Protect humans and nature from global warming and saving costs, also regarding costs of environmental damage.	No

1371594	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	No
1371595	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I look at the big picture, and the long term advantages, not only for vehicle owners, but for the environment which needs a fast track onto continued breathing space.	No
1371601	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371607	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371611	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1371613	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371614	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we all share the same Planet and everyone has the responsibility to do the best they could to fight for a good climate. \,it doesn't do anything if only our country does it\, well anyone has to start. every big thing happened with one small step. make this step happen, over time every country will follow and start fighting for a good climate.	No
1371616	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I have children. I feel that Australia always postpones meaningful change. This is the future of Australia. Option A only benefits corporations at a financial level. That's it. Option C must be the choice	No
1371618	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371620	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1371621	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The world is already getting too warm. The sooner we fix that, the better. Choosing option C is not just for Australia, but shows leadership and encouragement to the rest of the world.	NULL
1371626	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	The whole net zero push is not based on fact. Carbon dioxide is not a problem for our world.	No
1371628	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1371630	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371632	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371633	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL

1371634	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Let's not go too fast and cost our economy too much in the process. There are a lot of people employed in the MV industry.	Yes
1371637	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is a crisis. We cannot afford to wait or dawdle.	NULL
1371638	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371643	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371646	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371648	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371651	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to take action as fast as possible.	NULL
1371655	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371656	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The outlay for option c is more but works out better in the end with the benefits of C for me personally far outweighs the benefits of option B. We also need to be attacking climate change as quickly as possible and building more renewable energy sources which will be used for a lot more than just cars. I also find that pollution is pretty awful right now in Australia. While it is no where near as bad as somewhere so immensely populated like Japan, there's cars here spew black smoke in faces	No
1371659	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371668	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to clean up this planet sooner than later whatever the financial cost.	No
1371672	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe Australia is lagging behind the world in terms of transition, and we need to prioritise catching up	No
1371674	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Go full in on EVs	No
1371678	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	The fast start option will be widening the gap between rich and poor the most and therefor the flexible solution is better for citizens of the world	Yes
1371682	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371683	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate emergency, the time to act was yesterday, option C gives Australians the highest benefit in health and quality of life.	Yes



1371685	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Limiting climate change, reducing pollution, lowering reliance on fossil fuels, increasing public health	No
1371689	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It needs to be done immediately	No
1371692	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Not all benefits are measurable in money, yet they are far more valuable overall and at a fraction of extra costs.	No
1371695	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C has a higher total benefit, including health and GHG emissions, which are well overdue in Australia. The benefits cost ratio is marginally below option B, however the benefits of Option C outweigh this	No
1371696	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371698	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371706	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to cut emissions as fast as possible	No
1371707	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C delivers greatest benefits to motorists & communities (impact analysis table 10). Option C has less government & compliance costs to taxpayers & suppliers. Option B & C suppliers vehicle technology costs are overstated compared to Option A given over 85% cars sold worldwide are already covered by an efficiency standard. My own analysis suggests motorists electricity & battery replacements costs are overstated given advances in grid renewables and battery technologies. While 7% NPV discount rate may be in line with Government guidelines it seems overly conservative given accumulating benefits from improving health and improving climate. Overall, my analysis suggests Option C delivers greatest benefits cost ratio.	Yes
1371708	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	This produces the best results	No
1371709	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate changes!!	No
1371710	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	N/A	Yes
1371712	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371714	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has been an international laggard for too long. We must pull our weight on climate change action and environmental pollution, and the transport sector is a major target for action. The government can partly remedy the lost years of no action by adopting Option C.	No
1371715	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371718	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1371723	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want a cleaner, greener world for my grandchildren	NULL
1371724	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371734	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The average Australian uses more than 10 times what the globe can provide for people! That is really outrageous.	No
1371735	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fastest possible - there is no alternative, if you truly believe in why you are doing it at all.	No
1371738	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371742	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is no more time left to save the planet	No
1371746	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371747	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	no time to lose. every possibility to reduce emissions and improve conditions should be grabbed	NULL
1371750	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Life on this planet	NULL
1371756	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371757	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371758	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371761	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	CLIMATE CRISIS!! We can't wait!!	No
1371762	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Planet is collapsing and we know the reason since more than 40 years ago, is now or never.	No
1371764	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371766	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Quicker the better	No

1371771	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must deal with climate change as fast as possible.	No
1371772	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371773	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Please support C	No
1371774	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	best way to go	No
1371778	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to transition as fast as possible!	No
1371781	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371783	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	greater cost benefits with lowest emissions and fastest uptake	No
1371785	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Efficiency essential, slow climate change.	No
1371791	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371792	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Its the quickest option and forces actual change.	No
1371793	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change!!	No
1371796	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371800	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371809	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We don't really have time and option C isn't quick enough but it's the best option available	No
1371815	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	we need this now, in my opinion	No
1371816	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1371819	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	save the planet	No
1371821	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This should already have happened earlier.	Yes
1371823	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to transition to clean energy asap	NULL
1371824	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	consumers will need time to adjust to this change	Yes
1371826	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	NULL
1371832	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It makes the best thing to reach the goal	No
1371834	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371841	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371843	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371846	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australians & the Australian environment deserve to be protected from pollution & this is a good start. The reduction in pollution to the Australian environment, our lungs etc must be done as quickly as possible.	No
1371849	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Saving pollution and planet is the highest priority	Yes
1371852	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371856	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371858	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I can't believe that this is not a priority for government to fast track something that should already be in place	No
1371861	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371862	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe in the right to breath in clean air.	NULL

1371863	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371864	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371865	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371871	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 0th	NULL	Yes
1371875	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371877	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Save the planet	No
1371878	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371880	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371881	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371886	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The sooner the better for humanity and earth	No
1371891	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	climate crisis demands solutions now	No
1371907	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371911	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371915	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to address climate change immediately. Option C creates the fastest change.	NULL
1371922	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371924	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	safer level of emissions	Yes

1371925	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have know about global pollution and climate change problems for long enough now. Time to make a fast transition and be a global leader in car policies and drive technological change.	NULL
1371934	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Better for the planet and budgets	No
1371938	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371939	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371941	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Urgent need	No
1371948	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia already suffers due to climate change. We need to speed up the transition as fast as we can to prevent further damage.	No
1371950	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371952	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	There is no time to lose. Putting politics before our survival is wrong.	No
1371953	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we are way behind already, please do not delay further!	No
1371954	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have to act in CO2 emissions, and have delayed long enough	No
1371958	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1371961	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's the environment, Stoopid!	No
1371963	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Planet	No
1371968	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371969	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371975	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1371976	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371978	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371980	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's the best option for the planet	No
1371981	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371983	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to transition quickly. It will hasten innovation and infrastructure. We can't afford to continue to pollute our shared air and climate.	No
1371985	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is so important that we move as quickly as possible towards greater fuel efficiency. The faster we move, the less will have to be undertaken by our children.	Yes
1371994	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	the world needs action now.	No
1372001	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As a grandmother, now 87 years old, I have been appalled at the power held by corporate organisations in preventing and avoiding taking prompt action to ensure a safe future for future generations. The reduction of funding to CSIRO for necessary research by past federal governments as well as the ignoring of many pleas by scientists such as David Suzuki in the early nineties means that we no longer have the luxury of delaying prompt action to care for planet earth.	No
1372002	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372003	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372004	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372006	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372008	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372009	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Its our last chance	NULL
1372017	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The quicker the better - there is no time to waste....	No
1372019	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 0th	NULL	Yes

1372028	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	The planet is in crisis. These steps should have been taken decades ago when scientists began reporting on the problem. Delaying is stupid.	No
1372030	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C provide the fastest transition to clean cars with an accelerated trajectory to beat emissions targets in Europe and the US. And also is a warning to the government to stop the car lobby.	No
1372032	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372033	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372034	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372038	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C gives the best benefits	No
1372040	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option c gives the best benefit	NULL
1372044	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372045	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372046	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to phase out fossil fuels and increase the uptake of electric vehicles as fast as possible. I have been frustrated that Australians don't have access to the multitude of EVs available overseas and are paying too much for those we can buy. Option C will do this quickest and provides significant cost benefits.	NULL
1372050	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372052	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Preferred environmental outcomes	No
1372053	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372054	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B is a very good compromise towards Option C	Yes
1372055	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372060	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No



1372064	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want the human race to live and not destroy the planet, and money is ensuring we will all die	No
1372065	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372066	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Just Look at the Nature and you can see by yourself!	NULL
1372071	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We can't afford to dawdle.	NULL
1372072	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The planetary situation requires it	No
1372073	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372077	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372082	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372088	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372089	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We can't keep running from our contributions to climate change. The BCR for option C may be lower than for option B but the benefits are clearly the highest. Not embarking on the most ambitious path now is only leaving Australia further behind practically and morally.	No
1372093	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The entire world MUST do everything possible to arrest Climate Change immediately! The best way to do that is controlling hydrocarbon emissions.	No
1372095	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372097	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372099	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372101	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372105	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 1st	Option C will save drivers money and reduce pollution from vehicles.	No

1372108	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372115	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is best for protecting the planet as fast as possible	No
1372118	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Why wait?	NULL
1372123	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372124	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Too many polluting cars in the world	No
1372125	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1372126	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372128	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Our climate is in crisis and change is needed as quickly as possible	No
1372129	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	because time is running out and if we don't start sooner than later it will be too late!	No
1372130	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to be ambitious for the climate	No
1372131	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372133	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to prioritize green energy if we have any chance of a future.	NULL
1372138	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we need immediate problem solving	No
1372143	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Fastest option	No
1372144	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	NULL
1372146	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Overall best option	No

1372147	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372148	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372151	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372152	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Unbearable heat and fire	No
1372153	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reduces emissions the most.	No
1372161	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Need to save our planet	No
1372162	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372168	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372171	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's a global issue for this world.	No
1372174	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372179	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	The more we can do to help worldwide adherence to responsible elimination of harmful emissions the better!	No
1372186	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372187	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372192	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The world can't wait.	NULL
1372193	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372198	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1372201	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372202	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372203	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372206	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate situation is urgent.	NULL
1372211	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372214	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Time is running out to avoid climate disaster	NULL
1372215	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Mother nature can not cope with our abuse of its resources. Immediate action is necessary for our future	No
1372216	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This option allows the fastest response with the biggest benefits	No
1372220	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1372224	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372226	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The future needs to be green + the people of Australia deserve cheaper fuel prices	No
1372232	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This option provides the most benefits in the quickest timeframe.	No
1372233	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Urgent measures are required to prevent disastrous climate change	No
1372236	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The earth - our home - is on fire. Every year will be globally hotter than the last. We're already thru the 1.5C barrier. If you do not go with option C it will only be MUCH worse - both at home and abroad.	No
1372237	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is the quickest way to cut emissions	No
1372238	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has every opportunity to be a global leader in implementing policies that reduce pollution, promote sustainable industry and champion ecologically sound solutions, but instead of being a leader, we have been a laggard. Let's not waste anymore time - Option C or we're not being serious.	No

1372240	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	It is too late for any other option	No
1372241	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372242	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	This is very urgent. We already late	No
1372244	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372246	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Climate change is accelerating—we must accelerate too.	No
1372252	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372253	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cutting emissions will save drivers money.	NULL
1372257	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We, as in human and animal life as we know it, are already out of time. There is no time for anything but the fastest possible transition away from fossil fuels, and only capitalist players in the first fuel industry and related industries benefit - in the short term - from a slower option.	No
1372264	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372266	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Thanks for your consideration	No
1372268	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372269	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372270	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis is urgent	No
1372271	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Everyone must chip in, not just EU and USA	No
1372272	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372277	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Environmental protection	NULL

1372284	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372287	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372289	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The need to act has far past and the added cost of C is worth the outcome.	Yes
1372291	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1372292	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The reduction of carbon in the atmosphere is urgent in view of the rate of change taking place to the climate	No
1372297	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	reduce climate change	NULL
1372298	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to take action as quickly as possible!	No
1372299	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1372300	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372301	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372302	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fastest reduction in carbon emissions	No
1372303	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is threatening the earth - it is a crisis and we must respond quickly.	No
1372305	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372310	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a crisis and need to act accordingly	No
1372311	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372313	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1372319	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372320	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372321	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372322	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is imperative that petrol driven cars are removed from the roads as soon as possible to improve public health, reduce carbon emissions and stop global warming.	No
1372323	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	No time to waste! However, government must ensure that the transitions regardless of speed do not place profit ahead of the objective!	No
1372332	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Without determined intent, a less-effort means nothing gets done.	No
1372335	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's getting too late to think about gradual transitions	NULL
1372336	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372338	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are running out of time.	No
1372339	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to be ambitious and drive down vehicle emissions as quickly as possible.	NULL
1372344	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want every creature to live on a healthy planet.	Yes
1372347	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372350	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372351	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are overdue in responding to the rapid change of the mondial climate. There is no time to waste. And there is enough money/ economic power to make the nessecary changes in our energy(fuel)infastructures. But only if we do not wait!	No
1372354	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Best value	No
1372359	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Option C is the only realistic chance for reducing CO2	No

1372363	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372371	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372372	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372373	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372375	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372380	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372388	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have a need for a quick start; the Earth's temperature has already increased past the point of no return.	Yes
1372391	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	NULL
1372393	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372396	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Speed; cost-benefits ratio	NULL
1372397	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372399	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 0th	NULL	Yes
1372405	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Marginal increased costs, faster outcomes for benefits and it is the right thing to do, given how tardy Australia has been.	No
1372413	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372414	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372416	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No



1372421	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Option c is really the only acceptable option for my family.	No
1372423	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should choose the plan, which is best for the environment. That way our planet lasts longer.	No
1372428	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1372429	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1372431	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cheaper cars with the best benefit for the air.	No
1372433	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	No
1372434	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C has greatest benefit and fastest achievement. We need this. The world needs this. Australia can be a leader!	NULL
1372435	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372441	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is no time to wait. Changes that improve our environment need to happen immediately and as soon as possible. We can already see the negative impact we've created by remaining detached to this issue. Maintaining balance with our natural earth is the only way we survive as a species.	Yes
1372447	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want climate change minimized	No
1372448	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Beat CO2 targets as fast as possible. Time to act seriously	No
1372461	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to move as fast as possible to stave off the wise effects of climate catastrophe	NULL
1372463	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372464	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The world is hurtling towards disastrous climate change consequences, and Australia has oversized influence on the world stage. If we not only fail to lead, but also drag our feet, that makes things much more difficult for those trying to convince governments to act decisively. On a more selfish front, overseas car makers will never bring modern automotive technology to Australia as long as our poor efficiency standards allow them to use Australia as a dumping ground.	NULL
1372470	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act as quickly as possible to have the biggest impact.	No
1372472	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	There is no place in the world that is now safe from the disastrous destabilization of climate due to fossil fuel emissions. We should have been acting on this 50 years ago, now is only better than never.	No

1372478	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	NULL
1372481	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to ensure the safety of our planet for our heirs.	No
1372482	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Best option for reducing harmful emissions	No
1372487	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372488	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372490	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	The benefits to cost ratio is high while also being the fastest start to what should have started years ago.	No
1372492	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Benefits outweigh the costs.	NULL
1372493	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are already late. We need to act immedietely.	No
1372496	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This option is necessary to provide the quickest transition away from fossil fuels.	No
1372500	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372502	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I am very concerned about Climate Change	No
1372503	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Better for climate change and for the air quality	No
1372504	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372506	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372507	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1372508	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is the quickest, and best way to help everyone have much cleaner air to breathe and also reduces all the pollution of gas powered vehicles.that increases global temperatures.	No

1372511	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372513	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372515	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act swiftly with some consideration to minimising impacts to the public.	Yes
1372517	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Best way to do it right	Yes
1372518	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need the fastest transition possible. Also this is just theory. Practice will certainly be slower so we can't afford to waste any time and be conservative. If we don't go for the most ambitious option, future generations will question why we had identified a better option and not run with it.	Yes
1372519	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372520	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372523	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change	No
1372526	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372532	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372536	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is accelerating and so must we to counter the effects	NULL
1372538	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to get a move on but may need to adjust in the future	Yes
1372543	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C provides the highest meet benefits in the shortest time. Kind of a no-brainer.	No
1372544	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372545	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fixing the climate has to happen now!	No
1372547	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL

1372549	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372551	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to address the problem asap for environmental and economic reasons	No
1372553	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372554	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Whyb give the auto industry more time to tell us lies	No
1372555	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1372556	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	NULL
1372557	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372562	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372568	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	NULL
1372575	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372577	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372578	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372580	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372582	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	It is the best way	No
1372584	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372588	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	C is the closest to an acceptable response(l (though it is still insufficient)	No

1372594	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372595	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372598	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372599	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	reduce Pollution from vehicles	No
1372603	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372606	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C will save drivers money and reduce pollution from vehicles - the fastest way to reduce pollution	Yes
1372609	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372611	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372613	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372615	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is the most efficient and helpful	No
1372616	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I believe that a. Steady transition is required. The technology is there and has been used by USA , Europe and many other countries. There needs to be very clear guidelines and compliance.	Yes
1372618	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1372619	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372620	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372625	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Feasability and ecological-friendliness	Yes
1372626	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Climate change needs swift and decisive action.	No

1372627	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372628	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372629	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372631	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to stop producing greenhouse emissions.	No
1372632	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372638	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is important for all people all around the globe that we transition away from fossil fuels, the faster the better.	No
1372639	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	The numbers	No
1372642	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372643	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372648	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I don't want my children, or grandchildren, as a result of climate breakdown, to either boil to death, or drown!	No
1372652	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372655	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	Yes
1372664	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372665	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372667	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372670	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1372671	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372672	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372675	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should have adopted stricter standards 10 years ago. We need to catch up to the rest of the advanced world.	NULL
1372676	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372677	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372678	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fast transition is important at the moment	No
1372683	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372689	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372691	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	I believe a reasonable transition is helpful to the parties involved.	Yes
1372694	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	option a is completely unacceptable, should not even be ranked	NULL
1372695	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we don't have much time to waste	Yes
1372696	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has left it too late and now need to go hard to save the planet	No
1372704	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fastest transition possible. For too long Australia has had no vehicle efficiency standards, mean we now have a lot of work to do to catch up with the rest of the world. If previous governments had been more future focused, we would not need to implement the fastest plan. As previous governments have dallied, the need to transition quickly is greater.	NULL
1372707	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate catastrophe demands action because we have delayed such action for decades.	No
1372713	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I don't trust the government will meet the fastest option as they haven't met any other targets. So I'm voting for the fastest option in the hope it will speed things up.	NULL
1372714	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	we are already falling so behind targets we cannot delay any longer.	No

1372715	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Need to change now. Time is as important as money.	No
1372718	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Greenhouse emissions must reduce, fast, if we want a safe future for our children	NULL
1372721	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372723	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This needs to happen soon. No matter what option is chosen, delays will occur. Better to have a lag on a near goal, than a far goal.	No
1372729	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Save our planet for our grandchildren and their grandchildren.	No
1372737	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	the sooner he better	NULL
1372738	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372741	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372743	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372749	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	climate responsibility	No
1372751	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372760	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I care about the planet. There is not much time left and changes must happen fast.	No
1372763	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Time we actually committed ourselves. Australia is very tardy in working on this	No
1372764	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce emissions as fast as possible abd there are advantages in doing so.	No
1372767	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Benefit total is lower cost overall	Yes
1372772	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate emergency requires fast solutions.	Yes



1372773	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1372780	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	NULL	NULL
1372781	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to transition to renewables as soon as possible.	No
1372783	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372789	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372793	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's a no-brainer. We have been behind the rest of the world on this since forever.	No
1372795	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to get moving as quickly as possible for the climate and the human race	No
1372798	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372801	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1372803	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	greener	Yes
1372806	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want fossil fuel cars to be off the road quickly and I do not want polluting cars being dumped on the Australian market	Yes
1372807	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is here we need to act swiftly	Yes
1372815	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372816	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1372822	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Do things in a timely manner and get it right, rather than rush things and not get it right.	Yes
1372823	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL

1372825	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to bring in low emission transport options as soon as possible. Option C does this with the et benefit being by far the greatest.	No
1372827	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Our atmosphere needs every little bit of help we can give it.	No
1372830	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need a fast solution to reduce carbon emissions now!	NULL
1372833	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is highest investment, but will reap the greatest reward. Morally, Australia needs to do what it can to bring down emmissions, and I believe businesses have the power to transition this quickly if indeed they are obligated by government. I also believe that fast change is needed because it will determine the future (climate and social health) much more then any change in the latter half of the decade	No
1372834	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We don't have time to waste - Australia is already lagging far behind in climate change initiatives	No
1372843	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This should have been done years ago. Governments from both sides should be embarrassed with the delays.	NULL
1372846	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option B has loopholes for carmakers like Toyota to keep selling polluting petrol vehicles forever. BE AMBITIOUS LABOR!!!!	No
1372850	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372857	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We HAVE to reduce our emissions DRASTICALLY, starting NOW	No
1372858	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australian citizens need government to be bold, brave and live up to the climate challenges. We only get one chance, and one go at creating a livable future for society. What are economic gains on a dead planet? Let's show the world we mean business when it comes to tackling climate. Businesses will step up if they are obligated to, and their lobbying efforts don't get in the way. What we do now will define much more then efforts that come to fruition in the future. Lets do it now.	No
1372863	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372866	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to beat CO2 targets asap	No
1372868	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have lost a decade with politicians unable to accept the science; the result is runaway warming and the chaos that climate change is wreaking on the planet. We have to go radical in all areas, but especially in serious and prompt action to cut vehicle greenhouse emissions.	No
1372872	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Urgency in solving the problem is paramount at this late stage in mrecognising the problem!	No
1372874	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because it's important	No
1372880	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Environmental gain	NULL

1372881	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372882	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Save the planet	No
1372883	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do everything possible as fast as possible to avoid catastrophic climate change.	NULL
1372884	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Code Red for the planet means act immediately and do absolutely everything possible as fast as possible to stop the unfolding climate catastrophe. Nothing less is acceptable, prudent, or wise - economically speaking or otherwise.	NULL
1372886	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act as quickly as possible. We are way behind many other countries. But Option B would be far better than nothing.	Yes
1372888	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is most effective at reducing CO2 emissions, which are now very urgent as our ice sheets in Arctic and Anarctic are melting faster than anticipated, as are all land-based glaciers elsewhere. They won't regrow for centuries and store our dwindling freshwater reserves for the planet.	Yes
1372889	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's a no-brainer with renewables set to provide most of the electricity.	No
1372891	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Time is running out	No
1372892	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372901	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	The importance of greening our world as soon as possible.	No
1372902	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	It is critical that Australia adopt fuel emission standards and a scandal that we have not done so in the past so that we are behind most countries in the OECD and even the US. I actually prefer Option C, but practically as it costs more and there would undoubtedly be a consumer/ business backlash, I reluctantly support Option B instead. It is vital that Australia adopt NVES that reduce our Carbon emissions, bring cleaner air (better health), save motorists money and use less fuel.	Yes
1372906	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Undeniable climate and environment impacts from human industrial activity	No
1372911	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need ambitious climate action now - middle of the road won't cut it. We need demonstrate ambition and really work to reduce emissions, which is why you should choose option C.	No
1372917	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have a responsibility to act as quickly as possible to reduce environmental damage both for the world's current population and future generations. There is no reason to pollute when here are alternatives.	Yes
1372920	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We aren't at a point where we can take non-committal answers to environmental concerns. If we wish for the world to keep living, decisive action must be taken.	No
1372928	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL

1372935	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act quickly on reducing carbon emissions. We need to be proactive on this issue for the benefit of future generations.	No
1372937	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The Cost/Benefit analysis overlooks the cost of greenhouse gas emissions/global warming	No
1372938	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372942	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372943	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Longterm benefits to the environment and also to Australian residents and fastest transition to clean transport.	No
1372949	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372953	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Time is running out to achieve Climate Warming goals. Cost of inaction is greater than cost of action now.	No
1372954	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Govt action essential for change, most industry players can't be trusted to implement long overdue improvements	NULL
1372955	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372960	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	It is the best option!	No
1372963	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1372966	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Any effort to help minimise pollution on our planet deserves consideration and support.	NULL
1372974	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372975	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372986	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372987	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's urgent that we drive down carbon emissions. The benefits to human health will assist in offsetting higher costs of the scheme.	No

1372988	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372990	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The planet is warming - we need to act fast. And C has the greatest net benefits.	Yes
1372998	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I strongly believe that Australia must adopt the best options now, for the benefit our children and grandchildren who deserve a better future world than the \,climate deniers\, who say \,We have time to delay a bit more\,would give them.	No
1373000	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373001	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act quickly on climate action and emissions reduction, and implement these changes as soon as possible	No
1373009	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 2nd	NULL	No
1373010	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373015	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	It will dive emissions down more rapidly	No
1373020	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Due to decades of inaction by previous governments we no longer have the luxury of a slow transition with lower costs. This is now too urgent and too important to pander to the desires or fear mongering of industry who have been making billions of dollars of profits in the meantime. We need strong action now.	No
1373021	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is no planet B, immediate actions is needed and Australia can be the spearhead in preservation.	No
1373022	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Swift and dramatic action is necessary.	No
1373038	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	better world for my grandchildren	No
1373040	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	This is an emergency	No
1373041	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to act decisively to reduce emissions but not to lose citizen support in the process	Yes
1373044	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cleaner quicker	No
1373045	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to set an example for Emmons Reductions	Yes

1373047	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need a rapid transition to efficient transport to address the critical contribution of transport emissions to climate change mitigation and for Australia to correct our current very poor levels of vehicle emissions.	Yes
1373049	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373055	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to get this fixed NOW!!	Yes
1373059	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373062	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Ending pollution is not a game where we pick options, it is a serious matter that impacts all of us. It has nothing to do with corporate profits or easy solutions. Fighting climate change is humanity's biggest war of all time and our most difficult. We can't actually see the enemy we are fighting but that enemy is attacking on many fronts. We must get serious about dealing with climate change and take the politics out of it. There can be no half measures.	NULL
1373063	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Air pollution kills thousands of people every year. Plus we are living in a climate emergency. We need to go as fast as humanly possible to reduce emissions.	No
1373085	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373088	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1373091	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	most expedient; more cost effective	NULL
1373092	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is a crisis even bigger than covid - we need to treat it as such and move as fast as possible to make up for lost time . We can do it so we must.	No
1373097	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	For too long Australia has lagged behind the rest of the world in vehicle emissions standards, which has resulted in untold health harm to possibly generations of people. These standards need to be brought in as quickly as possible.	NULL
1373104	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	logical conclusion	No
1373106	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe Option C is the best one for Australia given the net benefit.	NULL
1373111	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373112	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373117	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	NULL

1373118	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	It is the only sensible option for any reasonable minded person who cares about the environment, future & climate.	Yes
1373124	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act on this as quickly as possible, especially for our future generations. we have already done much harm to this workd.	No
1373129	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1373135	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1373138	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Embarrassingly, Australia has, along with Russia, one of the very worst vehicle emissions minimisation regimes. This is seriously bad for public health, appalling for reducing Greenhouse Gas emissions and a prominent blight on governance. It is decades overdue and inexcusable for a wealthy nation.	No
1373140	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Toyota and the car lobby want to keep dumping their petrol-guzzling cars in Australia for as long as possible.	No
1373147	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The technology exists today, mainly due to other Nations actions in forcing better outcomes from automotive manufacturers, and therefore Australia merely has to demand immediate access to this technology.	No
1373150	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373155	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to speed up this transition and put an end to car manufacturers stonewalling	Yes
1373167	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1373172	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we've already gone beyond 1.5 degrees global warming!	No
1373173	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373174	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373176	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373178	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	if we dont stop pollution there will be no future past 2100	No
1373183	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We really don't have the time.	NULL

1373184	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Time to get greener or loose our planet I	Yes
1373187	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373188	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We don't have the option of patience if we look at the bigger ecological picture	NULL
1373194	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to transition as quickly as possible.	No
1373196	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have no choice for a liveable planet. Australia is a complete laggard and we need to catch up with the rest of the world.	No
1373198	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373201	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis needs the fastest actions possible to mitigate the impacts we are already seeing, so the faster the response, the better	No
1373203	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have to do something radical as there is a climate crisis. I want to leave a better world for future generations and not be the one that caused all the damage.	Yes
1373205	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373210	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option B isn't ambitious enough. Scandinavian countries are miles ahead of Australia when it comes to vehicle emission reductions. The US isn't exactly a role model when it comes to emissions or sustainability.	No
1373213	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373214	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373215	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373217	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373221	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I think it is important to move quickly, but not at the expense of equity across the motoring population. Option B provides a very significant benefit over Optino A, but there is a smaller additional benefit between Options C and B, but qith option C being considerably more costly.	Yes
1373223	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option A is a non-starter; it's almost worthless and next to useless. I feel Option B is a good starting point that supports the most areas without committing us to something unachievable or high-impact.	Yes



1373225	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	C is best option in the long run	No
1373226	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want to see Australia doing more to combat climate change.	No
1373227	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to take more positive action to reduce greenhouse gas emission.	Yes
1373229	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe option C will produce the best environmental outcomes.	Yes
1373230	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Flexible just means there will be ways for manufacturers to avoid found the more difficult things. We need rigid policies that force action now.	No
1373233	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373234	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Options C and B are investment linked for best outcomes. Whichever works best I will support.	NULL
1373239	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Total benefits greatest	No
1373251	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Environmental impact	Yes
1373253	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There are already a lot of electric cars on the roads, that number will be only increasing, why not get ahead of the curve.	No
1373258	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cleaner environment	No
1373259	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373263	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Environment	No
1373265	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Time has run out as far as pollution of our world goes. Act fast anyway.	No
1373266	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The faster we transition to a lower carbon (and pollution) output, the better. We have used a hybrid car for years and it immediately halved our petrol bill. Electric cars are the best option for consumers and the planet.	No
1373269	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This is important for Australians future.	Yes

1373281	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373282	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are long overdue for action this option does speed things up for environmental protection	No
1373284	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We do not have time to waste, we need to transition as quickly as possible to reduce pollution.	NULL
1373287	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	i hope for the best result for nature	No
1373291	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Best for environment	No
1373292	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is no time to spare to reduce emissions. Everything must be done as quickly as possible. Companies are more than able to afford helping to pay for this transition, you simply must tax them for their profits more if the budget is a problem.	No
1373297	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to work as quickly as possible to save the planet and reduce risk of further climate catastrophes	No
1373300	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373303	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis is happening *right now*, and will continue to get worse and worse the longer we wait, not just in Australia but all around the world. The costs are nothing compared to the damage being done right now, and every nation must do everything they can.	NULL
1373305	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is real and needs immediate and urgent action	NULL
1373308	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Only Option C will decrease vehicle emissions quickly!	No
1373311	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to come in line with any policy that helps lower emissions. I must not support a government that listens to bullying from companies without the best interests of the r citizens in mind. The government must follow option C And at worst yes I will support option B	Yes
1373317	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have had a disastrous summer of heatwaves and floods. We have no option but to act quickly. The world has already lost our 1.5 degree target of global warming for the century - in less than a quarter of the century. Option C is the very LEAST that we can do.	No
1373323	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Rapidly changing climate conditions brought on by carbon emissions	Yes
1373326	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Better overall benefits including personal i.e. health, plus environmental and household benefits and costs.	Yes
1373329	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	No

1373333	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I have an EV already and know the benefits, reduced costs for fuel and servicing, a safer vehicle, no emissions, no noise. And so much fun to drive! Let's not rank with Russia as a backward nation on emission standards. We only have 1 planet, we really need to act urgently on climate. I live in the Hawkesbury area and am looking to move because of the extreme heat and flooding we get, and it will get worse if we do nothing. Please enact Option C. Less costs than adaptation & disasters!	No
1373336	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because we cannot afford to delay any longer, or 'go slow' on the transition away from highly inefficient vehicles. It might be a little more painful in the short term, but we need to do it.	No
1373342	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It needs to be taken seriously and happen.	No
1373344	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373346	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373350	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It feels like we need to catchup and anything but a fast start will just cause more harm.	No
1373358	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373365	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's a climate emergency and we need to do everything that is necessary to respond to that emergency. There is no justification for compromise.	No
1373373	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The sooner the better as we are lagging behind and the cost to the planet is way too high	No
1373377	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373384	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	get dirty cars off road as soon as possible but at the same time have infrastructure in place to allow fast charging of electric vehicles.	Yes
1373389	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	looks like the best option	Yes
1373390	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C will bring Australia in line with standards in most of the rest of the developed world	No
1373400	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to care for this planet. There is no planet B, where we can find asylum. Option C Option C will drive down vehicle emissions quickly, it will save drivers money and reduce pollution from vehicles, it doesn't include loopholes for carmakers like Toyota to keep selling polluting petrol vehicles forever	Yes
1373402	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The science is clear that greenhouse gas emission cuts need to be deep and they must be made ASAP and the cost benefit ration of option C is nearly as good as option B.	No
1373410	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	This is an important step for climate change and safeguarding the plane for the future	Yes

1373419	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have to EVERYTHING possible we can do NOW. We have already reached an 1.5 degree increase in global temperature and it's still rising, we have no time to loose	No
1373421	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is the best option.	No
1373431	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1373438	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373443	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to adopt the swiftest solution to reduce pollution, for our health, and emissions for the survival of our planet.	NULL
1373444	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to hurry up	No
1373446	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373448	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	These changes have to be made but Option B allows people and industry more time to do it in a more stepped process..	Yes
1373449	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373452	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373453	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373459	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to get to the target asap!	No
1373469	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to transition from fossil fuels rapidly	Yes
1373476	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373482	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As stated in the consultation impact analysis, "the primary objective of Government action is to reduce CO2 emissions from new cars" (page 25). Therefore, Option C will deliver a significantly better result for Australians while still delivering almost the same (over 96%) Benefits Cost Ratio as Option B.	NULL
1373488	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia to act rapidly to reduce climate change accelerating greenhouse gas emissions to reduce the devastating cost of climate extremes such as floods, fires, storms etc. In addition, more needs to be done about the health impacts from car emissions particularly regarding their effects on children in high traffic areas	No

1373489	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373497	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate emergency	NULL
1373501	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have procrastinated long enough. We are quickly running out of time to take meaningful action.	No
1373504	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change requires we make emissions reductions as large as possible right now.	No
1373507	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	With the aggressive effects of global warming being felt everywhere, it is definitely time to limit fuel emissions as soon as possible, which is why I back Option C.	NULL
1373516	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373517	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Net benefits	No
1373527	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	C appears to be the best and most expedient choice	No
1373533	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373534	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373536	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1373537	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	As much as I want you to only pick option C, I think it will be easier to get option B up & running. Please do better than the rest of us, I believe you can do it.	Yes
1373538	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 1st	The best one to choose	No
1373543	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373545	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The car industry wants to use Australia as a dumping ground for vehicles that they're not permitted to sell elsewhere	No
1373551	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is behind the rest of the world in reducing vehicle emissions and to attempt to save our planet, we have to take drastic action on this (and several other things) as soon as possible.	No

1373554	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The planet is in a precarious state. Australia, as a wealthy economy, has an ethical obligation to contribute to getting the planet away from this precipice. It will be costly but not as costly as living in a much hotter environment. e.	No
1373565	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	the planet can't keep waiting	No
1373571	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Get rid of pollution quickly	No
1373572	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's taken too long for this to even be looked at by the government	NULL
1373579	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I support option c for all three but it won't let me select three C3s or unselect any. That just makes them move around randomly.	No
1373580	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Facts, scientific evidence and for environmental and economic sustainability, C is the absolutely best option. THE ONLY OPTION	No
1373583	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	All scientific evidence and fact lead to option C.	No
1373589	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have no time to waste in driving down greenhouse gas emissions.	NULL
1373594	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To curb the effect climate change we need to act fast.	No
1373599	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C will provide the fastest transition to clean cars with an accelerated trajectory to beat emissions targets in Europe and the US. An overwhelming vote for Option C gives the government a popular mandate to take real action, rather than listen to lobby groups and the Murdoch media..	No
1373602	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Time has run out for the slower options	NULL
1373609	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to transition as quickly as possible to meet climate change targets.	Yes
1373610	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are way behind most western countries.	No
1373613	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is real and impending	No
1373616	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia risks being a global laggard if we don't do this.	Yes
1373618	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Faster effects, which are desperately needed. No more going slow and thinking it is not our problem!	Yes

1373624	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We dont have enough time to take a slow option, the world is already at 2 degrees of warming!	Yes
1373626	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because it's the fastest transition.	NULL
1373630	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Transportation is a major greenhouse gas producer, so taking a faster approach to make that sector cleaner will have a significant positive impact.	NULL
1373631	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reducing carbon emissions	No
1373633	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We're in a climate change emergency, time is ticking, Australia is so far behind and we need to finally get going on this.	Yes
1373643	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	health and environmental	Yes
1373653	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Tipping points are already here due to arrogant denial so get on with it. \flexible\, only means lobbyists will drag it out till the neoliberal profit b people get back in.	No
1373654	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	B appears to offer a steady policy with good outcome avoiding the higher costs.	Yes
1373655	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Scientists tell us we are facing a climate emergency. In question 5 below I support option b but prefer option C.	Yes
1373656	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change needs action now	No
1373669	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a state of climate emergency that requires fast action!	No
1373676	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Something must be done to slow climate change now even we can't stop it.	No
1373677	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to get this happening to reap the benefits of more technologically advanced engines, lower emissions, better fuel economy and a cleaner climate solution.	Yes
1373678	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Urgency	NULL
1373680	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	There's great urgency so the quicker the better. No other choice gives such a strong clear resolute message that now is the time to act definitively. It may already be late but we've got a chance to do our best with no half measures.he strongest	No
1373683	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Speed	No

1373693	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I think change needs to happen as quickly as possible.	No
1373696	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Emissions need to be reduced now, we are behind on the transition away from fossil fuels	No
1373702	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The need to address climate concerns is urgent.	Yes
1373704	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The slow option is TOO slow, we need fast action NOW.	No
1373708	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Option C will provide the fastest transition to clean cars with an accelerated trajectory to beat emissions targets in Europe and the US. An overwhelming vote for Option C gives the government a popular mandate to stare down the car lobby.	NULL
1373710	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373714	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate crisis, we need to reduce emission ASAP please	No
1373716	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reducing emissions is critical and should not be at the whim of the car manufacturers who dump dirty cars on us	No
1373718	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	De-carbonising our society and industry is the most pressing moral challenge happening in this decade but will have benefits for future generations. The short term financial cost is outweighed many times over by innumerable and hard to quantify benefits.	NULL
1373719	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373721	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373724	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1373739	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want a speedy transition to minimal emissions.	No
1373743	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373746	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373751	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL



1373752	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373755	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373757	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373758	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Global warming isn't actually presenting an option.	NULL
1373760	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	No time to waste to maintain life for humans on this planet	NULL
1373761	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Australia urgently requires cleaner fuels and Australia has large reserves of LPG and LNG so why import toxic fuels when we have clean indigenous transitional fuels ?	No
1373763	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1373764	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373766	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Stop postponing and start doing	No
1373767	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Global climate change is a much bigger than usual, existential threat to the planet and to life, especially human life. Business as usual approaches no longer are viable, and caution will be not rewarded. Only an approach that treats the problem as an emergency will get my support.	No
1373768	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fuel cost savings,less pollution	No
1373770	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's a climate emergency	NULL
1373772	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373779	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	I believe we need to speed up our adoption of lings that reduce emissions. This change has come far too slowly.	No
1373782	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	NULL	Yes
1373785	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1373788	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373790	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Rapid climate change fundamentally altering the earth's atmosphere.	No
1373794	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Get it done	No
1373797	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373828	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We absolutely have to get this done quickly	No
1373829	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have no more time to waste and need ambitious and fast change for the better	No
1373831	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373835	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is important that Australia moves as quickly as possible	No
1373837	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Our climate is breaking down NOW	NULL
1373839	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Bigger benefits, not hugely greater costs from option C to B and shows true commitment to reducing environmental injury.	Yes
1373840	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373841	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373846	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373850	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373851	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373857	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because option c is best.	No

1373858	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373859	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I think we should be doing as much as we can as quickly as we can.	No
1373860	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373863	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need the change to happen fast - the benefits in the long run will outweigh the short-term higher costs.	No
1373865	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	One planet we have, not two!!! If we want mankind and other life to survive on this planet, we must as quick as possible act to stop heating it up at a rate never seen before. Non of us will be able to adapt!	NULL
1373868	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373873	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has fallen behind the rest of the world on this issue. It's time to get moving quickly without giving car manufacturers an opportunity to lobby government and slow down the process. Option C has greater costs, but greater benefits too.	No
1373875	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Proportionally small difference between B and C..	Yes
1373877	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373878	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Time is running out	NULL
1373882	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have no time, we need to invest & act. Paying now will benchmark Australia against other nations of the world that have made tough decisions and the people are happy and feel good about the commitment	No
1373883	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373884	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1373885	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1373887	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Ideally, after delaying for years, I prefer the faster option C, but listening to the objections from those in the trade, I can live with B. I can't live with A.	Yes
1373888	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is the most logical and best results for the country and people. Fastest movement towards climate change benefits as less pollution being generated also Australia then doesn't become a dumping ground for obsolete environment targets within vehicles	No

1373890	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373892	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	As the change will be a shock to some people the benefits will come to all as the program moves forward. This will help with more BEV vehicles being introduced to Australia giving people more choice as to the type of vehicles currently available in other countries. Also the reduction of fuel consumption and emissions will benefit everyone over time.	Yes
1373893	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373895	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we've waited to long for this already. Needs to be as fast as possible.	No
1373897	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Under the efficiency standard people can still buy inefficient vehicles if they want, and without a cost premium, as there is no tax on inefficient vehicles The standard requires manufacturers selling inefficient vehicles to offset them by making more vehicles with efficient technology available to avoid penalties. For example, there are many hybrids, mild hybrids and EVs that are available abroad that are not available here and manufacturers are prioritising markets with efficiency standards. So we are missing out. The customer can't decide if the vehicles are not made available.	Yes
1373898	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373902	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Save my planet!	No
1373903	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373912	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	take a stand by reducing co2 transmission faster. Keeping the costs reasonable with option B, put please take your responsibility in keeping the planet a place where our kids can live.	Yes
1373917	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need urgent action to make Australia a global success	No
1373923	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce our co2 emissions as fast as possible. The costs of not doing so include sea level rise and higher storm damages as well as lives.	No
1373924	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should do something really remarkable and different, lets think about the Australian people first.	No
1373935	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Health and greenhouse emissions	NULL
1373939	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373941	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	stop pullution from cars as fast as possible	NULL
1373946	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	You need to get on with this, pronto!	No

1373948	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I am an Environmental defender, & maximum work on CO2 Footprint has to be done, quickly.	No
1373950	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373951	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C over B is a no brainer, incremental investment of \$12b gives \$30b benefit. A is pointless	No
1373952	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Time is of the essence, decarbonisation needs to happen rapidly to safeguard the lives and well-being of humans globally	No
1373953	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373955	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are so far behind the rest of the world, we should have been on board decades ago and we completely ignore the damage done to health by pollution from vehicles both diesel and those not serviced properly. We now know that these fumes damage lungs, heart and brain function. I do not want to be responsible for inflicting this on the children of the future.	No
1373956	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Clean air, reduced noise, better health for people. Option C is the best for communities and quality of life.	NULL
1373957	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Even option C is not fast enough	No
1373961	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373969	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373971	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373974	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This is the best option for a sustainable future for Australia and the world.	Yes
1373977	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's a no-breainer really. It will save a LOT of money, it is faster and, most importantly, cleaner. I prefer to leave nature intact for the next generation.	No
1373981	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	NULL
1373982	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The Australian government needs to support a swift transition to fossil free transport.	No
1373986	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1373987	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	No
1373990	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373991	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This should be a priority	No
1373993	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1374001	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1374006	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1374007	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Protecting the Climate	No
1374010	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1374015	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	`Be ambitious, fast and implement Option C?	No
1374017	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	If there's a smarter, faster way to cut emissions, let's do it	No
1374019	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are all going to die if we don't do something about our emissions, quickly and strongly. I would like not to die..	No
1374021	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The only way to truly address climate change is to transition as rapidly as possible away from putting more carbon into the atmosphere. Option B can only be considered a \,fall back\, plan for the sake of the planet.	NULL
1374024	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1374025	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1374027	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Time is critical	No
1374028	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1374031	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Health benefits and reductions in CO2 are the very best reasons for my choice of option C	No
1374033	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1374040	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate crisis. We need to act as fast as possible to reduce carbon emissions from fossil fuel use.	NULL
1374050	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1374052	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1374053	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1374056	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has lagged behind and should not delay catching up as quickly as possible.	No
1374059	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1374063	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Effective and efficient	No
1374065	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Politically easier to pass than Option C yet gets action started. I wish the timeline had been mentioned.	Yes
1374066	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	an escalation in the advent and use of cleaner technologies in the transport industry is paramount to a cleaner , and cooler planet. For far too long the automotive industry has consistently used aged technologies in the pursuit of profits over less polluting options, they cannot be trusted to implement the necessary improvements without public and governmental pressure. Essentially the automotive industry has failed. Even the introduction of EV's it is still pandering to EGO based consumers.	No
1374090	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fastest abatement of CO2	NULL
1374093	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1374094	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is a big need to change the lifestyle in Australia to make it sustainable. So far, we're leading in use of resources per person, consumerism is at its high. We are well-equipped to make a change quickly.	Yes
1374096	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Long overdue	NULL
1374097	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Global climate change MUST be mitigated	No

1374122	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	the climate crisis	No
1374128	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The faster the change on this issue, the better -- for the world, not just Australia.	No
1374148	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The difference between the upfront cost of C and B is not that large in the grand scheme of things, and delivers ultimately greater benefits across the board. It would be wonderful if for once, Australia could be a world leader in something good.	NULL
1374151	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	New cars in Australia use 20% more fuel than new cars in USA, its a joke that Australia is a dumping ground of inefficient cars and large petrol guzzling polluting heavy, and dangerous, cars are dominating our roads. Do not lets the car industry bully the govt.	No
1374156	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There's simply no time to lose--the climate emergency isn't going to pause or lend us a lobster just because most of us are bludgers	No
1374157	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The cost of the benefits.	Yes
1374158	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	The best	No
1374174	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1374178	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change & assoc Insurance premiums	No
1374181	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Stop pollution	No
1374182	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As a country, we are far behind other countries with policies to reduce our fuel emissions. With climate change affecting the world as quickly as it is, we need to step up our game and make major improvements. That's why I believe option c is the way to go, as it puts us in a better position to combat climate change and reduce harmful petrol emissions.	Yes
1374188	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C will quickly reduce emissions.	No
1374192	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's obviously the best option	No
1374196	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's seeming really hard to make any policy changes once they're set in stone. Rather than hardly putting minimal or a half effort into an issue like this, it's better to go full throttle to reap the most benefit, rather than trying and failing to up the benefits later.	Yes
1374199	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	The sooner in place the better.	No
1374212	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	It's long overdue in Australia so let's get going to catch up with the rest of the developed world and hopefully surpass them.	Yes



1374217	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis is just that: a crisis. Australia has wasted decades already. We can't afford to keep making half-hearted efforts. We must act as strongly as possible, NOW!	No
1374219	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1374221	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1374222	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change	Yes
1374243	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's long overdue. Its not just about money.	No
1374244	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to incentivise and lead the transition	No
1374251	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to lower emissions as quickly as possible. Please stop pandering to the car industry. They are using Australia as a dumping ground for high-emissions vehicles.	No
1374253	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1374257	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1374285	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis is urgent, so the response to transport emissions should reflect this. SUV's must be included in the passenger vehicle category. Penalties for exceeding the target should be substantial and the government should be implementing real-world testing of vehicle emissions to ensure that inaccuracies of lab-based testing are avoided.	Yes
1374289	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has been slow to adopt standards and needs to act fast to catch up.	Yes
1374290	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do this as quickly as possible as we're already years behind other advanced nations.	No
1374424	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1374428	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has already waited too long	No
1374454	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1374463	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We're in a climate emergency. No time to be dithering.	No

1374467	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	It is imperative we take a strong environmental stand and do what is best for Australians and the planet ASAP.	No
1374491	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Time is running out!!	Yes
1374588	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The transition needs to happen as fast as possible, we have wasted too much precious time already, too much carbon dioxide has been released into the atmosphere already.	No
1374600	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Faster and best outcome	No
1374626	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The environment is at the verge of collapse	No
1374651	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C gives the most savings with the biggest support to slowing climate change	No
1374747	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1374763	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to transition faster to renewables and lower our impact on the planet	Yes
1374770	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1374790	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1374818	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Given the speed of climate change, we also need to change quickly, thus fast action is the only way. Plus Option C has the greatest net and total benefits.	NULL
1374829	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1374832	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act fast or we will miss the chance to reverse the effects on this world of ours. Now is the time to be bold.	No
1374850	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1374873	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	This whole thing is just another kick in the guts to anyone who lives outside a major city. This NVES does not consider in the slightest, the huge and crushing impact that this will have on regional and remote Australians. My reasons for my choices are to try to slow this ill-thought-out standard to allow future governments to see some sense and abolish it.	No
1374883	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate crisis. The faster we stop burning fossil fuel the better. But there is an immediate cost to this and we all must be prepared to pay it. The longer we put off paying that cost the higher it will become through the effectiveness of human induced climate disasters.	Yes

1374891	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Most efficient way of obtain most of the benefits. Option 1 is too little and too slow.	Yes
1374910	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Faster is better	NULL
1374940	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1374952	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The whole world, including Australia, needs to take action to limit adverse climate change, and as quickly as possible.	NULL
1374976	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1374998	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1375005	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis is already costing lives, and will only escalate with every day we wait. We cannot waste time..	No
1375011	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to urgently take steps to reduce emissions and convert to more battery driven technologies. This is an opportunity for Australia to boost local industry to drive innovations, and the sooner we get started the better.	Yes
1375015	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375016	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The fastest way forward to reduce our use and reliance of/on Fossil fuels.	NULL
1375023	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375024	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375025	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to move away from fossil fuels as soon as possible.	No
1375028	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	No
1375060	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	The fastest option is best as there is no time to wait.	No
1375068	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 2nd	Saying we will save X amount of money on the fuel bill is irrelevant if we cant afford to buy a new car. With housing and even grocery purchase getting beyond the reach of too many Australians it seems this project is unrealistic. Also, bear in mind that if Australians buy more utes than cars it says thats because they EANT to. I'm not one of them nor am I a particular fan of the new breed 4 door utes but we should be able to choose something as personal as our own car.	No

1375069	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	When driving I see an explosion of ridiculously overpowered and polluting vehicles on the roads eg Large Utes such as RANs and Mustangs and of course the ubiquitous SUVs that are again excessively large.	Yes
1375071	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1375124	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375210	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have no time to waste.	NULL
1375219	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do this quickly	No
1375224	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375226	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cost difference between Options C & B small on such a big scale. Results are more meaningful.	Yes
1375228	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375232	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	A considered approach is required in this country given demographics and cultural considerations. Lifestyle is important; there is a need to consider recreation and recognise the unintended consequences of well-meant but possibly over-zealous government policy. People that want, or need, towing vehicles to meet work, business or recreational functions (such as caravanning) should not be punished by the imposition of higher levies through the Luxury Car Tax or any other mechanism. This policy should not be a \,one size fits all\.	No
1375234	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's the most efficient	No
1375249	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Governments have regularly shown they get their data and effects on individuals and businesses incorrect and any new initiative that may impose additional costs on individuals should be introduced more slowly so the true effects of the initiative can be seen and responded to appropriately	No
1375271	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Electric vehicles only meet the needs of a limited number of people i.e. those who move in small, concentrated geographical zones. They do not have the ability to tow with any form of viable range and cannot meet recreational needs. There is a need to not impose additional taxes, levies or other costs on Australians who might need to, or wish to purchase a towing vehicle such as a Toyota Landcruiser in order to enable them to tow their caravan, or similar. I could support Option B if it came without the pecuniary penalties being proposed to be placed on ordinary Australians who need/want a towing vehicle with a workable range - the Luxury Car Tax or similar mechanism is an unacceptable penalty on people.	No
1375272	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Taken a long time for Australia to get in line and we have to do more to get even with the rest of the oecd	Yes
1375298	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need immediate action on these issues. It's too late to go slowly.	Yes
1375299	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Just a big con , will do nothing to save the so call climate emergency , another Tax. Government should be concerned about the poor third world country fuel quality's sold to the Australian public.	No

1375303	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	None of these options are suitable. Educate the public and drop taxes on electric vehicles and there will be a natural transition. People want to be treated respectfully, not bullied by governments.	No
1375306	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Delivering a strong and effective fuel efficiency standard for Australia's light vehicle fleet is essential to drive down carbon pollution and cut the cost of living for Australians. The New Vehicle Efficiency Standard (NVES) should reflect that there is a dire need to meet our Net Zero targets as soon as possible. I believe that a mixture of Option B and Option C is the best choice for Australia to ensure we reduce CO2 emissions, preferably with the Option C target provided by the government's impact analysis of 74 million tonnes by 2050. This will support the government to meet its Net Zero targets and allow space for other industries that face stronger challenges for transitioning to reduce their emissions. I also believe the NVES should prioritise a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles by 2035 at the latest. I believe that cutting vehicle emissions is imperative to delivering cleaner air for better health, boosting national energy security, and improving access to greener cars for Australians as soon as possible, while supporting us to slow global warming and protect Australia. I strongly support the key common features in options B and C as minimum starting points for unlocking better access to low and zero emissions vehicles as soon as possible. Primarily, I support and believe the following features be included in the NEVS: SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles. Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles. The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial. The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out. Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time. The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	Yes
1375310	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Delivering a strong and effective fuel efficiency standard for Australia's light vehicle fleet is essential to drive down carbon pollution and cut the cost of living for Australians. The New Vehicle Efficiency Standard (NVES) should reflect that there is a dire need to meet our Net Zero targets as soon as possible. I believe that a mixture of Option B and Option C is the best choice for Australia to ensure we reduce CO2 emissions, preferably with the Option C target provided by the government's impact analysis of 74 million tonnes by 2050. This will support the government to meet its Net Zero targets and allow space for other industries that face stronger challenges for transitioning to reduce their emissions. I also believe the NVES should prioritise a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles by 2035 at the latest. I believe that cutting vehicle emissions is imperative to delivering cleaner air for better health, boosting national energy security, and improving access to greener cars for Australians as soon as possible, while supporting us to slow global warming and protect Australia. I strongly support the key common features in options B and C as minimum starting points for unlocking better access to low and zero emissions vehicles as soon as possible. Primarily, I support and believe the following features be included in the NEVS: SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles. Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles. The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial. The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out. Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time. The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	Yes
1375311	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia's emission standards are an embarrassment. We have one of the highest per capita CO2 emissions in the world. We are a wealthy nation that has prospered from fossil fuel industrialisation. It's well overdue for action to be taken.	No
1375315	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are so far behind progressive countries on this, where we should be leading the world given our reliance on cars (and therefore impact) and availability of renewable resources to run electric vehicles.	NULL
1375316	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B strikes the best balance	Yes

1375318	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	I am concerned that car import companies will have too short a time to adjust to the standard. I am also concerned that many, most Australians don't want the impacts of the standard. I believe higher prices of their preferred vehicle is not what they want.	No
1375321	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to move as rapidly as possible	No
1375328	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	We do not have much longer to discuss this. This should have been done long time ago. The whole world has already reacted - 10-20 years ago, only Australia thinks they can do what they want. Now the Government still wants to have more time. Now Australia has to deal with the costs. The temperature has already risen to a point which is not good and still they keep on dreaming here that everything is fine ....	NULL
1375335	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It needs to be done as soon as possible!	No
1375338	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 0th	NULL	Yes
1375342	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Urgency to reduce carbon emissions to slow climate change.	No
1375344	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	The net benefit as well as the overall cost of implementing the scheme	Yes
1375346	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fuel cost reductions to consumers. Rapid emissions reductions. Incentive for EV sales to increase.	NULL
1375353	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This proposal is decades overdue and it is pleasing to finally see a policy on this topic. Australia is so far behind the rest of the world. This policy will have a positive impact on our environment by reducing emissions in a growing industry, whilst also help create a better vehicle market and cheaper petrol bills for consumers. My reasoning for option C is that we are already seeing the disastrous impacts of climate change and costs of living and we need to do more and fast. However, I also support option B and this may be what is more likely to pass in parliament. We just need action. No more stalling on important policies like these. I welcome the government's approach to actual reform and bettering our future.	Yes
1375356	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	benefits	No
1375363	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	WE have start thinking humanity first. Human survival is of no concern for the planet. But it should be our major concern.	Yes
1375369	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1375376	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Delivering a strong and effective fuel efficiency standard for Australia's light vehicle fleet is essential to drive down carbon pollution and cut the cost of living for Australians. The New Vehicle Efficiency Standard (NVES) should reflect that there is a dire need to meet our Net Zero targets as soon as possible. I believe that a mixture of Option B and Option C is the best choice for Australia to ensure we reduce CO2 emissions, preferably with the Option C target provided by the government's impact analysis of 74 million tonnes by 2050. This will support the government to meet its Net Zero targets and allow space for other industries that face stronger challenges for transitioning to reduce their emissions. I also believe the NVES should prioritise a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles by 2035 at the latest. I believe that cutting vehicle emissions is imperative to delivering cleaner air for better health, boosting national energy security, and improving access to greener cars for Australians as soon as possible, while supporting us to slow global warming and protect Australia. I strongly support the key common features in options B and C as minimum starting points for unlocking better access to low and zero emissions vehicles as soon as possible. Primarily, I support and believe the following features be included in the NEVS: SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles. Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles. The Government should consider	Yes

			lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial. The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out. Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time. The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	
1375381	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	In line with US and Europe. High level of emissions reduction. Cost savings compared to option C with high CBR.	Yes
1375390	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375391	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The quicker we implement climate action, the better. Although Option C has a lower cost benefit ratio than Option B, it will see that the benefits are reaped much sooner. Looking at the detailed comparison, the projected differences for 2029 CO2 rates are drastic and enough to justify Option C. The importance of an effective NVES to our fight against climate change and emissions goals is not to be understated. However, Option B is still preferable to Option A.	Yes
1375399	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1375413	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Delivering a strong and effective fuel efficiency standard for Australia’s light vehicle fleet is essential to drive down carbon pollution and cut the cost of living for Australians. The New Vehicle Efficiency Standard (NVES) should reflect that there is a dire need to meet our Net Zero targets as soon as possible. I believe that a mixture of Option B and Option C is the best choice for Australia to ensure we reduce CO2 emissions, preferably with the Option C target provided by the government’s impact analysis of 74 million tonnes by 2050. This will support the government to meet its Net Zero targets and allow space for other industries that face stronger challenges for transitioning to reduce their emissions. I also believe the NVES should prioritise a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles by 2035 at the latest. I believe that cutting vehicle emissions is imperative to delivering cleaner air for better health, boosting national energy security, and improving access to greener cars for Australians as soon as possible, while supporting us to slow global warming and protect Australia. I strongly support the key common features in options B and C as minimum starting points for unlocking better access to low and zero emissions vehicles as soon as possible. Primarily, I support and believe the following features be included in the NEVS: SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles. Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles. The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial. The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out. Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time. The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	Yes
1375414	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Concern for the negative impact delaying transition will have	No
1375425	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The quicker we obtain cleaner vehicles the better. Australia has been too slow in getting its act together on climate change for decades now. This can be an opportunity to take responsibility and lead the world by example.	NULL
1375432	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe Australia has taken far too long to implement such a policy and we need to do our best to catch up to other developed countries. The stopping and reduction in global warming needs immediate action from government and individuals to be reduced as rapidly as we can for future generations of people and species on this planet.	Yes
1375445	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have to get this done quickly, no time to lose.	No

1375450	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The impacts of climate change are already being strongly felt around the planet. Together, we need to all that is possible to reduce the scale and severity of the impacts we are creating, and reducing vehicle emissions is one obvious, timely, and relatively straightforward action that can be taken.	No
1375458	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	All efforts need to be made to reduce co2 emissions and other vehicle pollution.	Yes
1375468	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Fast change is imperative	Yes
1375473	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we need to move on these environmental issues, not waste time.	No
1375487	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	fastest GHG emissions and cost savings	No
1375490	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act as quickly as possible and this is the fastest route	Yes
1375492	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Australia's contribution to world wide carbon emission's is 1% hence there is absolutely no reason to address the minuscule contribution individuals vehicles contribute to this. Clearly this is a push towards electric vehicle which rely on inhumane mining practices to mine precious metals such as cobalt.	No
1375495	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Let's get intentional with our actions and quest for a better future.	No
1375512	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Proceed with the utmost urgency, Au has been desperately lagging due to political climate wars	No
1375516	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375532	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Urgent to reduce emissions	No
1375538	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Faster CO2 abatement and greater reduction in other harmful emissions resulting in healthier living standards.	NULL
1375549	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Action to reduce emissions is urgent because climate change is the biggest threat to humanity.	No
1375556	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375573	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Need to drive better availability of EVs in Australia	Yes
1375580	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Most effective	No



1375586	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	No
1375588	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Delivering a strong and effective fuel efficiency standard for Australia's light vehicle fleet is essential to drive down carbon pollution and cut the cost of living for Australians. The New Vehicle Efficiency Standard (NVES) should reflect that there is a dire need to meet our Net Zero targets as soon as possible. I believe that a mixture of Option B and Option C is the best choice for Australia to ensure we reduce CO2 emissions, preferably with the Option C target provided by the government's impact analysis of 74 million tonnes by 2050. This will support the government to meet its Net Zero targets and allow space for other industries that face stronger challenges for transitioning to reduce their emissions. I also believe the NVES should prioritise a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles by 2035 at the latest. I believe that cutting vehicle emissions is imperative to delivering cleaner air for better health, boosting national energy security, and improving access to greener cars for Australians as soon as possible, while supporting us to slow global warming and protect Australia. I strongly support the key common features in options B and C as minimum starting points for unlocking better access to low and zero emissions vehicles as soon as possible. Primarily, I support and believe the following features be included in the NEVS: SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles. Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles. The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial. The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out. Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time. The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	Yes
1375593	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is no joke. Our earth is dying, our air hazy, our water polluted. We MUST act now. This is a low hanging fruit and this is a no brainer.	No
1375597	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375604	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	I am going by your information.	No
1375606	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1375614	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375616	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375618	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	It's the fastest plan for driving down emissions.	No
1375621	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need an ambitious plan	NULL
1375623	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The impacts of climate change are expensive, far more expensive than investments to try and mitigate the worst impacts. With enthusiastic leadership, the majority of Australians will support bold action. Let's do it!	No

1375628	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is far behind the rest of the world and we also need to reduce our emissions as fast as possible	No
1375639	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I am providing my individual response to this survey as it is a topic I feel very passionate about. Having worked in the Automotive Industry for 10 years, including time spent working at the Factory of one of the largest Automakers in the world - I can say that introducing Fuel efficiency standards in Australia has only positive consequences. Prices will not increase for Australians; prices will go down. The arguments saying they will increase go completely against how vehicle manufacturing and market planning work within the Automotive Industry. Even in 2017, I was part of discussions about the vehicle plan for the next 10 years when the discussion was about at what time diesel models will be completely eliminated from the product line up. Inefficient and polluting models will not be made by manufacturers in the future as they have their own targets to hit and the whole world has vehicle efficiency standards. It is a cycle based on the regulation of countries that feeds into those market plans and may influence whether to continue making inefficient models, but either way each year high emitting vehicles will be cut from the production line. At the moment, markets with efficiency standards get the best most efficient cars and Australia is deprioritized with less choice and less efficient cars that cost more to run. I propose the most aggressive option for Australia because I believe it is possible. With a smaller population and less vehicles to transition, Australia is in a position to become a leader and drastically cut carbon emissions. It will take greater policy effort and support to ensure the focus is on driving demand for more efficient vehicles (by reducing the upfront costs to customers of a newer vehicle) - but this would only be a temporary measure. The quicker and higher the volume of demand for electric vehicles and efficient vehicles the cheaper they become. Australia can grab hold of the opportunity with manufacturing and recycling batteries here in Australia which could transform the economy. All things work in a system and a cycle, so by setting the most ambitious targets all efforts and action will fall in line to put the country in the best position to decarbonize and hit or climate goals whilst future-proofing the economy. This standard is a complete no brainer and frankly is far too late. My advice coming from the UK is to quickly get on top of the dangerous rhetoric that forms trying to push the message that greener cars are for the rich and all these measures are to take money away from working class/low income families. The only way to do this, is to make sure that a lot of effort is put on working hand in hand with local community and real people and demonstrating that the best thing for the planet is also the best thing for people on low incomes too, it can save them money. This is possible is policy is geared in a way that makes electric cars accessible to all.	Yes
1375642	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Economic benefit	Yes
1375648	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375659	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change needs urgent action	NULL
1375666	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	I could support Option B provided that people who want or need towing vehicles are not penalised under this legislation. EV's only have limited application.	No
1375670	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1375678	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act now	Yes
1375696	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to get serious on fuel emission standards. The atmospheric CO2 level increase needs to be stopped asap.	No
1375703	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1375707	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Let's get it done and reap the benefits sooner.	NULL

1375711	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1375715	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I strongly believe that Australia's Standard should be the strongest in the world and there's no excuse for it not to be.	Yes
1375717	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should make Australia's Standard the strongest in the world	Yes
1375718	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C has moves quickest	No
1375719	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375724	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should make Australia's Standard the strongest in the world. The strong headline target and fleet limit curve rules of Option C will help us both catch up and stay at the front of the global queue for efficient vehicles, making the Australian market extremely attractive for low and zero-emissions vehicles; save Australian consumers the most money in the long term; and reduce carbon emissions in the fastest way. Although the headline targets of Option B are good, they would only have us catch up to the US, and stay behind most other car markets (including right-hand drive markets like the United Kingdom and New Zealand). Sufficient notice has been given to manufacturers. Both Options B and C allow manufacturers two years before strong limits are set, which is more than enough time to adjust their supply. The Government has been clear about its intention for a New Vehicle Efficiency Standard since 2022, and Australia is one of the last developed countries to implement one. Benefits to consumers should be a priority. In the current cost of living crisis, the government should be prioritising options that lead to more wins for consumers. The benefit-to-cost ratio of Option B and C are very similar (4% difference), but the net benefits of Option C are far greater (18% difference). Penalties should match the rest of the world. The penalty price of Option C is more comparable to the European Union and will force manufacturers to comply and prioritise the Australian market. As the Government found, there is no evidence this will increase vehicle prices. Credits should expire within two years. The shorter expiry of credits in Option C means that overperforming manufacturers (such as electric vehicle-only manufacturers like Tesla and BYD) have a shorter time to sell their credits to other companies, making a slightly fairer playing field. No dodgy loopholes for mainstream technology. As in both Options B and C, excluding technology credits creates more transparency and simplicity in the scheme, and increases positive results for Australian consumers and carbon emissions. Multiplier credits in particular should be ruled out entirely. SUVs should be classified as passenger vehicles. As in both Options B and C, including SUVs and in the "Passenger Vehicle" category is smart and makes the Australian NVES stronger, especially given the consumer preference for larger vehicles. The Light Commercial Vehicle category should exist for genuine utility and commercial vehicles, not for bigger cars by default.	Yes
1375730	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1375731	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C has the biggest reduction in costs and biggest amount of benefits	Yes
1375736	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	If we don't adopt a vehicle emission standard Australia will become (and I think already is) the dumping ground for dirty cars in the world. Do we really want this? Also, from a cost benefit analysis Option C is clearly the best choice. We reap the most benefit for health and society.	Yes
1375738	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1375748	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C allows Australia to catch up with the rest of the world in regards to accessing efficient vehicles, creating a more attractive market locally for low and zero-emissions vehicles; help Australian consumers to have choice of models and price; and reduce carbon emissions quickly.	Yes
1375749	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia should have the strongest emission standards. For our health and the environment.	No

1375750	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	This new policy will further increase the cost of living for average, working class households.	No
1375756	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are not moving fast enough to get to 0 emissions. The earth is dying and we need to do something now	No
1375759	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Would prefer C from a climate view but understand that B is more palatable for thge majority. A seems like an oportunity for the car industry body to scuttle the proposal given the long time lines. ASlso If the ledgislation will resulty in more efficient cars isn't thar a win for every one.	NULL
1375760	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should make Australia’s Standard the strongest in the world. The strong headline target and fleet limit curve rules of Option C will help us both catch up and stay at the front of the global queue for efficient vehicles, making the Australian market extremely attractive for low and zero-emissions vehicles; save Australian consumers the most money in the long term; and reduce carbon emissions in the fastest way. Although the headline targets of Option B are good, they would only have us catch up to the US, and stay behind most other car markets (including right-hand drive markets like the United Kingdom and New Zealand). Sufficient notice has been given to manufacturers. Both Options B and C allow manufacturers two years before strong limits are set, which is more than enough time to adjust their supply. The Government has been clear about its intention for a New Vehicle Efficiency Standard since 2022, and Australia is one of the last developed countries to implement one. Benefits to consumers should be a priority. In the current cost of living crisis, the government should be prioritising options that lead to more wins for consumers. The benefit-to-cost ratio of Option B and C are very similar (4% difference), but the net benefits of Option C are far greater (18% difference). Penalties should match the rest of the world. The penalty price of Option C is more comparable to the European Union and will force manufacturers to comply and prioritise the Australian market. As the Government found, there is no evidence this will increase vehicle prices. Credits should expire within two years. The shorter expiry of credits in Option C means that overperforming manufacturers (such as electric vehicle-only manufacturers like Tesla and BYD) have a shorter time to sell their credits to other companies, making a slightly fairer playing field. No dodgy loopholes for mainstream technology. As in both Options B and C, excluding technology credits creates more transparency and simplicity in the scheme, and increases positive results for Australian consumers and carbon emissions. Multiplier credits in particular should be ruled out entirely. SUVs should be classified as passenger vehicles. As in both Options B and C, including SUVs and in the “Passenger Vehicle” category is smart and makes the Australian NVES stronger, especially given the consumer preference for larger vehicles. The Light Commercial Vehicle category should exist for genuine utility and commercial vehicles, not for bigger cars by default.	Yes
1375767	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia’s Standard must be the strongest in the world The strong headline target and fleet limit curve rules of Option C will help us both catch up and stay at the front of the global queue for efficient vehicles, making the Australian market extremely attractive for low and zero-emissions vehicles; save Australian consumers the most money in the long term; and reduce carbon emissions in the fastest way. Although the headline targets of Option B are good, they would only have us catch up to the US, and stay behind most other car markets (including right-hand drive markets like the United Kingdom and New Zealand). Sufficient notice has been given to manufacturers Both Options B and C allow manufacturers two years before strong limits are set, which is more than enough time to adjust their supply. The Government has been clear about its intention for a New Vehicle Efficiency Standard since 2022, and Australia is one of the last developed countries to implement one. Benefits to consumers should be a priority In the current cost of living crisis, the government should be prioritising options that lead to more wins for consumers. The benefit-to-cost ratio of Option B and C are very similar (4% difference), but the net benefits of Option C are far greater (18% difference). Penalties should match the rest of the world The penalty price of Option C is more comparable to the European Union and will force manufacturers to comply and prioritise the Australian market. As the Government found, there is no evidence this will increase vehicle prices. Credits should expire within two years The shorter expiry of credits in Option C means that overperforming manufacturers (such as electric vehicle-only manufacturers like Tesla and BYD) have a shorter time to sell their credits to other companies, making a slightly fairer playing field. No dodgy loopholes for mainstream technology As in both Options B and C, excluding technology credits creates more transparency and simplicity in the scheme, and increases positive results for Australian consumers and carbon emissions. Multiplier credits in particular should be ruled out entirely. SUVs should be classified as passenger vehicles As in both Options B and C, including SUVs and in the “Passenger Vehicle” category is smart and makes the Australian NVES stronger, especially given the consumer preference for larger vehicles. The Light Commercial Vehicle category should exist for genuine utility and commercial vehicles, not for bigger cars by default.	Yes
1375768	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should make Australia’s Standard the strongest in the world The strong headline target and fleet limit curve rules of Option C will help us both catch up and stay at the front of the global queue for efficient vehicles, making the Australian market extremely attractive for low and zero-emissions vehicles; save Australian consumers the most money in the long term; and reduce carbon emissions in the fastest way. Although the headline targets of Option B are good, they would only have us catch up to the US, and stay behind most other car markets (including right-hand drive markets like the United Kingdom and New Zealand). Sufficient notice has been given to manufacturers Both Options B and C allow manufacturers two years before strong limits are set, which is more than enough time to adjust their supply. The Government has been clear about	Yes

			its intention for a New Vehicle Efficiency Standard since 2022, and Australia is one of the last developed countries to implement one. Benefits to consumers should be a priority In the current cost of living crisis, the government should be prioritising options that lead to more wins for consumers. The benefit-to-cost ratio of Option B and C are very similar (4% difference), but the net benefits of Option C are far greater (18% difference). Penalties should match the rest of the world The penalty price of Option C is more comparable to the European Union and will force manufacturers to comply and prioritise the Australian market. As the Government found, there is no evidence this will increase vehicle prices. Credits should expire within two years The shorter expiry of credits in Option C means that overperforming manufacturers (such as electric vehicle-only manufacturers like Tesla and BYD) have a shorter time to sell their credits to other companies, making a slightly fairer playing field. No dodgy loopholes for mainstream technology As in both Options B and C, excluding technology credits creates more transparency and simplicity in the scheme, and increases positive results for Australian consumers and carbon emissions. Multiplier credits in particular should be ruled out entirely. SUVs should be classified as passenger vehicles As in both Options B and C, including SUVs and in the “Passenger Vehicle” category is smart and makes the Australian NVES stronger, especially given the consumer preference for larger vehicles. The Light Commercial Vehicle category should exist for genuine utility and commercial vehicles, not for bigger cars by default.	
1375769	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should make Australia’s Standard the strongest in the world The strong headline target and fleet limit curve rules of Option C will help us both catch up and stay at the front of the global queue for efficient vehicles, making the Australian market extremely attractive for low and zero-emissions vehicles; save Australian consumers the most money in the long term; and reduce carbon emissions in the fastest way. Although the headline targets of Option B are good, they would only have us catch up to the US, and stay behind most other car markets (including right-hand drive markets like the United Kingdom and New Zealand). Sufficient notice has been given to manufacturers Both Options B and C allow manufacturers two years before strong limits are set, which is more than enough time to adjust their supply. The Government has been clear about its intention for a New Vehicle Efficiency Standard since 2022, and Australia is one of the last developed countries to implement one. Benefits to consumers should be a priority In the current cost of living crisis, the government should be prioritising options that lead to more wins for consumers. The benefit-to-cost ratio of Option B and C are very similar (4% difference), but the net benefits of Option C are far greater (18% difference). Penalties should match the rest of the world The penalty price of Option C is more comparable to the European Union and will force manufacturers to comply and prioritise the Australian market. As the Government found, there is no evidence this will increase vehicle prices. Credits should expire within two years The shorter expiry of credits in Option C means that overperforming manufacturers (such as electric vehicle-only manufacturers like Tesla and BYD) have a shorter time to sell their credits to other companies, making a slightly fairer playing field. No dodgy loopholes for mainstream technology As in both Options B and C, excluding technology credits creates more transparency and simplicity in the scheme, and increases positive results for Australian consumers and carbon emissions. Multiplier credits in particular should be ruled out entirely. SUVs should be classified as passenger vehicles As in both Options B and C, including SUVs and in the “Passenger Vehicle” category is smart and makes the Australian NVES stronger, especially given the consumer preference for larger vehicles. The Light Commercial Vehicle category should exist for genuine utility and commercial vehicles, not for bigger cars by default.	Yes
1375770	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	NULL	Yes
1375773	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Achievable, cost/benefit gap higher than A less than B, (moderate entropy),	Yes
1375775	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	The benefit/costs figures provided in the table could have just as easily been conjured up out for thin air. No details have been given as to the inputs and assumptions made in the model. For the analysis to be assessed properly all the inputs, assumptions and methodology should be provided. It is not possible to determine with amount of accuracy of the results without this information. Remember the old saying, garbage in/garbage out..	No
1375784	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375787	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to match the UK and EU and then be better!	NULL
1375789	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1375793	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I think the health benefits are vastly undervalued and the benefits to all sections of the environment, via climate effects, not taken into account	No
1375801	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We have to adapt to the effects of climate change. Supporting a strategy that is going to be acceptable to the general public is a prerequisite. The ideology underpinning option C doesn't want to accept the realities of technology supply and expects a total acceptance of the stated goals without any strategic flexibility. Option A proposes a strategy that is as good as doing nothing and is designed to maintain the status quo...	Yes
1375806	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	choice.....stay out of my choice mr bowen	No
1375820	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Why is it Australia is such a cowardly country and is always behind the 8ball when it comes to reigning in the big polluters. So far the average Australian has had to do the heavy lifting in response to climate change, and this is true for vehicle emissions and supporting EVs. As a farmer I have no choice but to drive a diesel as there are no acceptable EV alternatives in Australia. I look at what is available in the USA and Europe and sigh with frustration. And for goodness sake let's stop subsidising the fossil fuel sector.4X4	No
1375823	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has been lagging behind the rest of the civilised world on this issue for far too long. Action is well overdue so taking the strongest action now will start us on the path to catching up. Just do the right thing!	Yes
1375839	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	To catch up with the rest of the world finally.	Yes
1375840	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to be ambitious about fuel standards because of the inevitable pressure of climate change.	No
1375842	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate situation is now desperate. We need to take the strongest possible measures now because we have delayed far too long.	No
1375845	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I have chosen the option B as it is the best of both worlds. Because Australia is SO far behind in this area, even though I would like to undertake option C, I think that the best choice is B because it will work but not be too much of a shock to ordinary Australians as C.	Yes
1375848	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	option b is realistically achievable option that will finally allow Australia to stop being the dumping ground for the world's most polluting vehicles.	Yes
1375849	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1375856	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This is critical to Australia's transition to cleaner, more efficient transport and an important part of addressing climate change, half measures are just not going to do the job.	No
1375857	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B shows a more graduated and achievable approach to emission reductions	Yes
1375860	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need the most effective option to cut emissions the quickest and hilding vehicle manufacturers to account instead of giving them a free pass and bing Australia into alignment when it conesx to vehicle emissions standards with the rest of the world.	NULL
1375866	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Get started now to catch up with the rest of the world	No
1375872	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should make Australia's Standard the strongest in the world The strong headline target and fleet limit curve rules of Option C will help us both catch up and stay at the front of the global queue for efficient vehicles, making the Australian market extremely attractive for low and zero-emissions vehicles; save Australian consumers the most money in the long term; and reduce carbon emissions in the fastest way. Although the headline targets of Option B are good, they would only have us catch up to the US, and stay behind most other car markets (including right-hand	Yes

			drive markets like the United Kingdom and New Zealand). Sufficient notice has been given to manufacturers Both Options B and C allow manufacturers two years before strong limits are set, which is more than enough time to adjust their supply. The Government has been clear about its intention for a New Vehicle Efficiency Standard since 2022, and Australia is one of the last developed countries to implement one. Benefits to consumers should be a priority In the current cost of living crisis, the government should be prioritising options that lead to more wins for consumers. The benefit-to-cost ratio of Option B and C are very similar (4% difference), but the net benefits of Option C are far greater (18% difference). Penalties should match the rest of the world The penalty price of Option C is more comparable to the European Union and will force manufacturers to comply and prioritise the Australian market. As the Government found, there is no evidence this will increase vehicle prices. Credits should expire within two years The shorter expiry of credits in Option C means that overperforming manufacturers (such as electric vehicle-only manufacturers like Tesla and BYD) have a shorter time to sell their credits to other companies, making a slightly fairer playing field. No dodgy loopholes for mainstream technology As in both Options B and C, excluding technology credits creates more transparency and simplicity in the scheme, and increases positive results for Australian consumers and carbon emissions. Multiplier credits in particular should be ruled out entirely. SUVs should be classified as passenger vehicles As in both Options B and C, including SUVs and in the "Passenger Vehicle" category is smart and makes the Australian NVES stronger, especially given the consumer preference for larger vehicles. The Light Commercial Vehicle category should exist for genuine utility and commercial vehicles, not for bigger cars by default.	
1375873	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to adopt world leading approaches such as Norway, a country that has set an example of strategies to protect the future	No
1375876	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should make Australia's Standard the strongest in the world The strong headline target and fleet limit curve rules of Option C will help us both catch up and stay at the front of the global queue for efficient vehicles, making the Australian market extremely attractive for low and zero-emissions vehicles; save Australian consumers the most money in the long term; and reduce carbon emissions in the fastest way. Although the headline targets of Option B are good, they would only have us catch up to the US, and stay behind most other car markets (including right-hand drive markets like the United Kingdom and New Zealand). Sufficient notice has been given to manufacturers Both Options B and C allow manufacturers two years before strong limits are set, which is more than enough time to adjust their supply. The Government has been clear about its intention for a New Vehicle Efficiency Standard since 2022, and Australia is one of the last developed countries to implement one. Benefits to consumers should be a priority In the current cost of living crisis, the government should be prioritising options that lead to more wins for consumers. The benefit-to-cost ratio of Option B and C are very similar (4% difference), but the net benefits of Option C are far greater (18% difference). Penalties should match the rest of the world The penalty price of Option C is more comparable to the European Union and will force manufacturers to comply and prioritise the Australian market. As the Government found, there is no evidence this will increase vehicle prices. Credits should expire within two years The shorter expiry of credits in Option C means that overperforming manufacturers (such as electric vehicle-only manufacturers like Tesla and BYD) have a shorter time to sell their credits to other companies, making a slightly fairer playing field. No dodgy loopholes for mainstream technology As in both Options B and C, excluding technology credits creates more transparency and simplicity in the scheme, and increases positive results for Australian consumers and carbon emissions. Multiplier credits in particular should be ruled out entirely. SUVs should be classified as passenger vehicles As in both Options B and C, including SUVs and in the "Passenger Vehicle" category is smart and makes the Australian NVES stronger, especially given the consumer preference for larger vehicles. The Light Commercial Vehicle category should exist for genuine utility and commercial vehicles, not for bigger cars by default.	Yes
1375883	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is absurd Australia is this far behind, and there is no reason to not do everything in our power to accelerate the transition. Climate Change is now. To be effective, the standard should \,update the official Australian test protocol (NEDC) as it is outdated and increasingly underestimates on-road emissions [...thus] undermining effective emission reduction. The standards should also include on-board monitoring of fuel consumption. It's vital to measure real-world fuel efficiency and emissions of new vehicles and to make this information public to ensure standards are achieving their goals\,	No
1375886	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We can't delay a move for cleaner air its important for our children	Yes
1375889	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is already behind nearly every other nation and needs a quick change to catch up to the rest of the world	Yes
1375897	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Lighter and heavier SUVs are a huge and expanding section of the car market.People who used to buy sedans,hatchbacks and wagons now buy SUVs. It's harder and harder to get a non-SUV new passenger vehicle.SUVs must therefore be classified as passenger vehicles. Australia has been hugely polluting beyond most other comparable nations for many decades.We must quickly make up for this disparity,addressing our disproportionately high past pollution levels. We should make Australia's Standard the strongest in the world The strong headline target and fleet limit curve rules of Option C will help us both catch up and stay at the front of the global queue for efficient vehicles, making the Australian market	Yes

			extremely attractive for low and zero-emissions vehicles; save Australian consumers the most money in the long term; and reduce carbon emissions in the fastest way. Although the headline targets of Option B are good, they would only have us catch up to the US, and stay behind most other car markets (including right-hand drive markets like the United Kingdom and New Zealand). Sufficient notice has been given to manufacturers Both Options B and C allow manufacturers two years before strong limits are set, which is more than enough time to adjust their supply. The Government has been clear about its intention for a New Vehicle Efficiency Standard since 2022, and Australia is one of the last developed countries to implement one. Benefits to consumers should be a priority In the current cost of living crisis, the government should be prioritising options that lead to more wins for consumers. The benefit-to-cost ratio of Option B and C are very similar (4% difference), but the net benefits of Option C are far greater (18% difference). Penalties should match the rest of the world The penalty price of Option C is more comparable to the European Union and will force manufacturers to comply and prioritise the Australian market. As the Government found, there is no evidence this will increase vehicle prices. Credits should expire within two years The shorter expiry of credits in Option C means that overperforming manufacturers (such as electric vehicle-only manufacturers like Tesla and BYD) have a shorter time to sell their credits to other companies, making a slightly fairer playing field. No dodgy loopholes for mainstream technology As in both Options B and C, excluding technology credits creates more transparency and simplicity in the scheme, and increases positive results for Australian consumers and carbon emissions. Multiplier credits in particular should be ruled out entirely. SUVs should be classified as passenger vehicles As in both Options B and C, including SUVs and in the "Passenger Vehicle" category is smart and makes the Australian NVES stronger, especially given the consumer preference for larger vehicles. The Light Commercial Vehicle category should exist for genuine utility and commercial vehicles, not for bigger cars by default.	
1375900	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375901	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reducing emissions as quickly as possible; reduce the number of unnecessarily large vehicles which are a waste of resources. Do not allow for loopholes	No
1375908	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Best value for environment and economy. Australia should have strong standards, ideally the best in the world. The intent of the new laws should not be open to reinterpretation. If we had always had electric cars there would be incredible opposition from the public to allow diesel and petrol cars to pollute our cities. The intent of the law should be that passenger vehicles are any transporter used mainly for private journeys. Otherwise manufacturers will make SUVs that count as Utes and defeat the intention of the legislation.	Yes
1375911	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should make Australia's Standard the strongest in the world The strong headline target and fleet limit curve rules of Option C will help us both catch up and stay at the front of the global queue for efficient vehicles, making the Australian market extremely attractive for low and zero-emissions vehicles; save Australian consumers the most money in the long term; and reduce carbon emissions in the fastest way. Although the headline targets of Option B are good, they would only have us catch up to the US, and stay behind most other car markets (including right-hand drive markets like the United Kingdom and New Zealand). Sufficient notice has been given to manufacturers Both Options B and C allow manufacturers two years before strong limits are set, which is more than enough time to adjust their supply. The Government has been clear about its intention for a New Vehicle Efficiency Standard since 2022, and Australia is one of the last developed countries to implement one. Benefits to consumers should be a priority In the current cost of living crisis, the government should be prioritising options that lead to more wins for consumers. The benefit-to-cost ratio of Option B and C are very similar (4% difference), but the net benefits of Option C are far greater (18% difference). Penalties should match the rest of the world The penalty price of Option C is more comparable to the European Union and will force manufacturers to comply and prioritise the Australian market. As the Government found, there is no evidence this will increase vehicle prices. Credits should expire within two years The shorter expiry of credits in Option C means that overperforming manufacturers (such as electric vehicle-only manufacturers like Tesla and BYD) have a shorter time to sell their credits to other companies, making a slightly fairer playing field. No dodgy loopholes for mainstream technology As in both Options B and C, excluding technology credits creates more transparency and simplicity in the scheme, and increases positive results for Australian consumers and carbon emissions. Multiplier credits in particular should be ruled out entirely. SUVs should be classified as passenger vehicles As in both Options B and C, including SUVs and in the "Passenger Vehicle" category is smart and makes the Australian NVES stronger, especially given the consumer preference for larger vehicles. The Light Commercial Vehicle category should exist for genuine utility and commercial vehicles, not for bigger cars by default.	Yes
1375914	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate action	No
1375917	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes



1375920	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Hold concern for trajectory we as a planet are on, and embarrassed that we are lagging behind the rest of the world. We are late to the party and we need real change.	No
1375921	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1375923	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As a retired grandfather I am very concerned about the climate emergency and how it will impact my children and grandchildren. Option C is my preference because it does the most to help Australia meet its national and international obligations to reduce carbon emissions. We have reached a tipping point where if we don't act now it could be too late and the ocean currents will change our lives and the lives of our children and grandchildren for ever. I therefore urge you from my heart to adopt option C. to adopt option C	No
1375924	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C will provide the most benefits to Climate, Users, Cities, etc.	No
1375937	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375942	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	Need an option between A and B. Pushing too hard likely to lead to a conservative backlash.	Yes
1375955	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should make Australia's Standard the strongest in the world The strong headline target and fleet limit curve rules of Option C will help us both catch up and stay at the front of the global queue for efficient vehicles, making the Australian market extremely attractive for low and zero-emissions vehicles; save Australian consumers the most money in the long term; and reduce carbon emissions in the fastest way. Although the headline targets of Option B are good, they would only have us catch up to the US, and stay behind most other car markets (including right-hand drive markets like the United Kingdom and New Zealand). Sufficient notice has been given to manufacturers Both Options B and C allow manufacturers two years before strong limits are set, which is more than enough time to adjust their supply. The Government has been clear about its intention for a New Vehicle Efficiency Standard since 2022, and Australia is one of the last developed countries to implement one. Benefits to consumers should be a priority In the current cost of living crisis, the government should be prioritising options that lead to more wins for consumers. The benefit-to-cost ratio of Option B and C are very similar (4% difference), but the net benefits of Option C are far greater (18% difference). Penalties should match the rest of the world The penalty price of Option C is more comparable to the European Union and will force manufacturers to comply and prioritise the Australian market. As the Government found, there is no evidence this will increase vehicle prices. Credits should expire within two years The shorter expiry of credits in Option C means that overperforming manufacturers (such as electric vehicle-only manufacturers like Tesla and BYD) have a shorter time to sell their credits to other companies, making a slightly fairer playing field. No dodgy loopholes for mainstream technology As in both Options B and C, excluding technology credits creates more transparency and simplicity in the scheme, and increases positive results for Australian consumers and carbon emissions. Multiplier credits in particular should be ruled out entirely. SUVs should be classified as passenger vehicles As in both Options B and C, including SUVs and in the "Passenger Vehicle" category is smart and makes the Australian NVES stronger, especially given the consumer preference for larger vehicles. The Light Commercial Vehicle category should exist for genuine utility and commercial vehicles, not for bigger cars by default.	Yes
1375966	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375967	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Lack of EV alternatives for SUV an Utes. Especially in relation to towing capacity for RV	No
1375968	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should make Australia's Standard the strongest in the world. The strong headline target and fleet limit curve rules of Option C will help us both catch up and stay at the front of the global queue for efficient vehicles, making the Australian market extremely attractive for low and zero-emissions vehicles; save Australian consumers the most money in the long term; and reduce carbon emissions in the fastest way. Although the headline targets of Option B are good, they would only have us catch up to the US, and stay behind most other car markets (including right-hand drive markets like the United Kingdom and New Zealand). Sufficient notice has been given to manufacturers. Both Options B and C allow manufacturers two years before strong limits are set, which is more than enough time to adjust their supply. The Government has been clear about its intention for a New Vehicle Efficiency Standard since 2022, and Australia is one of the last developed countries to implement one. Benefits to consumers should be a priority. In the current cost of living crisis, the government should be prioritising options that lead to more wins for	Yes

			consumers. The benefit-to-cost ratio of Option B and C are very similar (4% difference), but the net benefits of Option C are far greater (18% difference). Penalties should match the rest of the world. The penalty price of Option C is more comparable to the European Union and will force manufacturers to comply and prioritise the Australian market. As the Government found, there is no evidence this will increase vehicle prices. Credits should expire within two years. The shorter expiry of credits in Option C means that overperforming manufacturers (such as electric vehicle-only manufacturers like Tesla and BYD) have a shorter time to sell their credits to other companies, making a slightly fairer playing field. No dodgy loopholes for mainstream technology. As in both Options B and C, excluding technology credits creates more transparency and simplicity in the scheme, and increases positive results for Australian consumers and carbon emissions. Multiplier credits in particular should be ruled out entirely. SUVs should be classified as passenger vehicles. As in both Options B and C, including SUVs and in the "Passenger Vehicle" category is smart and makes the Australian NVES stronger, especially given the consumer preference for larger vehicles. The Light Commercial Vehicle category should exist for genuine utility and commercial vehicles, not for bigger cars by default.	
1375974	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C helps us to leapfrog ahead, and be a leader instead of a follower or worse. Do something good for the environment!	No
1375979	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	More costs are worth it for a faster result. The government needs to not be cowardly and get things done as soon as possible.	NULL
1375981	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	Yes
1375986	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need change yesterday. Just do it.	No
1375990	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Australia needs to do something urgently over the excessive use of carbon based fuels exacerbated by its lack of fuel standards	Yes
1375995	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	A real world option not a cult option	No
1375997	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C provides the greater benefit to the consumer, the government and compliance. Electricity costs will be mitigated by increased use of renewable energy.	No
1376010	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fastest way to least emissions	Yes
1376011	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We don't have time to waste on half measures. The cost of moving faster now will be more than compensated for over the long run if we manage to avert greater increases in global temperatures. Faster moves also serve as demonstrations, encouraging other nations to move faster as well.	NULL
1376018	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is no excuse to continue to be the dump for old style ICE transport. We are idiots to pretend we have no alternative. I watch occasional ads and I am amazed by the number of car ads - nearly all focussing on speed, cross country (really?) and style. We are laggards on this. No point in taking the middle ground. Get some courage despite the inevitable mis/dis information via socials and noalition friends. Go hard, go early - even if it is 10 years too late	No
1376021	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	A fast transition would be of great detriment to lots of individuals and businesses	Yes
1376026	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Better air quality to help save the planet	No
1376027	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has to set itself up as a leader in terms of efficiency standards for vehicles.	Yes

1376032	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	The UK and Europe made a MASSIVE MISTAKE by prioritising greenhouse gas emissions targets without consideration of the far more dangerous NOx emissions. Greenhouse gases warm the planet. NOx kills people. From the Wikipedia article on European emission standards: \,Diesels have more stringent CO standards but are allowed higher NOx emissions.\, The UK in particular saw a huge spike in respiratory related deaths/illnesses when their policies lead to a big increase in diesel vehicle purchases. And remember, as 'Dieselgate' showed, many vehicles that purport to meet required standards (which is bad enough) are actually far worse emitters of NOx. In Volkswagen's case \,the vehicles emitted up to 40 times more NOx in real-world driving\, (Wikipedia). From the links you've provided I've seen no clear indication that NOx emissions have been taken into consideration. Therefore I cannot support any policy that does not prioritise our health. In Australia we are already seeing the proliferation of diesel vehicles such as the Ford Ranger (currently the number one selling vehicle). You're right that we're lagging behind the rest of the world but PLEASE don't make the SAME STUPID MISTAKE other countries have. Irregardless of Euro 6 compliance, diesel will always be bad in high numbers. So any policy that seeks to reduce greenhouse gas emissions must also disincentivise the purchase of diesel passenger and light commercial vehicles.	No
1376045	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should make Australia's Standard the strongest in the world The strong headline target and fleet limit curve rules of Option C will help us both catch up and stay at the front of the global queue for efficient vehicles, making the Australian market extremely attractive for low and zero-emissions vehicles; save Australian consumers the most money in the long term; and reduce carbon emissions in the fastest way. Although the headline targets of Option B are good, they would only have us catch up to the US, and stay behind most other car markets (including right-hand drive markets like the United Kingdom and New Zealand). Sufficient notice has been given to manufacturers Both Options B and C allow manufacturers two years before strong limits are set, which is more than enough time to adjust their supply. The Government has been clear about its intention for a New Vehicle Efficiency Standard since 2022, and Australia is one of the last developed countries to implement one. Benefits to consumers should be a priority In the current cost of living crisis, the government should be prioritising options that lead to more wins for consumers. The benefit-to-cost ratio of Option B and C are very similar (4% difference), but the net benefits of Option C are far greater (18% difference). Penalties should match the rest of the world The penalty price of Option C is more comparable to the European Union and will force manufacturers to comply and prioritise the Australian market. As the Government found, there is no evidence this will increase vehicle prices. Credits should expire within two years The shorter expiry of credits in Option C means that overperforming manufacturers (such as electric vehicle-only manufacturers like Tesla and BYD) have a shorter time to sell their credits to other companies, making a slightly fairer playing field. No dodgy loopholes for mainstream technology As in both Options B and C, excluding technology credits creates more transparency and simplicity in the scheme, and increases positive results for Australian consumers and carbon emissions. Multiplier credits in particular should be ruled out entirely. SUVs should be classified as passenger vehicles As in both Options B and C, including SUVs and in the "Passenger Vehicle" category is smart and makes the Australian NVES stronger, especially given the consumer preference for larger vehicles. The Light Commercial Vehicle category should exist for genuine utility and commercial vehicles, not for bigger cars by default.	Yes
1376047	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Need to drop CO2 emmissions as fast as possible - transport is the fastest and cheapest way to do this	Yes
1376050	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should make Australia's Standard the strongest in the world The strong headline target and fleet limit curve rules of Option C will help us both catch up and stay at the front of the global queue for efficient vehicles, making the Australian market extremely attractive for low and zero-emissions vehicles; save Australian consumers the most money in the long term; and reduce carbon emissions in the fastest way. Although the headline targets of Option B are good, they would only have us catch up to the US, and stay behind most other car markets (including right-hand drive markets like the United Kingdom and New Zealand). Sufficient notice has been given to manufacturers Both Options B and C allow manufacturers two years before strong limits are set, which is more than enough time to adjust their supply. The Government has been clear about its intention for a New Vehicle Efficiency Standard since 2022, and Australia is one of the last developed countries to implement one. Benefits to consumers should be a priority In the current cost of living crisis, the government should be prioritising options that lead to more wins for consumers. The benefit-to-cost ratio of Option B and C are very similar (4% difference), but the net benefits of Option C are far greater (18% difference). Penalties should match the rest of the world The penalty price of Option C is more comparable to the European Union and will force manufacturers to comply and prioritise the Australian market. As the Government found, there is no evidence this will increase vehicle prices. Credits should expire within two years The shorter expiry of credits in Option C means that overperforming manufacturers (such as electric vehicle-only manufacturers like Tesla and BYD) have a shorter time to sell their credits to other companies, making a slightly fairer playing field. No dodgy loopholes for mainstream technology As in both Options B and C, excluding technology credits creates more transparency and simplicity in the scheme, and increases positive results for Australian consumers and carbon emissions. Multiplier credits in particular should be ruled out entirely. SUVs should be classified as passenger vehicles As in both Options B and C, including SUVs and in the "Passenger Vehicle" category is smart and makes the Australian NVES stronger, especially given the consumer preference for larger vehicles. The Light Commercial Vehicle category should exist for genuine utility and commercial vehicles, not for bigger cars by default.	NULL

1376052	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change!	Yes
1376056	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1376059	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change, we need to act now.	No
1376061	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to catch up with the rest of the world. It needs to stop being beholden to fossil fuel industry and providing them any subsidies. Support the industries that provide job creation and better economics for Australia, which statistics say is NOT fossil fuels.	Yes
1376064	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act quickly for climate change. We need to push the market. We import all new vehicles. We need to encourage the suppliers and consumers to adopt more fuel efficient vehicles as fast as possible.	Yes
1376066	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cost/benefit analysis is best	Yes
1376067	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	For the sake of our next generation, we must immediately do something to slow the rate of climate change and this is one step amongst others that MUST be put in place.	Yes
1376069	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's embarrassing that we don't have a standard yet. It'll still be embarrassing if we introduce something less than the US has. We may not be able to lead the pack, but should at least align with what the UK and EU have set	No
1376071	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	No more time to waste! Do it for our kids!	No
1376072	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is here, the costs will be (are already) huge. Let's just get cracking on everything we can do to mitigate and adapt.	Yes
1376076	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should make Australia's Standard the strongest in the world. The strong headline target and fleet limit curve rules of Option C will help us both catch up and stay at the front of the global queue for efficient vehicles, making the Australian market extremely attractive for low and zero-emissions vehicles; save Australian consumers the most money in the long term; and reduce carbon emissions in the fastest way. Although the headline targets of Option B are good, they would only have us catch up to the US, and stay behind most other car markets (including right-hand drive markets like the United Kingdom and New Zealand). Sufficient notice has been given to manufacturers. Both Options B and C allow manufacturers two years before strong limits are set, which is more than enough time to adjust their supply. The Government has been clear about its intention for a New Vehicle Efficiency Standard since 2022, and Australia is one of the last developed countries to implement one. Benefits to consumers should be a priority. In the current cost of living crisis, the government should be prioritising options that lead to more wins for consumers. The benefit-to-cost ratio of Option B and C are very similar (4% difference), but the net benefits of Option C are far greater (18% difference). Penalties should match the rest of the world. The penalty price of Option C is more comparable to the European Union and will force manufacturers to comply and prioritise the Australian market. As the Government found, there is no evidence this will increase vehicle prices. Credits should expire within two years. The shorter expiry of credits in Option C means that overperforming manufacturers (such as electric vehicle-only manufacturers like Tesla and BYD) have a shorter time to sell their credits to other companies, making a slightly fairer playing field. No dodgy loopholes for mainstream technology. As in both Options B and C, excluding technology credits creates more transparency and simplicity in the scheme, and increases positive results for Australian consumers and carbon emissions. Multiplier credits in particular should be ruled out entirely. SUVs should be classified as passenger vehicles. As in both Options B and C, including SUVs and in the "Passenger Vehicle" category is smart and makes the Australian NVES stronger, especially given the consumer preference for larger vehicles. The Light Commercial Vehicle category should exist for genuine utility and commercial vehicles, not for bigger cars by default.	Yes
1376077	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No

1376078	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I have solar / batteries and are about to take to a EV We are totally self dependant in our all electric home so why oh why can't others get on board instead of pandering to the fossil fuel push against renewables It's not rocket science and their are a lot of empty ugly factories that mainly use power during daylight hours going to waste	No
1376079	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is upon us, we need to act decisively and fast - in Australia we rely too much on individual transport, too many cars with only one person transported. Any incentive (which this fast Option is) to stop people using Individual cars is welcome.	No
1376087	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 0th	We need to move faster towards lower emissions and vehicle standards as we are clearly behind other modern economies. We should now then go harder, with ambitious and meaningful change to improve. Australia should see this as an investment and ultimately the longer we wait the harder and probably more reluctant people will be to adjust and recalibrate.	Yes
1376089	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Four children and nine grandchildren	No
1376090	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	I do not support this at all. The environmental cost of PRODUCING and MAINTAINING these vehicles (including the manufacture and disposal of batteries and components) should be included as well as the emissions. These changes will only serve to line the pockets of corporations and politicians, and will leave businesses and middle income people struggling and paying for the costs when they are already suffering under this government.	No
1376095	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	these options have the best health and environment benefits. Higher costs should be bourne by the companies like Toyota that have continually tried to delay change in Australia to boost their profits, whilst at the same time selling cleaner cars elsewhere in thexworld	No
1376098	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Our fuel efficiency standards are well behind the rest of the world to our detriment. We need to reach the best standards in an efficient way.	Yes
1376108	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is by far the biggest threat facing the human race. It is vital that we transition away from fossil fuels as rapidly as possible.	No
1376112	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	See attachment. Surely saving our planet's liveable environment is enough of a reason	No
1376120	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Best for the future.	No
1376144	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	I don't support them at all. The cost is too high for the average person. I live in a fairly isolated area, very little public transport, an electric vehicle is to expensive and not feasible on the distance we need to travel even for simple things like a dentist or medical appointment. Having to stop to recharge a vehicle would add so much extra travel time to the journey. What about all the tradies that need their utes, people with caravans need bigger vehicles, why should they be discriminated against. Stopping immigration would make a big difference to the amount of vehicles on the road. Improve the public transport system to make it viable. Bring in nuclear power to reduce the cost of electricity. Australia is a vast country, not everyone lives in the city. Come and drive in the outback or isolated areas on dirt roads dodging kangaroos and emu's in a small vehicle, see how safe you feel.	No
1376146	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Bring our emissions.to world best practice asap	Yes
1376153	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should make Australia's Standard the strongest in the world The strong headline target and fleet limit curve rules of Option C will help us both catch up and stay at the front of the global queue for efficient vehicles, making the Australian market extremely attractive for low and zero-emissions vehicles; save Australian consumers the most money in the long term; and reduce carbon emissions in the fastest way. Although the headline targets of Option B are good, they would only have us catch up to the US, and stay behind most other car markets (including right-hand drive markets like the United Kingdom and New Zealand). Sufficient notice has been given to manufacturers Both Options B and C allow manufacturers two years before strong limits are set, which is more than enough time to adjust their supply. The Government has been clear about its intention for a New Vehicle Efficiency Standard since 2022, and Australia is one of the last developed countries to implement one. Benefits to consumers should be a priority In the current cost of living crisis, the government should be prioritising options that lead to more wins for consumers. The benefit-to-cost ratio of Option B and C are very similar (4% difference), but the net benefits of Option C are far greater (18%	Yes

			<p>difference). Penalties should match the rest of the world The penalty price of Option C is more comparable to the European Union and will force manufacturers to comply and prioritise the Australian market. As the Government found, there is no evidence this will increase vehicle prices. Credits should expire within two years The shorter expiry of credits in Option C means that overperforming manufacturers (such as electric vehicle-only manufacturers like Tesla and BYD) have a shorter time to sell their credits to other companies, making a slightly fairer playing field. No dodgy loopholes for mainstream technology As in both Options B and C, excluding technology credits creates more transparency and simplicity in the scheme, and increases positive results for Australian consumers and carbon emissions. Multiplier credits in particular should be ruled out entirely. SUVs should be classified as passenger vehicles As in both Options B and C, including SUVs and in the "Passenger Vehicle" category is smart and makes the Australian NVES stronger, especially given the consumer preference for larger vehicles. The Light Commercial Vehicle category should exist for genuine utility and commercial vehicles, not for bigger cars by default.</p>	
1376177	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This has taken too long, so needs to be introduced as soon as possible.	No
1376179	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to urgently prioritise emission reduction for health of humans and planet.	Yes
1376181	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1376185	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	In addition to electric cars, retrofitting techniques have historically been developed that enabled ultra-high vehicle fuel efficiency. See <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nWOUzfwg-ag&amp;t=444s">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nWOUzfwg-ag&amp;t=444s</a> from 7.00 onward. As a result of these advances either being neglected or suppressed, such high mileage cars have not been sold in the vehicle marketplace. The world record for vehicle fuel efficiency stands at 31,000mpg.	No
1376191	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to catchup to other developed countries and stop being a duping ground for inefficient vehicles. The move will also drive more EV choices which has been lagging comparative nations..	Yes
1376192	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must do everything possible to halt the worst effects of climate change so Option C is the only choice for me	No
1376201	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Want cleaner air to breathe.	No
1376203	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1376205	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	<p>We should make Australia's Standard the strongest in the world The strong headline target and fleet limit curve rules of Option C will help us both catch up and stay at the front of the global queue for efficient vehicles, making the Australian market extremely attractive for low and zero-emissions vehicles; save Australian consumers the most money in the long term; and reduce carbon emissions in the fastest way. Although the headline targets of Option B are good, they would only have us catch up to the US, and stay behind most other car markets (including right-hand drive markets like the United Kingdom and New Zealand). Sufficient notice has been given to manufacturers Both Options B and C allow manufacturers two years before strong limits are set, which is more than enough time to adjust their supply. The Government has been clear about its intention for a New Vehicle Efficiency Standard since 2022, and Australia is one of the last developed countries to implement one. Benefits to consumers should be a priority In the current cost of living crisis, the government should be prioritising options that lead to more wins for consumers. The benefit-to-cost ratio of Option B and C are very similar (4% difference), but the net benefits of Option C are far greater (18% difference). Penalties should match the rest of the world The penalty price of Option C is more comparable to the European Union and will force manufacturers to comply and prioritise the Australian market. As the Government found, there is no evidence this will increase vehicle prices. Credits should expire within two years The shorter expiry of credits in Option C means that overperforming manufacturers (such as electric vehicle-only manufacturers like Tesla and BYD) have a shorter time to sell their credits to other companies, making a slightly fairer playing field. No dodgy loopholes for mainstream technology As in both Options B and C, excluding technology credits creates more transparency and simplicity in the scheme, and increases positive results for Australian consumers and carbon emissions. Multiplier credits in particular should be ruled out entirely. SUVs should be classified as passenger vehicles As in both Options B and C, including SUVs and in the "Passenger Vehicle" category is smart and makes the Australian NVES stronger, especially given the consumer preference for larger vehicles. The Light Commercial Vehicle category should exist for genuine utility and commercial vehicles, not for bigger cars by default.</p>	Yes

1376214	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1376215	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C chosen as first choice as it provides the best pathway to maximum CO2 emission reductions.	No
1376233	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is a climate emergency and we need to treat all things feeding into with an emergency style response	No
1376234	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should make Australia's Standard the strongest in the world The strong headline target and fleet limit curve rules of Option C will help us both catch up and stay at the front of the global queue for efficient vehicles, making the Australian market extremely attractive for low and zero-emissions vehicles; save Australian consumers the most money in the long term; and reduce carbon emissions in the fastest way. Although the headline targets of Option B are good, they would only have us catch up to the US, and stay behind most other car markets (including right-hand drive markets like the United Kingdom and New Zealand). Sufficient notice has been given to manufacturers Both Options B and C allow manufacturers two years before strong limits are set, which is more than enough time to adjust their supply. The Government has been clear about its intention for a New Vehicle Efficiency Standard since 2022, and Australia is one of the last developed countries to implement one. Benefits to consumers should be a priority In the current cost of living crisis, the government should be prioritising options that lead to more wins for consumers. The benefit-to-cost ratio of Option B and C are very similar (4% difference), but the net benefits of Option C are far greater (18% difference). Penalties should match the rest of the world The penalty price of Option C is more comparable to the European Union and will force manufacturers to comply and prioritise the Australian market. As the Government found, there is no evidence this will increase vehicle prices. Credits should expire within two years The shorter expiry of credits in Option C means that overperforming manufacturers (such as electric vehicle-only manufacturers like Tesla and BYD) have a shorter time to sell their credits to other companies, making a slightly fairer playing field. No dodgy loopholes for mainstream technology As in both Options B and C, excluding technology credits creates more transparency and simplicity in the scheme, and increases positive results for Australian consumers and carbon emissions. Multiplier credits in particular should be ruled out entirely. SUVs should be classified as passenger vehicles As in both Options B and C, including SUVs and in the "Passenger Vehicle" category is smart and makes the Australian NVES stronger, especially given the consumer preference for larger vehicles. The Light Commercial Vehicle category should exist for genuine utility and commercial vehicles, not for biggercars by default.	Yes
1376235	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is currently the greatest global threat. We must enforce all possible emission reduction policies immediately. Though option C may cost more money in the short term, it will help us avoid more expensive \band-aid\ fixes for the symptoms of climate change.	No
1376237	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1376238	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is ESSENTIAL that we rapidly transition away from highly polluting internal combustion cars and the standards also offer an opportunity to put downward pressure on car sizes and weights. As far as I could read the health benefits BCR does not include increased casualty rates associated with larger and heavier vehicles, where there are stark increases comparing passenger and small SUVs with large SUVs and large utes. Option C - ideally with a high weight threshold - may place downward pressure on availability of these vehicles which are both the worst for emissions, as well as worst for public health, road safety for other drivers, cyclists, pedestrians, and strain our valuable urban public spaces by taking up more room. The flow on benefits of option C are critical to a liveable Australian future.	Yes
1376239	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Faster way to reach emissions targets	Yes
1376240	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate emergency and need to act fast. Option C also is very similar to the overall cost benefit to that of Option B	Yes
1376243	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Urgency - the need to act NOW to reduce emissions & speed up the transition to renewables generally & EVs in particular.	No
1376245	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	We need to be mindful if costs to the community	No

1376246	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is so far behind the curve that it is crucial that it catches up.	Yes
1376250	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is too far behind with global emissions standards & laws, & something has to change.	No
1376252	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	To ensure greater acceptance with minimal resistance, benefits gained must come at a lower cost. Loopholes should be closed to prevent the unnecessary increase in Utes for non commercial use.	Yes
1376253	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	The benefits outweigh the costs.	Yes
1376254	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1376255	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	7 years ago we bought a 2nd-hand Nissan Leaf. We planned this year to replace the battery and use the old one for powering our house. That's almost impossible because our government has been so slow in supporting EV infrastructure. We're way behind the rest of the world and, as a result, are importing cars that pollute our air instead of clean EVs. We need to catch up fast! C is the best option, but B is better than what we have.	Yes
1376257	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I don't believe there should be loopholes for "commercial vehicles" ie utes which make a big portion of car sales in Australia	Yes
1376259	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1376261	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1376262	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's obvious to me that global warming is a real and growing problem. Australia appears to be well behind the rest of the world in contributing to the correction of the problem in many areas. Not that we don't have innovative technology developments in many areas but primarily as a result of self-interested, short-sighted, greedy people who seem to care little about the future they leave behind for their children. Lack of political bravery has resulted in Australia being left in 2nd last place in the world to introduce a NEVS. It's just plain common sense that doing so is necessary. The loopholes in legislation that allow big city car owners to buy tax payer subsidised large gas guzzling utes and 4WDs that spend 99% of their time unloaded, picking up kids and shopping is ridiculous. I'm reminded of this daily driving behind them on our city streets and taking in the fumes of the older ones. Sure they're necessary for people living in regional areas and they should be supported where justified, but the fact that taxpayers subsidise city based individuals owning them is reprehensible. If people want to have big cars and utes, let them pay a premium for the right to use them, not give them tax breaks and subsidies. The USA is hardly a global beacon in environmental leadership, we should be aligning our emissions standards to the global leaders rather than USA laggards. Go on, be brave, do the right thing!	No
1376264	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1376265	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must reduce vehicle emissions as quickly as possible. Option C will get us there the quickest, with only a slightly lower benefits to cost ratio than option B. We've been an outlier regarding vehicle emissions, we should be aiming to achieve similar results to NZ, the UK & Europe, not the big car loving US. But even option C needs more work, to remove loopholes. Currently there no requirement for light commercial vehicles (which can be heavier & more polluting) to only be used by businesses. So a mum can own a polluting ute for the primary purpose of picking up the kids from school. Any bias regarding weight should be removed, as we want the general population to be driving smaller vehicles, not larger, heavier vehicles.	No
1376267	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is lagging behind when we should be leading the world in clean and efficient transport	Yes



1376270	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	It's a good balance for cost and infrastructure to be achievable	Yes
1376272	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Burn less fuel, makes healthier bodies. Respiratory health is fundamental to life & improves cardiovascular health markers. Will decrease the nation's spend on health, create budget for other important infrastructure. The flow-on effect for LESS POLLUTION in our communities has far greater benefit than is being spruiked. Stop talking about emissions and start calling it POLLUTION. Fossil fuel industry has a vested industry to oppose the transition (subsidies from tax, strong lobby groups).	Yes
1376276	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should make Australia's Standard the strongest in the world	Yes
1376278	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1376280	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fast action is required. We are already behind most other countries.	NULL
1376282	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1376287	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is real and due to human activity	Yes
1376294	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Quicker transfer to cleaner fuel practice.	No
1376298	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	City streets and footpaths get covered in diesel soot too fast today. Apartment building carparks accumulate this soot at a cost to residents. We should rapidly incentivise moving away from inefficient large vehicles for passenger transport, ideally towards EV's.	No
1376300	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C has the greatest benefits for emissions and health. After two decades of climate wars, we need to catch up	Yes
1376304	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The need for strong action to alleviate climate change is critical. Feet have been dragged for too long already and without the strongest possible regulations, feet will drag for even longer. Those most impacted will be those who have ignored the problem for longest and benefitted most from climate destruction!	No
1376305	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Save our planet.	No
1376309	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Being a Millennial/Gen Z, climate change and the cost-of-living crisis is severely impacting our lives. To reach global net zero by 2050, the International Energy Agency "advocates for 100 per cent of new cars to be zero emissions by 2035 at the latest" to reach the global net zero by 2050 goals in the following years. Option A is not acceptable. Option C is my preference to save costs and reduce emissions as much as possible. If you would like to discuss further, I would be happy to discuss with you in person on the topic.	Yes
1376316	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I am a young Australian passionate about tackling the climate crisis, as I have been deeply impacted by the cost of living crisis that comes with it. To me, option C is the clearest choice because it brings climate action the quickest. Option A is unacceptable to me.	Yes
1376317	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The difference between C and B in cost benefit ratio are too small to be worth waiting for the benefits. There will be opportunity costs paid with time if we take too long to act.	NULL
1376323	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	It is outrageous, not to mention embarrassing, that we are having to accept dirty, 2nd-rate vehicles	Yes

1376332	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is assessed above to have the highest benefit. The increased cost of Option C relative to Option B is mostly increased electricity costs. If Australia actively and aggressively pursued a transition to electrification as envisaged in the Draft 2024 Integrated System Plan Green Energy Exports of 600GW electricity generation capacity by 2050 electricity would be cheaper as well. And Australia would be a richer country. I support Option C. In my opinion emulating America's massive Toorak Tractor electric trucks should not be Australia's target objective. Option C is fast start. Wayne Swan and Greg Combet both said go hard and go early and this is the same.	NULL
1376339	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to not only reduce our transport emissions as quickly as possible, but also reduce Australia's dependence on imported oil, in order to increase our resilience to international supply problems which are likely to develop in the coming decades.	NULL
1376341	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1376347	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1376350	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I would like my great nephews and nieces, not be worried about the environment	No
1376351	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to stick to the science and decarbonise as quickly as possible	Yes
1376361	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act quickly and the benefits to the individual and the community as a whole are positive all while reducing the risks associated with runaway climate change. Of course the benefits are there for all living things and may help preserve biodiversity which all rely upon.	Yes
1376363	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should make Australia's Standard the strongest in the world The strong headline target and fleet limit curve rules of Option C will help us both catch up and stay at the front of the global queue for efficient vehicles, making the Australian market extremely attractive for low and zero-emissions vehicles; save Australian consumers the most money in the long term; and reduce carbon emissions in the fastest way. Although the headline targets of Option B are good, they would only have us catch up to the US, and stay behind most other car markets (including right-hand drive markets like the United Kingdom and New Zealand). Sufficient notice has been given to manufacturers Both Options B and C allow manufacturers two years before strong limits are set, which is more than enough time to adjust their supply. The Government has been clear about its intention for a New Vehicle Efficiency Standard since 2022, and Australia is one of the last developed countries to implement one. Benefits to consumers should be a priority In the current cost of living crisis, the government should be prioritising options that lead to more wins for consumers. The benefit-to-cost ratio of Option B and C are very similar (4% difference), but the net benefits of Option C are far greater (18% difference). Penalties should match the rest of the world The penalty price of Option C is more comparable to the European Union and will force manufacturers to comply and prioritise the Australian market. As the Government found, there is no evidence this will increase vehicle prices. Credits should expire within two years The shorter expiry of credits in Option C means that overperforming manufacturers (such as electric vehicle-only manufacturers like Tesla and BYD) have a shorter time to sell their credits to other companies, making a slightly fairer playing field. No dodgy loopholes for mainstream technology As in both Options B and C, excluding technology credits creates more transparency and simplicity in the scheme, and increases positive results for Australian consumers and carbon emissions. Multiplier credits in particular should be ruled out entirely. SUVs should be classified as passenger vehicles As in both Options B and C, including SUVs and in the "Passenger Vehicle" category is smart and makes the Australian NVES stronger, especially given the consumer preference for larger vehicles. The Light Commercial Vehicle category should exist for	Yes
1376367	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1376369	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should make Australia's Standard the strongest in the world The strong headline target and fleet limit curve rules of Option C will help us both catch up and stay at the front of the global queue for efficient vehicles, making the Australian market extremely attractive for low and zero-emissions vehicles; save Australian consumers the most money in the long term; and reduce carbon emissions in the fastest way. Although the headline targets of Option B are good, they would only have us catch up to the US, and stay behind most other car markets (including right-hand drive markets like the United Kingdom and New Zealand). Sufficient notice has been given to manufacturers Both Options B and C allow manufacturers two years before strong limits are set, which is more than enough time to adjust their supply. The Government has been clear about its intention for a New Vehicle Efficiency Standard since 2022, and Australia is one of the last developed countries to implement one. Benefits to	Yes

			consumers should be a priority In the current cost of living crisis, the government should be prioritising options that lead to more wins for consumers. The benefit-to-cost ratio of Option B and C are very similar (4% difference), but the net benefits of Option C are far greater (18% difference). Penalties should match the rest of the world The penalty price of Option C is more comparable to the European Union	
1376371	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1376372	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1376375	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1376378	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	If we are going to make a change, we need to be more aggressive. Climate change effects have already run off the tracks, and the next climate crisis I see will be large swathes of climate refugees, and communities disabled due to climate effects like heatwaves. It's so hard to get reform in this area done, so if we are going to do it, we might as well go for gold. Option A is unacceptably prone to green washing. Lets be more ambitious here	NULL
1376382	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	This is all based on false economies. How can you actually put a \$ value on all of this when it is based on carbon credits which are as made up as crypto currency. You need to work out true figures on CO2 reduction when everything is factored in, such as mining, disposal of vehicles at end of life, disposal of vehicles when damaged and not cost effective to repair, cost of repairs of vehicles factoring when different manufacturers that have limited coverage. You also need to show the true running costs of all vehicles and if any more damage is done to roads due to the weight of Battery Vehicles. As BV's use more tyres, where is this priced into your made up figures. We also need to start calling them what they are. They are battery vehicles. Same way we call all cordless tools battery tools, not electric tools.	No
1376383	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Faster we drop dirty and inefficient cars using fossil fuels the better.	Yes
1376391	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Delivering a strong and effective fuel efficiency standard for Australia's light vehicle fleet is essential to drive down carbon pollution and cut the cost of living for Australians. The New Vehicle Efficiency Standard (NVES) should reflect that there is a dire need to meet our Net Zero targets as soon as possible. I believe that a mixture of Option B and Option C is the best choice for Australia to ensure we reduce CO2 emissions, preferably with the Option C target provided by the government's impact analysis of 74 million tonnes by 2050. This will support the government to meet its Net Zero targets and allow space for other industries that face stronger challenges for transitioning to reduce their emissions. I also believe the NVES should prioritise a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles by 2035 at the latest. I believe that cutting vehicle emissions is imperative to delivering cleaner air for better health, boosting national energy security, and improving access to greener cars for Australians as soon as possible, while supporting us to slow global warming and protect Australia. I strongly support the key common features in options B and C as minimum starting points for unlocking better access to low and zero emissions vehicles as soon as possible. Primarily, I support and believe the following features be included in the NEVS: SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles. Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles. The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial. The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out. Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time. The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	Yes
1376392	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I support option C or even stronger measures. Option C has much larger benefit than B, with a benefit:cost ratio that is probably indistinguishable from B given the uncertainties involved in these estimates. Australian vehicle efficiency standards are decades overdue and are a no-brainer for both economic and environmental reasons. The inevitable objections from the car industry are not credible - efficiency measures have been in place in almost every other advanced economy for many decades and the car industries in those countries remain profitable.	Yes
1376395	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Higher vehicle efficiency standards will realise economic benefits sooner and prevent Australia becoming a dumping ground for more polluting vehicles.	Yes

1376399	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1376406	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1376410	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Not enough working infrastructure at present	No
1376416	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Electrical infrastructure does not support e vehicles for foreseeable future esp while still depending on fossil fuel for generation of power. Battery Storage is insufficient for overnight demand (esp including vehicle charging) without fossil fuel generation. The energy density of hydrocarbon fuels far exceeds that of electric storage technologies available. Proposals do not consider low /no emission hydrocarbon fuels eg hydrogen or other fuel cell tech using existing hydrocarbon fuels. There needs to be a more gradual progression to electric vehicles to allow for technologies to mature, market forces to remain in play, to prevent price gouging based on regulatory necessities and to reduce exposure to international competitive threats, both commercial and military.	No
1376423	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We're already too far behind the rest of the world, and we need to counter the excesses of other Australian industries.	No
1376424	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The environmental issues and problems of this world need to be dealt with swiftly. They are getting worse and worse and the reluctance of politicians to deal with it, as a pressing matter, is worrying. Which is why I have voted for the fastest option.	No
1376430	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1376432	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We desperately need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions globally, as rapidly as possible, and I see Australia playing a key role in this and showing leadership.	No
1376433	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1376436	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1376437	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1376440	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are on the brink of tipping the ecological system to a point of no return.	No
1376444	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	More acceptable costs	Yes
1376445	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1376448	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need action sooner rather than later.	Yes

1376456	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should make Australia's Standard the strongest in the world. The strong headline target and fleet limit curve rules of Option C will help us both catch up and stay at the front of the global queue for efficient vehicles, making the Australian market extremely attractive for low and zero-emissions vehicles; save Australian consumers the most money in the long term; and reduce carbon emissions in the fastest way. Although the headline targets of Option B are good, they would only have us catch up to the US, and stay behind most other car markets (including right-hand drive markets like the United Kingdom and New Zealand). Sufficient notice has been given to manufacturers. Both Options B and C allow manufacturers two years before strong limits are set, which is more than enough time to adjust their supply. The Government has been clear about its intention for a New Vehicle Efficiency Standard since 2022, and Australia is one of the last developed countries to implement one. Benefits to consumers should be a priority. In the current cost of living crisis, the government should be prioritising options that lead to more wins for consumers. The benefit-to-cost ratio of Option B and C are very similar (4% difference), but the net benefits of Option C are far greater (18% difference). Penalties should match the rest of the world. The penalty price of Option C is more comparable to the European Union and will force manufacturers to comply and prioritise the Australian market. As the Government found, there is no evidence this will increase vehicle prices. Credits should expire within two years. The shorter expiry of credits in Option C means that overperforming manufacturers (such as electric vehicle-only manufacturers like Tesla and BYD) have a shorter time to sell their credits to other companies, making a slightly fairer playing field. No dodgy loopholes for mainstream technology. As in both Options B and C, excluding technology credits creates more transparency and simplicity in the scheme, and increases positive results for Australian consumers and carbon emissions. Multiplier credits in particular should be ruled out entirely. SUVs should be classified as passenger vehicles. As in both Options B and C, including SUVs and in the "Passenger Vehicle" category is smart and makes the Australian NVES stronger, especially given the consumer preference for larger vehicles. The Light Commercial Vehicle category should exist for genuine utility and commercial vehicles, not for bigger cars by default.	Yes
1376459	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option A is barely worth considering. Option B is better but still a compromised solution. Option C is my preferred choice of action because not having a vehicle emissions standard in Australia has meant that we have lagged well behind the rest of the world in reducing CO2 and other emissions from our national vehicle 'fleet'. Option C offers the fastest route to address that while still allowing the existing vehicles on our roads to continue until their owners choose to update to newer more fuel efficient less polluting models or make the change to EV or other zero emission vehicles.	No
1376462	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1376463	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1376466	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	NULL
1376468	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1376472	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must decarbonise now. The time cost of carbon is too expensive. Inaction today will only mean drastic action in the future.	NULL
1376473	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1376480	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1376483	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1376486	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes

1376494	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1376495	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1376499	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The most important thing for us to do is to reduce our carbon emissions - and to do so, as soon as humanly possible. Failure to do that will cost us very much more money in the long-term through dealing with environmental disasters.	No
1376501	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	A stonger NVES will mean that manufacturers are incentivised to bring a wider variety and lower cost EVs to Australia. We don't want Australia to be a dumping ground for inefficient, polluting cars.	Yes
1376503	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	I drive a dedicated LPG vehicle it is already clean and cost efficient, unfortunately it's being phased out	No
1376505	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1376508	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1376514	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want the emissions reduced & for my children to have a cleaner future with better air quality and a world where global warming is no longer an immediate threat to humanity. If we decrease CO2 manufacturing targets, it will result in increased focus on the development of more affordable choice in electric cars.	Yes
1376518	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1376527	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	This needs to be done as soon as possible.	No
1376529	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The savings outweigh the costs. For our planet's future we need to cut emissions as quickly as possible. But I'm happy to go with the government's plan B if they get onto it quickly. Anything is better than the situation we are currently in in Australia	Yes
1376552	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Support government for the most achievable outcome	Yes
1376557	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1376562	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	It is better for the environment and our health	Yes
1376565	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1376567	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The overall cost benefit is better from Option C (173.65b-58.75b). The time to act is now, we have a rapidly dwindling window to make a change to ensure that we reach the goals of the Paris agreement and limit warming to 1.5°C. The savings benefits MUST be put towards the recycling and reusable industries to help process the residual cars that cannot be converted to electric or hydrogen vehicles, in other words, we do not want cars that can no longer be used to end up in land fill.	Yes

1376575	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	TIME HAS RUN OUT	Yes
1376576	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to bring emissions under control asap; Australia needs to commit to net zero.	No
1376606	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1376609	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Instead of taxing, there should be promoting. Promote LPG as a fuel source. It is cheaper (cost of living bennefit) it is cleaner (70% cleaner than diesel) and it is Australian produced (domestic). LPG has been proven to succeed with the right government. It is time to give it another chance, and reinvigorate thousands of jobs in the conversion industry.	No
1376617	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia faces a pivotal decision regarding its New Vehicle Efficiency Standard (NVES). While all options offer improvements, Option C stands out as the most powerful catalyst for a cleaner, more prosperous future. Firstly, Option C champions environmental responsibility. By surpassing EU and US emission targets, we'd lead the fight against climate change and inspire others to follow suit. Secondly, this bold choice ignites economic potential. Lower fossil fuel dependence equals long-term savings for consumers. Additionally, the shift towards cleaner vehicles sparks innovation and job creation in the clean energy sector. Moreover, Option C future-proofs our economy. As the world transitions to low-carbon alternatives, stricter standards will ensure Australian businesses remain competitive. Finally, cleaner cars signify healthier communities. Reduced emissions translate to cleaner air, improved public health, and reduced healthcare costs. While initial costs for car manufacturers might increase, long-term fuel savings and targeted government support can mitigate these concerns. Choosing Option C signifies a bold commitment to a sustainable future. It fosters environmental leadership, economic growth, and public health – a potent combination propelling Australia towards a brighter tomorrow. Let's choose wisely.	No
1376618	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are late to start tackling transport emissions and so we must move as fast as possible.	Yes
1376619	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	A fast transition will save money in climate damage over long term, it's an investment in society not a negative cost	No
1376624	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is my preferred choice because it is the most ambitious. Australia needs to take its climate change responsibilities seriously and to this point, Australia's vehicle efficiency standards have been embarrassingly low, thus continuing in the same vein with an unambitious option like Option A is not at all preferable. Being ambitious now will stand us in better stead for the future. It is better to make a seemingly large correction in our course now, than to opt for Option A and find that to mitigate or miniseris the effects of climate change we need to implement far more drastic and expensive measures. Option B does not go far enough.	NULL
1376628	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reducing CO2 is more important than a simple cost-benefit analysis.	No
1376629	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	For the sake of our contribution to environmental conservation and global human and creature habitat preservation, in addition to the renewable energy research, innovation and industry/production fields, we need to take the fastest and most thorough possible action on this front. We are already many decades late and cannot waste more time and money (future costs) delaying. The cost to our future is prohibitive with options other than Option C	No
1376631	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1376642	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1376645	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes

1376649	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is important to make the transition as soon as feasible. Australia has the opportunity to become a world leader in this sphere. A few dollars' sacrifice per person are worth it for the sake of our children and for our environment, which cannot act on their own behalves.	Yes
1376651	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Any push toward mandating emissions and particular types of vehicles will lead to less access and greater costs to consumers/the general populus. This removes a level of diversity in the consumer market and will force consumers into a position where business can monopolise the price of vehicles assuming less products will be available to the market due to the stringent regulations. Further there are no guarantees in the framework that will protect consumers against vehicle defects or improper targets as seen with new EV's and the risk of batteries, when considering emissions produced and toxicity over the span of the products life cycle. Likewise previous emission scandals with various manufactures with regard to conventional combustion engines. As the market progresses there will be a natural tendency toward emission reduction and it will be a very costly exercise to all parties to mandate this for short term gains.	NULL
1376655	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Since we have no native car industry to disadavantage, we should proceed with very rapid transport decarbonisation	Yes
1376658	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we've wasted enough time. Local air quality, and therefore postive local health impacts is seemingly never factored into the cost of any kind of action.	Yes
1376678	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Immediacy and efficiency need to be balanced, but drastic changes need to be made ASAP to ensure we preserve our environment and get out from the stranglehold of oil companies.	Yes
1376682	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1376683	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is decades behind countries with energy and fuel efficiency standards, and we are already accelerating towards catastrophic climate change due to emissions. There is no more time to waste.	NULL
1376689	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1376694	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The costs we have to pay later will be a lot higher than what we will need to invest right now in the fastest option c.	No
1376696	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should make Australia's Standard the strongest in the world The strong headline target and fleet limit curve rules of Option C will help us both catch up and stay at the front of the global queue for efficient vehicles, making the Australian market extremely attractive for low and zero-emissions vehicles; save Australian consumers the most money in the long term; and reduce carbon emissions in the fastest way. Although the headline targets of Option B are good, they would only have us catch up to the US, and stay behind most other car markets (including right-hand drive markets like the United Kingdom and New Zealand). Sufficient notice has been given to manufacturers Both Options B and C allow manufacturers two years before strong limits are set, which is more than enough time to adjust their supply. The Government has been clear about its intention for a New Vehicle Efficiency Standard since 2022, and Australia is one of the last developed countries to implement one. Benefits to consumers should be a priority In the current cost of living crisis, the government should be prioritising options that lead to more wins for consumers. The benefit-to-cost ratio of Option B and C are very similar (4% difference), but the net benefits of Option C are far greater (18% difference). Penalties should match the rest of the world The penalty price of Option C is more comparable to the European Union and will force manufacturers to comply and prioritise the Australian market. As the Government found, there is no evidence this will increase vehicle prices. Credits should expire within two years The shorter expiry of credits in Option C means that overperforming manufacturers (such as electric vehicle-only manufacturers like Tesla and BYD) have a shorter time to sell their credits to other companies, making a slightly fairer playing field. No dodgy loopholes for mainstream technology As in both Options B and C, excluding technology credits creates more transparency and simplicity in the scheme, and increases positive results for Australian consumers and carbon emissions. Multiplier credits in particular should be ruled out entirely. SUVs should be classified as passenger vehicles As in both Options B and C, including SUVs and in the "Passenger Vehicle" category is smart and makes the Australian NVES stronger, especially given the consumer preference for larger vehicles. The Light Commercial Vehicle category should exist for genuine utility and commercial vehicles, not for bigger cars by default.	Yes



1376698	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Intervening in the market to force people to buy cars made of lithium dug up from slaves all to chase some utopian dream to violate the second law of thermodynamics and achieve the "circular economy" and "net zero" by 2030 is the most patently insane thing ever to have been attempted. So much so that, in the end, it is destined to fail and will only ever achieve mass poverty, famine and complete destabilisation and destruction of society. Like the "Great Leap Forward" this "Green Leap Forward" will just kill people and families in the end. You should stop taking your marching orders from the UN, get outside of the despicable hell hole that is Canberra and actually represent the people who vote you in and pay your wages.	No
1376700	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1376702	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C has a greater cost:benefit ratio. There have been too many negative impacts of climate change already. To take this slowly risks too much. Let's get going!!	NULL
1376703	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1376711	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	With only a minor diffeence in cost benefit ratio, the increased push towards renewables will align us more with progressive jurisdictions like the UK and EU, and help promote Australia's credentials as a world leader on important issues. It will also have greater health and environmental impacts.	NULL
1376712	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Let's take cation and make this a reality	Yes
1376715	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1376720	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	The standards will affect new vehicle reliability, durability and Affordability for people located more so in remote areas that depend on vehicles for traversing harsh terrain and require durable / reliable vehicles long range driving.	No
1376728	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to move as fast as possible on reducing CO2 emissions to reduce the effects of climate change.	No
1376731	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce air pollution from cars.	No
1376737	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australian needs to get serious about MV efficiency and cleaner operating vehicles. To not go hard initially is a mistake. A life truism is the first step is the hardest. And for motor vehicle improvements it is equally correct.	No
1376743	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1376746	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C offers far more potential for long term benefits while still offering strong shorter term gains. This would greatly outweigh the extra costs it has over Option B. Option A is highly ineffectual, lacking in purpose and would promote technological stagnation, which will contribute to economic recession.	Yes
1376747	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C has the greatest net benefit and will mean a faster achievement of long overdue goals	NULL
1376757	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Menos contaminación	No
1376758	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need immediate action NOW before it is too late. Cost should not be an issue.	Yes

1376762	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1376763	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Im trusting the research has been done and im glad these changes are now economically supportable. We need to adapt quicky but too quickly can cause other problems	Yes
1376767	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia should hasten its response to atmospheriC CO2 especially in relation to vehicle emissions. Australians need government to apply vehicle standards appropriate to a cleaner future,and delay will only harm individuals by saddling them with inappropriate vehicles for the future.	No
1376777	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1376779	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1376840	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We're desperately running out of time - we need to go hard and fast on reducing emissions.	Yes
1376854	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	To reduce the amount of pollution from car and to do this reasonably quickly.	Yes
1376959	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I prefer option B because it provides signicant benefits in terms of reducing emmissions and savings on fuel costs while avoiding the higher costs to consumers associated with option C. Option B allows manufacturers two years before strong limits are set. This is more than enough time to adjust their supply. Manufacturers have known these standards were coming and Australia is one of the last developed countries to implement fuel efficiency standards. I support including SUVs in the Passenger Vehicle category. The Light Commercial Vehicle category should exist for genuine utility vehicles, not just bigger cars.	Yes
1376982	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1377008	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Consumers in Australia are a forgotten group. We deserve better than to be the dumping ground for the worlds old technology. We need to protect our environment and our citizen's health.	No
1377021	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	Yes
1377040	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1377073	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Gives time to implement for change.	Yes
1377085	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1377103	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	There are some vehicles like UTEs that will become extremely expensive as the manufacturers/ distributors are likely to pass on the costs of change over/ penalties to us as middle income consumers. UTEs running on ICE would be a vehicle of luxury leading to overall increase in inflation. The cost of living which is presently extremely painful will further burden us as middle income consumers.	No
1377106	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1377117	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Having grown up in the Cook electorate, I have seen the impacts of bushfires which have led friends and coworkers needing to evacuate. I believe that the new efficiency standards forces us to reach net zero faster.	No
1377121	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 0th	The govt's approach of slow and steady is the right option, but I would like to see a ban on the large Ford Ranger and similar models of other vehicle producers. It's not only about excessive fuel consumption but more about safety issue for drivers of smaller vehicles.	Yes
1377127	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need rapid action now.	NULL
1377158	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should make Australia's Standard the strongest in the world The strong headline target and fleet limit curve rules of Option C will help us both catch up and stay at the front of the global queue for efficient vehicles, making the Australian market extremely attractive for low and zero-emissions vehicles; save Australian consumers the most money in the long term; and reduce carbon emissions in the fastest way. Although the headline targets of Option B are good, they would only have us catch up to the US, and stay behind most other car markets (including right-hand drive markets like the United Kingdom and New Zealand). Sufficient notice has been given to manufacturers Both Options B and C allow manufacturers two years before strong limits are set, which is more than enough time to adjust their supply. The Government has been clear about its intention for a New Vehicle Efficiency Standard since 2022, and Australia is one of the last developed countries to implement one. Benefits to consumers should be a priority In the current cost of living crisis, the government should be prioritising options that lead to more wins for consumers. The benefit-to-cost ratio of Option B and C are very similar (4% difference), but the net benefits of Option C are far greater (18% difference). Penalties should match the rest of the world The penalty price of Option C is more comparable to the European Union and will force manufacturers to comply and prioritise the Australian market. As the Government found, there is no evidence this will increase vehicle prices. Credits should expire within two years The shorter expiry of credits in Option C means that overperforming manufacturers (such as electric vehicle-only manufacturers like Tesla and BYD) have a shorter time to sell their credits to other companies, making a slightly fairer playing field. No dodgy loopholes for mainstream technology As in both Options B and C, excluding technology credits creates more transparency and simplicity in the scheme, and increases positive results for Australian consumers and carbon emissions. Multiplier credits in particular should be ruled out entirely. SUVs should be classified as passenger vehicles As in both Options B and C, including SUVs and in the "Passenger Vehicle" category is smart and makes the Australian NVES stronger, especially given the consumer preference for larger vehicles. The Light Commercial Vehicle category should exist for genuine utility and commercial vehicles, not for bigger cars by default.	Yes
1377181	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Fast but flexible is more likely to be acceptable to the public in this our country of political climate war	Yes
1377187	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1377201	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1377208	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	NULL
1377240	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to cut emissions as quickly as possible	No
1377250	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to have the gold standard for vehicles emissions	No
1377290	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	B is not fast enough and it seems there would be a lot of faffing around anyway. If we assume that the government will be very inefficient (which is what it always is), we want to pick the fastest one to get the most out of it (part C). but i also understand that its hard to get money for these things	No
1377306	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need this urgently but I accept that in rural areas there may be problems moving straight to option C, as support infrastructure is not available in more isolated areas.	Yes

1377314	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	why wait? cars are a global product, we make none here so mandate for the best global cars to be sold here	Yes
1377346	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	See doc for full reasons. In sum: (1) PREFERRED OPTIONS- option C preferred but option B ok. NEVER 'option' A; (2) Supplier transition time to start scheme of 2025 fair; (3) Incentivises smaller & lighter vehicles; (4) current situation untenable - quicker implemented the better; (5) incentivise XERO, emission uptake through enforcement (penalty, data and sufficient policing) (6) Laudable in options B and C to remove / close / rule out 'super credits' and 'loopholes'.	Yes
1377451	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Get on with it NOW!	Yes
1377458	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should make Australia's Standard the strongest in the world The strong headline target and fleet limit curve rules of Option C will help us both catch up and stay at the front of the global queue for efficient vehicles, making the Australian market extremely attractive for low and zero-emissions vehicles; save Australian consumers the most money in the long term; and reduce carbon emissions in the fastest way. Although the headline targets of Option B are good, they would only have us catch up to the US, and stay behind most other car markets (including right-hand drive markets like the United Kingdom and New Zealand). Sufficient notice has been given to manufacturers Both Options B and C allow manufacturers two years before strong limits are set, which is more than enough time to adjust their supply. The Government has been clear about its intention for a New Vehicle Efficiency Standard since 2022, and Australia is one of the last developed countries to implement one. Benefits to consumers should be a priority In the current cost of living crisis, the government should be prioritising options that lead to more wins for consumers. The benefit-to-cost ratio of Option B and C are very similar (4% difference), but the net benefits of Option C are far greater (18% difference). Penalties should match the rest of the world The penalty price of Option C is more comparable to the European Union and will force manufacturers to comply and prioritise the Australian market. As the Government found, there is no evidence this will increase vehicle prices. Credits should expire within two years The shorter expiry of credits in Option C means that overperforming manufacturers (such as electric vehicle-only manufacturers like Tesla and BYD) have a shorter time to sell their credits to other companies, making a slightly fairer playing field. No dodgy loopholes for mainstream technology As in both Options B and C, excluding technology credits creates more transparency and simplicity in the scheme, and increases positive results for Australian consumers and carbon emissions. Multiplier credits in particular should be ruled out entirely. SUVs should be classified as passenger vehicles As in both Options B and C, including SUVs and in the "Passenger Vehicle" category is smart and makes the Australian NVES stronger, especially given the consumer preference for larger vehicles. The Light Commercial Vehicle category should exist for genuine utility and commercial vehicles, not for bigger cars by default.	Yes
1377467	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Other countries have set great examples on how this CO2 strategy will fail and all this talk about saving people/government money is not feasible/sustainable. BEV production cost is no longer coming down, so there will still be a price premium from ICEV to BEV. As an individual I have to spend more to breakeven in 5 years. But it's better for the environment? Studies are finding BEV production emits 300-600% more CO2 compared to ICEV & takes up to 2-5 years of driving to breakeven (with 100% green electricity). Australia does not have the capability to upgrade our electricity infrastructure. Electricity production/storage, power lines, sub stations, public chargers. Finally people just don't want BEV's. Look at all countries, Europe, UK, USA, China where BEV share is remaining stagnant as minority. Government is better off spending the money planting trees.	No
1377488	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is crucial we address climate emissions as soon as possible, and car use is a significant component of that.	Yes
1377626	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	I do not believe thagt introducing a fast tracked ill planned vehicle emissions process into Australia will have any positive effect on global emissions as we are too small a market and pushing us to purchase vehicles made in more polluting economies than ours will only increase emissions.misions	No
1377646	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C will provide the fastest transition to clean cars with an accelerated trajectory to beat emissions targets in Europe and the US. An overwhelming vote for Option C gives the government a popular mandate to stare down the car lobby.	No
1377651	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Urgent action is needed for cleaner personal transport, and Australia is starting well behind comparable countries. Something also needs to be done to remove smoggy (particulates) emissions from existing vehicles or get them off the road.	Yes
1377656	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	A pragmatic option to stop being the world dumping ground for high polluting vehicles	Yes

1377672	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This is an urgent matter.	NULL
1377688	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Best for the future	Yes
1377689	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1377696	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1377701	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change and environmental breakdown is already impacting Australia so we have no time to waste!	Yes
1377708	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is here. Let's not waste any more time.	No
1377711	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1377712	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There has been a lot of talk by CEO's of manufactures and they all say it depends on what legislation as to how quickly they transfer to a greener future. If we approve for full tilt it will a definite 1 in a box of many it would also save on unnecessary middle wastage in the mean time of items such as hybrids that are now being taken off the roads in Norway for full electric option.	No
1377748	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Act before cronies of Trump and Putin are in power	Yes
1377749	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have wasted so much time getting to this point that we are left with no but to go as hard and as fast as possible to make up for last time. Some might object but ultimately Australia's drivers and the environment will be the beneficiaries.	No
1377763	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	low emissions is a must	No
1377784	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Dying planet. Must act but have to take greedy folk with us.	Yes
1377786	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Don't put off the inevitable need to act rapidly.	No
1377795	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C delivers a high cost-to-benefit ratio, as well as enabling future benefits like energy security and new economic opportunities. Importantly, Option C also delivers the best climate outcomes of the three proposed options. It is a cheap and effective way to meet our climate obligations and avoid very bad climate consequences for our children.	Yes
1377796	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	My reason for this choice is that Australian government needs to be more bolder and take more risks when tackling big companies such as the car automotive industry. The other reason is because is the fastest and best way to out emissions down and actually meet our targets, we have seen more counties and unions bring in these harder laws and actually work like the EU	No
1377798	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Without an adequately matching standard to the global situation, Australia has been and will continue to be the dumping ground of poor efficiency and highly polluting vehicles. Option C offers the greatest level of return, particularly in term of its health benefits which is currently underestimated.	Yes

1377806	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is already years behind what it should be. It is imperative to move as fast as possible. The slower options allow car manufacturers to dump vehicles in Australia that not wanted in othe jurisdictions.	No
1377811	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1377814	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I think we should be prepared to pay more for a better outcome	Yes
1377816	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has been behind other developed nations and needs to catch up. Especially if we as a nation want to be seen as a renewal energy provider of choice. We need to be multi faceted. Infrastructure needs to go hand in hand with encouraging EV uptake, renewal energy generation, decentralized storage. Disincentives for fossil fuels can help fund the transition.	NULL
1377818	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1377836	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Better environmental protection, cheaper in long term for society	No
1377838	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to get there as quickly as we can, supported by renewable electricity generation	NULL
1377894	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I would really prefer option C, but realistically option B would be more practical to implement for the general public to understand the process and be more prepared financially and self manage the changes.	Yes
1377907	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1377978	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Represents the best option between cost and benefit	Yes
1378078	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Important for quality of life in the society of future generations. Our country will benefit in the long term.	No
1378091	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Our kids need the fastest plan. It's not a joke we are creating the world they'll inhabit. FFS we should be trying harder.	Yes
1378127	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is becoming a fossil fuel fleet dumping ground, without stronger energy efficiency standards we will only go backwards.	No
1378141	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	National CO2 emissions are a more concerning issue to me than higher taxes.	Yes
1378175	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Superior benefit cost ratio	Yes
1378216	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is important that change occur as quickly as possible. Australia has been lagging behind other developed countries for far too long.	No

1378217	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Middle ground & compromise.	Yes
1378231	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to quickly cut our emissions from transportation. As one of the wealthiest countries in the world, Australia can afford to step up to this challenge.	No
1378232	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We cannot continue to be a dumping ground for the automobile companies heavy polluting vehicles, especially the massive Utes that are charging around Sydney terrifying people such as myself in smaller Hybrid and low consumption cars.	Yes
1378247	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1378254	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	co2 mitigation	Yes
1378264	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	While there are some higher costs there is also necessary flexibility and hopefully assistance for those who cannot afford the transition, as well as providing parity with other jurisdictions which will allow access to available technology and participation in international markets	Yes
1378267	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to get going on reducing car CO2 emissions	Yes
1378271	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We no real choice but to go for it hard NOW - simply because of so many previous years of inaction and wasted opportunity opportunity	No
1378277	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to get to net zero as soon as possible and a fast transition is therefore required.	NULL
1378301	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do something now to slow down the devastating effects of climate change and this would be a great start.	Yes
1378304	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1378322	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Rapid action on climate change and on improving air quality in cities is extremely important, even if it is slightly higher cost.	Yes
1378328	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	economic viability	Yes
1378329	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The long term economic benefits are the highest for Option C, but more importantly, it reduces the likelihood of the motor vehicle industry exploiting loopholes to the detriment of the Australian community	No
1378338	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	All types of pollution must be stopped as fast as possible.	Yes
1378346	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Climate Change is the paramount equation by which to \,bend the J curve\, of carbon accumulation in the atmosphere. It is the only option for all people to work upon.	Yes

1378351	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Highest net benefit	Yes
1378352	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The current global situation with climate issues should be moving all countries to taking all possible steps to reduce all possible emissions. I understand electorally why the government would prefer option B, and at the end of the day, I would support it, as it is better than nothing, and the money saved could be put to use in other areas.	Yes
1378353	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	B is just too fast to enable a reasonable transition which does not hurt consumers who might need adequate towing vehicles; things like Toyota Landcruisers should be considered as a tow vehicle, not a passenger vehicle. Needs to be a softer Option B to facilitate the change.	No
1378365	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis is having devastating effects on our communities and the environment. Australia has lagged on climate action for too long putting profit and politics above the safety and health of citizens. The only way to reach our net zero targets is to act fast and hard. Transition to renewable energy is behind schedule due to avoidable planning and infrastructure delays. Transport needs to take on its share and do so quickly. Australian's have shown a great desire for hybrid and electric vehicles, but we have been let down by the lack of fuel efficiency standards. We have so little choice in the available market and the options we do get are overpriced and have long waiting lists. Average Australian households can not afford the price or wait for an efficient new car. The health benefits of reducing vehicle pollution are enormous. There is a huge financial and social burden from deaths, hospitalisation, chronic illness, and absenteeism due to air pollution directly attributable to transport. Large SUV vehicles are a consumer choice not a business necessity. They must be included and accounted for as passenger vehicles. Everything possible should be done to encourage the purchase of lighter vehicles. The road safety benefits of removing unnecessary large vehicles from our roads are enormous. Credits are loopholes that weaken the effectiveness of any scheme. Biodiversity offset and carbon credits are failing us and damaging our environment. Don't make the same mistakes here. Penalties must be in line with similar markets such as the EU or we will continue to get poorer model choices from car manufacturers. Option B is the bare minimum required. Slow action on other areas of emissions reduction means Option C is necessary.	Yes
1378381	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1378383	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1378395	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We owe it to future generations to act as fast as possible in a the transition to more sustainable future. Anything else is false economy and morally unjustifiable.	Yes
1378397	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis should determine target strength The NVES should set emission targets over a timeframe that reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. This requires a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2035 at the latest. Option C and B are both acceptable as they would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions. Targets are sufficiently distant for supply to catch up Option C and B have the same starting target in 2025, which gives car companies two years to prepare for the stricter targets under option C (which only kick in from 2026 onwards). Two years is sufficient time for car makers to adjust their supply, given the number of ZEVs already on the global market and more under development. Car companies have known of the Government's intention to introduce some form of NVES since 2022, and 85% of the world is already covered by emissions standards, making this change foreseeable. If there is a short period where a number of the most polluting vehicles in Australia increase in price due to penalties under Option C, that can be managed through car companies buying credits from 100% ZEV car makers, further subsidising their price, and encouraging the overall shift. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	Yes



1378410	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The start to reduce emissions is already unacceptably late and we need to do what is necessary to catch up with where we should already be.	Yes
1378415	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I choose option C first because I have known we need to limit our use of fossil fuels my entire 55 years of life. I've know that because my father, a nuclear physicist and solar scientist knew this before I was born. He knew it because many other scientists knew it. So in this context this \fast start\, is the best option available to take criminally delayed action on climate change. Any further delay in action on climate change is also criminal particularly since climate change is clearly killing people, and destroying property and our planet. The scientists predicted that 50+ years ago also. The business world will cry poor etc. at the same time they love to tell us how good they are at making products and money. Let them demonstrate their acumen by requiring them to exceed the efficiency standards other countries have already achieved so they can make money without killing people and our planet. Letting the business world decide our future is like letting the passengers fly the plane we are all on. Business people don't understand the physics required to sustain life on this planet. Politicians need to.	Yes
1378426	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis should determine target strength The NVES should set emission targets over a timeframe that reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. This requires a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2035 at the latest. Option C and B are both acceptable as they would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions. Targets are sufficiently distant for supply to catch up Option C and B have the same starting target in 2025, which gives car companies two years to prepare for the stricter targets under option C (which only kick in from 2026 onwards). Two years is sufficient time for car makers to adjust their supply, given the number of ZEVs already on the global market and more under development. Car companies have known of the Government's intention to introduce some form of NVES since 2022, and 85% of the world is already covered by emissions standards, making this change foreseeable. If there is a short period where a number of the most polluting vehicles in Australia increase in price due to penalties under Option C, that can be managed through car companies buying credits from 100% ZEV car makers, further subsidising their price, and encouraging the overall shift. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	Yes
1378427	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 0th	If in doubt choose 'B'.	Yes
1378429	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The Urgent Case for Aggressive Fuel Emission Standards in Australia Australia, a nation of vast distances and reliance on vehicles, faces a critical crossroads in the fight against climate change. The transportation sector is a major contributor to our greenhouse gas emissions, and without decisive action, the consequences will be dire. An aggressive fuel emissions reduction standard is essential to ensure a sustainable future for Australia. Firstly, such standards would directly address climate change. By mandating lower emissions from vehicles, we curb the release of harmful pollutants, mitigate the rise in global temperatures, and combat the escalating extreme weather events plaguing our nation. These events, from devastating bushfires to severe floods, disrupt lives and livelihoods and burden our economy. Secondly, fuel emission standards drive innovation and economic advantage. By fostering research and investment in cleaner technologies, Australia can position itself as a leader in the green automotive industry. This transition creates future-proof jobs, fuels economic diversification, and boosts our global competitiveness. Thirdly, improved fuel efficiency means significant cost savings for Australians. Vehicles that consume less fuel translate to lower operating expenses, a crucial benefit amidst rising living costs. These savings benefit not just individuals but also businesses and our overall economy. Finally, cleaner air is a fundamental right. Reducing vehicle emissions protects public health, particularly in urban areas where pollution is a growing concern. This leads to healthier communities and reduced healthcare expenditures. Critics may argue that strict standards could hinder the automotive industry. However, global trends clearly demonstrate a shift towards cleaner transportation. Australia cannot afford to be left behind. Proactive measures will position us well in the emerging electric vehicle market. The time for complacency is over. An aggressive fuel emission reduction standard is not just environmentally responsible; it is a sound economic and social investment for our nation. Let Australia embrace its potential to lead the transition to a clean energy future.	NULL

1378430	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	So we don't die	No
1378433	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis should determine target strength The NVES should set emission targets over a timeframe that reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. This requires a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2035 at the latest. Option C and B are both acceptable as they would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions. Targets are sufficiently distant for supply to catch up Option C and B have the same starting target in 2025, which gives car companies two years to prepare for the stricter targets under option C (which only kick in from 2026 onwards). Two years is sufficient time for car makers to adjust their supply, given the number of ZEVs already on the global market and more under development. Car companies have known of the Government's intention to introduce some form of NVES since 2022, and 85% of the world is already covered by emissions standards, making this change foreseeable. If there is a short period where a number of the most polluting vehicles in Australia increase in price due to penalties under Option C, that can be managed through car companies buying credits from 100% ZEV car makers, further subsidising their price, and encouraging the overall shift. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	Yes
1378439	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis should determine target strength The NVES should set emission targets over a timeframe that reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. This requires a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2035 at the latest. Option C and B are both acceptable as they would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions. Targets are sufficiently distant for supply to catch up Option C and B have the same starting target in 2025, which gives car companies two years to prepare for the stricter targets under option C (which only kick in from 2026 onwards). Two years is sufficient time for car makers to adjust their supply, given the number of ZEVs already on the global market and more under development. Car companies have known of the Government's intention to introduce some form of NVES since 2022, and 85% of the world is already covered by emissions standards, making this change foreseeable. If there is a short period where a number of the most polluting vehicles in Australia increase in price due to penalties under Option C, that can be managed through car companies buying credits from 100% ZEV car makers, further subsidising their price, and encouraging the overall shift. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	Yes
1378440	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Having lived in Europe, we are the laugh stock of the world. Time to grow up.	Yes
1378441	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	It seems to be the best way to go.	Yes

1378447	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	<p>The climate crisis should determine target strength The NVES should set emission targets over a timeframe that reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. This requires a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2035 at the latest. Option C and B are both acceptable as they would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions. Targets are sufficiently distant for supply to catch up Option C and B have the same starting target in 2025, which gives car companies two years to prepare for the stricter targets under option C (which only kick in from 2026 onwards). Two years is sufficient time for car makers to adjust their supply, given the number of ZEVs already on the global market and more under development. Car companies have known of the Government's intention to introduce some form of NVES since 2022, and 85% of the world is already covered by emissions standards, making this change foreseeable. If there is a short period where a number of the most polluting vehicles in Australia increase in price due to penalties under Option C, that can be managed through car companies buying credits from 100% ZEV car makers, further subsidising their price, and encouraging the overall shift. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.</p>	Yes
1378457	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	<p>Australia and Russian are the only 2 industrialised countries to have weak standards. Climate change is accelerating and we must implement option C to adhere to the Paris climate agreement. The climate crisis should determine target strength The NVES should set emission targets over a timeframe that reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. This requires a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2035 at the latest. Option C and B are both acceptable as they would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions. Targets are sufficiently distant for supply to catch up Option C and B have the same starting target in 2025, which gives car companies two years to prepare for the stricter targets under option C (which only kick in from 2026 onwards). Two years is sufficient time for car makers to adjust their supply, given the number of ZEVs already on the global market and more under development. Car companies have known of the Government's intention to introduce some form of NVES since 2022, and 85% of the world is already covered by emissions standards, making this change foreseeable. If there is a short period where a number of the most polluting vehicles in Australia increase in price due to penalties under Option C, that can be managed through car companies buying credits from 100% ZEV car makers, further subsidising their price, and encouraging the overall shift. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time The Government should also implement real-world</p>	Yes
1378460	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	<p>The climate crisis should determine target strength The NVES should set emission targets over a timeframe that reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. This requires a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2035 at the latest. Option C and B are both acceptable as they would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions. Targets are sufficiently distant for supply to catch up Option C and B have the same starting target in 2025, which gives car companies two years to prepare for the stricter targets under option C (which only kick in from 2026 onwards). Two years is sufficient time for car makers to adjust their supply, given the number of ZEVs already on the global market and more under development. Car companies have known of the Government's intention to introduce some form of NVES since 2022, and 85% of the world is</p>	Yes

			already covered by emissions standards, making this change foreseeable. If there is a short period where a number of the most polluting vehicles in Australia increase in price due to penalties under Option C, that can be managed through car companies buying credits from 100% ZEV car makers, further subsidising their price, and encouraging the overall shift. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	
1378462	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to start working towards this, we are currently one of the last developed nations to have efficiency standards	Yes
1378465	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis should determine target strength The NVES should set emission targets over a timeframe that reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. This requires a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2035 at the latest. Option C and B are both acceptable as they would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions. Targets are sufficiently distant for supply to catch up Option C and B have the same starting target in 2025, which gives car companies two years to prepare for the stricter targets under option C (which only kick in from 2026 onwards). Two years is sufficient time for car makers to adjust their supply, given the number of ZEVs already on the global market and more under development. Car companies have known of the Government’s intention to introduce some form of NVES since 2022, and 85% of the world is already covered by emissions standards, making this change foreseeable. If there is a short period where a number of the most polluting vehicles in Australia increase in price due to penalties under Option C, that can be managed through car companies buying credits from 100% ZEV car makers, further subsidising their price, and encouraging the overall shift. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	Yes
1378472	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Flexibility will be more amenable to suppliers	Yes
1378481	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	Yes
1378483	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	Yes
1378496	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B is more economic and will eventually achieve the goal	Yes
1378508	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The NVES should set emission targets over a timeframe that reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. This requires a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2035 at the latest. Option C and B are both acceptable as they would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer	Yes

			period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions.	
1378509	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is outrageous that, along with some 3rd world nations, we do not, like all other westerised countries. It has made Australia a dumping ground for manufacturers which they are unable to sell elsewhere. If we do not manage a change to electrified	Yes
1378511	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis should determine target strength The NVES should set emission targets over a timeframe that reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. This requires a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2035 at the latest. Option C and B are both acceptable as they would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions. Targets are sufficiently distant for supply to catch up Option C and B have the same starting target in 2025, which gives car companies two years to prepare for the stricter targets under option C (which only kick in from 2026 onwards). Two years is sufficient time for car makers to adjust their supply, given the number of ZEVs already on the global market and more under development. Car companies have known of the Government's intention to introduce some form of NVES since 2022, and 85% of the world is already covered by emissions standards, making this change foreseeable. If there is a short period where a number of the most polluting vehicles in Australia increase in price due to penalties under Option C, that can be managed through car companies buying credits from 100% ZEV car makers, further subsidising their price, and encouraging the overall shift. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	Yes
1378520	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to get this fixed for our kids sake	Yes
1378521	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 0th	NULL	Yes
1378526	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce emissions asap.	No
1378530	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis should determine target strength The NVES should set emission targets over a timeframe that reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. This requires a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2035 at the latest. Option C and B are both acceptable as they would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions. Targets are sufficiently distant for supply to catch up Option C and B have the same starting target in 2025, which gives car companies two years to prepare for the stricter targets under option C (which only kick in from 2026 onwards). Two years is sufficient time for car makers to adjust their supply, given the number of ZEVs already on the global market and more under development. Car companies have known of the Government's intention to introduce some form of NVES since 2022, and 85% of the world is already covered by emissions standards, making this change foreseeable. If there is a short period where a number of the most polluting vehicles in Australia increase in price due to penalties under Option C, that can be managed through car companies buying credits from 100% ZEV car makers, further subsidising their price, and encouraging the overall shift . SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based	No

			adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	
1378534	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is far behind the rest of the world in terms of fossil fuel usage and transition to greener energy systems. How wonderful to not only catch up but lead the way!	Yes
1378542	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As a country we should be leaders in taking action to reduce CO2 emissions.	Yes
1378546	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This is urgent if we are going to have an impact in this country	Yes
1378551	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This has been a long time coming, so needs to be implemented	Yes
1378565	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is seriously affecting us all and poorer loe lying countries,siming for the quicjest is the right thing to do	NULL
1378577	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis should determine target strength The NVES should set emission targets over a timeframe that reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. This requires a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2035 at the latest. Option C and B are both acceptable as they would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions. Targets are sufficiently distant for supply to catch up Option C and B have the same starting target in 2025, which gives car companies two years to prepare for the stricter targets under option C (which only kick in from 2026 onwards). Two years is sufficient time for car makers to adjust their supply, given the number of ZEVs already on the global market and more under development. Car companies have known of the Government’s intention to introduce some form of NVES since 2022, and 85% of the world is already covered by emissions standards, making this change foreseeable. If there is a short period where a number of the most polluting vehicles in Australia increase in price due to penalties under Option C, that can be managed through car companies buying credits from 100% ZEV car makers, further subsidising their price, and encouraging the overall shift. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	Yes
1378580	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1378581	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The faster the change the better,	Yes
1378583	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia does not have a motor vehicle industry, so are in a prime position to ensure FOREIGN corporations comply with our HIGHEST & BEST Environmental requirements... if they want to sell cars here. Hopefully, it will get rid of those dangerous TANK like vehicles!!	Yes

1378584	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	NULL	Yes
1378588	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Believe urgency required and it beggars belief that Australia doesn't have stricter emissions control	Yes
1378589	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C clearly provides the greatest benefits and there is little difference in the benefit cost ratio compared to option B. In particular, all opportunities should be taken to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and impacts on human health. Option C does this best. It is also likely that the BCR does not fully account for a range of intangibles and if it did, this would most likely improve option C's BCR - especially given that it best internalises the costs of the myriad external costs caused by vehicle use. Further, BCR analysis tends to value the present over the future, given the use of discount rates. Again, option C would likely rank higher if more regard was given to the future.	Yes
1378600	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis should determine target strength The NVES should set emission targets over a timeframe that reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. This requires a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2035 at the latest. Option C and B are both acceptable as they would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions. Targets are sufficiently distant for supply to catch up Option C and B have the same starting target in 2025, which gives car companies two years to prepare for the stricter targets under option C (which only kick in from 2026 onwards). Two years is sufficient time for car makers to adjust their supply, given the number of ZEVs already on the global market and more under development. Car companies have known of the Government's intention to introduce some form of NVES since 2022, and 85% of the world is already covered by emissions standards, making this change foreseeable. If there is a short period where a number of the most polluting vehicles in Australia increase in price due to penalties under Option C, that can be managed through car companies buying credits from 100% ZEV car makers, further subsidising their price, and encouraging the overall shift. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past. Q	Yes
1378601	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	price, and encouraging the overall shift. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	Yes
1378603	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It seems we must transition asap.	No
1378616	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1378623	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis should determine target strength The NVES should set emission targets over a timeframe that reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. This requires a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2035 at the latest. Option C and B are both acceptable as they would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. Moving faster will result in lower	Yes

			emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions. Targets are sufficiently distant for supply to catch up Option C and B have the same starting target in 2025, which gives car companies two years to prepare for the stricter targets under option C (which only kick in from 2026 onwards). Two years is sufficient time for car makers to adjust their supply, given the number of ZEVs already on the global market and more under development. Car companies have known of the Government's intention to introduce some form of NVES since 2022, and 85% of the world is already covered by emissions standards, making this change foreseeable. If there is a short period where a number of the most polluting vehicles in Australia increase in price due to penalties under Option C, that can be managed through car companies buying credits from 100% ZEV car makers, further subsidising their price, and encouraging the overall shift. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	
1378625	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have no time to lose so need to be ambitious and expedient.	Yes
1378627	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis should determine target strength. The NVES should set emission targets over a timeframe that reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. This requires a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2035 at the latest. Option C and B are both acceptable as they would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions. Targets are sufficiently distant for supply to catch up Option C and B have the same starting target in 2025, which gives car companies two years to prepare for the stricter targets under option C (which only kick in from 2026 onwards). Two years is sufficient time for car makers to adjust their supply, given the number of ZEVs already on the global market and more under development. Car companies have known of the Government's intention to introduce some form of NVES since 2022, and 85% of the world is already covered by emissions standards, making this change foreseeable. If there is a short period where a number of the most polluting vehicles in Australia increase in price due to penalties under Option C, that can be managed through car companies buying credits from 100% ZEV car makers, further subsidising their price, and encouraging the overall shift. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	Yes
1378633	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change emergency demands urgent action on emission reduction. In an ideal world, option C would be best. But option B is probably best bang for the buck.	Yes
1378635	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As stated in yr explanation: Option C Provides the fastest transition, with an accelerated trajectory to beat CO2 targets for 2030/32 in EU and US in 2028/29. This results in both a high net benefit and greater abatement. We are a rich country and can manage the higher costs, as many other developed Western democracies have or are doing.	No
1378637	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Better health, lower climate impacts, reduced likelihood of extinctions (humans and other species)	No



1378640	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Best way to meet CO2 targets	No
1378643	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Penalties should be substantial The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	Yes
1378644	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Penalties should be substantial The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	Yes
1378650	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia does not have a manufacturing industry to support. Hence we should concentrate on getting the very best outcomes for the people in terms of improving air quality, better health and using the latest technology and the most efficient vehicles available as soon as possible.	No
1378653	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B is the most workable solution.	Yes
1378654	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	With the climate changing before our eyes, it's imperative that Australia leads the way toward a low-emissions future.	Yes
1378661	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1378666	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Time is ticking - we need to move faster, even if it costs us a bit more initially. Benefits to the environment, our health, our hip pocket... as well as quieter, less polluted roadway (which benefits bike riders and pedestrians. s	Yes
1378667	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want a cleaner future.	No
1378668	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Please do NOT include any exception for light commercial vehicles or allow them to fall under less stringent rules than passenger vehicles. This kind of policy has had disastrous effects on the United States, where there are far too many unnecessary pickup trucks which are largely used only as passenger vehicles (also resulting in increased road fatalities and pedestrian deaths). We must discourage unnecessary use of larger polluting vehicles where a smaller one is more than sufficient. If a person chooses to buy a light commercial vehicle with high emissions for work or leisure, they should pay the extra cost of their increased pollution rather than forcing the rest of the population to subsidise their personal choice and distorting the market in favour of polluting vehicles. A proper free market requires negative externalities to be correctly priced in.	NULL
1378669	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis should determine target strength The NVES should set emission targets over a timeframe that reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. This requires a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2035 at the latest. Option C and B are both acceptable as they would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions. Targets are sufficiently distant for supply to catch up Option C and B have the same starting target in 2025, which gives car companies two years to prepare for the stricter targets under option C (which only kick in from 2026 onwards). Two years is sufficient time for car makers to adjust their supply, given the number of ZEVs already on the global market and more under development. Car companies have known of the Government's intention to introduce some form of NVES since 2022, and 85% of the world is already covered by emissions standards, making this change foreseeable. If there is a short period where a number of the most polluting vehicles in Australia increase in price due to penalties under Option C, that can be managed through car companies buying credits from 100% ZEV car makers, further subsidising their price, and encouraging the overall shift. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles Option C and B rightly	Yes

			include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles. The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial. The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out. Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time. The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions (onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	
1378677	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1378678	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1378681	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are so far behind the rest of the OECD, we need to catch up asap.	Yes
1378684	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Air pollution is a pretty deadly issue. However, I don't think replacing polluting cars with electric options is the solution. Active and public transport is far more effective. Thus I would prefer higher investment in transitioning away from private vehicles rather than excessive investment in the reduction of emissions by virtue of providing subsidies and building infrastructure that will lock us up into more car dependent futures.	Yes
1378687	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The quicker the better	NULL
1378688	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Given the urgency of getting to net zero, I support the highest cost but quickest CO2 reduction Potok.	Yes
1378693	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Governments, vehicle makers and people who drive vehicles have known for a long time that emissions pollute and have harmful impacts. The worst of these is causing world temperatures to rise. This \global warming\ is reaching a crisis point. We need to rapidly reduce emissions to zero. We have the technology to achieve this.	Yes
1378697	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The benefits of transitioning quickly to better standards are real. In 2024 we are already seeing incredibly troubling and unforeseen climate issues (including very hot oceans in the northern hemisphere and unprecedented heat wave days, even in Perth). These are more severe already than even the original worst case predications. We simply cannot wait longer without huge financial and social costs.	No
1378699	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1378701	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We have been so long getting to even consider the initiative, so we need to move as quickly as practical	Yes
1378705	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1378710	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	the cost of environmental damage (wild fires, floods, drought) is already high - we need the fastest road to decarbonisation	No
1378712	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The barriers to full electric vehicles in Australia are greater than many other parts of the developed world because of the distances and low population densities in much of the country. A more ambitious target forces the fully electric demand squarely onto the urban areas and the need for high capacity infrastructure is brought forward. The rural areas will remain fossil fuelled for quite a long time. Better fuel efficiency for oil and gas based fuel products will be the major drivers of freight and rural domestic car emissions. The behavioural responses to the cost impacts will be as important as the fuel efficiency improvements to the overall impact.	NULL

1378715	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Time is running out.	NULL
1378722	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has a lot of catching up to do and we need strong standards as quickly as possible. This is worth the higher cost.	NULL
1378727	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	High emissions vehicles impact people's health and the climate	Yes
1378728	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option A is too weak and doesn't include SUV's.	Yes
1378739	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate crisis. Australia is lagging in action in ca The NVES should set emission targets over a timeframe that reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. This requires a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2035 at the latest. Option C and B are both acceptable as they would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions. Targets are sufficiently distant for supply to catch up Option C and B have the same starting target in 2025, which gives car companies two years to prepare for the stricter targets under option C (which only kick in from 2026 onwards). Two years is sufficient time for car makers to adjust their supply, given the number of ZEVs already on the global market and more under development. Car companies have known of the Government's intention to introduce some form of NVES since 2022, and 85% of the world is already covered by emissions standards, making this change foreseeable. If there is a short period where a number of the most polluting vehicles in Australia increase in price due to penalties under Option C, that can be managed through car companies buying credits from 100% ZEV car makers, further subsidising their price, and encouraging the overall shift. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C	Yes
1378741	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are facing a climate crisis and as a first world nation and need to step forward and align with other nations on fuel efficiency standards asap.	NULL
1378742	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	The climate crisis should determine target strength The NVES should set emission targets over a timeframe that reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. This requires a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2035 at the latest. Option C and B are both acceptable as they would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions. Targets are sufficiently distant for supply to catch up Option C and B have the same starting target in 2025, which gives car companies two years to prepare for the stricter targets under option C (which only kick in from 2026 onwards). Two years is sufficient time for car makers to adjust their supply, given the number of ZEVs already on the global market and more under development. Car companies have known of the Government's intention to introduce some form of NVES since 2022, and 85% of the world is already covered by emissions standards, making this change foreseeable. If there is a short period where a number of the most polluting vehicles in Australia increase in price due to penalties under Option C, that can be managed through car companies buying credits from 100% ZEV car makers, further subsidising their price, and encouraging the overall shift. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in	Yes

			Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	
1378743	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has one of the largest transport-related carbon emissions figures in the world, and we are a large country without a comprehensive efficient public transport system. We need to work and invest hard to get our country up to a decent standard of lower emissions as soon as possible.	Yes
1378753	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	For too long have our vehicles blown out to such behemoths that consume too much fuel. The acts that the government intend to take have my full support as it will reduce fuel costs on all new vehicles. I am only saddened that this change did not happen sooner.	Yes
1378754	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	we urgently need to catch up on years of inaction and transition to better cars - petrol and electric.	Yes
1378755	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1378759	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The planet has almost reached – if not already passed – the climate tipping point. It's too late for slow and measured approaches: we need to act as FAST as we can to try to rein in the damage and hope to help the planet heal. I commend the government for taking this long-overdue action, and I am strongly in favour of the option that delivers the fastest change, Option C. The car companies don't need extra notice. They know they've been living on borrowed time for years, and have been happy to dump their polluting ICE vehicles on a welcoming Australian market while the rest of the planet holds them to account.	Yes
1378774	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I feel investing for a cleaner environment is a key to life on earth. Australia must play its part.	No
1378776	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	If car makers unable to supply enough cars when it is launched due to technical or logistics reasons, we will see higher costs to be borne by the society (with less choices of cars in the market) yet benefits may not be achieved.	No
1378782	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	i care about our environment, about the health of the planet, the clean air and ocean. we have injured the ecosystem enough already. There are too many people in the planet and permanent growth economy doesn't work. we need to do everything we can to limit the damage.	NULL
1378795	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1378797	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions.	Yes
1378807	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Health benefits as well as economic benefits	Yes
1378808	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis should determine target strength The NVES should set emission targets over a timeframe that reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. This requires a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2035 at the latest. Option C and B are both acceptable as they would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions. Targets are sufficiently distant for supply to catch up Option C and B have the same starting target in 2025, which gives car companies two years to prepare for the stricter targets under option C (which only kick in from 2026 onwards). Two years is sufficient time for car makers to adjust their supply, given the number of ZEVs already on the global market and more under development. Car companies have known of the Government's intention to introduce some form of NVES since 2022, and 85% of the world is already covered by emissions standards, making this change foreseeable. If there is a short period where a number of the most polluting vehicles in Australia increase in price due to penalties under Option C, that can be managed through car companies buying credits from 100% ZEV car	Yes

			makers, further subsidising their price, and encouraging the overall shift. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	
1378810	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis should determine target strength The NVES should set emission targets over a timeframe that reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. This requires a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2035 at the latest. Option C and B are both acceptable as they would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions. Targets are sufficiently distant for supply to catch up Option C and B have the same starting target in 2025, which gives car companies two years to prepare for the stricter targets under option C (which only kick in from 2026 onwards). Two years is sufficient time for car makers to adjust their supply, given the number of ZEVs already on the global market and more under development. Car companies have known of the Government’s intention to introduce some form of NVES since 2022, and 85% of the world is already covered by emissions standards, making this change foreseeable. If there is a short period where a number of the most polluting vehicles in Australia increase in price due to penalties under Option C, that can be managed through car companies buying credits from 100% ZEV car makers, further subsidising their price, and encouraging the overall shift. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	Yes
1378830	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is my opinion that people are free to make a choice to buy a higher emitting vehicle. However there should be heavy costs to their pocket if they have made a considered decision to drive a car that pollutes heavily and affects the health and security of those around them. I do not support option B because due to accelerating climate change, we simply don't have time to be tinkering around the edges when it comes to CO2 emissions.	No
1378837	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis should determine target strength The NVES should set emission targets over a timeframe that reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. This requires a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2035 at the latest. Option C and B are both acceptable as they would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions. Targets are sufficiently distant for supply to catch up Option C and B have the same starting target in 2025, which gives car companies two years to prepare for the stricter targets under option C (which only kick in from 2026 onwards). Two years is sufficient time for car makers to adjust their supply, given the number of ZEVs already on the global market and more under development. Car companies have known of the Government’s intention to introduce some form of NVES since 2022, and 85% of the world is already covered by emissions standards, making this change foreseeable. If there is a short period where a number of the most polluting vehicles in Australia increase in price due to penalties under Option C, that can be managed through car companies buying credits from 100% ZEV car makers, further subsidising their price, and encouraging the overall shift. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in	Yes

			Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	
1378843	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1378845	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	set us up for the future and provides best benefits	Yes
1378846	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has a huge potential to be a renewables leader, based on our climate and our natural resources. We should take further advantage of this position by accelerating our EV takeup through initiatives such as this, that will have flow-on effects through to the rest of the economy more broadly.	Yes
1378851	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce pollution as quickly as possible for the climate & our health	No
1378853	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	We have waited so long for this necessary and obvious change to be implemented, there is no excuse to delay it any longer. I live in the inner west and I find the pollution is getting worse each year. We must be the laughing stock of the international car industry, I am so glad that the new government is finally taking responsibility.	NULL
1378855	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is falling behind in having a strong and sustainable industry to compete in world market. Investing heavily into renewables would push Australia into stronger position in the world, leveraging on our resource wealth.	Yes
1378864	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	A no brainer - we have needed high emissions standards for a decade or more. Time to catch up with the rest of the civilised world!	No
1378867	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis should determine target strength The NVES should set emission targets over a timeframe that reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. This requires a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2035 at the latest. Option C and B are both acceptable as they would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions. Targets are sufficiently distant for supply to catch up Option C and B have the same starting target in 2025, which gives car companies two years to prepare for the stricter targets under option C (which only kick in from 2026 onwards). Two years is sufficient time for car makers to adjust their supply, given the number of ZEVs already on the global market and more under development. Car companies have known of the Government’s intention to introduce some form of NVES since 2022, and 85% of the world is already covered by emissions standards, making this change foreseeable. If there is a short period where a number of the most polluting vehicles in Australia increase in price due to penalties under Option C, that can be managed through car companies buying credits from 100% ZEV car makers, further subsidising their price, and encouraging the overall shift. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	Yes
1378868	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	If we want to save this planet for our kids, we need to act now and act fast.	No

1378874	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to phase out fossil fuels as fast as possible	No
1378888	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Not doing something radical now will only prolong the economic pain as we are simply deferring costs to be spent on climate change adaptation rather than mitigation. The cost difference between B and C is not that great but will deliver higher net abatement which is crucial.	No
1378899	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1378926	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis should determine target strength The NVES should set emission targets over a timeframe that reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. This requires a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2035 at the latest. Option C and B are both acceptable as they would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions. Targets are sufficiently distant for supply to catch up Option C and B have the same starting target in 2025, which gives car companies two years to prepare for the stricter targets under option C (which only kick in from 2026 onwards). Two years is sufficient time for car makers to adjust their supply, given the number of ZEVs already on the global market and more under development. Car companies have known of the Government's intention to introduce some form of NVES since 2022, and 85% of the world is already covered by emissions standards, making this change foreseeable. If there is a short period where a number of the most polluting vehicles in Australia increase in price due to penalties under Option C, that can be managed through car companies buying credits from 100% ZEV car makers, further subsidising their price, and encouraging the overall shift. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	Yes
1378927	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis should determine target strength The NVES should set emission targets over a timeframe that reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. This requires a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2035 at the latest. Option C and B are both acceptable as they would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions. Targets are sufficiently distant for supply to catch up Option C and B have the same starting target in 2025, which gives car companies two years to prepare for the stricter targets under option C (which only kick in from 2026 onwards). Two years is sufficient time for car makers to adjust their supply, given the number of ZEVs already on the global market and more under development. Car companies have known of the Government's intention to introduce some form of NVES since 2022, and 85% of the world is already covered by emissions standards, making this change foreseeable. If there is a short period where a number of the most polluting vehicles in Australia increase in price due to penalties under Option C, that can be managed through car companies buying credits from 100% ZEV car makers, further subsidising their price, and encouraging the overall shift. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	Yes

1378935	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1378953	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	NULL	Yes
1378967	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate change is serious & need to act carefully & follow the science. Need to act now.	No
1378970	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change seems to be causing a lot of unanticipated outcomes for the environment world-wide, including changes in land and water temperatures, changing ocean currents, increased stress on a wide range of species, rising sea levels which are already impacting on coastal and island communities, etc. With so many unknowns and such negative impacts it is imperative that we maximise our responses to reducing greenhouse emissions. Australia, as a strong economic leader and natural resources provider, should also be showing leadership by being pro-active and maximising our climate responses.	NULL
1378974	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1378986	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1378992	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	We need to cut emissions as soon as possible	NULL
1379028	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want to reduce the emissions as fast as possible.	Yes
1379031	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Because it is incredibly obvious from current climate forecasting and current extreme weather events that we are not moving fast enough. We need to pay to move faster and do the right thing for the planets future, our future and that of our children.	No
1379034	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	In addition to their emissions, these bloated vehicles intimidate (due to their weight, bulk and danger in an accident) both pedestrians and cyclists, reduce visibility for other vehicles and take more space to park. The sooner they can be economically replaced with more efficient, and hopefully somewhat smaller vehicles the better!	Yes
1379037	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis should determine target strength The NVES should set emission targets over a timeframe that reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. This requires a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2035 at the latest. Option C and B are both acceptable as they would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions. Targets are sufficiently distant for supply to catch up Option C and B have the same starting target in 2025, which gives car companies two years to prepare for the stricter targets under option C (which only kick in from 2026 onwards). Two years is sufficient time for car makers to adjust their supply, given the number of ZEVs already on the global market and more under development. Car companies have known of the Government's intention to introduce some form of NVES since 2022, and 85% of the world is already covered by emissions standards, making this change foreseeable. If there is a short period where a number of the most polluting vehicles in Australia increase in price due to penalties under Option C, that can be managed through car companies buying credits from 100% ZEV car makers, further subsidising their price, and encouraging the overall shift. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in	NULL



			real time The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	
1379041	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to have already done it.	No
1379364	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis should determine target strength The NVES should set emission targets over a timeframe that reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. This requires a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2035 at the latest. Option C and B are both acceptable as they would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions. Targets are sufficiently distant for supply to catch up Option C and B have the same starting target in 2025, which gives car companies two years to prepare for the stricter targets under option C (which only kick in from 2026 onwards). Two years is sufficient time for car makers to adjust their supply, given the number of ZEVs already on the global market and more under development. Car companies have known of the Government's intention to introduce some form of NVES since 2022, and 85% of the world is already covered by emissions standards, making this change foreseeable. If there is a short period where a number of the most polluting vehicles in Australia increase in price due to penalties under Option C, that can be managed through car companies buying credits from 100% ZEV car makers, further subsidising their price, and encouraging the overall shift. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	Yes
1379447	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Best health benefits. Australia is already so far behind other nations that we can't stay out feet any longer.	Yes
1379487	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I think we can & need to do much better. The climate crisis is very real and we need to do as much as we can to reduce emissions in as many areas as possible. We (Australia) are already the laughing stock of how poor our emissions standards are, so let's aim to at least match other countries. Preferably exceed them & set a better standard. We need to do this for the future of our children & this country.	Yes
1379488	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Even with the greater costs, option C still renders the highest benefit. Also, I don't believe we have the luxury of time anymore. Hence, we must act fast.	NULL
1379557	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has waited too long already to implement fuel efficiency standards, so I think we need to go as fast as possible to catch up with other nations in order to prevent a climate catastrophe.	Yes
1379607	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is so far the developed world in controlling transport emissions it is shameful and measures should be undertaken to reduce these emissions as soon as possible. Only today it has been reported the the Great Barrier Reef is already showing signs of another bleaching even-reducing emissions ASAP is imperative.	Yes
1379625	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I have moved already to a full EV	Yes
1379656	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Benefit cost ratio is best	Yes
1379721	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The net benefit is better	No

1379733	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis should determine target strength The NVES should set emission targets over a timeframe that reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. This requires a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2035 at the latest. Option C and B are both acceptable as they would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions. Targets are sufficiently distant for supply to catch up Option C and B have the same starting target in 2025, which gives car companies two years to prepare for the stricter targets under option C (which only kick in from 2026 onwards). Two years is sufficient time for car makers to adjust their supply, given the number of ZEVs already on the global market and more under development. Car companies have known of the Government's intention to introduce some form of NVES since 2022, and 85% of the world is already covered by emissions standards, making this change foreseeable. If there is a short period where a number of the most polluting vehicles in Australia increase in price due to penalties under Option C, that can be managed through car companies buying credits from 100% ZEV car makers, further subsidising their price, and encouraging the overall shift. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	Yes
1379784	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	I believe we should start these standards as soon as possible	NULL
1379785	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to start being leaders in this space and decarbonise our economy as quickly as possible. Get on with it and stop being bullied by lobbyists afraid of change.	NULL
1379796	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 0th	It seems to be an adequate and flexible option.	Yes
1379816	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	We will end up paying for the carbon emissions. The sooner we reduce the emissions the better for the environment.	No
1379876	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to urgently do our part to prevent environmental collapse. This has economic, health and societal benefits. It gives the country a sense of responsibility and trustworthiness as we get closer to the 2032 games	NULL
1379885	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1379902	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need a high benefit at reasonable cost	Yes
1379906	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia as a country needs to catch up with its global obligations, and provide its citizens with options that are available in other countries.	Yes
1379912	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because we have already passed several tipping points . To have any sort of future we need to act as quickly as possible	No
1379940	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to catch up with the rest of the world and we need to think of the future of the all the species here on this planet	Yes

1379943	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Australians (and manufacturers) resist change. Better to get the ball rolling with a reasonable scheme, than the whole being rejected.	Yes
1379947	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1379958	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Moving faster provides greater benefit, especially for the environment and climate.	Yes
1379997	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to catch up to the rest of the world. A NVES will bring Australia in line with other advanced countries. Who wants to be grouped with Russia! Option B is a wishy-washy compromise. Option C is courageous and necessary!	Yes
1379999	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	I don't support any of the above, the government have got their priorities totally wrong as usual. This is going to hit the population with guaranteed extra costs not only in the price of new vehicles but all running costs, service, cost of electricity, insurance , add to that the inability to travel 1000k without stopping and recharging bloody batteries. Also people like me who drive 20k per year towing caravan, boat etc around Australia impossible I could go on and on but as with all the other stupid ideas this government has come up with under the direction of Albanese and the nutter Bowen the comments from the public will not count until Australia is completely broken.	No
1380010	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We can do so much better, battery electric cars aren't new & encouraging them works, look at Norway for what can be achieved, and today is easier for EVs than a decade ago was	No
1380016	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is real and very serious	No
1380017	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	We are already well behind. The evidence is clearly apparent.	No
1380022	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to fix the climate now... If Floods, bushfires, storms aren't enough I don't know what is	NULL
1380024	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C delivers the greatest health and social benefits in the near term, and most importantly in the long term. By \social benefits\, this is the benefits to Australian society itself. Option C will maximise efforts to reduce the expanding greenhouse gas emissions from the transport sector, when climate change represents a profound threat to Australian society in the longer term. This comes after Australia has recorded its 3rd highest summer temperatures, within the first and second highest recorded temperatures also recorded in the last five years. Failing to do what can be done now, simpler defers greater cost and greater social pain to a fast approaching future. Option C also has the highest benefits for human health just on an air pollution perspective, and over the longer term for cost. Furthermore, I also respectfully add tha (a) At a bare minimum, SUVs should be treated the same as other passenger vehicles like sedans, and not given any exemptions and loopholes, particularly due to their outsized and growing contribution to air pollution, GHG emissions and damage to our roads due to their weight (b) The government should use the fuel efficiency standards to encourage and promote lighter, small vehicles, due to their lower impact and cost upon society across the board (eg. GHG emissions, particulate pollution, impact on road infrastructure and maintenance). (c) Penalties for non compliance should be significant, and a significant deterrent (d) The government should require real time testing of the fuel efficiency of vehicles by manufacturers, in light of the widespread evidence that laboratory testing has resulted in flawed, seriously inaccurate results. There should not be exemptions from the standards.	Yes
1380026	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	the timing is late but maximal decrease in carbon emmissions is essential	Yes
1380027	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Maximise net benefit	Yes

1380034	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because it's a climate emergency, half measures are not appropriate any more.	No
1380039	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To aim as high as we can for the best result possible.	NULL
1380043	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Internal combustion engined cars are approximately 30% efficient and pollute our environment. Fully electric cars are approximately 80% efficient and don't pollute our environment. People are out of touch with the basic physics concepts involved in using energy and this confuses the real issues. How can we reduce pollution if we are still importing petrol cars? America, Europe and China have realised the change to electric vehicles is essential to mitigate climate change and in Australia we seem more concerned with towing our imaginary boats! People have been romanced by the 500 km range offered by petrol cars when their daily drive is less than 50km! Driving internal combustion engined cars is an irresponsible waste of energy.	Yes
1380044	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Just stop dithering and get on with it. Utmost speed.	NULL
1380046	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I have three children and nine grandchildren, I have a loving duty to protect their lives in every way I can. I know from the science that fossil fuel use is directly and imminently endangering their lives and all of Life on Earth. I want the change to renewable energy to happen NOW, fossil fuel use must stop NOW.	Yes
1380053	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia must do as much as possible as soon as possible as reducing ghg emissions is urgent and we are all suffering from the health and climate impacts of slack standards due to slack government policies	No
1380054	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	I believe this is just another tax grab for the Labour government and will not do anything to make the motor car any more efficient let alone save the planet. with massive ships and aero planes leaving our shores and airports everyday the car is a tiny polluter in comparison. All they want to do it increase taxes and the quickest way is the motorist, they rake in enough through the double hit on our fuel and more by keeping the fuel prices very high and ups the cost of goods.	No
1380056	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1380058	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Provides the fastest transition, with an accelerated trajectory to beat CO2 targets for 2030/32	No
1380062	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have been lagging behind other OECD countries for too long now, so we need the fastest route to low emissions vehicles.	Yes
1380074	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Anything less than option C isn't good enough	No
1380076	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is falling further behind on emissions reduction targets. We need to impliment EV and all renewable energy options as quickly as possible	NULL
1380081	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We do not have the luxury of time to do anything slowly. We need to catch up to the rest of the world and do the right thing for the environment and our health. .	Yes
1380086	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis should determine target strength: The NVES should set emission targets over a timeframe that reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. This requires a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2035 at the latest. Option C and B are both acceptable as they would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions. Targets are sufficiently distant for supply to catch up: Option C and B have the same starting target in 2025, which gives car companies two years to prepare for the stricter targets under option C (which only kick in from 2026	Yes

			onwards). Two years is sufficient time for car makers to adjust their supply, given the number of ZEVs already on the global market and more under development. Car companies have known of the Government's intention to introduce some form of NVES since 2022, and 85% of the world is already covered by emissions standards, making this change foreseeable. If there is a short period where a number of the most polluting vehicles in Australia increase in price due to penalties under Option C, that can be managed through car companies buying credits from 100% ZEV car makers, further subsidising their price, and encouraging the overall shift. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles: Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles: The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial: The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out: Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time: The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions (onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	
1380087	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1380090	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Too much time has already been wasted trying to reduce CO2 emissions	No
1380091	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I think that we require a decisive correction from the previous apathy on transport emissions. I would like to see moves like this eradicate huge, inefficient vehicles from the road and possibly,, bring back the family car derived ute, like the Commodore or Falcon utes from Holden and ford respectively. I'd also like to see ongoing emissions testing of vehicles and the destruction of the American truck imports. They import with them all of their baggage, such as intolerable crash safety. I'd also like this to start a wider conversation on transport decarbonisation, investment into east coast rail freight opposed to trucks, high speed rail and even local trams.	Yes
1380096	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Sooner we get started, the sooner the changes will happen and the sooner things will improve.	Yes
1380100	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Improved air quality and less CO2 in atmosphere. Helps to address climate change.	Yes
1380104	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Highest benefit-cost ratio and will put Australia on the right path to achieving net zero by 2050.	Yes
1380107	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1380110	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are 10 years behind the EU standards, suppliers have had a great deal of time knowing these (or similar) regulations would finally becoming to Australia. They just want to keep dumping their older poor inefficient technology to maintain profits for as long as possible as many of the big suppliers have not spent enough time or money on new zero emissions vehicles. Lets not forget the appalling behaviour of the big suppliers over falsifying diesel emissions. Diesel cars should be banned ASAP, with diesel van and trucks phased over a period of time once the technology is mature.	Yes
1380111	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1380114	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C delivers the most positive outcome in terms of all quality-of-living factors, while having an only minor additional cost, and overall cost benefit ratio close to option B. Given the global race humanity faces against building an unpayable emissions debt, leaving us in dangerous territory for the climate, a rapid transition offers benefits beyond those in Australia. It also can place Australia in a leadership position to accelerate the transition for other countries, and solidify an important role in future clean economies. I would just caution against approaches that emphasise buying our way out of the problem, particularly if that is public money that goes directly out of the country to buy the products. We must have our own expertise and local industries, and helping the public transition away from emissions intensive lifestyle choices is paramount.	Yes

1380125	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Most practical trade-off between real world benefit and cost given exuding fleet.	Yes
1380127	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	\,B\, gives the best bang for bucks outcome	Yes
1380130	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to move quickly to reduce atmospheric pollution, and upgrade the \,national fleet.\,	Yes
1380132	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to catch up with the rest of the world	No
1380137	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	most benefits	No
1380147	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Need to act faster sooner	No
1380151	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we need to move FAST to prevent a climate disaster. we are sooo far behind the rest of the world with emission standards, it's a no brainer! we need to catch up!~	NULL
1380155	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should make the Australian standard the strongest in the world in order to attract low or zero emission vehicles. We should not be aiming to just catch up with the rest of the world but to lead for a change. The manufacturers have had plenty of notice have had plenty of notice. It is now time to think about what is best for the environment and the people. The longer we wait and slower we start the more the long term cost.	Yes
1380156	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis should determine target strength The NVES should set emission targets over a timeframe that reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. This requires a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2035 at the latest. Option C and B are both acceptable as they would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions. Targets are sufficiently distant for supply to catch up Option C and B have the same starting target in 2025, which gives car companies two years to prepare for the stricter targets under option C (which only kick in from 2026 onwards). Two years is sufficient time for car makers to adjust their supply, given the number of ZEVs already on the global market and more under development. Car companies have known of the Government's intention to introduce some form of NVES since 2022, and 85% of the world is already covered by emissions standards, making this change foreseeable. If there is a short period where a number of the most polluting vehicles in Australia increase in price due to penalties under Option C, that can be managed through car companies buying credits from 100% ZEV car makers, further subsidising their price, and encouraging the overall shift. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	Yes
1380165	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is real. Time to get on with it	NULL
1380173	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The big twin cab Ute's take up a full lane and are not a family vehicle. They plainly use more fuel and encourage aggressive behaviour. Being g industrial they would not be fuel efficient. Tha large SUV,'s are good for a family but think if all family members own car then they should all be fuel efficient.	No

1380174	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Recent on going "Extreme" weather indicates a need to act as fast as possible	No
1380179	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change won't wait. The additional costs between 2 and 3 are acceptable to me.	No
1380184	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The NVES should set emission targets over a timeframe that reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. This requires a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2035 at the latest. Option C and B are both acceptable as they would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions. Targets are sufficiently distant for supply to catch up Option C and B have the same starting target in 2025, which gives car companies two years to prepare for the stricter targets under option C (which only kick in from 2026 onwards). Two years is sufficient time for car makers to adjust their supply, given the number of ZEVs already on the global market and more under development. Car companies have known of the Government's intention to introduce some form of NVES since 2022, and 85% of the world is already covered by emissions standards, making this change foreseeable. If there is a short period where a number of the most polluting vehicles in Australia increase in price due to penalties under Option C, that can be managed through car companies buying credits from 100% ZEV car makers, further subsidising their price, and encouraging the overall shift. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	Yes
1380189	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The negative effects of climate change are accelerating. We need to act faster and smarter now.	Yes
1380192	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Anything that can help us combat climate change and the resulting extreme weather and other events is worth fast tracking and will only have benefits, both long and short term.	Yes
1380193	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are actually very late to implement these changes, and our environment is very damaged by our neglect. The sooner we act, the better in the long term.	Yes
1380195	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Greenhouse gas emissions need to be eliminated as soon as possible. otherwise the world will suffer economic and social consequences far greater than the cost of transition. Norway has proved it is possible to motivate electric vehicle use - we can do the same. Additional benefits include improvement in air quality - currently governments are comfortable with toxic waste discharge into the air, even though they have long prohibited liquid waste discharge into waterways. The only difference is that one is liquid and the other is gaseous.	No
1380198	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1380201	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1380206	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes

1380208	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should make Australia's Standard the strongest in the world. The strong headline target and fleet limit curve rules of Option C will help us both catch up and stay at the front of the global queue for efficient vehicles, making the Australian market extremely attractive for low and zero-emissions vehicles; save Australian consumers the most money in the long term; and reduce carbon emissions in the fastest way. Although the headline targets of Option B are good, they would only have us catch up to the US, and stay behind most other car markets (including right-hand drive markets like the United Kingdom and New Zealand). Sufficient notice has been given to manufacturers. Both Options B and C allow manufacturers two years before strong limits are set, which is more than enough time to adjust their supply. The Government has been clear about its intention for a New Vehicle Efficiency Standard since 2022, and Australia is one of the last developed countries to implement one. Benefits to consumers should be a priority. In the current cost of living crisis, the government should be prioritising options that lead to more wins for consumers. The benefit-to-cost ratio of Option B and C are very similar (4% difference), but the net benefits of Option C are far greater (18% difference). Penalties should match the rest of the world. The penalty price of Option C is more comparable to the European Union and will force manufacturers to comply and prioritise the Australian market. As the Government found, there is no evidence this will increase vehicle prices. Credits should expire within two years. The shorter expiry of credits in Option C means that overperforming manufacturers (such as electric vehicle-only manufacturers like Tesla and BYD) have a shorter time to sell their credits to other companies, making a slightly fairer playing field. No dodgy loopholes for mainstream technology. As in both Options B and C, excluding technology credits creates more transparency and simplicity in the scheme, and increases positive results for Australian consumers and carbon emissions. Multiplier credits in particular should be ruled out entirely. SUVs should be classified as passenger vehicles. As in both Options B and C, including SUVs and in the "Passenger Vehicle" category is smart and makes the Australian NVES stronger, especially given the consumer preference for larger vehicles. The Light Commercial Vehicle category should exist for genuine utility and commercial vehicles, not for bigger cars by default.	Yes
1380220	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to step up our accountability and actions to reduce emissions	Yes
1380221	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Planet carbon budget already approaching 1.5dec C warming. The climate crisis should determine target strength. The NVES should set emission targets over a timeframe that reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. This requires a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2035 at the latest. Option C and B are both acceptable as they would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions. Targets are sufficiently distant for supply to catch up. Option C and B have the same starting target in 2025, which gives car companies two years to prepare for the stricter targets under option C (which only kick in from 2026 onwards). Two years is sufficient time for car makers to adjust their supply, given the number of ZEVs already on the global market and more under development. Car companies have known of the Government's intention to introduce some form of NVES since 2022, and 85% of the world is already covered by emissions standards, making this change foreseeable. If there is a short period where a number of the most polluting vehicles in Australia increase in price due to penalties under Option C, that can be managed through car companies buying credits from 100% ZEV car makers, further subsidising their price, and encouraging the overall shift. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles. Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles. The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial. The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out. Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time. The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions (onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing wh	Yes
1380239	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option A is the least effective and excludes SUVs which are major polluters.	NULL
1380255	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1380257	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	NULL	NULL



1380262	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	fuel-efficient vehicles, making the Australian market extremely attractive for low and zero-emissions vehicles; save Australian consumers the most money in the long term; and reduce carbon emissions in the fastest way.	No
1380263	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The benefits of option C outweighs the costs and above all it's more sustainable.	No
1380264	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	More chance of not being blocked in Parliament	Yes
1380268	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The financial and health benefits of option C make it the only viable option	No
1380279	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Stop burning unnecessary fuel. Eventually it will run out. Just watch how the cltis changing, it is obvious	No
1380280	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1380282	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The approach of putting money as the priority had gotten us into this mess in the first place. Do our best to meet the targets so that successive generations don't have to pay for it. The outlay is more initially, but over time is the cheapest option to transition quickly. EVs are already here and there are several affordable options, even second hand options. Stop aiming for mediocrity - combining buzz words of 'strong' and 'ambitious' with 'achievable' makes the government sounds stupid and gutless - you're campaigning instead of doing your job and everyone is sick of the endless campaigning. Why won't the government show courage and do what's right? What's ACTUALLY strong and ambitious? Option C (and even further than option C if you can manage it) is the best outcome for people. Yes it costs money, but in the end it saves lives.	No
1380289	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must accelerate efforts to reign in carbon emission in all spheres causing the problem.	NULL
1380293	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	If we have any hope of meeting emissions reduction targets, we need bold decisive action.	Yes
1380297	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The lack of ICE vehicle options will be offset by Australia receiving access to a greater variety of low emission vehicle options. Those unable to afford EVs will continue to have access to Australia's existing fleet of vehicles and will have access to a greater quantity of affordable and cheaper to run EVs in the future under option C that they would under option B or A.	NULL
1380303	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	An EV sceptic from the oil and gas industry, I'm not 18months into ev ownership and I will never buy an ICE car again. Overall cost of ownership is much better, the science says that over the cars lifecycle I'm emitting less co2, I live in regional Australia and routinely (twice a year) do a 2600km road trip to see customers and stakeholders, the tesla charging network is amassing and improving all the time. Where we have to use fuel it should be the cleanest it can be.	Yes
1380306	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 0th	NULL	NULL
1380314	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	It's long overdue, we can't keep wasting time.	Yes
1380327	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fastest adoption, highest net benefit	No
1380329	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1380331	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1380339	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is one of the worst countries in the world for vehicle emissions standards, we need to rapidly catch up.	No
1380342	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Make car ownership cheaper	No
1380345	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1380350	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Benefits	No
1380355	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1380360	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1380363	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Its realistic for this country	No
1380369	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Catch up to other countries and stop lagging behind	No
1380371	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	I strongly support the move to EV's for normal daily operation, however 4WD's and utes in general are popular and necessary in many cases. Option B should put the MC category into the LCV class so that all 4WD vehicles are less affected by the NVES.	Yes
1380372	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B delivers many of the benefits of Option C but gives consumers time to convert to EVs, potentially still being able to sell their fuel emissions vehicles. The health benefits arising from reduced pollution will be available to all - not just those who can afford to own EVs	Yes
1380377	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Global consistency	Yes
1380378	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	So we don't upset the fat right COALition and Murdoch corp.	Yes
1380381	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fastest possible transition regardless of cost. Otherwise, the costs will be greater later on.	Yes
1380382	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis should determine target strength The NVES should set emission targets over a timeframe that reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. This requires a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2035 at the latest. Option C and B are both acceptable as they would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions. Targets are sufficiently distant for supply to catch up Option C and B have the same starting target in 2025, which gives car companies two years to prepare for the stricter targets under option C (which only kick in from 2026 onwards). Two years is sufficient time for car makers to adjust their supply, given the number of ZEVs already on the global market and more under	Yes

			development. Car companies have known of the Government's intention to introduce some form of NVES since 2022, and 85% of the world is already covered by emissions standards, making this change foreseeable. If there is a short period where a number of the most polluting vehicles in Australia increase in price due to penalties under Option C, that can be managed through car companies buying credits from 100% ZEV car makers, further subsidising their price, and encouraging the overall shift. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	
1380385	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The NVES should set emission targets over a timeframe that reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. This requires a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2035 at the latest. Option C and B are both acceptable as they would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions. Targets are sufficiently distant for supply to catch up Option C and B have the same starting target in 2025, which gives car companies two years to prepare for the stricter targets under option C (which only kick in from 2026 onwards). Two years is sufficient time for car makers to adjust their supply, given the number of ZEVs already on the global market and more under development. Car companies have known of the Government's intention to introduce some form of NVES since 2022, and 85% of the world is already covered by emissions standards, making this change foreseeable. If there is a short period where a number of the most polluting vehicles in Australia increase in price due to penalties under Option C, that can be managed through car companies buying credits from 100% ZEV car makers, further subsidising their price, and encouraging the overall shift. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	Yes
1380388	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Too much time has been wasted already.	NULL
1380389	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1380391	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1380392	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1380395	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Car emissions in Australia only made up a little over 8% of CO2 emissions in Australia in 2020. The government is not working hard enough to bring down emissions from other areas, instead they are proposing rules that are going to make us, as vehicle consumers foot the bill of climate change that we did not cause. Notwithstanding the fact that other reforms are being undertaken when it comes to climate change in other sectors, it does not stand to reason that the individual consumers should be made to pay for vehicle emissions standards. There may be a counter argument that car companies will foot the bill as they will be the ones paying the fines, but in reality the capitalist economy will ensure that the cost of the fines	No

			will ultimately be passed onto the consumer. Further, introducing emissions standards will force individuals who need to go on long trips for work in the outback and remote areas to eventually buy cars that are not fit for purpose. Technology is not at a stage where you can travel for 1000kms in one go in an electric vehicle. Technology does not allow for people to go on road trips without waiting for extremely long periods of time to 'refuel' their electric cars (yes you can go from 10% - 80% charge in under 20 mins in some car models), but that is still a long time in a country of our size. Further, there are no ways to charge electric cars in the outback and I doubt that a financial case will ever exist to have charging stations in extremely remote areas off the main highways and roads. So, it is illogical to push SOLELY for electric cars. There is also the argument that hybrid vehicles could be used for these purposes. Well, there are many negatives associated with these vehicles as well (and all of these also apply to battery electric vehicles). Firstly, the batteries cost the same amount as the whole car to replace when they get 10 years old, no one can afford that. Secondly, the batteries cause toxic chemicals, arguably worse for the environment as they can leech into the water system, to be expelled from disused batteries when they cant be used provided they are not recycled. Thirdly, due to the high cost of batteries, if the batteries are damaged for whatever reason, which could happen even if you were to drive over a rock and scrape the bottom of your car, insurance companies will often write-off the entire car due to the battery costing more than the value of the car or costing a ridiculous proportion of the cost of the car. Thus, insurance for these cars will largely outweigh the fuel savings as people are paying for the insurance costs of repairing cars that are costing so much to fix when they get damaged or break. Therefore, insurance costs will start to increase dramatically, used cars will be of less value due to their degraded batteries, and people will have cars incapable of taking them on the trips they need to undertake for whatever reason. People have different needs, allow choice, don't dictate.	
1380396	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to do this as quickly and acceptably as possible.	Yes
1380400	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is real and it's time AUS catch up with the OECD!	No
1380401	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Will save the people lots of money and also less spending on health	No
1380402	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We in Australia are the dumping ground for sub-standard cars/4x4s/ trucks for far too long, makes it seem we are pandering to the old soviet ideals	No
1380404	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1380411	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	The climate won't wait.	No
1380412	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1380427	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1380432	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to be ambitious and begin to be a world leader with regards to reducing its climate impact. Australia's per capita contribution to climate change is irresponsible and should be reigned in as soon as possible. On top of this, Australia misses out on the newest and greatest options for vehicles as manufacturers prioritise delivery of these vehicles to markets that already have these equivalent standards in place.	Yes
1380434	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1380441	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we are not doing enough to reach our targets, and some of the projections for emissions reductions from current policies are likely to be optimistic	Yes

1380442	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1380446	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The few degrees of warming are already melting the ice caps and acidifying the seas. This is URGENT	No
1380447	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has avoided fuel efficiency standards for way too long and we have missed the opportunity to do it 'slowly'. Taking the middle option just gives the Coalition and lobby groups more opportunities to play spoiler and tear down the improvements. Australia needs to take a strong and determined stance to get back inline with the rest of the world on fuel efficiency.	Yes
1380449	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Let's get dirty gas-guzzling cars off our roads!	No
1380450	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The many large high-emissions vehicles being sold in large numbers here should be limited. They are dangerous and are promoted as tax deductible expenses which leads to further excess distances	No
1380451	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1380452	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1380456	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1380462	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Increased Costs for households	No
1380465	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis should determine target strength The NVES should set emission targets over a timeframe that reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. This requires a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2035 at the latest. Option C and B are both acceptable as they would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions. Targets are sufficiently distant for supply to catch up Option C and B have the same starting target in 2025, which gives car companies two years to prepare for the stricter targets under option C (which only kick in from 2026 onwards). Two years is sufficient time for car makers to adjust their supply, given the number of ZEVs already on the global market and more under development. Car companies have known of the Government's intention to introduce some form of NVES since 2022, and 85% of the world is already covered by emissions standards, making this change foreseeable. If there is a short period where a number of the most polluting vehicles in Australia increase in price due to penalties under Option C, that can be managed through car companies buying credits from 100% ZEV car makers, further subsidising their price, and encouraging the overall shift. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	Yes
1380466	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	The cost of moving too fast to renewables and greener emissions targets is more than the average Australian can afford. Many people are really struggling already. The emissions targets and the levy being charged are way more than other countries have implemented. It is too much, way too soon!	No

1380470	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because we're headed into a climate catastrophe and we need to do everything we can to reduce emissions	Yes
1380471	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I care about our kids future	Yes
1380474	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1380482	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are already behind the rest of the OECD countries. We need to catch up to improve our air quality and also get access to more efficient vehicles.	Yes
1380484	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Far too aggressive a target that manufacturers will struggle with and just end up pushing up costs, in particular in Light commercial category which has had medium commercial dumped into it. Will be a hard hit on commercial and suitable tow vehicles, pushing retention of older vehicles with less pollution controls and safety features	No
1380490	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	If the earth's atmosphere reaches critical temperature rise we and all creatures on this planet will be dead, so no option.	No
1380494	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We notoriously lag behind all the time. If you don't want australia to be the dumping ground of all petrol cars then make it faster.	No
1380495	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Aligns best with international community. Does not perpetuate high emissions cars on the road.	No
1380496	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	You can't pollute now and magically reverse it later. It's better to be serious about this and get it done. Future generations need us not to sell them out for quick gain.	No
1380497	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Need to see Govt implementing policy to reduce emissions as soon as possible.	Yes
1380499	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Need to aggressively make up for lost time.	No
1380503	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1380505	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The faster we move on this the better for people's health. You will save money from the health budget. You should also stop supporting the fossil fuel industry with all those subsidies	No
1380511	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1380512	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1380513	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	There's not much difference between Option B and C, but B may be more palatable to the majority of people.	Yes

1380519	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To reduce Carbon emissions quickly.	No
1380523	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Economic benefit	Yes
1380528	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Support green energy	No
1380529	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	IPCC report	Yes
1380531	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Electric vehicle owner and believe in a greener future.	No
1380537	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1380540	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce CO2 emissions quickly and by a large amount. Option C comes closet to this outcome.	NULL
1380542	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We can cope with extra cost but not with increasing pollution caused by conventional vehicles. Australia is a wealthy country and we must act quickly to match the rest of the world in vehicle efficiency.	No
1380543	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	EVs are cheaper to run and better for health.	Yes
1380547	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Better cars, better air quality, less deaths	Yes
1380548	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The longer Australia lags behind the rest of the developed world the harder it will be to catch up. A fast start encourages safer cleaner cars sooner than later and will drive competition (eg prices) down making lower emissions vehicles the logical choice	Yes
1380550	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This is the option that will bring down emissions fastest, as we need to do. I am concerned about the inclusion of mass in the formula - it seems we can still have increased mass of vehicles under this arrangement.	No
1380555	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We compete with the largest markets for the most efficient drivetrains. The sooner we're on a level playing field, the better for Australian consumers.	Yes
1380556	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Net Zero by 1.5 degrees warming. Avoid further climate breakdown	No
1380557	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have taken too long to act and now there is no time to waste. We must act fast for the sake of our children and the future of the planet.	No
1380561	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As a mechanic its frustrating to see such marginal improvements in vehicle efficiency. With a young family of my own i want to see net zero reached as fast as possible.	Yes

1380563	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	The figures provided for the benefits side of this equation for options B and C are fanciful and will not materialise in the real world.	No
1380566	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1380569	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1380577	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1380578	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Let's get with thr rest of the world	No
1380579	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1380580	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	We must need to do so much better! Half measures won't cut it	No
1380582	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	It will make NO difference to climate change and impact our economy unnecessarily.	No
1380583	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1380587	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1380590	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1380591	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1380594	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1380598	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1380602	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Delivering a strong and effective fuel efficiency standard for Australia's light vehicle fleet is essential to drive down carbon pollution and cut the cost of living for Australians. The New Vehicle Efficiency Standard (NVES) should reflect that there is a dire need to meet our Net Zero targets as soon as possible. I believe that a mixture of Option B and Option C is the best choice for Australia to ensure we reduce CO2 emissions, preferably with the Option C target provided by the government's impact analysis of 74 million tonnes by 2050. This will support the government to meet its Net Zero targets and allow space for other industries that face stronger challenges for transitioning to reduce their emissions. I also believe the NVES should prioritise a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles by 2035 at the latest. I believe that cutting vehicle emissions is imperative to delivering cleaner air for better health, boosting national energy security, and improving access to greener cars for Australians as soon as possible, while supporting us to slow global warming and protect Australia. I strongly support the key common features in options B and C	Yes



			as minimum starting points for unlocking better access to low and zero emissions vehicles as soon as possible. Primarily, I support and believe the following features be included in the NEVS: SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles. Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles. The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial. The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out. Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time. The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	
1380603	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The most reduction in carbon emissions in the least amount of time	Yes
1380604	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1380607	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C gives the greatest benefits. We need to address greenhouse emissions either the greatest possible urgency. We can implement Option C and do that's what we need to do.	Yes
1380614	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The government needs to start taking climate change seriously.	No
1380615	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	My family are from rural Australia, the backbone and \,primary\, industry that built this country. Our work contributes to import and export dollars and keeps the country fed and clothed. The country road network is in a state of disrepair and is worsening by the day. That combined with exploding feral animal numbers, every drive in the country is a chance to lose your life, even in the vehicles we drive currently. We need the light commercials and 4x4 wagons we have and we need them to be more affordable. We already pay huge amounts of luxury car tax and higher stamp duty on the cars the govt deems a luxury instead of seeing its a necessity. This plan will increase the vehicle price exponentially. Combine that with huge kms between fuel stops, electric and cross over vehicles are simply not a choice we can make. What this plan will do to the cost of transport for us will be crippling. Lets not forget the risk to our safety should we be forced in to lesser vehicles. Go back to the drawing board and make a plan compliant to Australia rather than something that works at an urban level because what you have created here, is absolutely embarrassing.	No
1380620	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	It must be achievable without destroying what we have now, however, transition will be painful in terms of services and social change.	Yes
1380627	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1380634	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to catch up to the rest of the world. Option C is the only choice.	No
1380638	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As an individual who is severely impacted by current emissions, I strongly believe that option C is the best approach for the health of our nation. Aggressive policy with incentives for both the everyday individual and industry is required to push Australia forward towards more environmentally conscious technology. The only way for industry to be motivated on that pathway is for policy to push them. The everyday consumer have been showing their preference however this has been severely hampered by the lack of development within industry and suppliers who are holding onto profits for shareholders as their main priority.	Yes
1380649	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we need to cut emissions as quickly as possible	Yes
1380651	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	C is fastest option	No

1380654	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The technology is available to go straight to option C; benefits for climate in terms of emissions mitigations; and, public health in terms of reduced PMM2.5.	Yes
1380655	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australians has the most to benefit from strong action. We are already a hot country, set to get hotter with increased fire risk. Additionally, the stronger action is a mere 19% more in net cost than option B, so it makes good economic sense to spend a little bit more to get a better outcome.	No
1380658	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Best for the planet and the health of its inhabitants.	No
1380665	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1380670	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I support the government's preferre Option B, being an ambitious, necessary and realistic framework to enable Australians to enjoy and benefit from a cleaner, cheaper vehicle fleet.	Yes
1380676	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Time is running out to stop critical climate change. Urgent introduction of fuel emission standards are needed.	Yes
1380680	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has an urgent need for investment in infrastructure to facilitate the transition to sustainable energy environment and not be left behind. We can also grasp this opportunity to be a leader in developing renewable technology industries.	Yes
1380681	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Electric vehicles are not the future, just a muddle point.	Yes
1380688	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to act now and strongly but we need to support those who can least afford it to make the change also	Yes
1380692	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Better for the environment & Australia will have better access to more efficient vehicles	Yes
1380706	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Existential risk to humanity is at play and requires drastic action.	Yes
1380717	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C best of the 3 options, but should be made stronger by removing loopholes, international comparison shows Option C is at least where we should be based on comparable jurisdictions like NZ, UK and EU. Supercredits should be not included at all. Vehicle mass should be considered further, ideally making the mass curve flat to not encourage large vehicles. Light commercial vehicles will be a loophole that weakens the scheme if not tightened. This policy is a good start but not a silver bullet, and must be done alongside strong investment in public transport, cycling infrastructure and developing walkable neighbourhoods.	No
1380718	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Highest cost option gives the highest benefits. If we are not aggressive, my great grandchildren may not have a habitable planet to live. I want to the the most I can, not be held by procrastinators who think this is job for someone else.	Yes
1380720	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	This is the only realistic option for us, our country and the world	No
1380725	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	In terms of climate response, and reducing fossil fuel costs and dependency - we need to be going as far as possible with this policy. The faster we start limiting emissions, the better. These standards will also be beneficial for consumers. I personally would like to purchase a low emission vehicle but there are few affordable options at present. We should also encourage lighter and smaller vehicles - we have too many utes and suvs that are never used for a commerical purpose and are more likely to cause serious injury or death in a car crash.	Yes

1380727	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis should determine target strength The NVES should set emission targets over a timeframe that reflects the urgency of the climate crisis. This requires a transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) by 2035 at the latest. Option C and B are both acceptable as they would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. The impact analysis estimates that by 2050, option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets in a context where other sectors face even greater challenges to reduce emissions. Targets are sufficiently distant for supply to catch up Option C and B have the same starting target in 2025, which gives car companies two years to prepare for the stricter targets under option C (which only kick in from 2026 onwards). Two years is sufficient time for car makers to adjust their supply, given the number of ZEVs already on the global market and more under development. Car companies have known of the Government's intention to introduce some form of NVES since 2022, and 85% of the world is already covered by emissions standards, making this change foreseeable. If there is a short period where a number of the most polluting vehicles in Australia increase in price due to penalties under Option C, that can be managed through car companies buying credits from 100% ZEV car makers, further subsidising their price, and encouraging the overall shift. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles Option C and B rightly include SUVs in the passenger vehicle category. There is no justification for a higher CO2 limit for a vehicle that is larger due to consumer preference, rather than for a genuine utility or commercial reason (which is covered by the LCV category). The NVES should encourage lighter vehicles The Government should consider lowering the break point for vehicles to 1800 kg or less, or better yet, eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. Penalties should be substantial The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding their CO2/km target – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are an excellent feature of both B and C. Banking and trading of credits is acceptable if limited in scope – these should not be expanded beyond the 2 years suggested by Option C. Emissions should be tested in real time The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions ( onboard fuel consumption monitoring) to prevent manufacturers from producing laboratory testing which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	Yes
1380729	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1380756	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Damages on the Environment, Health and cost savings of B&C are very important to me and others. Option C is best because it also reinforces Australia fuel security. It enables Australia not to have depend on Fossil fuel import. Option C is not too much of a stretch. It is consistent with our neighbor NZ. Most importantly, the important gains of Option C (and B) can only be achieved when all super credits and loop holes must be Prevented and currently they exist in Option B and C.	Yes
1380817	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Greater environmental benefits but also greater cost benefits. Embarrassing that on a world stage we are so far behind either comparable developing countries in terms of having decent standards. I do not support option B because it is weak. I support option C. Option B is better than nothing, but a poor approach.	No
1380831	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I don't want Australia to be the dumping ground of the world for high emissions cars.	Yes
1380853	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Our environment needs swift and decisive action if we are going to make any difference	No
1380859	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have already been slow in Australia to adopt vehicle efficiency standards compared to the rest of the world. Let's stop extending this time and start taking it seriously for the good of our carbon footprint.	No
1380862	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Environmental benefit must be first concern	No
1380865	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1380870	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	While my preferred choice is option C, I worry that the electricity infrastructure will not have sufficient ability to meet the demand. Option A, with its continued reliance on imported fuel is a bad option	Yes

1380875	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to align our efficiency standards with world's best practice. This will result in significantly less pollution and significant reduction in carbon emissions.	NULL
1380885	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1380887	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I don't believe there is time to waste in adopting efficiency standards.	Yes
1380889	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Greater Co2 reduction. I believe current processes are undervaluing co2 reduction	Yes
1380896	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1380901	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Govt has been too slow to react already. Time to get on with it	No
1380903	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This is an emergency on a scale never before seen. I know the ALP is famously uninterested in doing something about this, but now is not the time for half measures	No
1380904	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	For greatest environmental health	NULL
1380916	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1380918	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The strongest option to reduce emissions quickly and reach net zero ASAP. Reducing CO2 should be our priority.	Yes
1380925	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C has a higher net benefit than B and, to the extent that it might put Australia ahead of the global curve, that would be a good thing	NULL
1380928	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1380932	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	It's an emergency but I'm concerned about how costs are transferred to families and businesses. The faster the better where ever that's possible please.	Yes
1380934	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Additional benefits easily outweigh additional costs involved.	NULL
1380950	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C would be the preference however it could be hard to achieve. Option B seems the more realistic transformation change.	Yes
1380951	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C clearly provides the greatest benefits across all categories of benefits and is clearly the best option to allow Australia to catch up with more developed countries. Australia has a moral obligation as a wealthy first world nation to transition as fast as possible to Net Zero.	NULL

1380953	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	The Government should select the option with the highest level of emissions abatement. Vehicle manufacturers are already producing many low-cost zero emissions and low emissions vehicles, and are clearly capable of meeting strong emissions standards. The Government's estimates of compliance and vehicle technology costs under the scheme are likely exaggerated. Lower costs would mean the cost-benefit ratio of Option C is higher.	Yes
1380955	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	This will just drive prices of new cars up during a cost of living crisis. It will also drive up the prices of used cars just when they are starting to come down.	No
1380958	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	New car supply is now starting to improve this plan will reduce supply and increase prices of new cars again	No
1380960	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	reduce pollution in the air	Yes
1380961	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1380963	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This is long overdue and the pace needs to be faster to send a message to industry, therefore option C makes most sense. The major differences in Option B and C seem to be in electricity costs which should be part of other complementary initiatives to keep lower so there may be benefits in pushing for Option C.	Yes
1380966	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	We are not on high incomes, only modest.	No
1380968	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to address climate change and get old, inefficient cars off the road - including big gas guzzling SUVs.	No
1380979	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	My sincere preference is to take the fastest route.	NULL
1380981	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to proceed with the energy transition as quickly as possible. Option C provides the fastest route to turning over the vehicle fleet. The difference in cost/benefit ratio is small enough that the quicker option should be chosen.	Yes
1380983	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C delivers the greatest overall benefit, justifying the increased costs relative to B	Yes
1380987	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Greater cost benefit ratio for C over B, shows we're serious and brings us up to speed with other countries which will ensure we don't provide an excuse for car manufacturers and don't end up with a legacy of lower standard vehicles	Yes
1380997	Name withheld	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1381002	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1381007	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Must act faster	Yes
1381010	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to remove our existing subsidies of carbon-intensive transport as rapidly as we can	No

1381013	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	option C accelerate faster to our Net Zero target.	Yes
1381016	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs an aggressive approach to emissions reductions to undo the harm of the last 10 years of inaction. This will help us demonstrate leadership globally, and get Australia back on track for our 2050 net zero goals.	Yes
1381026	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	For Australia to have the greatest chance of limiting impacts to 2c warming and associated increased climatic events and economic costs Option C will provide greatest security in achieving this outcome. This considers the high vehicular dependency which Australia relies upon for both private but also transport use in the country. This will also align with individual Council and State commitments towards Net Zero Emissions targets that are required before 2050. Economic analysis of climatic events from emissions/ warming must be considered in the decision making which will only continue if rapid transition is not afforded. As Australia trails behind all other developed nations for the transition to low/ no emissions technology this will force manufacturer uplift to align with model variety and encourage manufacturer technological improvements benefiting community long term.	NULL
1381028	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to decarbonise as quickly as possible and electric cars is a key part of that.	Yes
1381041	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1381044	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I've chosen to support option 3 - the fastest transition to greener, lower-emissions vehicles, and electric vehicles, due to its compelling Benefit-Cost Ratio (BCR) analysis results. The benefits significantly outweigh the costs when compared to the other options. This choice is not just about economics; it's also about our responsibility to future generations and our planet. Climate change poses severe risks, and we need to do our part by reducing emissions as quickly as possible. Moreover, Australia has been lagging in this transition. It's high time we leverage this opportunity to leap forward, not in small, incremental steps, but bold, substantial strides. This transition promises not only environmental benefits but also potential economic and health benefits. Cleaner air, less noise pollution, and a significant reduction in greenhouse gas emissions are just a few of the potential advantages. By embracing this change, we can set a precedent, demonstrating to the world that rapid transition is not only possible but also beneficial to citizens and the country as a whole.	Yes
1381047	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need action now	NULL
1381049	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Without a guarantee that people who live in areas, people who have business needs or those who have caravans or trailers are not adversely impacted (ie price increase of vehicles taxes ect.) I believe there would be not only an economic but a personal financial, social and psychological impact.	No
1381059	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to cut emissions as soon as possible. The societal costs outweigh the direct financial costs.	Yes
1381061	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	None of the above thanks. The claimed savings cannot be believed.	No
1381063	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We have to something sensible and deliverable, which we can do by implementing efficiency standards broadly in line with the US and EU, and for which there is a wide range of vehicles in production	Yes
1381064	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	No to all options. Experts have said that this will only increase pieces.	No
1381065	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	I don't support any option. Chris Bowen can't be believed on this one.	No

1381067	Name withheld	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	NULL	Yes
1381070	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Needs to be fast, but people are slow to get going , unfortunately	Yes
1381077	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1381078	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	High emissions are responsible for a great deal of mental issues	Yes
1381080	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to be ambitious to reduce emissions and respond to the pressing issue of today which is Climate Change	Yes
1381085	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We don't really have the option to wait. We should aim for option C, which offers the fastest emissions reduction, as well as the highest return on investment target immediately. Additionally, the ability to do sell credits should be planned to be phased out, perhaps gradually, from the get go.	Yes
1381090	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to get serious about doing all we can to combat climate change and should be aiming to lead to world and be a role model, not just follow	No
1381092	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Australia should be a front runner and lead the way globally in vehicle efficiency standards	Yes
1381093	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B provides the best flexibility and hopefully the less resistance from incumbents	Yes
1381097	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is an existential issue for the planet. As a developed country with a significant carbon export footprint and a legacy of denial and agreement obstruction we have a moral responsibility to act swiftly and lead in decarbonisation.	Yes
1381102	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reach and exceed our emissions as quickly as possible. An extra \$12 billion is nothing when we're already spending \$46 billion	NULL
1381104	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia's record on climate change is a crime against humanity's future. We could live in a country powered entirely by renewable energy, woven together by accessible public transport, in which the opportunities of this transition are designed to systematically eliminate racial and gender inequality. Caring for one another and caring for the planet could be the economy's fastest growing sectors. We know that the time for this great transition is short. Climate scientists have told us that THIS is the DECADE to take decisive action to prevent catastrophic global warming. That means small steps will no longer get us where we need to go. We need to leap.	No
1381111	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Provides maximum economic and health benefits. Also better integration with EU and US standards, so should be simple for manufacturers to implement.	Yes
1381116	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It gets a faster start, with lower emissions by 2029.	NULL
1381128	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I am very concerned about climate change. I live in a busy city road I am also very concerned the health impacts of diesel emissions. My three nearest neighbours had dementia and they had all about	NULL
1381134	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce our emissions as quickly as possible. We have already wasted too much time.	Yes

1381135	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	All current climate data is outpacing predictions; immediate action is necessary. Any perceived cost saving now will be met with significantly higher cost of health/community/climate impact and associated spending in the next 50-100 years. Spend the money and curb the impact now, or pay with more than money later.	Yes
1381136	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The Australian Government needs to stop being so apathetic and conservative about any kind of human-induced climate change abatement. We -- all of us -- have prevaricated for at least 40 years.	NULL
1381139	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Climate change.	NULL
1381142	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Don't support any of the options. You are just adding to the cost of living crisis by increasing the price of vehicles.	No
1381147	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1381148	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	No thanks to any of the options. This policy is based on the false idea that EVs are zero emissions. In the UK the Advertising Standards Authority has ruled that electric cars cannot be advertised as completely "zero emission" because of the carbon dioxide that is generated when they are made and charged. So this policy needs to be reworked to include ALL emissions in a vehicles lifecycle. The current assumptions are completely wrong. An EV will generate CO2 emissions if the owner charges it using the mostly fossil fuel powered electricity grid.	No
1381151	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	No to all options. This policy is based on the false idea that EVs are zero emissions. In the UK the Advertising Standards Authority has ruled that electric cars cannot be advertised as completely "zero emission" because of the carbon dioxide that is generated when they are made and charged. So this policy needs to be reworked to include ALL emissions in a vehicles lifecycle. The current assumptions are completely wrong. An EV will generate CO2 emissions if the owner charges it using the mostly fossil fuel powered electricity grid.	No
1381152	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	All options are bad. Don't you people understand that EVs are not zero emissions. Yes they have zero tailpipe emission but not completely zero emissions. Anyone with a brain would realise that.	No
1381153	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I am extremely concerned about the impacts of climate change and we should be doing all that we can to keep global warming below 1.5 degrees. As a family we spend as much money as we can to transition (solar and we are buying an EV and heat pump this year) but it has to be the entire population doing the heavy lifting.	Yes
1381154	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B is the closest to a progressive plan, however a reduction of over 60% is very ambitious and the credit banking, pooling and trading not favourable for implementing a new program. Furthermore, the penalties need to be more saleable as the program is introduced. Overall, the Australian Government needs to revise the option and find middle ground between option A and B.	No
1381156	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	None of the options are any good. Please scrap the entire scheme. EVs are not zero emissions!	No
1381159	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Most effective option	No
1381161	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As it is already many many years down the track from where strong action on emissions should have been taken, substantial steps need to be taken now. Unfortunately , we don't have the luxury of taking this matter slower as the negative impacts from inaction this far are significant for our planet. Strong and concerted efforts must happen immediately.	No
1381162	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We only have one planet. It's critically important that we reduce the impact on global warning. As a family, we're doing as much as we can - why can the government not do everything available?	Yes
1381163	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fastest transition to a low carbon economy is required. Incentives for vehicle manufacturers need to be tangible.	NULL
1381164	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to move quickly on this, but bring everyone along with us.	Yes



1381167	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to reduce carbon emissions, but especially the impact on human health and the health of the animals and plants.	Yes
1381168	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	A plan needs to be ambitious and reflective of the outsized risks facing our future.	Yes
1381172	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Sending Australia and its people broke whilst other countries expand and prosper with no regard for the environment	No
1381175	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cleanest, soonest	Yes
1381176	Name withheld	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Of the 3 options, Option C is the best but is still insufficient to reduce emissions in line with a 1.5 degree science-based emissions reduction target. Options A and B are insufficient and unacceptable. If the government is serious about taking action on climate change, Option C should be accelerated further with a trajectory all the way to zero emissions and with no loopholes for light commercial vehicles. Option C currently contains unacceptable loopholes for light commercial vehicles. Stricter eligibility criteria for what counts and who can claim it as a light commercial vehicle should be enacted to ensure this doesn't become a loophole used to undermine the effectiveness of the standard. Efficiency standards and encouraging the uptake of EVs is a very positive step, but it must be done alongside strong investment in public transport, cycling infrastructure and developing walkable neighbourhoods through planning reforms that will lead to a safer and healthier society. Strong incentives should also be given to encourage the uptake of e-bikes which are orders of magnitude more efficient than even EVs. As the owner of an e-bike, I can attest that they really do encourage mode shifting to this more sustainable, zero emission and active transport option.	No
1381177	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Environmental impact	Yes
1381181	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to cut carbon emissions as much as possible as quickly as possible.	Yes
1381182	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is the most effective of the three options, although it is still feeble given how catastrophic climate change is and the health effects of traffic pollution. I think you have underestimated the cost of the health effects because you seem to have only considered air pollution directly cause by vehicles. As the greenhouse gases emitted by vehicles lead to more bushfires and floods, they lead to more bushfire smoke and mouldy houses, both of which trigger asthma and other medical conditions. Also, research is continuing to uncover more health problems caused by traffic pollution. I don't know how you calculated "the value placed on human life and health," but I think human life and health should have a higher priority than industry profits. It would be better if Australia followed the Climate Council's recommendations: <a href="https://www.climatecouncil.org.au/resources/submission-to-fuel-efficiency-standard-consultation/">https://www.climatecouncil.org.au/resources/submission-to-fuel-efficiency-standard-consultation/</a> .	NULL
1381183	Name withheld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	My survey response is a quiet, fierce cry for change. Enough. Please act, do what you know is right. Option C is in your power. This planet and the life it supports cannot wait patiently while 'the government's preferred Option B' plays out. Such pretty words, so delicately spoken. But here's the thing. The government is just a speck of stardust drifting in the vast time it's taken for our planet to evolve and give us life. This living, breathing organism Earth is patient, sure and steady for life. We are part of this and yet we shatter Her hard-won balance. I am sorry, but it is arrogant and futile to think 'the government's preference' matters right now. How much destruction of our billions-of-years-old-home is acceptable to the government? What seeds of trauma are you willing to plant by enabling the greed of a few? Please tell us, what is your preference in this regard? Nor can our planet wait around patiently while those who would benefit from Option A line their pockets. Their time is up. It has to be, or time is up for all of us. Greed. That's what this comes down to. But we're better than that. We're Australian. We care about each other, about our friends around the world, and this ancient, intensely beautiful land and planet that suffers. Greed does not define us, it defines the few. Our future on this fragile life-supporting planet cannot, must not, go down in their name. I say this again, from one human to another, please do what is right. I hope that we can prevent more communities being submerged in water. More loved ones burning and dying in one another's arms. More singed wildlife crawling through cinders. More blackened skeletons of cattle, horses and sheep scattered across the land. This is just the beginning of my hopes that flow from fear. My hopes and fears run deep, as do those of so many Australians who are ready for change. My son's eyes stung last week in Victoria's fires, his little lungs hurt in the 2019-20 fires. What will our children and future generations endure for the greed of so few in power today? I hope to be able to afford an electric car one day, and that it is in reach for everyday Australians. Money talks, right? Let us speak. You will hear us loud and clear. Option C, please.	NULL

