



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

Number of responses: 4233

Submission 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)
1359637	Alice	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Best cost/benefit ratio	Yes
1359803	Jean Ramirez	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Better BCR	Yes
1359808	Robin Belford	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The change cannot happen fast enough. It's time the greenwashing by the likes of Toyota et. al. is exposed for the lie that it is, and the dumping of substandard vehicles in the Australian market ceased.	No
1359809	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce emissions as much and as soon as possible. Our grandchildren will hold us to account.	NULL
1359812	Saratchandran	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B has highest Benefit Cost ratio.	Yes
1359813	Heath Rauchle	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cost benefits outweigh options for c and climate change necessitates a faster transition	Yes
1359815	Oliver Reddaway	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to achieve the maximum benefit as quickly as possible.	Yes
1359816	Werner Theinert	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is happening now and the tipping points are upon us. For the sake of our children and our grandchildren we need to get on with it, no more talking Just Do It! The race to save the planet should have been started years ago, we don't have any time to waste on further discussions. Option C and do it now!	No
1359817	David Adams	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should aim for net zero ASAP. Many other countries are prohibiting new ICE vehicles on a similar timeframe.	Yes
1359818	merelyn saunders	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to move on climate with urgency. C would bring the biggest range of clean cars to the Australian market. It will bring clean cars to the second hand market sooner. Boldness will encourage innovation here as we more fully join the international efforts towards zero fossil fuels. Despite the decreasing cost benefit C offers gains in health and climate worth investing in.	No
1359819	Simon Whitehouse	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	These standards are in place already in many other parts of the world. The vehicle manufacturers operate within them and there is no reason for the standards in Australia to be anything less than those in the EU and US	No
1359820	Ian Burl	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	climate change	NULL
1359821	Simone Ford	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is years behind other nations on this - it's time to catch up while also spending funds now (that will be necessary anyway eventually) to gain maximum benefits in the future. We could finally be world leaders (not a dumping ground) on this, so raise your ambitions!	Yes
1359822	Kathleen Carlisle	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	That fact that Russia and Australia are the only two countries in the OECD that don't have an emissions fuel standard in place is utterly disgraceful and inexcusable. Thousand of Australians die every year due to pollution cause by ICE vehicles. We need to transition to EVs as quickly as possible and fuel standards will accelerate this and help to prevent the dumping of dirty vehicles into Australia in the future.	No

1359823	Phil Browne	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is already years behind much of the developed world. Therefore we need to act faster to catch up. Plus the additional cost of the fastest option is not as much as I expected and is affordable, especially when you consider the greater benefits from the fastest option.	Yes
1359825	Neil Belford	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Actually the best total benefit is provided by C	No
1359826	Rachel Brdanovic	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate emergency, and need to reduce fossil fuel emissions as quickly as possible. This is one way to act that will also save Australians money.	No
1359829	Katharine	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option c - we are lagging the world and need to jump start and catch up. Our beautiful nation is impacted by increasingly damaging climate events and we need to do everything in our power to slow or stop the impact.	Yes
1359830	Jeff Lee	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We must get in line with the rest of the world to get the right vehicles and also address clean air as fast as possible	Yes
1359831	Dale Curtis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act on transport emissions as quickly as possible. People are still buying new Internal Combustion Energy vehicles due to the lack of choice of Electric Vehicles. Australia has demonstrated that it has an appetite for EVs, so let's get moving. Lower fuel efficient standards have left Australia as the dumping ground of cars with high emissions.	Yes
1359833	Virginia Bowe	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Higher net benefits	No
1359836	Bill Holliday	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The fastest option will have a much greater benefit to cost ratio than described because the costs described do not include the costs of particulate pollution arising from tyre wear and road surface wear which together constitute about 50% of current vehicle particulate emissions. The more stringent standard will make it easier to apply tighter standards to heavy vehicles which cause almost all road damage as damage varies as axle load to the fourth power, e.g. 40% more load doubles damage.	NULL
1359837	Steven Bell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This will accelerate the use of EVs and reduce the effects of climate change	Yes
1359838	Lyndal O'Gorman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate emergency. We need to transition away from fossil fuels as soon as possible. Yes, it is more costly but the cost of acting too slowly is far greater.	Yes
1359839	Ken Dyer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	By itself, fuel standards will not achieve much benefit. The average age of cars on Australian roads exceeds 10 years. Many are inefficient. Reducing car age has many benefits beyond just fuel savings as the attached document states.	No
1359844	Caroline Alcorso	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is far behind with this issue. We should have had these reforms decades ago. Lets get going!	NULL
1359845	philip howe	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The faster the government does something about protecting the environment the better, we have spent far too long destroying our environment and I don't see why we should wait any longer to fix it. I already save money on fuel by only using 95 ron or higher when I purchase petrol even though my car will run on 91 ron, my car runs much cleaner and I recoup the cost of fuel with a significantly lower service charge. I also have a small ev which is used for trips around my city	No
1359846	Cary Burnett	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must act extremely quickly with regard to reducing our CO2 emissions. At the current rate of global climate change, what is the cost of a 'business as usual' approach to the climate crisis versus making tough decisions now to improve living conditions in the future. These standards should have been introduced 30 years ago. Australia is always too late with its decisions.	No
1359847	Tony Boatman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fastest pathway to 2030 goals. Support rapid energy transition, improved health, cleaner air.	No
1359848	Bianca Cottle	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes

1359849	Michael Lovell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I see little benefit in pursuing Option A. Option B is acceptable; however, Option C provides greater economic and environmental benefits more quickly. For example, delaying the phasing in of new ADR for existing models until 1 July 2028 makes no sense. We could and should bring that change forward by at least one or two years.	Yes
1359850	Neville Bruce	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The quicker and faster and further we move on this issue the better. Question 5 below is odd. I prefer option C but would not object to option B, that is supported by Government	Yes
1359851	Dinesh Piskala Mahadevan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need more Battery Electric vehicles on our roads than Hybrid and Petrol vehicles to tackle air pollution and emissions effectively in our cities & suburbs and which will ultimately lead to a better quality of living & health of our citizens, especially young children's.	Yes
1359852	Martin Stone	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Australia needs to be more responsible and catch up with the rest of the world on these standards	Yes
1359854	Felix MacNeill	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is no time to waste and the benefits of moving slowly are far outweighed by the benefits of a more rapid transition.	NULL
1359855	John	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Whilst Option C shows a weaker benefits cost ratio over the time frame, the technology deployed will continue to provide a benefit going forward, and thus provide more benefit than shown. Also, the net benefit is the highest, and so it is a clear winner	No
1359860	Tim Muirhead	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to address the climate crisis urgently. If option c leads to inequities, address these through targeted subsidies for low income people.	Yes
1359862	Paul Draper	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Has been far too long in coming; option B is a reasonable & considered option on the face of it	Yes
1359863	Ian Lilley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	These changes are well overdue so we need to play catchup not merely progress at the same pace as others.	Yes
1359866	Tim Brown	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fuel savings to reduce cost of living pressure, cleaner air to breathe and access to move EVs in the car market. Battery electric vehicles are better cars, with better acceleration and less emissions which is good to climate and for health. Charging infrastructure is slowly expanding across the country, although many rural and remote areas will be behind in EV adoption they might need government assistance to adopt more EVs. Home charging and destination charging will help remote EV drivers	Yes
1359867	Gary Evans	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I think we have had too much inaction with the previous government so now need no further delay	Yes
1359869	Brian Snape	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to seek a quick solution to the current problems which have been caused by current importers trying to keep Australia open to their low grade, polluting imports.	No
1359872	Joel Gribble	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is accelerating and The urgency for action has not been communicated effectively, following years of inaction. Strong government policy of vehicle emissions will lift the profile and urgency of the need for action in the transport sector. Option C will support the transition to EVs which are needed to support a 100% renewables grid.	No
1359874	Meredith	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	It's a strong standard and puts Australia on track to achieve its targets in line with the Paris Agreement. By 2028 it will align Australia with USA, where cars are currently 31% more efficient than here. We'd have more choice of new lower polluting cars. We'd save \$108B in petrol costs. The standards proposed by petrol car lobbyists would be almost worthless - "negligible" reductions in costs and pollution.	Yes
1359876	Colin Brown	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Vehicle emissions contribute massively to Australian emissions	Yes
1359877	Lindsay Eden	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is a lagard and we need to be part of the solution, not a \drag me kicking and screaming\, nation. I want to be proud of Australia's position, especially with our Pacific family.	No

1359879	Robin Laver	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has a high standard of living relative to other countries. Therefore we can afford the higher cost option in order to achieve higher benefits. Where consumers are not able to pay the higher costs, they will delay purchase of new car, or there may need to be targeted Government support for those affected. The world cannot afford to delay action on emissions reductions and Australia needs to contribute. Option C is justified further, by the higher net benefit.	Yes
1359881	James Gatland	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Opportunity for Australia to lead the world in low emissions transport. Fastest option to reducing Australia's GHG emissions. Best outcome for the general public through fuel savings and improved air quality.	No
1359884	Giles Graham	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Opoyion C has the highest net benefit, and although it has the highest costs, high transport costs will support complementary govt objectives (e.g. reducing urban sprawl and delivering more transit oriented development).	Yes
1359885	Bradley Schultz	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have a moral imperative too act quickly	Yes
1359887	Allen Blewitt	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are so far behind the rest of the world and our carbon reduction targets are so challenging, particularly given the poor state of public awareness, that we have no alternative to OptionC. As it is, even if we opted for Option 2, there is ahigh likelihood that vested interests in the fossil fues industry, the media and traditional ICE vehicles importers, will obstruct and delay it. ay it.we have no choice	Yes
1359894	Christopher Wood	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to seriously address this issue	No
1359895	Jak Grimm	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need the fastest transition available, considering Australia is so far behind 85% of the rest of the world.	No
1359898	Bjorn Siem	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has a lot of catching up to do in reducing our transport emissions. We also have the biggest percentage of rooftop solar systems in the world which are perfect for charging EVs. But promoting daytime charging we can soak up this abundant and cheap resource and avoid our current minimum demand issue as well.	Yes
1359901	Peta Luck	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To reduce carbon emissions, improve air quality within cities, and create clarity for all importers and potential new manufacturers.	Yes
1359902	Hal K. Colebatch	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	highest benefit to cost, quickest outcome	Yes
1359903	EP Proctor	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are out of time, we need to make aggressive changes to survive	No
1359904	Mark Enders	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	After decades of delay we need to move quickly in this highly polluting sector. I'm a health care worker and I want to see improved population health outcomes. I live on the doorstep to the reef and I want to see us do all we can to protect this natural wonder. And I live in North qld where we are more heavily battered by insurance than the cyclones we regularly face. We need to move as fast as possible to protect both the environment and our economy.	No
1359905	Greg Forster	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The changing of our climate requires urgent preventive action!	No
1359906	Rob McQualter	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	For a small extra cost we get substantial community benefit, not even considering the urgency of the climate crisis.	No
1359911	Danielle King	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Our vehicle efficiency standards are non exstant and an embarrassment. We are in a climate crisis, and household costs are at an all time high. An agressive target is needed to stop us being the globes dumping ground for fossil fuel and inefficinet vehicles	No

1359912	Carl Heinicke	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Why wait, we have an opportunity to reduce emissions now and minimise the impact on future generations	No
1359914	Debra Hall	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Reasonable timeframe and reasonable outcomes	Yes
1359915	Alberto	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	The car industry needs some time to understand and adjust to the new requirements. Soon after that, rapid implementation of regulations will be necessary to ensure compliance with carbon reduction targets. Every individual needs to contribute to decarbonisation of our economy, and transport is critical.	Yes
1359918	Lee Capocchi	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need rapid action to bring fuel efficient (and thus, less polluting) vehicles to Australia as soon as possible. This would result in improved health for Australians and save them a reasonable amount of money at the bowser. It will also encourage the manufacturers to supply more EVs and Plug-in Hybrids to our country. In turn, consuming less petrol or diesel means our fuel imports would will fall per capita and reduced demand will have a dampening effect on the retail price of fuel.	No
1359920	James Harker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Environmental benefits. We need to move with the best technology, not keep old clunkers.	No
1359922	Amy Rogers	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	More benefit. Fastest reduction in Australia's second biggest source of emissions.	Yes
1359923	Pamela jane	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Rapid action is essential for us to have the potential to mitigate climate disaster	NULL
1359924	Hugh V Sykes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I want to see a strong response but one that has community support and is unlikely to be abolished should the Australian government change at the next election.	Yes
1359925	Donald Smith	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Collectively government has failed to start the process so now the time is upon us we have no choice if we wish to continue to inhabit the planet comfortably.	Yes
1359927	Bruce Henderson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1359934	Jelmer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Besides being left behind if we do not adopt aggressive standards, Australian miners and mineral explorers will benefit from EV adoption. We should promote the adoption of EVs with lithium, nickel, copper and other EV materials mined in Australia.	Yes
1359935	William Angus	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has been behind for so long, we are already a dumping ground for obsolete technology. It has a higher cost, but will give even greater results over the long term. It also means manufacturers will have to treat us the same as the EU to sell cars here, with more choice and the latest technology.. i have been a mechanic in Australia for 35 years, as well as a regular visitor to Rurope and the US. We are being shafted in Australia and have been for years.	No
1359938	Andrew D	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As an automotive worker the new cars Australian's are buying are excessive. As an example a heavy and polluting Ford ranger for 1 person to drive to work in the city or a large BMW or Range Rover for a mother to drop 1 5 year old child at school in toorak. These cars and people are a waste of resources. I would suggest getting rid of the people but unfortunately we aren't under Chinese rule yet so stricter controls on total knobs buying flashy wanker cars to impress their 5 Instagram followers.	Yes
1359941	Jane Davidson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1359942	James Sloan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are so far behind now, we need to do something fast.	No

1359945	Marcello	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Our home requires our immediate attention.	No
1359947	Anthony Russell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1359949	cathy Donohues	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have to be courageous and bold, Option 3 will deliver greater health and environmental improvements.	No
1359953	Janet Hohnen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We've been so late to this policy issue, need to send strongest possible signal. Legislation should be passed by mid year and in effect befriend of the year. Plenty of existing models of what works effectively, no need to start as if from square 1. Do it well but without further delay	No
1359955	Katy Daily	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is far behind the rest of the world, and as a result we need policy that will catch us up quickly, so we aren't the dumping ground for ICE cars. The Government's response is good in that it gets us to the EU standards, but it is phased in too slowly. Other countries also provide much more generous subsidies to accelerate the transition. Relying on novated leases means everyone won't have access to the benefits	NULL
1359961	James Blunt	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Health benefit	Yes
1359963	Matt	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Faster start has more net benefits and the best outcome.	Yes
1359965	Rob Hills	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is a long way behind other comparable countries and needs to catch up. We also need to break the stranglehold that the fossil fuel industry holds over energy policy in Australia	No
1359967	Andrew Cox	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	We need urgent action to reduce emissions.	No
1359972	Steven Applin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The sooner we improve emissions standards the healthier we'll be and the cleaner our air will be.	Yes
1359975	Lucinda Flynn	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because we need to do everything we possibly can to reduce emissions fast- to avoid both known and unknown consequences of global warming	No
1359976	Avinash	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is proud to be one of the world leader and early adopters of Renewable Energy and sustainable energy transition. Holding this title it would not be justifiable for Australia to be left behind in field of Automotive efficiency and emissions. Although Australias automotive market is miniscule compared to other countries, history has shown that many countries look up to Australias approach and solutions to model their countries solutions. Australia should consider this make a decision.	No
1359977	Stefan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This transition will save money, reduce pollution, improve health and the environment. It will avoid us being the dumping ground for polluting cars	NULL
1359987	Kris Stapleton	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Let's do our bit to help	No
1359988	Henry Fern	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Action required at quickest pace to make up for years of neglect	Yes
1359989	Aaron Fry	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Without a strong focus on reversing climate change we are just ignoring the environmental consequences we are leaving for our children!	Yes

1359991	Jenny Sim	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act rapidly to minimise ongoing clashes mate related damage	Yes
1359993	Graham Mulroney	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have already spent too much time getting to this point. Decisive action is needed.	No
1359996	Claire Boyce	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Better for consumer and better for environment. Enviromental choices will ensure the better health and food security of our children.	Yes
1359997	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should have moved to zero emissions years ago	NULL
1359998	sohan gnawali	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1360000	Dale	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Why wait. The benefits are there and the numbers are clear. The faster we move the better off the country will be. Be ambitious.	Yes
1360001	Stefan Gigacz	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This is an urgent problem. Not only will it reduce CO2 emissions quicker, it will also have great health benefits for the community. Option B is only a \,compromise\, because Option A is on the table, and it shouldn't be.	No
1360002	Andrew Bell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1360003	brian jackson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	part of the reason for my choice is that option c has the greatest net benefit	NULL
1360005	Grant Cribb	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option A does nothing. This is not the time to go slow, get it done.	No
1360008	Peter Lochore	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This policy is now overdue. The lead time in option C is sufficient. The only reason for option B to be chosen over C is your risk and 'cost' analysis. Your paper's concern for cost and risk does not sufficiently consider intergenerational equity. In other words, the risks and costs of option C are overstated when the interests of our children (and those not yet born) are more highly valued.	No
1360010	Nanette	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should align with the rest of the world asap.	Yes
1360012	Josh Hallwright	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Less emissions, less geopolitical risk, cheaper	Yes
1360014	Mike Manning	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The sooner, the better for Aussie consumers & the environment. It really should be a no-brainer.	No
1360016	Colin Trainor	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Greatest benefit in all areas for not much (more) cost compared to B	Yes
1360020	Lyle Nash	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Too much time has been lost all ready	Yes

1360022	Rodney	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	your not taking into account of people out of cities needing bigger capacity engines for towing etc ,	No
1360023	Katrin Swindells	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Urgency for climate action necessitates this, plus it decreases our reliance on inflationary fossil fuels	Yes
1360024	Alexander	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are starting from a low base and need to make up a lot of ground because of that.	No
1360025	Michelle Phillips	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Quite frankly, none of them go far enough nor fast enough. Grow some gumption, stop taking money from the fossil fuel industry & think of the future Australians.	Yes
1360027	Cameron Wilson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The quicker we transition to EVs the better off we'll be financially and environmentally.	Yes
1360036	Anthony Carney	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are so behind the eight-ball with regards to fuel standards, we need to catch up, fast! Option A is basically doing nothing, option B would be fine but should have been legislated ten years ago. We've lost a decade of progress on the issue and only Option C gets us back on track fast enough.	Yes
1360037	Sharon Ramel	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in trouble climate wise, it would be insane to take ICE option A, just do it - option C	No
1360039	Johan Scheffer	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want to see vehicle/transport emissions reduced as far as possible to meet our carbon emissions targets the government has set.	Yes
1360040	David McInnes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Go early go hard - legacy car makers just want to maintain the status quo for as long as they can - why delay the inevitable - the world is going electric whether they like it or not	NULL
1360042	Tim Connors	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option B is the American standard - CAFE is well known to have resulted in the dominance of American-style trucks on their roads, which is a poor outcome for both an efficiency and safety.	Yes
1360043	angelo abil	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reducing emissions is a priority for our environment and provides a financial benefit for motorists (using less fuel) and will provide more choices of vehicles.	Yes
1360046	Leo Sheppard	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	the health benefit attracted my attention.	Yes
1360048	Paul O'Keefe	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	No time to waste	NULL
1360051	Phil	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	More benefits	Yes
1360052	Don Plowman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1360053	Dwayne Ripley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It makes the most economic sense; a higher cost but higher savings and a quicker transition. Plus, any middle ground approach risks backpedalling with any change in government. Force the transition. The liveability of the planet literally depends on it.	NULL

1360056	Mathew	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1360057	Alex Naoum	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1360059	Kyle Hasler	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Must keep up with global standards	Yes
1360063	Janet Renner	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	At present people who can least afford the change are stuck with fossil fuel vehicles and need assistance to shift to EVs. We are already behind other countries and need to do more, we also need to help as many people as possible transition to EVs	Yes
1360068	Kim Wilcke	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B is a step in the right direction that suits the times and allows for transition without the aggressiveness of Option C, yet	Yes
1360070	Elizabeth Mackey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	An achievable aim considering industry and the liberals predictable opposition	Yes
1360072	Jamie Gilmore	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is minimal difference in cost between B and C for a significant reduction in implementation time providing significant benefits for Australia. It will help Oz catch-up after decades of inaction in this area.	Yes
1360073	Paul McNamara	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B (the fast and flexible option) strikes the right balance between progress and expense.	Yes
1360074	Graham Strauss	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The urgency of the need for a solution to the effects of burning any fossil fuel from pollution and deterioration of climate quality is so urgent that the use of a blunt decision cost benefit analysis becomes questionable, specially since the cost of doing nothing is ignored although the comparison offered seems to suggest that even it has benefit. The need and choices are so clear though that in spite of limitations the choice now must be Option C.	No
1360075	Gerry Austin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1360081	Helen Long	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	C uses less emissions	Yes
1360084	Tim Forcey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is way behind and needs to catch up.	Yes
1360089	Simon van Wyk	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This has been on the cards for way too long. I'm about to buy a car and want the most fuel efficient one	No
1360090	Paul E	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Should have been implemented years ago. No more sralling	Yes
1360091	Geoff Blore	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	It is a good compromise	Yes
1360093	Ruth Elder	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have been laggards in this area for too long and really need to get a move on.	Yes

1360094	James Kite	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Faster fuel, money, and emissions savings	Yes
1360095	Deanna	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option A is untenable. I think Option C needs to be the target if Option B will be realised. The risk of Option B is dilution in implementation, delivering an Option A result.	No
1360098	Anthony L	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is currently lagging behind the rest of the world on this issue. Without a vehicle emission standard we have zero chance of achieving net zero goals. With a standard in place manufacturers will see which way the wind is blowing and plan accordingly. Currently Australia is the worlds dumping ground for high emission vehicles. Lets change that. Option A and B are cop outs. If we're serious about Net Zero and about being a leader on the global stage Option C is the only way forward..	No
1360100	Darren Fagan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We've lagged behind the world for far too long on efficiency standards. We need to get to an appropriate level asap.	No
1360103	Chris Gilpin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is well behind the world on this issue	No
1360104	Maureen Quinn	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to get where we need to be fast.	No
1360106	Jeff Sykes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has long needed these standards and we need to take a big stance. Climate change is real and should be our top focus.	No
1360107	Peter D. McNamara	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have financially benefited from low standards. Now it is time to catch up and be more responsible for the environment, etc, which, of course comes with a price.	NULL
1360112	Richard Morris	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1360113	Jim McAlpine	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The more we do to reduce fossil fuel emissions, the better for my grandkids	NULL
1360116	Helen Koustas	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1360117	Catherine Cox	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	No time to lose to combat climate change	NULL
1360118	Maureen Davis-Catterall	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Both have better outcomes in costs and benefits.	Yes
1360120	Ralph Buttigieg	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	We need to decarbonize ASAP also Australians need to have access to a broad range of cleaner cars	Yes
1360122	Stefan Sonderegger	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1360124	Wotherspoon Karen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Faster emission reductions are required. I believe the science based evidence on climate change.	Yes

1360129	Max Scheffler	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	fast start will incentivise manufacturers to bring down cost and improve infrastructure for EVs which will improve the benefits/cost ratio	Yes
1360130	Jocelyn Mackenzie-Ross	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We needed to implement vehicle emissions standards 20 years ago. There's no time to waste so we need to implement the standards now. People are dying from pollution and heat caused by climate change. We can't afford to wait any longer.	Yes
1360131	Linda Sekulic	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option A is useless and does nothing to reduce emissions or favour the consumer. What are we waiting for? Best to go for the fast start and just get on with it. I can't believe we haven't done this sooner. We're a supposedly developed country. Time is of the essence and I'm so tired of governments cheerleading for corporations and foreign nationals first instead of us.	No
1360132	Stuart Brown	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need emissions to drop as quickly as possible and the net benefit for option C is worth the slightly higher cost when compared to option B. Option A should not be considered at all. Option B is better than nothing.	Yes
1360136	Patricia Strauss	Option A - 1st, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Action on climate change is urgent. We don't have a choice, but to take mitigating action ASAP. We need to persuade doubters to come with us, not to placate them.	NULL
1360139	Nikhil Kurian	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are one of the only two developed nations without a firm efficiency standard. It's time we develop one and provide more voice to consumers, reduce emissions and accelerate the transition away from fossil fuel based transport. The options provided B and C are sensible options and while my preference is option C first. I can see the appeal of not going for perfection and make a start with option B.	Yes
1360140	James Sturch	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to be accelerating efforts to reduce emissions and address climate change as quickly as possible.	No
1360145	Michael Staindl	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to pull every lever possible to address the Climate Emergency with emergency speed and emergency scale	No
1360146	Phil Wing	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Another piece of the engineering puzzle to help save our planet	Yes
1360147	Peter Skinner	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate is too important and bold actions are necessary	Yes
1360149	John O'FARRELL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It will help people save money. It puts cleaner cars on the roads. Stop Australia from becoming a dumping ground for cars others countries can't sell.	Yes
1360150	Cameron Philips	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I'm tired of Australia being a laggard on issues like this.	Yes
1360152	Sally Trevena	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Clear achievable policy with cost benefits to consumers in reasonable timeframe	Yes
1360157	Nisha Khot	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are the only developed country without these standards & have become a dumping ground for inefficient vehicles. This needs to stop.	Yes
1360159	Thomas Ronald Pastras	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B provides the perfect mix of flexibility and rapidity, while providing the highest benefit/cost ratio.	Yes
1360162	Ron Harrison	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We've wasted too much time and can't afford to delay this any longer.	Yes

1360165	Steve Lewis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Fuel savings and reduced emissions	Yes
1360169	Tristan Ashford	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate crisis, and Australia's transport emissions have been going upwards. We must show strong leadership and make up for lost time. Moving to more efficient vehicles and electric vehicles will reduce our dependence on overseas importation of oil and petroleum products. Lets buy electricity from Aussies instead!	No
1360172	Rónán Branagan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As a young person, I (as well as most young people I know) are terrified about the implications that climate change will have on our futures if we do not change the way we live. Improving the efficiency and emissions of our vehicles is a major step in the right direction. At this point, I'm like with the science, we do not have a choice but to enforce option c. It is the most expensive option but it also has the most benefits. Please consider the future generations of the earth in your decision.	Yes
1360175	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce our CO2 emissions as quickly as possible.	Yes
1360179	Andrew Stimson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This has now been ignored for so long now. I believe the US introduced this in the 1970s	Yes
1360180	Michael Stevens	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to move faster on NVES to ensure that consumers have a wider choice of vehicles, but also to ensure that we have more efficient cars in order to reduce the cost of living.	Yes
1360183	Ragunath Appudurai	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Long overdue. Option B presents as a reasonable balance, with flexibility to ramp up as necessary.	Yes
1360184	Kate Lamb	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I care about the future	No
1360188	Jonathan Moore	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1360189	Darryl Woodhouse	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	CO ² emissions. I want to stop manufacturing dumping inefficient vehicles in Australia and ultimately phase out fossil fuel burners altogether ASAP.	No
1360191	Tom Walker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Dramatic climate action is required	Yes
1360192	Michael Smith	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change has already baked in 3C of warming. Australia has done little to reduce emissions. Option C proposed is a small step in the right direction.	Yes
1360193	Geoff March	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	The benefits of option C outweigh the costs significantly. The climate crisis must be addressed as a matter of urgency and option C does this best. The car industry already satisfies the fuel standards in the rest of the world. There is no need for a slow phase in (option B). Surely those companies would have a \,risk\, strategy in place for Australia already.	NULL
1360194	Karen Joyce	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Although option C has higher costs, much of that could be defrayed by cutting wasteful government spending such as subsidies to fossil fuel companies. The benefits of a faster start, by reducing the health and climate breakdown burdens, will save Australian lives.	NULL
1360197	Pat O'Leary	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to cut emissions fast as possible	NULL
1360198	Leanne Frederiksen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Improve efficiency and reduce emissions as fast as possible	Yes

1360201	Mark	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to move forward as quickly and efficiently as possible in this area.	Yes
1360204	Don Woodhouse	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C offers fast start which we urgently need and great long-term savings. The extra savings justify the increased start up costs in my mind.	Yes
1360205	Peter Steele	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is already behind large parts of the world in adopting vehicle emissions standards. Our complacency to date means we don't have the luxury of a 'gentle' start, we need to play catch up. I am supportive of Option B if compared to Option A or no action, but strongly encourage the government to push further and adopt option C	Yes
1360208	Alan Barker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Strong concern about climate change. Australia has to do its part	Yes
1360209	Derek Robertson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The quality of the Earth's atmosphere is the determining factor in this revision of standards so although Option C may be more expensive, it should ensure the highest returns in the long term.	No
1360213	Alison Lowe	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's critical if we are to maintain a liveable climate that we don't delay these necessary changes. While there will be upfront costs, shifting to EVs will ultimately reduce costs to consumers through reduced charging and maintenance costs.	No
1360221	Chris Papadopoulos	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C = better fuel economy and more choice for consumers plus better environmental outcomes sooner at a time when we cannot afford to wait.	No
1360222	Catherine	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Savings for the consumer, benefits the environment	No
1360226	Ben Capell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1360228	Jim McAlpine	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The sooner we reduce emissions from fossil fuels, the better it will be for everyone but especially my grandkids	NULL
1360235	Peter Brown	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Progressive policy such as this should have been implemented decades ago. Let us make some positive change in a sensible timeframe.	Yes
1360236	Gilbert Pesenti	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	given we are at least 10 years late , we have to make an effort to preserve our fragile environment and stop making decisions only based on perceived financial gain	No
1360239	Tom Price	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1360242	Thomas Sesselmann	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fastest transition and highest total benefits.	Yes
1360244	Lucas Griffin	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Most ambitious plan to deal with climate change, this will always be my preference due to my desire to have the next generation live a better life than myself, which I do believe is a common and fundamental human drive.. I like option B next as it has the best health benefits. I don't like option A as it does too little too slow.	Yes
1360254	Anthony	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to get this change happening quickly to reduce the health and environmental impacts of vehicle exhaust fumes. There seems to be some interest from Australian people, but the barriers are cost, availability, and practicalities (charging times, availability of charging stations). Efficiency standards address availability by giving automotive companies an incentive to sell EVs in Australia, rather than focusing on other markets to meet their fuel efficiency targets there.	Yes

1360257	Balaji Naranapatti	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The rest of the world has had these standards for years. In the light of dramatic changes to the climate due to global warming, Australia should catch up to these standards at the earliest.	NULL
1360258	Steve Temple-Heald	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option A is virtually pointless. Option C gives a much greater benefit for a small cost over Option B. The BCR's are very similar. Given the NEDC to WLTP conversion rates as well increasing the CO2 figures we need to move firmly to real world reductions. Ideally if the Govt had any real guts we would outlaw the sale/registration of new ICE vehicle after 2035, like the UK and A.C.T	No
1360263	Graham Marshall	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Need to reach net zero without delay	Yes
1360264	Daryl Maunder	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C has the greatest benefits to both the consumer, and to the country through reduced emissions and faster migration to EVs	No
1360273	Rodney Kiddy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do what's right for our children and the planet. We also need to align with all other modern economies	No
1360281	Richard fisher	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	At last a good policy, pay less for fuel, quicker uptake of electric cars which is governed by price, less fuel guzzlers, more electric budget options, AT LAST.	No
1360283	Sanjay Ramakrishnan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We can afford it. Better to pay now than in the future. Both financially and in environmental and physical health costs. It is completely ridiculous that we are paying big money to overseas car manufacturers to get their worst product	Yes
1360284	Greg Day	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia & Russia are the only developed countries without fuel efficiency standards. Australia needs to catch-up quickly. We need to be accelerating reduction of carbon emissions. This is a no-brainer given that it does not require development of new vehicles, it is just ensuring that we get fuel-efficient vehicles similar to the rest (excl Russia) of the developed world.	No
1360286	Jamie Lovick	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To transition to electrified and low emission transport as quickly as possible, providing the largest benefit to Australians.	No
1360290	Lewis martin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I recently tried to buy a hybrid vehicle and found that Australia had the worst options for this class as a result of providing getting rid of their least-efficient cars here since we lacked any standards. The best time to implement fuel efficiency standards with minimal disruption was 10 years ago. Failing that, we should implement the fast start ASAP. Most of the difference in costs come from electricity usage, which is an intended outcome of the changes, and should be compared against fuel cost	Yes
1360295	Grant Miles	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The use of fossil fuels must be reduced urgently and stronger emissions standards will encourage this.	Yes
1360296	Craig Trethewey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1360301	Margaret Horgan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Need to transition faster. Need to hastily curtail emissions	No
1360302	Philipp Hammes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is already behind and needs to catch-up with global	Yes
1360303	Rachael	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to do something quick in the health and environment space in relation to climate change and fuel emissions. We are trailing behind, where we are in a position where we could be setting an example	Yes
1360308	Jean	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The less fuel we burn the better and it needs to happen fast.	Yes

1360309	Ellen McCarthy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Environment - damage caused by substandard technology can stop now.	Yes
1360310	Craig Bowers	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are so far behind already, we need to catch up	Yes
1360313	Ben Johnston	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1360314	Lesley Barron	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Car pollution is responsible for 11 000 excess deaths each year in Australia. This is 11x more than the road death toll. We must reduce emissions from cars NOW!	No
1360315	Paul McVeigh	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	No time to waste on reducing emissions	Yes
1360320	Sharon C	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I hesitated about B or C. In the end, I thought that while economics are important, reducing our greenhouse gas emissions is more important. We need to move fast, and pay the price.	Yes
1360321	Keith Anderson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Due to climate change tipping point we need maximum amount of change	NULL
1360324	Lynney	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	A concern for carbon emissions.	Yes
1360325	Rod Munro	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As transport is Australia's fastest emissions growth area it makes sense to go harder on vehicle emission standards. It is embarrassing that we only Russia and Australia don't have the emission Standard similar to our peers. As an ex commuting cyclist the fumes from diesel vehicles in particular are not only disgusting but dangerous to health. BYD will soon release a plug in hybrid EV ute to be followed by a BEV ute. There is no reason to delay this change.	NULL
1360328	Lachlan Hardy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Industry requires some incentive and a flexible option gives that incentive, but also sets a recognised deadline for implementation. Option A does next to nothing, though it's clearly what industry wants. Thus option B is the least pain for the most realistic gain.	Yes
1360329	Harry	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Rapid improvement is needed due to the lag behind the other OECD countries. Need to be careful that this does not make auto manufactures push more LCVs instead of PVs. We want to both reduce the size of vehicles while persuing lower emissions. Auto makers should be incentivised to sell smaller cars over larger LCVs as these are lest carbon intensive in production.	Yes
1360331	Jane Smith	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because it will reduce fuel costs and emissions. This has been delayed for long enough and needs to be fast-tracked.	Yes
1360333	Mike Chamberlain	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate scientists have made it clear that all countries must act more quickly to reduce carbon emissions and avoid extremes of climate change. PS Question 5 below is ambiguous - I would support option B if option A was not do-able, but the data shows it is.	No
1360334	David Ingerson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We have to encourage the introduction of more smaller and more efficient vehicles, many of which are not even considered for importation into Australia, this also means that possibly a smaller vehicle class with different ADRs may need to be looked at as will the bringing of Petrol refining to more up to date standards.	Yes
1360339	Mark Joseph Cattaneo	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Technology solutions already exist. Strong encouragement towards business and consumer to more efficient future has clear benefits and low risk.	No
1360345	Remus Brasier	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe Australia is demonstrably behind the rest of the world in transport efficiency standards, and an ambitious approach with investment to match is the best way forward.	Yes

1360346	Kapil Gangwani	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Having worked in Automotive Industry for more than 15 years, and being aware of what is happening in the space of automotive industry worldwide, it seems we in Australia have to take hard and immediate steps to ensure we are well ahead in the game.	Yes
1360353	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should embrace the option returning the highest benefits to Australia as the preferred path. We do not want to be marooned with the last countries to convert from ICE's. However, I understand that to achieve a consensus Option B may be the chosen path. Either one is better than A.	Yes
1360360	Pieter Thomasz	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I believe we need something more effective than Option A but Option B allows opportunity for any necessary adjustments to be made along the way.	Yes
1360363	Timothy Beevor	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	You'll destroy the 4WD Industry. Why dont you adopt standards for all the little cars - and get the latest tech there, but leave the heavier vehicles alone? A nuanced approach would get way more support. You cant tow a boat with a Tesla - You cant tow a tool trailer either. Be pragmatic for once.	No
1360369	Judy Hyde	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Faster saving and less pollution - worth the cost.	No
1360372	Shane Maher	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	We need to stomp down on the emissions of the ridiculous amount of tradie utes and large SUVs.	Yes
1360373	Tony Egan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1360388	paul	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	all bullshit , light car category is nothing compared to big business for emissions ev cost more to produce and still have no real way of disposing of the batteries . they also way as much as a 4wd ute and hterefore cause as much wear and tear on the road infastructure and how the hell are we going to charge them when the power grid is unable to keep up with our current demand for households	No
1360392	Jack	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Hello, I'm writing in as I don't want automakers to make the vehicle worse and more expensive(due to harder requirements). I also don't think most utes will be compliant.	No
1360396	Mark Lawrence	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1360397	IAN BELL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Quicker to catch up with rest of world the better; Australia has lagged too long!	Yes
1360401	James Weir	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The more rapid the implementaion of stricter NVES, the better it is for the environment and our health, and a bonus is it will possibly help to improve Australia's otherwise poor reputation on matters associated with climate action.	No
1360405	Jarred	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe the large polluting vehicles that currently make up most of Australia's fleet are both uneconomical and take up far too much space . These vehicles result in terrible outcomes for human and environmental health, This legislation is needed to help Australia pivot to smaller, greener and safer vehicles. Or better yet, to dissuade people from purchasing a personal car at all. I believe we should factor in all societal costs of private car ownership into the purchase price.	Yes
1360406	Nicole Thornton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to work much faster than we have been to reduce our emissions and hit initial tatgets	Yes
1360409	Graeme Tunks	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The benefit is far greater than simply an economic advance. The platform for a transformation must be solid to support the coming generations who will have to deal with our, waste, wanton resource destruction, & obsession with ourselves	Yes
1360412	Markua	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes

1360416	Geoff Langdale	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I prefer that we adopt as aggressive an efficiency standard as possible. Australia has lagged, badly, on implementing fuel efficiency standards and it s now imperative we catch up with the rest of the world.	Yes
1360417	Michael Connors	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	The cost option seems very reasonable option C 3rd	Yes
1360418	Prashant Mehra	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Very important for Australia to join the rest of the world in lowering transport sector emissions and I'm also very keen to see far more choice in lower emissions passenger cars in the country.	Yes
1360419	Marcelle Kirby	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C seems to be the quickest and most effective answer to reducing emissions and bringing Australia into line with the rest of the countries who are seriously concerned about climate change the	Yes
1360420	Al Thomas	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	should have happened decades ago	Yes
1360422	Daniel Bleakley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C provides the most aggressive cuts to CO2 emissions and will more rapidly reduce air pollution in our cities.	Yes
1360426	Owen Matthews	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia should put its best foot forward in terms of influencing emissions reduction and improving the environment. Option C is the right choice to achieve those aims.	Yes
1360427	Chris Maltby	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fuel efficiency standards that correspond to other vehicle markets are long overdue. We need to make up for decades of inaction as quickly as possible. Vehicle manufacturers and importers are making these vehicles now, but not selling them in Australia.	Yes
1360429	Samir Abdallah	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Electric Vehicles as coming down in cost already. To get the most out of the benefits or BEV and to reduce climate risks we need to move quickly. Since this is only for new vehicles the age of the national fleet is an unknown factor that slows down the benefits.	No
1360433	Andreas Stephens	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The Net Benefits numbers between Option B & C are fairly close, yet many additional benefits of pushing more strongly on EVs are not included in the cost/benefit analysis. Zero value is placed on energy security, with electricity being produced locally, while fuel is imported to a large extent. Likewise, lower noise pollution does not appear to be included in the analysis. From my own experience, this is a significant and notable benefit that I enjoyed personally and all of us did during COVID.	No
1360438	Patrick Leamon	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Having parity with another country seems simplest for companies to comply. I'm most concerned about the health impacts on my children if we go with option A.	Yes
1360444	Yonah Festinger	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1360445	Taso Hatzi	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The fuel savings alone exceeds the cost, so why wouldn't we go with Option C?	No
1360447	Laura Thomas	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	As outlined in the report, Option B will enable Australia to meet legislated GHG emissions targets and international commitments (Paris agreement). This option also has the highest benefit cost ratio and balances the risk of new technology against the opportunities. Option A is not acceptable as it will not allow Australia to meet targets for carbon emissions and it will not incentivise car manufacturers to sell clean, efficient cars in Australia.	Yes
1360449	Dr Tim Kingswell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have been lagging behind the world for too long - we have the wealth and knowledge and technology to do much better. Let's aim high, make ourselves proud, and get the green momentum going! There really is no time to waste.	No
1360450	Jill Everett	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As a wealthy country I believe we should do the heavy lifting to help reduce emissions and stop climate change.	No

1360452	Malcolm Moore	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	This "initiative" specifically does not include Diesel Fuel (as used in Heavy Road Transport). With a direct comparison to Road Freight; Rail Freight Transport (using diesel-electric) uses about 33% diesel fuel for the same load over the same distance - so it is a "no-brainer" to get the Heavy Road Freight off the Roads and Highways – and move all Freight over distance (over say 100 km) by Rail Freight technology Removing tight bends out of CE 1870 era Rail way alignments is inexpensive.	Yes
1360454	Jane Mowbray	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are not acting fast enough. Industry has controlled things for too long selling inefficient vehicles. Public transport has been allowed to run down making more people dependent on cars. I would support Option B if I was sure manufactures and sellers had to prove they were selling fuel efficient vehicles.	Yes
1360457	Damien	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1360459	George	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	As an avid supporter of electric cars and sustainable transport, I believe that the current state of charging infrastructure and the high costs associated with battery replacements pose significant challenges. Despite the NRMA publishing a guide on electric vehicle battery replacement costs, the figures are often prohibitive for many individuals. I sincerely hope that improvements in both battery replacement affordability and the expansion of charging networks will be realized by the year 2050	Yes
1360460	Damien Lewer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fuel efficiency benefits everyone and we should be able to purchase the latest most efficient vehicles for use in Australia. It is clear that this is not the case at the moment and will not be until we have equivalent fuel efficiency standards to the rest of the world. I currently own two vehicles which comply with Euro 5 standards and appreciate their efficiency and savings in fuel costs. We are experiencing climate change, global warming in Australia and it is in all our interests to improve.	Yes
1360464	Andrew Zoerner	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is a climate action laggard & will suffer more from climate change than most other countries. Norway provides a inspiring model that Australia can adopt. We also need to take action to facilitate less reliance on private motor vehicles through encouraging more public transport and active transport. We should also assist poorer countries to transition in similar ways, & prevent them becoming 'dumping grounds' for polluting clunkers.	NULL
1360475	James Ross	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must act urgently to reduce carbon emissions! And hte net benefits from option C are greatest, so it must be the best choice.	Yes
1360481	Matt O	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This is a climate EMERGENCY anything less than urgent decisive action is a cop out	No
1360489	Meredyth Woodward	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	This is the most reasonable for speed of change and therefore most likely to be more widely accepted.	Yes
1360492	Tony Lane	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	For a marginal additional cost between C & B (\$12b - 25% roughly) the benefit predicted \$31b or 20%) seems very worthwhile	Yes
1360494	Anthony O'Connell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have been waiting for way too long to get emissions standards in Australia. Emissions standards have been in place in almost every country for years, in some countries decades. We simply do not need any more delays; just get on and do it.	Yes
1360495	James Lewis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I would like to see a faster transition toward meeting targets as I feel we are someway behind, as a country.	Yes
1360499	Rowan Monks	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need hard and fast action on Climate change. Strong Fuel Efficiency will make inroads on emmissions.	Yes
1360507	Alana Karathanasis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have a lot of catching up to do and the environmental degradation is only getting worse. We are a wealthy nation who can afford the higher costs if it means we don't all burn in a fiery death caused by climate change. Let's do this.	Yes
1360509	David Whitehead	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have a lot of catching up to do! But Option B would still be great.	Yes

1360527	Peter Wells	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Our climate needs all help available now.	Yes
1360530	Noel Crowe	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The cost is more than covered by the benefits achieved. Personally I want to buy an EV as soon as possible and waiting for yet more years is frustrating. I want to see the new and different models with the latest and most efficient performance as soon as possible. Australia has been lagging behind for far too long.	Yes
1360534	Jim McBryde	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need really good emissions standards to ensure that car suppliers to Australia provide our country with the most fuel efficient and lowest emission vehicles they can provide. This will help Australian consumers and the environment. It is a no brainer really.	Yes
1360538	James Butler	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The Science is clear, fossil fuel emissions must be stopped NOW, today. The extra cost will save lives and all of life on this planet.	Yes
1360540	Terry Sullivan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	This gets fair dinkum about doing something	Yes
1360544	Carol	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1360551	Peter	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has been lagging behind the rest of the world in regards to efficiency standards for vehicle's, we need to catch up as quickly as possible.	No
1360552	patricia abreu	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1360557	Dr Philip Pollard	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is financially the best strategy, but more importantly, provides a much better health outcome, and a much better emissions reduction outcome. How much did we commit to for the AUKUS subs? Way more than \$12B! However, Option B is a good position, and is infinitely better than where we are now.	Yes
1360559	Peter Carl Sheehan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Promote uptake of EV's and make all EV's cheaper to consumer sooner	Yes
1360567	Anne Butler	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The most valid public scientific knowledge from the UN, via the UN Sec General, states that we are facing a climate catastrophe. We must stop Fossil Fuels NOW.	Yes
1360574	Mark Stockdale	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Much smarter (economically) to regulate this now rather than pay more later. I like option C but option B is perhaps more realistic	Yes
1360577	Kirsten Ealand	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Better outcomes for climate change with the fastest option. Slightly more upfront cost but substantially better climate outcome which will save money in the long run. We're starting behind the right ball already so we need to act fast to play catch up.	Yes
1360579	Steve Rogers	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have v little time left to keep our world habitable for the next generations. We need to do all we can as fast as we can to reduce emissions as well as improve health outcomes from polluting fossil fuels.	No
1360580	joe lenzo	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	the faster the better. why wait so long. do it now.	No
1360582	Sue Collings	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Let's get going right now!	Yes

1360586	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	We've waited too long, we need to catch up quickly	NULL
1360588	Peter Barnes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in an accelerating climate crisis. We are still approving the expansion of coal and gas extraction. We lag far behind the rest of the developed world in abating vehicle pollution of our atmosphere. We need urgent, significant, effective action to reduce our share of the pollution we are still emitting at an increasing rate.	No
1360590	Patrick L	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	We must reduce our National Carbon Footprint.	Yes
1360591	Gavin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1360597	Ed Dixon-Valk	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The benefits outweigh the costs of option C (and option B - to a lesser extent).	Yes
1360599	Annelies Konon	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are so close to the brink some fast action is required to galvanise our whole population	No
1360606	Sue	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We're now not in a position to take ever longer to reduce carbon emissions.	Yes
1360610	Karen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Sounds like it will reduce pollution and increase more fuel efficient cars.	NULL
1360611	john purdom	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has lagged far behind other countries for too long, we desperately need to catch up- the legacy of the dirty inefficient cars for so many years is that we must finally pay the costs inherent in the current vehicle cohort.. The inclusion of SUV's is a long overdue discouragement to the overuse of these excessively high consumption vehicles, and this will also ease traffic flow.ffi	No
1360612	Drew McHugh	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We know what needs to happen. We need to be sensible about how we get there, but we need to get there fast, too.	Yes
1360613	Michael Dalladay	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Most achievable with government support and more likely to gain public support than option A	Yes
1360616	Kenneth Johnston	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reaching carbon dioxide targets is a priority as far as I am concerned.	Yes
1360622	Beverley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	If option 3 was pushed the costs required could further forestall moving forward with this much needed deal	Yes
1360623	Peter Main	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option A is not an option. The difference in cost between Option B and C are low enough to push for the extra benefits.	No
1360624	Andrew	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1360625	Margaret Clausen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is happening more quickly than predicted.	Yes

1360630	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Urgency is required	No
1360636	Thomas Kaufmann	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is so vulnerable to natural disasters, that the short-term cost-saving of a less aggressive emissions-reduction plan is not worth the long-term cost.	Yes
1360640	Lee Jeffery	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Action at last! To further support climate change mitigation, new coal and gas mining must also stop.	Yes
1360641	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is so far behind the rest of the world in limiting vehicle emissions that it need a major policy leap to catch up with the places, such as California , that are setting the benchmark.	No
1360646	Neil Mathison	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1360656	Brian John Richter	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need action immediately	No
1360657	Colin May	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Bite the bullet and get it over done with rather than going through a similar costly process again later on for option 3.	NULL
1360658	Louise Brogan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	This will be an acceptable start. If the government has to take the time and energy to fight more than required to get the legislation through, more time is wasted. This needs to be legislated as soon as possible to stop more dirty vehicles from being dumped onto our shores!	Yes
1360667	Felicity Davis	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Because we need to reduce CO2 emissions fast!	No
1360670	Phillip Baron	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1360672	Peter Burke	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Asap and maximum impact	Yes
1360675	Jane Louise Sultana	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To avoid the most catastrophic effects of climate change we need to urgently reduce greenhouse gas emissions.	Yes
1360677	Michael Meffert	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	incentive for transition to EV crucial	NULL
1360678	Brian Kleemann	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Like everything on the environment, we are dragging our feet & at most only ever doing catchup. I will support option B only because it is our only hope at the moment	NULL
1360679	Dhugal Fletcher	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	\$12 billion higher costs for \$30 billion higher benefits makes Option C the best outcome	NULL
1360681	Samantha Jenkinson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	My preference for option C first is the more immediate health benefit by reducing emissions through a shorter time frame. I note there is an extra billion dollars in health costs saved. The difference between B and C on BCR is small. Choosing C would drive energy reform as well. B is a good option if C won't get through.	NULL

1360686	Damian Camilleri	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1360688	Peter Casey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1360697	Sian Davies	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe we are in an urgent climate emergency that my children will feel the worst impact of. I would love to get an ev and this initiative will make that easier for me and all Australians	Yes
1360698	James Grubb	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Global Warming is a huge threat to all life on planet Earth	Yes
1360699	Ruth Norris	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are so far behind other countries, and the need for reduction in fossil fuel consu,ption and emissions is urgent	NULL
1360701	Lona Goudswaard	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is way, way behind in this respect and not only has to finally transition but also needs to catch up.	No
1360706	Anne Coppinger	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe it is important to achieve the objectives as quickly as possible. It will accelerate the availability of electric cars for the Australian market and as a result their price will gradually drop. This country has lagged behind most western countries and I am very glad that we will finally come into line. We look forward to playing our part by purchasing an electric vehicle to add to our solar , composting and other green iniatives that we follow.t	Yes
1360707	Sacha	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is an emergency	Yes
1360710	Marie-Louise Drew	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1360715	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1360716	Kevin Tennant	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It appears to provide the fastest reduction of fossil fuel (vehicle) pollution on offer	No
1360718	Graeme Swift	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option B might be watered down closer to Option A. Therefore, why not aim for Option C knowing that negotiations will dilute some elements, which could result in a mix of Options C, B and A, rather than just B and A. Given more than 19 million vehicles on the road now, vehicle longevity of more than 12 years, and annual sales of around 1 million, suggests that a missing element in the policy is subsidised removal of older vehicles belonging in the main to the lower socio-economic groups.	No
1360720	Maxwell F Warren	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	People need a price signal to switch to cleaner vehicles.	Yes
1360722	Brian Marshall	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia does not make cars and does not produce much fuel. I don't see why we should not adopt the highest standard in line with other wealthy countries.	Yes
1360727	Stephen Spencer	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 0th	NULL	Yes
1360729	Keith Gallacher	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Health	Yes

1360730	Alan Hayward	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have been lagging behind EU for many years	No
1360733	suvin tan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1360735	Mark Powell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I believe these are meaningful targets that are achievable for Australia and will bring this country in line with the rest of the world.	Yes
1360737	Gerard Doorakkers	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	Yes
1360739	Fiona Benson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1360740	Luke Prior	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1360744	Alex Pragnell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	There will always be a need to adapt infrastructure in major transition such as this and option B gives the best ratio of pace of change vs needing to adapt.	Yes
1360754	Jeanine Almond	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	With daily cost of living having increased markedly Australia I don't think it's possible for Option C to be favourable due to the fact that it is the most expensive option. I think that rather than looking for a costly quick fix that a moderate sustained plan for transition to more energy efficient transport .	Yes
1360756	Miguel Uribe	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I prefer the best option for the environment.	Yes
1360758	Andrew Remington	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Practical necessity taking into account economic and environmental circumstances	Yes
1360761	JR Marshall	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We're so far behind on environmental repair that we have to move as quickly as possible to save ourselves from ourselves.	Yes
1360767	Helen Rooth	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need rapid action in this area but managing costs is also important in order to reduce opposition and realise benefit.	Yes
1360770	Shah Alford	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Get there faster	NULL
1360772	Karel	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	We need to do this	Yes
1360774	Billy Hancock	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It make australia a richer country by having very fuel efficient cars we use less fuel which will reduce our balance of payments. This money can then be spent at home on everything from healthcare to school.	Yes
1360775	Steve Perry	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Effective and achievable policy which is well overdue.	Yes

1360776	Robyn Smith	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B will achieve a lot for a lower cost than Option A and without the potential to alienate too many people	Yes
1360778	Kit Laughlin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The planet is dying—and fossil fuel use is only one reason, but it is one we can change. I support option B, only if the Government cannot support option C.	Yes
1360779	Tim Harvey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I think this allows substantial progress in the most effective manner.	Yes
1360780	Surya	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	NULL	Yes
1360783	Werry	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	having an enforced ES will give me and my family access to more efficient vehicles, saving money on fuel in the long run	Yes
1360784	Dorothy White	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Bushfires, Floods and Deaths - heartbreak caused by climate change, serious action is needed, as it is likely to cost more as action is delayed.	Yes
1360785	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to rapidly reduce our greenhouse emissions. Australian's the highest per capita greenhouse gas emitters in the world and vehicle emissions are a large part of that. The lax vehicle emission standards is a large part of the reason manufacturers are not selling electric vehicles into the Australian market. Changing the standard will save everyone money..	No
1360789	Anne Kennedy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate crisis and at this stage can only hope to reduce the impact of what , if left will become exponentially catastrophic .. The difference in the overall cost benefit ratio is small between B and C but the environmental and health benefits I believe are the most important considerations. We should be aiming for maximum impact at this stage.	No
1360790	Rolf N Stockburger	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Optimal for both environment and health,	No
1360796	Keith Patingale	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to work quickly but not at a high cost	Yes
1360798	Phillip Brazel	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	If option A had been introduced years ago, yes, we could have went with this option. We are so far behind most of the world but more importantly from all of the scientists that have no political influence we are running out of time very fast. We can't afford to wait and the change needs to be more ambitious to meet these goals and give our kids a chance of a future that we were lucky enough to have. This can't be hijacked by the legacy auto industry. Please, make a change that might make a diff.	No
1360799	Judith Bone	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Because so little has been done, flexibility and ongoing support for infrastructure will require more time.	Yes
1360806	Elizabeth Honey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1360807	Harold Medd	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are behind the rest of the world and need to catch up asap	NULL
1360809	Michael Moller	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1360811	Peter Adamson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cleaner fuel quicker	No

1360813	Wide Bay Burnett Environment Council Inc	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1360814	Les Johnston	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Motor vehicle efficiency standards are long overdue. Flexible standards have a risk of a future Liberal Government stopping the whole project.	Yes
1360815	Leigh E Carter	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	This is an issue that we must be out in front of, we can no longer afford to be playing catch up at the expense of the planet or the life it supports.	Yes
1360825	Terry Steer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I. Alive aisryalianhas become a dumping ground for manufacturers to move their cars they aren't allowed to sell anywhere else	Yes
1360828	Ian Wingfield	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Simple maths. In the next question, I have said I do not support Option B. I want it clear that I support Option C, NOT Option A. I don't need to be an accountant. Total costs against total benefits. Option C offers the greatest difference between costs and benefits. Over \$100 billion. Never mind the higher cost, let's reap the greatest benefits.	No
1360831	Tracy Hughes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Whilst the outcomes of option C are most desirable, option B provides a more balanced approach	Yes
1360833	Keith Woolsey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We do not have time to waste. Emissions continue to increase. Higher net benefit.	No
1360834	martin fiedler	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1360836	Scott Williams	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must act as fast as possible to reduce emissions, simple. BCRs never fully account for all benefits and this one does not recognise the full impact of climate change. Car manufacturers have had many years to understand that this change was coming; those that have acted should be rewarded, and those who have lagged should now pay more.	Yes
1360837	Simon Hicks	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Steers a sensible course that will achieve good outcomes in a timely manner, but applies sufficient pressure on the OEMs to take action	Yes
1360840	Ian Hamilton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	While a very late start internationally opting B will provide large direct benefits with acceptable costs	Yes
1360843	Artur Boder	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is already behind in this manner and a dumping ground for dangerous, oversized and polluting vehicles that would be unregistrable in other developed countries. The localised air pollution in metro areas is egregious and has a horrible health toll...	No
1360846	Thomas Pugh	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want a fast Transition	Yes
1360847	Jonathan Peter	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Need to move faster to make up for falling so far behind OECD	Yes
1360848	Marie R	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act as fast as possible so option c is preferred. Also it doesn't cost that much more than option b	NULL
1360859	Alasdair	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1360861	Nicolas Foulon	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Accelerate the transition to efficient vehicles	No
1360863	Howard Moses	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Should have happened years ago. Too little, too late, but now let's go hard and catch up with Europe, US etc, at least. Even major car companies have been asking for these rules for years but even their pleas ignored by the COALition government. These rules, if strict enough, will give us a broader range of efficient cars and EVs. Who doesn't want cleaner air, quieter streets, better health for all, especially kids, less car maintenance and cars powered by sun juice from our own roofs?	No
1360865	Elodie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	If we don't put the money in now to transition quickly, we'll pay more later, not only dollars but in our health and our planet	NULL
1360869	Olivier Vallee	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are lagging behind the world, we need quick action.	No
1360874	Michael Berg	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option A provides minimal incentive to manufacturers (especially those manufacturers have neglected Battery EVs like Toyota) to change their fleets. option C does more sooner, but is likely to be at risk due to an undersupply of appropriate vehicles. That leaves option B as the next best option though likely to encounter resistance. The paper doesn't address tax incentives that encourage psuedo-business use of Utes as private vehicles in overly large numbers despite their environmental impact	Yes
1360875	Charlie Bell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Rapid reduction is essential	Yes
1360876	ScottBE	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	lowering fossil fuel emissions is vital for the health of our nation and our economy	Yes
1360879	Philip McIntyre	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	It is an achievable policy and allows for people who are having difficulty changing over time to do so without pressure	Yes
1360880	Peter Wolfs	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should join the rest of the world as soon as possible. The technology exists why wait?	NULL
1360882	Eric Lindsay	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Best for climate, best for reduced costs for fuel	Yes
1360883	Gary Gould	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Urgently need to reduce pollution before it's too late	No
1360889	Rick Cubis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The benefits are the greatest with option C.	Yes
1360894	Steffen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is more costly to start with but through economies of scale, we can reeduce costs further.	Yes
1360902	Duncan Beckerton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We've sat on our hands for too long, If we had started earlier we could have gone a diferent rout. The Climate needs our action yesterday not tomorrow	No
1360905	Gavin Bransgrove	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Need to address the issue immediately but not too quickly that transition costs are prohibitive.	Yes
1360907	Ian Garradd	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia will benefit by being ambitious. Savings in pockets, cleaner air & subsequent health benefits & healthcare cost savings. Less fuel imports & money lost on trade. Using less oil disempowers oil despots like Putin, Venezuelan & Iranian governments to name a few.	No

1360908	Ralph Cobcroft	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The world has reached at critical point with CO2 emissions and we need to do everything possible to stop using fossil fuels as quickly as possible.	No
1360912	David H	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act now to catch up to other countries with fuel efficiency standards to ensure we can get more affordable EVs through stronger competition instead of producers ever delaying their EVs in Australia.	No
1360915	Deanna	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I'm sick of working my aircon so hard every summer it breaks	Yes
1360921	Mr James N Bennett	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B offers the most realistic way forward. I would prefer the more aggressive Option C however in the current political climate this option will get so much doubt and false claims thrown at it, it may fail. so Option B please with clear messaging from the government so as to shut down any spurious negative claims	Yes
1360923	Sue and Steve Barrett	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Effective but less expensive	Yes
1360933	Lucy Worgan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1360934	Adrian Batchelor	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	If we are going to do it, as a rich country, we should help lead the way	Yes
1360946	Sue W	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	The mid one seems more manageable at this stage	Yes
1360949	Jenny Bradbrook	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have to act as quickly as possible. Given the inevitable pushback, i suspect option b is more likely to succeed ush back , I suspect optin	Yes
1360952	Patrick Salvaris	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The aim should be to reduce transport emissions as soon as possible which will be best achieved by option C. This option will also maximise the health benefits for all Australians with the reduction in transport pollution and particulate pollution. It will also maximise the options to the newest, cleanest cars on the international market.	Yes
1360954	Aaron Lundstedt	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	In Australia we have every resource required to go fully electric for our economy. It would be very dumb not to do so as soon as possible. Energy Independence is the most important battle we have to win at any cost. Nobody has ever gone to war for solar power or wind power.	No
1360955	Alan Newman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need world's best practice but adopted in a sensible way with the minimal cost and without allowing its opponents to whip up hysteria in the community.	Yes
1360956	Roland van Amstel	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We're not nearly reducing GHG emissions fast enough. Why does Australia always have to be a laggard?	NULL
1360957	Peter	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1360965	Gary Barnes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to catch up to other rich countries	Yes
1360966	Chris White	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	The cost is reflected within the benefits	Yes

1360968	Heidi	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are lagging substantially beyond the developed world and been allowed to be a dumping ground for inefficient vehicles. And meanwhile extreme climate is getting worse affecting us all in our quality of life, stress levels, housing stability and insurance costs. We have to take fast and hold action. Trabsport sector is a major carbon contributor in Australia.	Yes
1360969	Johan Karlsson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Greatest benefit for the taxpayer, for the healthcare system, and for emissions reductions. Australia has plenty of catching up to do, so we need to go fast and hard.	No
1360970	Bob Bell	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	I thought it was the best Option	Yes
1360972	Jon Temby	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need a faster transition i hi	Yes
1360974	Charles Morris	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We must transition quickly, but this will not be supported by businesses if the costs are too high. We always seem slow on the uptake with ideas that are cleaner and require some sacrifices.	Yes
1360976	John Strachan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Good balance between affordability and rate of decarbonisation	Yes
1360977	Sam klaer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are starting behind the rest of the world, why would we choose anything but the most aggressive to catch up. It also appears to have the highest net benefit cost.	Yes
1360981	Ben	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We owe it to future Australians to do everything in our power to fight anthropogenic climate change. I am concerned by the plan of applying a different standard to \,light commercial vehicles\,, as this will likely incentivise people to buy more large SUVs (Ford Ranger, Toyota Hilux, etc.), which are classed as LCVs. This will decrease the effectiveness of emissions reduction, cause increased costs to road maintenance, and lead to more lives lost in traffic accidents.	No
1360984	Jay Iwasaki	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The situation with climate change in Australia is dire. Labor is losing ground to the Greens and even to teals on climate change policy. Australia has lagged behind the world in efficiency standards for too long and it's time to take this problem seriously.	Yes
1360985	Gareth Williams	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	A fast transition would allow us to catch up with current and potential amended targets or US and EU. B doesn't feel as ambitious	Yes
1360986	Jason	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 0th	Most sensible.	Yes
1360987	A Nario	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1360988	Leah Stevens	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is lagging behind the rest of the world. We need to accelerate our transition to electric vehicles and renewable energy.	No
1360989	Tamara Wakeman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Due to slow past progress to address climate change it's more important than ever that action is fast-tracked	Yes
1360990	Mark	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must take every oppportunity to reduce emissions very rapidly. The 1.5C scenario is already gone and more extreme weather is certain unless rapid action is taken.	No
1360994	Anthony Hardy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Much higher overall benefits and reduces Australia's dependence on foreign oil.	No

1361000	Graham Dombkins	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option A feels like do nothing. This change is well overdue. Let's get it done. Option C	No
1361002	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1361003	David Ranson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to get those polluting cars of the road as soon as possible, since these cars will still be on the road in 15 years time, and Australians will be paying more for Saudi and Russian fuel for longer. This also makes our economy more vulnerable to threats from hostile powers. Pollution also kills more people	Yes
1361004	Troy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1361005	Simon Braniff	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1361011	Sandra Englart	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The benefits of Option C are greater and we now need to catch up after years of horrific neglect. Years ago, I would have said Option B as my first preference, but it is too late for that now. We are paying the price for a decade of conservative government and, of course, the climate wars dragging us backwards. We need to pay that price now to catch up.	NULL
1361013	Jeffrey Carlton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C provides the most benefits in the quickest time. We have waited far too long for decent (or any) emission standards, and have a lot of catching up to do.	No
1361014	Mikel Kew	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I think the benefits of rolling this out as quickly as possible under Option C are well worth the additional costs incurred.	Yes
1361016	Michael Dufty	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Improve access to EVs and efficient vehicles (especially small cars) which are currently often not offered in Australia.	Yes
1361019	Alison Dorn	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The situation the world is in is at a critical level, we can't afford to dilly dally any longer. If we had acted sooner I would have chosen option B as it probably is easier to get across the line however now is the time to be very very ambitious and to be strong enough to stand up to the negative voices of the fossil fuel lobby.	Yes
1361022	William Allard	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	WE have a Climate Crisis, urgent and bold action is required not incrementalism.	No
1361025	Sue Hawick	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B has a better chance of getting through and I want fuel efficiency standards now.	Yes
1361028	Matthew Andonov	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	A stronger and tougher New Vehicle Emissions Standard will drive down the cost of fuel for consumers and put Australia on track to meet our climate targets. Option C is best poised to give us that opportunity.	Yes
1361029	Oscar Jackson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1361030	Kelly Prestidge	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This is an exciting new trajectory for our country.	Yes
1361034	paul	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	If you're going to do it, do it well. Don't dither	Yes

1361037	Jennifer Hole	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to move quickly given the limited amount of time we have, but the Australia public has to be brought along and adjustments might have to be made.	Yes
1361038	Peter Brown	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1361045	Peter Vail	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	This seems sensible. It makes sense to align ourselves with the USA. It is just so disappointing that Australia has been so backward.	Yes
1361047	Christian Roth	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is behind the rest and not pulling its weight	Yes
1361052	David McLeod	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I would like to see maximum health and environmental benefits in the shortest possible timeframe	No
1361059	Warren Jack	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have been dragging our feet for far too long on meaningfully reducing vehicle emissions. Personally, I would like to see an accelerated approach but still fully support the government's proposed Option B	Yes
1361060	Sophie Hatcher	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I want to see more positive climate changes sooner. Option B as a minimum.	Yes
1361062	Mark Chandler	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We're already not doing enough to hit climate change targets. We need the most aggressive options. Car manufacturers had access to the same climate science that everyone had for decades. Those selling ICE models chose to take the easy option. They should now pay for that lack of responsibility. Also, traditional ICE car buyers will not shift their attitudes unless there is a greater incentive to.	Yes
1361065	John Philpott	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	8 billion people worldwide dying from air pollution we need to clean the air.	Yes
1361067	Mark Titley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is the only option that reduces CO2. Yearly car tax should be based on impact to the environment, or cars should be tested every 2 years to ensure they meet the manufacturer's specifications.	No
1361069	Andrew Fraser	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's time for Australia to have a bit of ambition for once in adopting technology and being part of innovation. Norway has proven it can be done already. Let's get on with it.	NULL
1361071	Daniel	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Mainly the cost to benefit ratio and the smallest change over time.	Yes
1361077	pat scowen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	fastest possible action needed - Australia already suffering from impact of climate change and it's projected to et worse	NULL
1361078	Romain Hedouin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	With a benefits cost ratio higher than 2, it's moronic not to invest more into the transition. If it were up to me, we would invest more than option C.	No
1361082	Kerryn Gray	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I think we need this to take effect as soon as possible because overall we are so far behind where we should be to avoid extinction.	NULL
1361086	Craig Robertson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should be a world leader on green energy . With our resources and weather we have literally no excuse. Let's get this done and get to the forefront. Oh, and when I cycle in Adelaide the traffic absolutely reeks with pollution and Sulfur so I ca only imagine how bad it is in Sydney and Melbourne. Be ambitious.	Yes

1361087	Pete	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1361094	Parthipan Balasubramaniam	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Most beneficial towards reducing CO2 emissions in the shortest possible time frame. Also important in considering average 15yr lifespan of new vehicles sold today.	NULL
1361095	Jace Donnelly	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1361097	Duncan Blackhurst	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1361101	Nicolette Black	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I feel that we need to start Hard!	Yes
1361103	Nicole Whitehouse	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This has been done very effectively elsewhere in the World (e.g. EU) and has been proven to give clear signals to the car market who have already cleaned up their act. We continue to get high emission cars solely because they can sell them here.	No
1361104	Geoff Norton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Political pragmatism	Yes
1361106	Rick Walters	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The net benefits are clearly greater for option C plus there are likely benefits that are not quantified and therefore not included in the analysis, such as reduced harm from air pollution.	Yes
1361108	Craig Burton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I am part of a project to retrofit mainstream gasoline cars to EV en mass, revr.tech. This project and others means the government can push harder on efficiency and emissions.	Yes
1361109	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1361111	Jeff Addinsall	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do more, faster!	No
1361114	Tyrone	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Transition to sustainable energy transport asap.	No
1361116	John	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We should be realistic, not trying to beat the world.	Yes
1361129	Ian Sylvester	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This seems a very conservative proposal given the climate disasters Australia has been through in recent years, and the unknown disasters which await us in the future. Option C is the least bad of the three.	No
1361132	Mark Lampard	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has spent the past two decades ducking its responsibility for emissions reduction as a developed nation for three decades. We must now accelerate and show leadership in all areas and setting aggressive fuel efficiency standards is but one way in which we can do so.	NULL
1361135	Lance Kennedy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The simple fact is that Australia is lagging behind other major economies due to previous government inaction.	Yes

1361142	Dennis Kavanagh	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to transition to EVs ASAP	No
1361145	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change, and why should we get rejections from the rest of the world in vehicles?	NULL
1361146	Neil Atwood	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We cannot delay any longer and need to weane ourselves off pefrol/diesel asap.	Yes
1361155	Norbert	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fuel efficiency standards are long overdue and have made Australia a dumping ground for fuel inefficient and polluting cars for too long.	Yes
1361157	Trefor Owen	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	Probably more resistance to option b but gives a better result than option a. Option c may cause too much resistance and so be counterproductive	Yes
1361161	Vivian Salim	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1361164	Roger Richards	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia urgently needs to meet strong emissions targets and speed the transition -just as Norway is doing.	No
1361165	Silvia	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	safeguard both the environment and the economic resources of families	Yes
1361166	Inderpreet Singh	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Allowing transition to lowering carbon emissions in a flexible manner ensures flexibility and consumer and manufacturing to work in partnership	Yes
1361168	Philip White	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1361172	Charlie Bell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe climate change is a serious problem and that we must cut greenhouse gas emissions hard and fast. Option A is nowhere near sufficient.	Yes
1361173	Shane McMullan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is imperative that every country work ambitiously to cut greenhouse emissions. While this option does cost a little more, australia is one of the richest nations in the world and with historically high per capita emissions. For this reason we should be world leaders in addressing climate change, currently we are not living up to our potential. Option C helps up take a step toward our potential. Aussies are great, it's time we started acting like it.	Yes
1361174	Anne-Marie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australian is lagging behind other developed nations. The automotive technology to run cheaper and less polluting cars already exists and is prevalent and mandated in many countries. Australia's should be supported through strong government policy to run cleaner cheaper cars to help drive positive health, cost of living and environmental outcomes for Australian car consumers.	Yes
1361175	TM Kenny	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need rapid acction on emissions reduction as we have wasted far too much time already and climate change effects are pronounced	Yes
1361176	Brian Hobby	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Need to get moving on emmissions abatement asap. brings lots of co benefits from a health and wellbeing perspective as well	Yes
1361177	Michael Knight	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Bigger savings, faster, and accumulation of CO2e emissions by 2030 lower.	Yes

1361180	Kerry	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1361185	Sue Kildea	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to move faster	No
1361190	Sandra Kift	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Urgency to reduce global warming	No
1361191	Mark Kift	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Better results sooner.	No
1361195	Martin Lukersmith	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to address this now. It's been too long coming	Yes
1361198	Jason Hainey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	This seems like a good balance that will cause the least disruption while still moving to bring us in line with the rest of the world. The benefits cost ratio appears to be the best for this option as well.	Yes
1361201	Andrew Gelbart	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option A is clearly not any attempt to improve Australia's fuel efficiency standards. It will result in lower \$\$ savings for Australian drivers, Poorer CO2 Emissions and poorer health outcomes, all of which are toally unacceptable. Option B is an acceptable standard with reasonable benefits and represents the minimum that should be proposed. Option C is a more ambitious plan which ought to be embraced since the additional benefits still outweigh the additional costs.	Yes
1361205	Peter LeCornu	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is preferred as it reduces the most emissions in the shortest possible time. The need to reduce emissions is urgent if my grandchildren are to have a future. Option B is much better than option A because of the reduced emissions.	Yes
1361207	Nic Wallis-Smith	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because leaders all around the world have collectively ignored climate change for 30yrs and we have now no time left ton transition or turn this problem around with 1.5 deg global warming here decades before it was expected . the fastest most radical changes are needed yesterday	NULL
1361209	Brian Phillips	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are late to the party - we need a fast catchup - for health, emissions and running costs reasons.	Yes
1361210	Wim Janssen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1361211	Fletcher Thompson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Inaction is not a realistic option to hit emissions reduction requirements and reduce lasting environmental damage at this stage. Option A, presented by the automotive industry, is pure inaction. B is good, but only just catching up. C is a clear and positive step towards decarbonising and improving efficiency in transport and the costs are completely reasonable. I support B at a minimum, but I'd prefer C.	Yes
1361219	Jan Ratcliff	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis is potentially catastrophic. We need to maximise our CO2 reduction immediately.	No
1361222	Cass Flanagan Willanski	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1361225	Horst Thiele	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis requires the fastest transition possible.	Yes
1361228	Richard Person	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Enough of the diesel and petrol pollution that is killing Australians	No

1361229	Mark Rauch	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	The benefits cost ratio with a great benefit but reduced cost with flexibility	Yes
1361230	Patrick Morgan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1361239	Dean Rizzetti	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	BCR of B & C are similar, and the increased innovation that will be driven by C is likely to reduce that difference even further. Australia's lagged behind for too long - we need to be as ambitious as we can at this point.	NULL
1361240	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Maximum benefit. Immediate effect.	No
1361241	Stuart	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	End horrible diesel massive utes clogging our streets.	Yes
1361242	Linda Breary	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Better for our country	No
1361244	Annette Almond	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia's vehicle efficiency and fuel standards have been below most other countries for some time. We are finally going to do something, let's do what will make the biggest positive impact, both environmentally and financially. The science tells us we must move now and fast to minimise the impact of climate change and provide a liveable sustainable future. There is no planet B.	No
1361245	Kim Dellar	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1361246	James Young	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I drive 170kms a day and the cost is killing our family budget	Yes
1361250	Ellis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have to move as fast as possible on climate change after so many wasted years, and the net benefits are greatest for option C.	Yes
1361252	Dr Catherine Ealing	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We don't have the time to go slow. We need 2024 to be a year of global action in all sectors of community and economy to transition as a matter of urgency, to net zero. We are currently way off target and heading towards climate catastrophe and we have 1 year now to turn things around and save the planet and humanity from global warming > 2 degrees.	No
1361253	Amanda Yorke	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	A complex mixture of environmental & economic concerns - Not that they can truly be regarded as separate phenomena: it's just that old economic models, such as the Liberals cling to, deny that messing with the environment has direct & indirect costs for which we are going to have to foot the bill.	Yes
1361254	Tim	Option A - 1st, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	This system basically ignores anyone not able to purchase a new vehicle, punishing those in the bush that drive large distances and need reliable, efficient fuel. Scrap electric and go hydrogen..	No
1361255	Wiersema	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is well behind other nations. Policies to limit climate change are currently too slow to prevent dangerous levels of global warming	Yes
1361256	Judith Ohana OAM	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The planet need urgent help to reduce CO2 in the atmosphere	No
1361258	NULL	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Energy transition ideals are not compatible with reality.	Yes

1361260	Kim Riddle	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Environment	No
1361261	Hazel Key	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1361263	Rod Wales	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to transition off fossil fuels as soon as possible. Climate change is happening and accelerating.	Yes
1361264	Robyn	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Obviously option B is the most sensible, but if the savings are even better, why not go for C? Actually, I don't understand why B has a better cost/benefit when C costs 12 billion more but saves 30 billion. Anyway it's fantastic that anything is being done at all in this long-neglected area. Please just make sure whatever you put in place can't just be undone by the LNP should they be in govt again...	NULL
1361271	John Roddick	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce our carbon emissions.	Yes
1361274	Daniel Pollard	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is the most urgent crisis facing humanity. We need to pull every lever we can as hard as possible.	No
1361278	Trevor Ellis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to transition quickly to cut vehicle emissions in a cost effective way	Yes
1361280	Matthew	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to get EV's into more peoples hands and we need to dispell the myths and scaremongering about EV's on social media and in some conventional media. There is a good ROI with option C so lets get on with it. We should not give industry more time to \adjust\, or \invest\. They have had plenty of time and considering the state of customer support with many of them, they need to pull their finger out and get to work.	No
1361282	James	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change. Efficiency. Saving money. Cleaner energy.	Yes
1361284	Troy Swan	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to transition off fossil fuel as fast as possible and what ever policy will get us there first that is the one that we should support	Yes
1361293	Roman	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	We need to decarb as fast as possible.	No
1361294	Troy Swan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Must transition off fossil fuels asap	Yes
1361295	Reg Newitt	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 0th	NULL	Yes
1361297	Luke L	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Tough times require tough solutions and with the weather and temperature getting more out of control, things will only get tougher if we don't act now.	No
1361298	Lisa F	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1361299	Ian Kruger	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have run out of time. All action now.	No

1361300	Christopher Meder	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Implementing stringent fuel emission standards in Australia is critical for addressing climate change and promoting sustainable transport. These standards push the automotive industry towards more efficient and cleaner vehicles, aligning with global efforts to reduce emissions. The urgency is amplified by the transport sector's significant contribution to Australia's greenhouse gas emissions. Mitigating these through stricter regulations is crucial for public health and environmental protection.	Yes
1361302	Kieren Diment	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Based on the BCR above option B is clearly superior, and may accidentally cause option C to be achieved by accident anyway	Yes
1361308	Jens Svensson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The savings of money and the environment puts option 3 first. Costs listed above are hypothetical, current batteries last as long as the cars and electricity can be virtually free from uyor own solar system.	No
1361310	James Manners	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to mandate fuel efficiency standards in line with other countries and to provide macro incentives to reducing fuel usage and co2 emissions	Yes
1361311	craig kidney	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	cost and efficiency	Yes
1361312	Ian McNaughton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	New record high CO2 recorded at NOAA's Mauna Loa on 3rd Feb 2024 (426.5ppm). Do it all, do it well, do it now.	No
1361316	Joe Pajtler	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1361318	Oliver	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change does not wait.	No
1361322	Omkar	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1361328	Charlie R	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are behind the globe left in the dark. Of course we should have emissions restrictions! And quickly!	Yes
1361330	David	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Biggest benefit fastest. HOw hard is it to comprehend?	No
1361332	Sai Prakash Lakkur	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1361334	Bruce McInnes	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	It will be cheaper health outcomes	No
1361336	Martin Scerri	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Need best solution now that creates a fair market and incentivises manufacturers to import efficient vehicles while not succumbing to the car lobbyists.	Yes
1361337	Richard Costello	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have already been waiting to long for this change !	No
1361340	Ryan Randell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Need to act fast. Been too slow for too long.	Yes

1361341	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B is probably more realistic	Yes
1361344	Richard Krohn	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Giving time to adjust to the change, however, second option should be used if there is pushback from the industry.	Yes
1361346	Steven Porritt	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Changes need to happen as soon as possible for the benefit of all people and the planet, now and into the future.	NULL
1361349	Bill Munro	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1361350	Lisa M	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	This is a fair and achievable option that will achieve significant environmental and health outcomes for all of us. It will support the uptake of EVs, and hopefully lower the number of polluting vehicles on our roads.	Yes
1361352	Thierry dardare	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to reduce the level of pollution from our cars	Yes
1361353	JOHN MASCARENHAS	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	STEADY PROGRESS WITHOUT ROCKING THE BOAT.	Yes
1361357	Dinesh Cooray	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change	Yes
1361358	Tibor Csapo	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are already too late and need to move as fast as possible.	No
1361360	Randall Mathews	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate crisis is a crisis. This needed to be done some time ago. All speed possible now.	Yes
1361363	Michael Searle	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Australia needs to act quickly and decisively to reduce emissions. We do not have time on our side. We need to make this happen quickly..	Yes
1361374	Owen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	For consumers and climate	No
1361375	david maycraft	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1361376	James	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1361378	yoshinori kawahara	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1361380	John Diamond	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	I don't think any of these should be taken up. Just provide the clean cars and let consumers make choices on what to buy. Over time the cleaner cars will be the majority as old ones wear out. The real danger I see is that any of these programs are going to cost people who cant afford it a lot of money. People are struggling to afford basics right now in Feb 2024 without additional costs for extremely marginal gain in regard to Australia's level of carbon or other emissions vs the world.	No

1361381	ML Kiely CPA	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option 1 a waste of time, effort & \$\$ Option 2 we don't manufacture motor vehicles.. tell corps to up their efficiency rates & stop whining Option 3 best net benefits & faster... just do it US/Murdoch will smear you no matter what you do!	NULL
1361383	Patrick Li	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	Plan B recognises the fine line between the urgency of climate action and the technological feasibility of the transition to electric vehicles.	Yes
1361386	Mary Thomson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C has the greatest number of benefits.	No
1361387	Johan Wittenberg	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There have been too many delays already. The benefits will be far better than predicted in the government preferred option which is likely a compromise towards fuel lobbyists and some car manufacturers.	No
1361391	Leigh Whittaker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Waited too long. Car companies have options and can just do it. We can't wait because climate change is serious and we should have moved in the 80s	Yes
1361392	Frank Noakes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I think option B is fair and embraces real action, which is long overdue.	Yes
1361396	Luke Morton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The faster the implementation the greater the net benefit.	Yes
1361398	Susan Chapman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	need to decarbonise fast	Yes
1361407	Prof Ray Wills	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The time for slow starts was last decade, and any option of a slow start in improving Australia's Vehicle Efficiency Standard was squandered by the previous Federal Government. Slow changes will impact iAustralia's car fleet for 2 decades. I have attached an old submission to the Garnaut inquiry I authored in 2008 calling for (among other things) fuel efficiency for Australian transport. It's time.	NULL
1361410	Frank Stoss	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B brings Australia in line with the emissions policies of the US and the EU. It provides lots of benefits to the driver and the community. While Option C might be better on many levels, it is harder to achieve and should therefore be aspirational. Option A is not at all ambitious.	Yes
1361412	Anna Russell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	BCR in option 2 is more favourable for a very good outcome	Yes
1361414	Angela	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	We are already out of time and must take the most drastic measures as quickly as possible.	Yes
1361415	Liz Ahern	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Want it to happen asap but aware how much resistance is likely. Need to be strong	Yes
1361418	Ben Newman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The cost to provide the transition is always higher when first implementing, my preference is to do it as fast as possible to increase the benefits sooner	Yes
1361419	Patricia Kearns	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I would prefer to go with C as we need to accelerate our response to climate change, but would accept Bas a start	Yes
1361423	Ian swney	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Bush fire season seems to start earlier each year. Fires and wild weather, habitat loss— terrestrial and in our oceans, farmers and fishers livelihoods under threat all point to the necessity of fastest possible transition to a low carbon economy.	NULL

1361424	Louise Clarke	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to make a faster transition in reducing CO2, for the survival of this beautiful plant and for the health and survival of our children.	No
1361425	Sherry Thomas	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I support the optiion B but these standards are long overdue and need to be implemented urgently, so I prefer option C	Yes
1361426	robin gardner	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It gives the best overall savings and the benefit cost ratio is similar to option 2, We need to get emissions down as soon as possible.	NULL
1361427	Nicholas O'Dwyer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Because option B is a strong and ambitious policy but provides flexibility for suppliers to adapt to the change.	Yes
1361428	Nicolas Sprael	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1361429	@imatightass	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Being such a tiny nation population wise, we should aim at most aggressive goals and smash them in half the time.	No
1361432	Mr Alain THIBERT	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1361435	Aidon Thomas	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Meet emissions targets and then keep pace with other jurisdictions, noting aust small market	Yes
1361439	Jim Stewart	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1361442	Geoff Mathers	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is no need for a slow transition. Since we stopped making cars in Australia, is should be a lot easier to hit aggressive targets than countries in the EU and US that do	No
1361443	DarylMc	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	More \$ benefits than the extra \$ costs	NULL
1361444	Mik Aidt	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate emergency. It is as if the Government hasn't understood the responsibility it has to protect the people of Australia. We need to cut emissions fast, and draw down CO2 urgently. Electrifying Australia's car fleet is inevitable anyway, it is only a question of the speed in which it will happen. The faster we decarbonise, the less costs from extreme weather devastation.	No
1361445	Adam Taneski	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce air pollution as soon as we can for our healths sake.	Yes
1361447	Alex Mosnier	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1361448	Adam Lippiatt	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Net benefit highest.	No
1361449	scott hutton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes

1361450	Helen Lyman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Air pollution and carbon emissions are having a significant impact on human health and the climate of the planet. We need to reduce both as quickly as possible. These new policies will only impact new vehicles, these vehicles will be on the road for a decade at least and there are many high emission vehicles staying on the road for a few years to come.	Yes
1361454	Jason Wheatley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We live in the electorate of Grayndler, the Prime Minister's is our member of parliament. Our home looks directly at the three huge unfiltered "ventilation" stacks that spread what is deemed to toxic to breath in the tunnel around our neighbourhood and into our lungs. The whole of Sydney breaths the toxic soup. The health, environmental and economic damage requires urgent action. We need our representatives to protect us, our environment and our economy. We need option C.	No
1361455	Martin Krsek	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Our planet is already exhibiting the adverse effects of ghg on human and other life forms. Floods, fires, drought. We cannot do enough to lower ghg sooner, to mitigate even worse impacts.	No
1361456	Geoff Slmpson	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	Looking for the maiximum reduction in CO2 emissions.	Yes
1361463	Tad Foley	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Policy has to change and be realistic and achievable against the fuel lobbyists.	Yes
1361464	Alban	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1361465	Richard Laxton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The world is going through a climate catastrophe. We delayed even these weak proposals for a decade, so the only option now is to go as far as possible.	NULL
1361469	Richard Neumann	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As a regular walker I would like a rapid improvement in air quality and as an EV owner I would like to see more Australians share the joy, with a wider choice of models at different price points.	Yes
1361473	Paul Leopardi	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	C is best overall	No
1361474	lee reynolds	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	fine particulate matter has a highly significant effect on childrens educational delvelopment and health, thus necessitating a faster transition. fine particulate matter has a highly significant effect on children's educational development and health, thus necessitating a faster transition.	Yes
1361477	Rod Teale	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Overall this is the best balance with a solid outcome.	Yes
1361478	Nick Cowling	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1361479	Jeremy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Faster change to catch up with the rest of the world and limit climate change. Provide quicker access to low cost low emissions vehicles.	No
1361481	Robert Taylor	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must act to get CO2 emissions down ASAP because of the massive negative impacts climate change is having on the world	No
1361482	Adrian McLean	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The difference between B and C, is not that great. So due to the abhorrent inability of governments worldwide to meet targets, mostly go beyond: the NEED is now, so option C is the only way to go. Tax benefits for utes, have helped nobody but the buyer - definitely not the environment nor the average person.	No
1361483	Mitch Micevski	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option A is the "do nothing option proposed by the car industry and should be rejected out of hand. Option B is the weak government compromise position. Option C is the only rational option given Australia and Russia remain the only developed countries without NVES.	No

1361487	terry	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Global warming	No
1361490	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1361491	Jan carter	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Best option for the environment	Yes
1361494	Andrea Chisari	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1361498	Derek West	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This decision is long overdue, no time to waste.	No
1361499	Aaron Barko	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Planet conservation	NULL
1361501	Alex	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The need to address climate change is imperative and urgent. Furthermore, the faster the transition the more we can accelerate our technologies and be a world leader in this field.	Yes
1361503	Barry Walker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I have only just placed an order for a EV and we live in a all electric home with soar ,batteries and a zero power bill	No
1361508	Ben Farrell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change	Yes
1361509	Michael Fuller	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to be taking all actions we can for the environment, Option C results in both the highest net benefit and the best outcomes for CO2e targets.	No
1361512	Jakob	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1361514	Vera	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need fast action from our government who are meant to govern us and improve our future	Yes
1361515	Penelope Stapleton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Reduce pollution and make EV more affordable and available	Yes
1361518	Andrew Dix	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	pragmatic and politically achievable - doesn't let the perfect get in the way of the good	Yes
1361519	Giovanni angelini	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want to save fuel and have more choice of vehicles.im also keen to lower pollution . I currently drive a PHEV	Yes
1361520	Scott Dovey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fuel emissions standards should have been in place at least a decade ago. Years of inaction mean we now have to choose the fastest option, even if it costs more.	Yes

1361521	Steven Thimios	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has lagged in this area for far too long. We need to get a move on.	NULL
1361526	Matthew Biviano	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The cost impact is on new vehicles so it would be good to have this embedded into the economy early to get the market the time to adjust, then by the time I need a new vehicle there should be better options available.	Yes
1361527	Tim Karl	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Australia has to catch up to standards long established in other countries...	Yes
1361531	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need more action sooner	Yes
1361541	Alex	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Maximise the benefits and start quickly. We have dragged out feet for a long time.	NULL
1361546	Daniel Sargent	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1361547	Neil Stewart	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are a decade or two too late. Get in with it. Fast	NULL
1361548	Denis Cowcill	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 0th	we need to do this sooner rather than later, should have been done years ago.	Yes
1361549	Michael Baker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must speed up the transition.	No
1361550	Darren Compton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1361552	Kate Fisher	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1361554	Richard Weatherhead	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must combat climate change for the sake of our children and the planet.	Yes
1361556	Andy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	85% of the world already has similar measures in place. We need to catch up, and now	Yes
1361558	Steve Chapman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need change asap	No
1361560	Richard Stewart	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	EVs are the superior vehicle for most people. Up until now they were too costly. With assistance charging infrastructure investment can be accelerated.	No
1361566	Philip Lucas	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I am tired of car, truck and cargo train diesel fumes and noises. We need to transition to EVs now. We need to discourage people buying huge utes from America and give incentives to companies to develop fuel efficient EVs.	No

1361570	Michael McGovern	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are way too far behind due to inaction.	NULL
1361575	Chris Cantor	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is happening right now and Australia is woefully negligent in its response to date. It is time for us to do our bit and time to end half hearted responses. We as a nation drive big inefficient gas-guzzlers and this should stop or at least those that do should pay for it.	No
1361585	ROBERT	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	BEST OPTION TO REDUCE CO2.	Yes
1361593	Ian	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Faster is better	Yes
1361596	Dominicus Tornqvist	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The entire world is well behind where it needs to be to keep global average temperatures from rising beyond 2C. This fuel efficiency policy is long overdue and should be implemented as quickly as possible. Automakers should have been ramping up BEV production years ago. This will force them and finally bring economies of scale into play to reduce prices. There is no sympathy for these companies who saw this coming years ago and did everything they could to delay it so they could keep polluting.	Yes
1361604	stuart Guthrie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to move quickly to reduce vehicle emissions and meet our targets. The quickest option is C. The motor industry has had many extra years to make money from dirty engines than other countries have allowed so we must aggressively move fast to undo this damage.	No
1361654	Daniel Quinn	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1361695	Rachel Badham	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1361696	Britt Simmons	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Preference for Option C as it gives us the greatest benefits (importantly the reduction in emissions) in the fastest timeframe. Which is what we need during a climate emergency! Opportunity to become a leader in this space, learning from the experience of other countries and beating them.	Yes
1361709	Victoria Jack	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1361722	Suzanne Parker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1361754	Sharon Miskell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to urgently reduce vehicle carbon emissions	Yes
1361764	Kerry Hunter	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need a single, simple, effective emissions standard to apply to ALL vehicles. Options A and B are essentially ineffective. The government's preferred US model will fail because it further incentivises the least suitable type of passenger vehicles currently on our roads. Massive urban trucks and SUVs. They're unsafe to other road users, unsuitable in city environments, resource and emissions intense. These are the vehicles that must be targeted. Australia remains a laggard on emissions policy	No
1361777	Manfred	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1361868	Ian Simons	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	The sooner we can encourage cheaper electric cars the better. The more electric cars, the cheaper they will become thru economies of scale.	NULL
1361881	Sylvie Constantine	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C fast-tracks the necessary transition away from polluting fossil fuels to fix our climate crisis, and would position Australia as world leader in clean/renewable energy production, replacing our current coal and gas exports. This desirable strategic	Yes

			objective, would recoup the initial higher cost of Option C versus Option B, so it would be worth it to take the lead of the new world economy. (Yet, Option B is better than nothing.)	
1361890	Deb Alexander	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are so far behind other countries on this, the sooner we catch up the better. I personally would like the option to be able to buy a cheaper electric car as a result of this change.	Yes
1361903	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1361906	Jonathan Vila	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has been behind the times for far too long. We should prioritise rapid decarbonisation of the transport industry by going option C. Whilst the costs are higher, the benefits are significant. I also believe the governments battery costs calculations to be far too much. We need to be ambitious especially when the benefits are not just savings on fuel bills but also to societal health in our cities. Less pollution will also see improvement in Australians health and long term improvement	NULL
1361987	Thor Stovell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to effect a smooth transition to EV's and fuel efficient ICE vehicles as soon as possible. It is clear from other countries who already have higher standards that it is achievable and doesn't harm the economy and in time the aging fleet of ICE vehicles will be removed and recycled. I want to purchase an EV as my next car and support the mass introduction as it will surely drive down prices.	Yes
1361990	Ariel Rezzani	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are already behind a lot of other comparable international states. I also want more and better choices of electric vehicles.	Yes
1361997	Rob Lake	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is very late to this and needs to catch up fast. We risk becoming a dumping ground as other countries enact strong. Australian transport sector lags significantly, a moribund rail freight sector does not help.	No
1361999	Travis Young	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	Need time to build infrastructure to support a huge ev fleet. Current infrastructure can't sustain the extra load on the grid.	Yes
1362034	Ross Poulton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Our climate emissions are dire, and we need to reduce these wherever we can. Option C is an aggressive way to transform one key part of our economy. Foreign car companies are already producing fuel-efficient vehicles but they are not sold in Australia. We are being left with older technology that pollutes more heavily. This policy will force their hand, getting their efficient cars (including but not only EVs) onto Australian shores sooner rather than later.	Yes
1362040	Mendoza	Option A - 1st, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Really to run Euro 5 vehicles in this country is to produce a better standard fuel , EVs have their place but isn't the answer and will not fix this road your forcing people to take.	No
1362057	Jay Starrs	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	If we don't move fast we will fall behind competitively. Australia is an excellent place to focus on a transition to renewables. Without moving quick to tackle accelerated climate change, the result will be trillions of dollars spent on health and disaster recovery.	Yes
1362124	Walter	Option A - 1st, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Ice Vehicles are efficient and co levels are within standard . To produce better emissions is to provide a better quality fuel to adapt to what's being made today. EVs have their place in cities and small commutes but it the answer. To make a greater impact would be if all houses had the battery packs and studies have shown greater offset to emissions.	No
1362139	Jan Scott	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to accelerate transition to prevent global heating	Yes
1362142	Jennifer Kent	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has lagged on fuel efficiency standards and the quicker they are adopted the more benefits will be derived in health, climate & fuel costs. Yes it is the more expensive option but the cost benefit is close to Option B & the benefits come sooner. Also the vehicle industry has adapted to such standards overseas so the transition shouldn't be that onerous.	Yes
1362144	Max Staniford	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B gives a rapid transition and aligns with world standards	Yes
1362176	Hyatt Nidam	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to look beyond the immediate short term and simply look forward 5 years. At this point we will regret doing anything but option c	NULL

1362197	Rosie White	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We must establish effective and achievable fuel efficiency standards. We have failed woefully to do this, now is the time as we simply must reduce our fossil fuel emissions.	Yes
1362204	Lee Horsley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act as quickly as possible to stall the effects of our greedy and careless treatment of this world in which we live. In the end, money is meaningless.	Yes
1362217	Alan Outhred	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1362263	ROXY AUDSLEY	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	It is sheer folly and wasted money to try to impose these restrictions on vehicles while the rest of the civilised world is flat out building coal and gas powered power stations. Australia produces less than 1% of worlds emissions. SPEND THE MONEY ON HOSPITALS!!	No
1362282	Dru	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	ROI for Australia	Yes
1362312	GaryP	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Because it's a lie! Does anyone expect that governments of any stripe will give up the fuel excise revenues - that are hiked twice a year - and allow anyone to 'save' on fuel costs! And, until there is proper end of life recycling in place for EVs, they are not a 'greener' choice. The best solution is to encourage longer term use of existing vehicles to achieve a 20 year on road life.	No
1362329	Peter W Hatton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Australia needs to take significant action to reduce climate change and to reduce the cost of living. This action, however must be achievable and should seek to encompass wide community support if it is to succeed.	Yes
1362352	Peter Davis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	A fast start is necessary so that we get a quick reduction.	Yes
1362360	Thomas Rowe	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is an existential crisis and is happening right now. It will only get worse if we don't act with the greatest urgency possible. Higher short term costs will incentivize uptake of EVs, electric stoves, ovens and furnaces, and renewable energy sources for the grid. These higher costs also reflect the real cost of using fossil fuels and starts to include the currently unpriced externality of climate change. Option C is idiotic and option B lacks proportionate urgency.	No
1362369	Joshua McKinnon	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I strongly endorse the option to get on with this important and urgent transition, as quickly as possible. We consistently see the costs of a renewable transition are always much lower than forecast. Let's get this transition done ASAP, then move on to transitioning heavier vehicles sooner.	Yes
1362387	Damien Stoddard	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	I dont believe the government should be involved in anything like this. find a better solution. This will only hurt everyday Aussies.	No
1362414	Ben	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is my preference because I value Australia's contribution to global warming much more than anything else.	Yes
1362421	Jordan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we are way too far behind the world, it's time to start being a leader.	No
1362465	Brendon Pywell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Comparing C to B, the additional savings of outweigh the additional costs. Cleaner air creating a healthier population. Reduced costs, especially when going electric. Less dependency on other countries for fuel. Reducing Australia's GHGs allows us to put further pressure on other countries to do the same, although regarding fuel emission standards, Australia is so far behind most countries to begin with.	No
1362471	Kate	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1362500	Linda Mcbean	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	2nd option on OA, OB, OC. Sorry I was unable to put my choice. A random selection came up.	Yes

1362526	Peter Mahoney	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Reduce global warming.	No
1362529	Adam	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Health related to emissions, I want cleaner air for my family & I. I state yes to supporting the governments preferred option B, only after preferring option C.	Yes
1362567	Suparna Vashisht	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The effects of climate change are proving to be disastrous for Australians. We need to move aggressively to reduce the factors that contribute to climate change.	No
1362574	Isabel	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	It's essential to reduce gas emissions	Yes
1362615	Kieran Murphy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We've already seen the impact of global climate change. We've also seen that other countries are adopting stricter standards, pushing the inefficient and polluting products into other markets with softer regulation. Australia is one of those markets, thus becoming a dumping ground for old and polluting technology.	No
1362648	Stelio Pappas	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1362663	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The faster the transition, the better of Australia will be in the long run	Yes
1362678	Gary Dean	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	electrify, electrify, electrify. no excuses.	No
1362700	Matthew McHale	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	How are we so far behind the rest of the world? We must do our bit to slow climate change.	Yes
1362707	Bruce Wyborn	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Going slow will only allow more pollution. Australia needs to stop relying on fossil fuels and be energy independent. I made the switch and haven't looked back. My vehicles are 100% charged from solar. Better to fall short of an aggressive target, than miss an easy one.	Yes
1362710	Stuart Kennedy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Time is the one thing that can never be retrieved. Let us move fast and attempt to catch up to the rest of the world.	No
1362747	M Stanton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia desperately needs to reverse the trend of larger, more powerful, heavier and more fuel inefficient cars, which are damaging our environment and our roads.	NULL
1362759	Martin Bes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	See attached statement	Yes
1362761	Simon	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to go as fast as possible	No
1362791	Ernie Terrazzino	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe we need to embrace the new technology as soon as possible to become leaders, not only as consumers but also as producers.	Yes
1362826	Renga Rajan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes

1362832	Lindsay Dullea	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C presents the most compelling strategy for reducing greenhouse gas emissions produced by petrol vehicles. Its accelerated trajectory to beat CO2 targets for 2030/32 in the EU and US by 2028/29 positions Australia as a leader in emissions reduction efforts. By swiftly transitioning to more efficient vehicles and embracing the latest fuel efficiency technology, Option C not only facilitates a significant reduction in emissions but also ensures that Australia remains competitive, globally.	Yes
1362836	Michael A	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Make it as fair as possible	Yes
1362841	John Archibald Wayne Caldwell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because of the fossil-fuel bound policies of the previous government we have fallen behind the rest of the developed world. It is time to bite the bullet and do our bit for the planet.	Yes
1362885	Charles Weston	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We have waited a long time and I think B is the best way forward	Yes
1362891	Sean Manners	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Common sense	Yes
1362894	Matthew Wyres	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	Minimise opportunities for targeting by conservative media and make sure the policy change is permanent	Yes
1362899	Jan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	No time to lose in transition to a cleaner energy future.	Yes
1362900	Greg Thompson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cost and environmental benefits would accrue much faster	Yes
1362901	Daniel Coughlan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reduction in emissions, Australia won't be a dumping ground for other countries inefficient fuel cars, Australia will catch up with other climate conscious nations, and savings for petrol vehicle drivers.	Yes
1362909	Munaver Gulamali	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to Go in hard and go in fast to reduce Co2 emission for the future of this planet	No
1362913	Adam Gulamali	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1362915	Ebrahim Gulamali	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1362916	Sakina	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1362917	Joseph Sarsero	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1362920	John Barnett	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B is in most respects sufficiently robust but not excessively so. By staying short of EU standards vehicle manufacturers should have no reason to complain (but of course, Toyota will anyway!). I do not support, however, the favoured treatment for heavy twin cab utility vehicles, the vast majority of which are not used for commercial purposes at all, and those that are used for commercial purposes such use is a small fraction of total use.	Yes
1362921	Roy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have hesitated for far too long. Option B might have been best if undertaken 5 years ago. Now we must make haste even if it costs more but with greater benefits	No

1362928	Quentin Dresser	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to reduce greenhouse gases urgently. The BCR value influenced my ranking.	Yes
1362935	Stephen Eastman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Proposed option B has the highest benefit cost ratio C. Option C has higher net benefits and abatement but also higher costs, slightly higher than the benefit cost ratio for Option C	Yes
1362975	Guy Abrahams	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	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, thus leading to a reduction in harmful greenhouse emissions which directly correlate to the impacts of climate change.	NULL
1362981	Jonathan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is appalling that Australia is one of the last countries in the world to have a vehicle efficiency standard. Not taking the fastest route from here would be another mistake. This is not about money for big business, this is about the health of Australians akin to second hand smoking. Obviously legacy car companies will not clean themselves up, so the government needs to step in and do this quickly.	Yes
1362990	Phillip Baron	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1362994	Dr Jasper Lee	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need rapid and cost effective measures to decarbonise transport	Yes
1363011	Graham Haywood	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1363020	Greg Sievert	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need the strongest possible target to get us back on track.	No
1363028	Sue Carolane	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	Option B represents a reasonable middle path, whereas Option C may be shot down in flames due to costs. Option A doesn't qualify as an option, in my opinion.	Yes
1363039	Colin Denman-Jones	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is well overdue to implement these global standards. Manufacturers can already comply. Savings to consumers, businesses and the environment are highest with option C.	Yes
1363049	Lois Wishart	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The need to transition to nil-emissions vehicles is urgent. Global overheating is escalating - 2023 was the hottest year in millions of years (refer IPCC). Disasters that devastate communities and economies are increasingly frequent. Vehicles powered by renewables will boost rather than harm the economy. There need to be incentives for companies to sell and people to buy smaller cars rather than SUVs, and for emissions-free commercial road transport vehicles.	No
1363051	Mark Fort	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	See attachment.	No
1363054	Ryan Beurle	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Provides the most benefits while keeping cost reasonable.	Yes
1363056	Philip O'Leary	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1363059	Julia Simpson	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	The level of CO2 emissions needs to be reduced ASAP	Yes
1363070	Phil Rollas	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia must catch up to other nations. We must target the Fast Start.	Yes

1363087	Shannon Walsh	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want Australian to be a leader in clean transport and fuel efficiency.	Yes
1363108	Richard AGAR	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	85 % of the world have fuel efficiency standards. Global warming is real. Lets get out of the blocks and make up for years of neglect in this area. its a no brainer	Yes
1363113	Ivan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Sensible achievable policy reduce emissions	Yes
1363116	Martyn Jeffs	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1363122	Lynda Willis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The world needs less pollution from petrol cars.	Yes
1363123	Gabor Gergely	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	In my opinion the flexibility in Option B is a nice to have, BUT the current situation requires strong action and the technology is out there, the sun the wind are generating more than enough power to make great changes and cut the majority of the fossil fuel industry out and reduce the pressure on individuals. At the same time creating a better environment, less health issues, financially stronger mid-class are all good reasons why the long run and fast action would work much better (Option C).	Yes
1363124	Alison Jones	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1363130	Rebecca Sweeney	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate emergency	No
1363144	Charlotte Davis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is an emergency, actions of all governments need to reflect that.	Yes
1363152	Bob Hodges	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Provides optimum transition time to the biggest savings and fastest catchup to the rest of the world. Gives Australians the fastest transition to best available vehicles	Yes
1363168	Christian Pagliaro	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The global climate emergency requires all efforts possible be made to limit warming. Option C is clearly possible and should therefore be chosen by the Australian Government.	No
1363170	Melissa Fairman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The quicker the better, if our money doesn't go to our planet, what's more important than that?	Yes
1363178	Geoffrey Knox	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change requires urgent action	NULL
1363181	Raya Stanton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is a long way behind many other countries & C makes up in a small way for lost time. A Tesla like ability to trade may assist further.	Yes
1363197	Zara	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1363223	Christopher Colhoun	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to support the future expansion of the new technologies that EV vehicles bring to transport and possible home battery, grid stabilisation	Yes

1363224	Danny Bearzatto	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Change has to happen quickly and without government intervention Toyota and Co will continue to make ICE and hybrid vehicles. The simple reason is that their investment in ICE vehicles (including hybrids) is a sunk cost and therefore in total terms, ICE vehicles are more profitable for them right now. They need a financial incentive to change and as shown the world over, this works. I support option C as we need big-auto to invest more, and invest quickly.	No
1363232	Greg Byrnes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because I do not understand how the costs are higher for option 3. What battery replacement costs?	No
1363238	Stephen Hanley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Australia is sharply feeling the effects of climate change and should not be lagging the world	Yes
1363255	Kerry Clarke	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	This option seems to provide a good sensible middle ground.	Yes
1363259	Connor Davies	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to transition to electric vehicles as rapidly as possible. Option 3 delivers the highest benefits to society and gives us the best chance at meeting our decarbonisation goals. Emissions from transport are the fastest growing in Australia and rapid and ambitious action is needed. Option B is good but option C would be even better	Yes
1363262	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1363263	Darcy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have a lot of catching up to do in this space. I would also like to see a net reduction in private vehicle reliance and more rail and active transport solutions instead of reliance on fossil fuels.	No
1363273	Helen Brookfield	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act now!	No
1363276	Gregory Andrews	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	In a climate emergency Australia needs to move as fast as possible to zero emissions. Transport is a major and growing polluting sector. It's essential to move fast and deeply on all emissions reductions. There are structural adjustment costs, but the costs of delay will be even higher.	Yes
1363281	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia should have strong emissions reduction ambitions and not be the world's dumping ground for polluting vehicles.	Yes
1363286	Noah Andrews	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want clean air and a safe planet and I will be alive at the end of this century while most of the politicians and policy makers won't.	NULL
1363288	Max Toovey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should be leading the way on reforms like this, it's taken far too long to get these measures in place, and for the next few years we should be aggressively playing catch up	No
1363289	Tim Smith	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fastest transition, our Fuel standards are far to low for option B to be viable.	No
1363304	Andrew Brown	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	There should be no penalty rates, if government wants to incentivise EV uptake it should provide subsidies like the US not pretend that adding onerous burdens will result in cheaper vehicles.	No
1363309	Richard Whitfield	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have been dragging our feet on this crucial issue for far too long, and must catch up with the rest of the worldr far too long. We must catch up with	Yes
1363326	Gauri Maini	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C offers \$30.7 billion in benefits at an additional cost of \$12.26 billion. These costs may be somewhat lower with increased participation and momentum from citizens who can champion the transition to renewables. This is an opportunity for us to reverse the harms caused by excessive mining and drilling to fuel our lifestyle.	No

1363335	Maria Lang	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	Option C is the only alternative if we want to act fast on climate change	No
1363339	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Lacking any established fuel efficiency standards; protracted process over many years, despite and active opposition of vested industry voices not yet stilled, Essential we act fast and decisively - in a balanced \unthreatening\ way - to establish a firm, effective baseline that proves its effectiveness and can be built on as necessary. Option B builds that essential good strong base. .	Yes
1363363	Matt	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	This will get dragged out regardless as the government are too deep in fossil fuel pockets, so lets aim for the highest which also generates the greatest financial and cost benefit.	No
1363367	Ian Parker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I am disappointed NVES has taken so long and feel we need to accelerate our emissions reduction ASAP.	NULL
1363370	Barney Fallows	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The Environment is all we have. We are slow to this party... so we dont have time to waste. The slowest option, is NOT and option for our kids	No
1363381	Marshall	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We've already left this too late. There is no Australian car industry to support. We can make whatever rules we want!	Yes
1363385	Lisa jody conn	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 1st	Working with elon	Yes
1363386	bev	Option A - 0th, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 1st	we have to get a move on. A quick, rapid, as fast as, urgent move on to have any chance of leaving a semblance of a sustainable environment for future generations (not to mention our children and grandchildren)	No
1363392	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must cut CO2 emissions at any cost. Transport is low hanging fruit, as we have seen the EU, particularly Nordic countries, have had great success decarbonising this sector.	Yes
1363394	Nigel Howard	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We NEED the fastest possible emissions reduction and EV's are highly strategic for the uptake of renewables especially once we have bi- directional charging for putting a HUGE amount of car battery storage on the grid for the 97% of time our cars are idle.	No
1363402	Andrew Peel	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is a race, and there is no time to waste.	No
1363404	Jane Hearn	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1363412	B Metcalf	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act as fast and decisively as possible to reduce impacts to future generations.	NULL
1363414	John M Schmidt	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must move as quickly as possible to absolute minimum emissions. Yes, doing so will cost more, but we have benefitted for far too long from getting the cheapest prices without regard to our future, and, more importantly, that of our children and their children. To continue as we have been or take an easy but less effective approach would confirm us as nothing more than parasites on our planet's resources. Science is now saying that we have apparently already passed the 1.5C increase \target\.	NULL
1363422	Karen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are already behind the 8ball! Let's go!	NULL
1363423	Nigel Kernick	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate emergency. Every day counts. These steps should have been taken more than a decade ago. There is no time to lose	No

1363430	Janet Dawson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	A good balance of climate effectiveness with economy of cost	Yes
1363433	Robyn Deane	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to address climate change urgently. Vehicle emissions must be reduced if we are to do more to stop the over-heating of our planet.	NULL
1363438	Jennifer Petinatos	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are far behind European nations and need a fast start to reap the most benefits	No
1363442	Adrienne	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is the biggest Emergency facing us on this planet, and we are not doing enough. We should be doing the most	No
1363445	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1363446	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate EMERGENCY!	No
1363448	Gita Sonnenberg	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's the strongest and therefor the best option	No
1363451	Andrew Town	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to fast track the transition for: our health, the environment and to give economic certainty to maximise investment	No
1363453	Lynn Greig	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	With the effects of global warming becoming steadily more catastrophic, urgent action is needed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, whatever the cost.	Yes
1363454	Alexander Dudley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate emergency and the planet cannot afford to continue pumping greenhouse gases into the atmosphere. We are already seeing the economic costs of lagging on action on climate change with increased insurance costs, more extreme weather events, and it is likely we will see boycotts and trade tariffs if we do not take strong action.	No
1363459	Rod Dilkes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	High emmitting vehicles should pay for the pollution they produce. The strongest possible market signal should be enforced.	Yes
1363460	Dr Tilman Ruff AO	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reducing carbon emissions as fast as feasible - much faster than current trajectory - is critical for a safe and healthy future. Accelerating the renewable energy transition for transport is feasible with available technology. Fast transition will benefit momentum and results. Reducing transport emissions is also a vital health issue especially in poorer areas of our cities choking in subsidised diesel (and petrol) exhausts. Option C has benefits across the board for modest extra costs.	Yes
1363472	Koel Wrigley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	The transition and emissions reductions is very important. I support this policy as it is in line with other countries, and is sorely needed.	Yes
1363477	Wendy Wait	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Its the fastest transition away from fossil fuels towards clean energy	No
1363492	Terence O'Hanlon	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Emissions reduction must be our priority.	No
1363511	Peter Frank	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Perfect the enemy of good - it's taken far too long already for Labor to address this issue but rather get their plan approved and started than waste time on a plan that has zero chance of being legislated. of	Yes

1363522	Paul King	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have been slow to introduce these standards. It's highly likely that other nations will adopt more stringent standards before Australia next modifies its standards. It's therefore best to push ahead more aggressively now so that we don't fall as far behind in the future. There has also been very poor action on climate to date and this is one of the easier areas to make savings and meet our obligations. More conservative approaches in this space risks having to make difficult changes in others	No
1363531	C Bettington	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	It's the ONLY option if you want to do everything you can do in this Climate Emergency! And Reducing Emissions is what the Government has committed to!	No
1363550	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1363555	Peter Haughton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	1. Health. The sooner we reduce health affecting emissions, the better for everyone. 2. Climate Change. The sooner we reduce climate affecting gases, the better future for our descendants. 3. There's no significant cost difference between B & C when valuing the results longer term and we need the results NOW!	No
1363569	Geoff Thomas	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Time is running out, we need to hasten, and also to explore new ideas,	NULL
1363573	Jessie Wells	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change mitigation and health are my two highest priorities, and are clearly better supported by option C	NULL
1363583	Peter Dickson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	A high net benefit and greater abatement, despite higher costs is preferable, especially when the higher cost is less than 20% more than option B. We must achieve net zero asap and that means \whatever it takes\.	No
1363591	Francis Bernard Hawkins	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reduced emissions will mean net zero target more achievable, plus big health dividend.	No
1363594	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1363633	Ben	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	To provide certainty for the industry, align with international targets and provide a market with vehicle options for the public.	Yes
1363664	Alan Taylor	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Estimates by Melbourne Climate Futures (part of University of Melbourne) estimate 11,000 deaths, and about 19,000 hospitalisations per year from vehicle emissions. The deaths are roughly 10 times the number of road accident fatalities, and there is a push to reduce those. Why should the lungs of children and adult be so less important? Furthermore, we are behind the whole world, which is going to impact Australia's export ability, particularly as new regulations tighten their grip on Scope 3	NULL
1363677	Paul Deighton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Need RAPID action to reduce carbon emissions. Option B will increase EV sales but not reduce large ICE vehicle sales quickly.	No
1363704	Sue Nye	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I don't believe we have sufficient time left to act. We must move swiftly to address the climate crisis we face.	No
1363714	David Williamson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need strong action on all aspects of climate change and reducing runnings cost if vehicles	No
1363741	Joachim Chapman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The cost-benefit is clear - option c is the better use of money. And it's better for the environment. We should aspire to be as efficient with our money as the EU / USA. Why take the choices with a lower cost benefit. Sure there's a higher cost, but take steps to strengthen the local industry that supplies to those costs and Australia will benefit with more local jobs etc.	Yes
1363784	Richard Jones	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do as much as we can to reduce emissions and encourage take up of EVs	NULL

1363797	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must act as fast as we can. Too much time has already been wasted. It will cost either way - the environment or our hip pocket. The environment must come first.	Yes
1363805	Joseph Figliuolo	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We have been laggards for too long, hence the catch up urgency and expense.	Yes
1363839	Sally Ash	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This policy is long overdue and welcomes. I believe we need to progress this as soon as possible, notwithstanding the marginal extra costs involved.	Yes
1363850	Anthony MOHN	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is a need for a faster start than what is happening in the US..	No
1363860	Claire Harvey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I am seriously concerned about what climate change will mean for our common future, including my children and their children. To me, action on climate change is a moral issue. I also think that it is quite scandalous that it has taken so long for this issue to be put on the table. Not only have Australians been generating more emissions than they have needed to for far too long (due to low/lax standards) we've all been paying for it financially through higher fuel costs. It is time for change.	No
1363866	I'm Old Gregg!	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Residents of Australia have some of the highest emissions per capita in the world (which is the only relevant measure, since the stupid troposphere doesn't seem to respect our arbitrary national boundaries).	NULL
1363882	Bill Westerbeek	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are reaching the global warming tipping point and only drastic and urgent actions may save us.	No
1363910	Sonia van de Haar	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Fast action cannot wait, we need higher standards immediately, not more evasion. The government needs to show leadership and fund the transition and get everyone on board. Industry cannot be trusted to dictate what is reasonable.	No
1363912	Alex McEwen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Closer to EU standard	No
1363913	James Clark	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Later is too late. We need to act quickly now in line with what climate science clearly tells us we need to do.	No
1363956	John Chapman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B provides the greatest benefit for the least cost. It is essential that Australia catches up with overseas standards in fuel efficiency, not only to wean us off petrol and diesel usage but also to avoid Australia being a dumping ground for inefficient cars in fuel ef	Yes
1363961	Don Hutton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1363962	Graham Englart	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I believe that one of the most important elements in deciding on the best option is the inclusion of SUVs in the same CO2 category as passenger cars. SUVs must, under no circumstances, be categorised in the light commercial vehicle range along with utes. I also like it that Option 2 does not allow pooling of credits and maximises simplicity and transparency by allowing no super-credits, no off-cycle credits and no air conditioning credits. Option A is inappropriate due to low penalties.	Yes
1363973	Bob Philipson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	With increasing climate impacts come increased community impacts such as air pollution, some that usually disadvantaged citizens. Pollution causes premature deaths, something that is well documented pollution causes illness and that affects workplace productivity.	No
1363986	Colin Hughes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a Climate Emergency we cannot afford to delay emission standards We must do everything possible to halve vehicles on our roads However these options have a perverse incentive to sell heavy large polluting diesel 4wds We must incentivise small light Micro EVs 90% journeys are less than 100km to shops work station friends Small EVs can be charged at home on a 15amp plug in 6 hours Large 4wds are responsible for 2x deaths if hit and responsible for huge insurance costs for injury and Dama	No

1363994	David Tomkins	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want to see the highest fuel efficiency standards possible introduced as quickly as possible so there is a chance my grandchildren will inherit a liveable planet!	Yes
1363999	John Cooper	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Lack of earlier progress and commitment for renewables means we are in dire trouble now, the economic and environmental costs we face are vastly greater than the cost of preventing or minimising how fast we destroy our priceless world.	No
1364011	Elizabeth Weiss	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's worth going hard and investing in a fast transition: the long term benefits (economic and environmental) hugely outweigh the extra short term cost.	Yes
1364022	Leigh-Chantelle	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Australia is behind most other countries and needs to future-proof and future-plan for the success of our country. There are already enough climate disasters, it's time to make some really big changes to create the important changes we need	Yes
1364058	Greg Horsley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	C makes most sense but B is acceptable.	Yes
1364070	Maud mussared	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1364080	Michael Hands	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1364083	Beth Noel	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Action on climate change has stalled. We need to do all we keen right away to make any difference	Yes
1364132	Fiona williams	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Buisness need to be developed and rolled out correctly to ensure no more false news is spread about renewable energy	Yes
1364157	Steve Gates	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	THE incremental cost increase of C above B is minor in the bigger picture, and we have no time to lose in urgently reducing our emissions. We lost a decade of progress under the Coalition govt, and it is time to catchup as fast as possible.	No
1364161	Gillian Williamson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need fast change and this is what should have happened ages ago	NULL
1364162	Martin Hurley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1364173	Digby Hughes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have known of the impact of climate change for decades - the time for timid Ction have to be a thing of the past	No
1364190	JM	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 0th	This is an important decision that needs to be implemented as soon as possible. Option B provides the correct level of response required.	Yes
1364212	Bronwen Kiely	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are out of time for second best options when it comes to climate change. The higher costs of a faster transition pale into insignificance compared to the costs of dragging our feet any more. And the benefits far outweigh the costs anyway! It's an no-brainer. Option C is my first choice. I would only support Option B over the pathetic inaction of Option A.	NULL
1364213	Annika Romeyn	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Climate change is progressing rapidly and strong, urgent action is needed to ensure a liveable plant for future generations	NULL

1364214	Renee Hillman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We don't have time to waste.	No
1364234	Paul Sullivan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Moral and ethical responsibility to our children and planet	No
1364257	Aurelia	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Code red for planet earth - I can't stand the planet dying	No
1364259	Darren Gladman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	High ratio of benefits to costs, fastest transition, best for future generations	No
1364268	David Gee	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is the greatest threat to human civilisation and political leaders need to implement policies to reduce carbon emissions as fast as possible. Any government which which doesn't address climate change with serious and urgent action will NOT get my vote.	No
1364273	Peter Horsley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have been saving \$1000s per year driving EVs, and we want to all Australians to have more choice when it comes to clean transport. EVs are also globally recognised as an essential component of a transition to net-zero to avoid the worst impacts of climate change, something is already today affecting many Australians.	Yes
1364281	Carly	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do everything possible to reduce emissions as fast as possible	Yes
1364293	Jesse Steinfeld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cost savings for households. Please ensure loopholes for large SUVs are closed	NULL
1364300	Glenn Bolton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have held off doing this for too long, so we have to catch up asap	No
1364304	John McNeil	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The third choice is a no brainer. \$30b in benefits for \$11b. Even Transurban would buy that ROI	No
1364315	Craig Scott	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate needs more action than this but it is at least a start	No
1364321	Fiona	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need ambitious targets in order to prevent devastating effects of climate change. It's a no brainer - no money on a dead planet so invest now.	No
1364328	Gary	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Change needs to have a real impact at a moderate rate	Yes
1364349	Paul Leslie Harris	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to do as much positive action as possible as soon as possible to minimise the effects of previous inaction!	Yes
1364365	Angela Wangatau	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1364378	Chris Wood	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1364384	Aidan le Gras	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	My children's future and the safety of the planet and each other.	No
1364385	Mike Belfield	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Any manufacturer who sells into Europe would already comply with EU emission rules, which is option \C\, so most would be able to immediately supply cars to C standard. However, I am a realist and the industry will cry poor, so I'd support option B	Yes
1364388	Fiona Baker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Change is urgently needed. We don't have time to wait. However, people who've already invested in an EV, home battery and solar should not have to subsidise irresponsible HUGE gas guzzling 4x4 owners to do the right thing. I'd like a tax cut in lieu of governments subsidising companies and climate deniers. Also why spend almost as much on a less effective solution.	No
1364389	David Jeffrey Simpson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Without the strongest possible response to this climate emergency I have grave fears that there will be a declining standard of living for all Australians. We all want prosperity safety and a clean beautiful natural world for ourselves and our kids. For me this one issue trumps all others.	No
1364424	Tim Sullivan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need an accelerated transition. We are in a climate emergency and have no time to lose.	No
1364425	Aileen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Best outcomes in C	NULL
1364451	therese milanovic	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1364456	Peter Natrass	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	C delivers greatest health benefits. University of Melbourne research shows transport emission from fossil fuel consumption cause almost 10 x more deaths in Australia each year than the national road toll. Like road trauma, it's about more than deaths, Injuries such as asthma and other respiratory conditions are a sound reason for selection Option C. UoM report here: https://www.unimelb.edu.au/newsroom/news/2023/february/vehicle-emissions-may-cause-over-11,000-deaths-a-year,-research-shows	Yes
1364462	Chris	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fuel efficiency standards are so important for lowering emissions, improving air quality, encouraging smaller cars that are safer on the road and helping people save money. We should make sure that those who need to drive have access to vehicles that hurt them and society the least and the most harmful and inefficient vehicles are phased out as quickly as possible.	NULL
1364464	Ross Adams	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	It is overdue that Australia catches up with the rest of the world in setting ambitious targets for reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. We owe this to our children and future generations.	Yes
1364475	Jane Caroline Banbury	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1364483	Joseph Loveday	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe the most aggressive approach will result in support for a modal shift away from cars-as-transport, and likely reduce the number of cars on Australian roads. The carbon abatement of replacing cars with active and public transport is much greater than the carbon abatement of replacing cars like-for-like with more efficient models; taken together with the need for immediate climate action, Option C is clearly the most effective.	No
1364491	Jacob Webb	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Stop cooking the planet	No
1364498	Neil Webster	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Accelerating the availability and affordability of EVs is essential to lower emissions in response to climate change. We have wasted over a decade. Get on with it!	Yes
1364503	Scott Cooper	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes

1364510	Timothy G	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need more viable alternatives to driving. An investment in bicycle infrastructure and public transport will greatly help this cause. If we continue to invest in car infrastructure we set ourselves up for failure. More lanes does not solve traffic, it makes it worse.	No
1364512	Timmy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We're in the midst of a climate emergency. Option B isn't good enough.	Yes
1364536	Angela Ashley-Chiew	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need fast and decisive action to address climate change. For this Option C is the best option. Whilst Option B is better than nothing it does not respond fast enough in the climate emergency we are in.	No
1364539	Julie Brand	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is no time to waste !!!	No
1364551	Mary-Faeth Chenery	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	It's essential that we start, and start with a substantial program to address especially the greenhouse gas emissions. Option B is the responsible way to go and has the best cost-benefit ratio.	Yes
1364566	John Barrenger	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Best option. Government should choose option C	No
1364569	Maria Arranz	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B soundsto be most achievable	Yes
1364577	Jim	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is the most appropriate for a climate emergency and years on inaction	NULL
1364604	Stephen Pennells	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Been observing our pollution of Naarm's air for decades and frequently ride a bicycle. \$~30b total benefit better than Option B and ~\$12b increased costs does this include health costs?.	NULL
1364607	Steve Lee	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Gets there faster with a small higher price but still gets there wuicker	Yes
1364609	Jayden Randell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Greatest effectiveness with combatting the climate crisis	Yes
1364611	Evan Christen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australians need clean air, minimise global warming and have lower fuel cost vehicles to reduce cost of living.	No
1364615	Abbey Sim	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	I support Option C because I believe that we need to be doing everything we can to combat the climate emergency. As a Christian, I believe strongly that we need to take care of the planet and protect the most vulnerable from the impacts of climate change. I bought an EV last year and I love it. However, I know that I was only able to do this because I am in a privileged financial position. I would like to be able to have government policy assist others to do the same.	No
1364620	Jason	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Health is the most important. Australia habitually lacks grand imagination and foresight. It's why the NBN is not as good as it should be. More renewables will be required to offset the cost of electricity and Australia will need to begin recycling and building batteries using it's vast resources. We need solar shading our car parks and chargers at the shops to plug in our cars. Apartments and tenanted building need panels. We need to charge EVs during midday. We need hydrogen to soak up solar.	No
1364651	Tim Eden	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C gives Australia the best chance to catch up to other markets like the US and Europe. It will also result in higher savings and more choice for Australians.	Yes
1364666	Daniel Hall	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1364677	Alex Hillman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The two main criteria for assessing these options is to create savings for Australians and to reduce climate impacts. Option C has the highest emission savings and the greatest financial benefits - its hard to see how anything else can make any sense.	No
1364688	James Anderson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is an existential threat to human wellbeing. We need to reduce CO2 emissions as rapidly as technology allows. In addition thousands of people die or become very ill (asthma, heart disease, stroke) due to exposure to fossil fuel combustion particulates. These can be reduced by cleaning up the fleet which would have a significant reduction on society's health costs.	Yes
1364693	Keith Williams	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Better health and environmental benefits. Better long term benefits	Yes
1364700	Allan Seymour	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1364705	Ben Rose	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Research by D Bressler in 2021 and BJ Rose, 2023 shows that Mortality from CO2 emitted by vehicles is 30-120 times higher than crash mortality. Toxic air pollution from vehicles is 7 times higher than vehicle crash mortality. The larger the vehicle the higher the air pollution mortality cost. If all passenger transport were micro EVs, public transport and E bikes air pollution deaths would decrease by 95%. These facts were not previously realized by policy makers	NULL
1364706	Terrance Anderson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Catch up to the rest and get a healthier environment. Save money on more efficient cars too	No
1364711	Russell Williams	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	costs (electricity and battery) are likely overstated in the long run so long run benefits of option C are understated. Option C must be the starting point for debate with Option B being fallback if achieving C leads to further delays or dilution	Yes
1364714	Connor	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C delivers the biggest benefit to the community both in saving for cost of living because it's seriously tough at the moment, and doesn't seem to be easing up any time soon, and also in reduced emissions which benefits everyone.	Yes
1364718	Bob Elliston	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to transition to zero emissions as FAST as possible, as does the whole world. Global heating is going to demand that and very much more if we are going to save our children from extinction.	NULL
1364726	Alan Glover	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We urgently need to make the transition to cleaner vehicles to reduce the emissions that are causing the climate crisis.	Yes
1364728	Brian	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate emergency. Australia must deliver or our kids will have no future. Fuel efficiency standards are necessary, reducing the number of motor vehicles on our roads is even more urgent. The costs are irrelevant when the costs of inaction far outweigh them.	No
1364735	Lynette	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act as quickly as possible on reducing carbon emissions and option C provides the fastest start and the best benefits to cost ratio	Yes
1364738	Sam	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Reduce living expenses pressure on hardworking Australians.	No
1364740	Dean	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Proposed option will further increase pressure on Australia households	No
1364746	Patrick Nyarko Abeka	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	New Vehicle Efficiency Standards (NVES). In addition to helping reduce emissions, the NVES will also improve air quality, reduce lung disease and cancers, save consumers money at the bowsers, and give new car buyers more choices including more affordable and longer-range EVs.	No
1364752	Kyle Topfer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to transition as fast as physically possible, there is no time left - the Government have had at least 6 decades to transition our society and have made very little progress. The Government's own scientific advisors have stated this is the critical decade. We have the opportunity to improve lives, cities, air and communities.	No

1364761	Benjamin Jones	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The fastest transition provides Australia with true leadership and sets a global standard for emissions reduction.	Yes
1364769	Steve	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1364772	Don Bird	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1364778	Shane Williamson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we need to start making it easier for Australians to choose non fossil fuel burning vehicles. Australia needs to make a stand against further polluting our amazing unique ecological environment.	No
1364792	Steve Edwards	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to cut emissions as fast as possible.	Yes
1364793	JAI STALLAN	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	I advocate for the minimal intrusion of government in setting new vehicle efficiency standards. Trust needs to be placed in the forces of free-market competition to drive innovation and meet consumer demands effectively. This approach prioritizes individual and corporate freedom, fostering an environment where businesses are incentivized to develop cutting-edge technologies without bureaucratic constraints. I believe in unleashing the full potential of entrepreneurial ingenuity.	No
1364796	Harriet	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to tackle climate change in as many ways possible. The best option is option c as it has the biggest impact, much greater benefits at a marginal additional cost.	No
1364813	Penny McCracken	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Send a strong signal that we are serious about reducing co2 emissions and other combustion pollutants	NULL
1364833	Laurence	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	c seems to be the best option.	NULL
1364835	Zoe Ryan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need a swift transition. The cost is dwarfed by the cost of lack of action to mitigate the effects of climate warming.	Yes
1364839	Reuben	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want a cleaner and more sustainable future for all generations to come in the future. One of the biggest impacts on our climate is fossil fuels and emissions from transportation. We need to transition to cleaner energy and cleaner cars as soon as possible.	No
1364840	George	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	I do not support any efficiency standard introduction.	No
1364863	Karen O'Clery	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	We are a long way behind and need to move faster now, the longer the delay the higher the cost.	No
1364873	Cornelia Craciun	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option A is definitely unacceptable. Timeframe is too slow and technology credits simply provide a loophole for manufacturers, enabling them to continue to producing non-compliant vehicles, which are both pollution producing and expensive to run, whilst claiming emissions cuts. I personally support the more effective Option C but, given our current economic climate, I can understand why the Government prefers option B.	Yes
1364895	Judith Manitzky	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1364897	Nicholas Ranson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	In my career, I have frequently worked with air particulate specialists, who analyse the degradation of air quality through various mechanisms like construction disturbances or combustion engines. Their results, not all yet published, show significantly harmful	Yes

			levels of air particulates and pollution by having combustion engines near to high density residential areas. I don't think that the full costs of the resulting health and environmental damage that this causes is properly accounted for.	
1364911	Lucie Vaughan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	the maths is there! it's a clear choice	No
1364924	Warren Fraser	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Strong weighting to environment and health benefits	Yes
1364926	Tim Brown (WhipSmart)	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	More is better in this instance. We are already behind the curve. Time to catch up.	Yes
1364949	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1364957	Sean Wright	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to bring fuel efficiency standards in line with the rest of the world and stop unnecessary deaths from car pollution	Yes
1364961	Jocelyn	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia will be left behind if we don't move quicker which will hurt the planet, Australians hip pocket, will make us look stupid to fellow countries. It should of happened decades ago, so it now needs to start asap.	Yes
1364967	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to make up for lost time ~20yrs of inactivity and lack of government focus	NULL
1364974	Therese Cosgrove	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I don't believe A is even an option. B is probably more realistic, ideally I would prefer C.	NULL
1364980	Linda Selvey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is far behind the rest of the world's rich countries in vehicle emissions standards. We need to catch up. This will save money and lives. I'm a public health physician and I would like to see improved health for all, particularly people living near busy roads. I'm also a keen cyclist and would like to not have to breathe in so much polluted air. This is why I support option C. Option B does not go far enough.	No
1365000	Avia Swan-Brown	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are already lagging and need to take huge steps to catch up. This country has a major issue with climate change, there is a significant lack of care and therefore action, while our country either burns or floods. Those affected expect the government to fix the problem, without accepting that it's everyone's responsibility.	No
1365002	Chris	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	A long overdue policy with time already lost, its time to move more quickly. I am concerned however The new government policy seems to reward car manufacturers for vehicles that emit more pollution per kilogram as they get heavier. This raises concerns, as it could encourage the production and sale of unnecessarily large and polluting vehicles, even if their emissions per kilogram are technically \,better\, than smaller cars. This could ultimately lead to higher overall emissions	Yes
1365042	Neil	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	the consequences of acting slowly will result in other poor outcomes which will come at a greater social and financial cost	Yes
1365060	Bailey Underwood	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want the fastest and most ambitious action on climate change, road safety, air quality, the obesity epidemic and health. It will be cheaper to spend now to avoid worsening these issues as opposed to needing drastic investment later.	No
1365067	Petra Wilden	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Options C is the fastest transition and as we are lagging behind a decade, the faster the better even if it is a little more expensive than option B.	Yes
1365091	Kimberly Hilder	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Introducing fuel efficiency standards is a decade overdue in Australia. There should be no further delay. Option C is the only option which doesn't allow for further delay.	No

1365108	Joe Dortch	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce emissions urgently and option C is the best for everyone overall	Yes
1365111	Stuart Absalom	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Option 3 will ensure that 2030 targets are within reach as transport is a significant contributor to carbon emissions. Currently we are running out of options. With the rapidly increasing interest in Electric Vehicles and lower emissions vehicles there is considerable support for a significant transition	No
1365144	Kerryn Gray	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I think we need to move as fast as possible because we're far behind where we should be in order to avoid extinction, and we may have already passed tipping point.	NULL
1365160	Eleanor Waters-Jones	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Australia is lagging behind in terms of car emissions and pollution generally, given that per capita, we produce some of the highest rates of waste and other polluting elements in the world. Option B will help satisfy all- its flexibility will allow it to fit the industry-focused Australian economy, whilst also propelling Australia in line with emissions targets. Climate change waits for no one, and we must act now.	Yes
1365166	Krzysztof Kot	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are running out of time to address the climate emergency. History will judge us for the actions we take now, we've run out of time to wring our hands about costs and benefits if we want our grandchildren to have a future.	Yes
1365174	Joshua Ward	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	If the goal is to reduce emissions, we should do it quickly. Manufacturers already know the writing is on the wall, so why are we not embracing this and leaning into EV adoption.	Yes
1365177	Sarah	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need fuel efficiency standards asap. We are lagging on making the shift to a renewable economy and need to respond to the climate emergency with haste	NULL
1365178	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to accelerate carbon reduction as soon as possible. There are no excuses.	No
1365193	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australian Efficiency Standard have lagged behind the rest of the world for too long and its time we step up. The NVES could also have the less obvious effect of reducing the number of large passenger vehicle sales in Australia (given these vehicles are typically less fuel efficient than smaller passenger vehicles). This would lend to a reduction in 'big car' dominance in Australian new car sales, and a subsequent reduction in crash severity and improved road safety outcomes.	Yes
1365210	Lynette Leftwich	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Costs	Yes
1365215	Micheline Campbell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is imperative that we improve vehicle efficiency to reduce emissions to both mitigate climate change, and improve air quality in urban areas. It is also important that no loop-holes are left for large vehicles, as occurs in other countries.	NULL
1365217	Andrea Paul	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option B is too little. We need to transition FAST. Emissions are rising. Nature does not wait, nor care about fancy "nett' zero accounting.	No
1365225	Murray	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have already taken too long to implement these standards, and I think it's better for all of us if we reduce emissions and see health benefits quickly.	Yes
1365240	Keith thompson	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Best would be C if it included the better parts of B. A is a do nothing option - pretty pointless. The measure has to be effective because anything we can do (and this is an easy one) to decrease emissions will put off climate collapse a bit longer. And there is no reasonable reason to not start earlier.	Yes
1365245	Neil Warner	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Want the fastest and best option considering how long Australia has taken o get this far compared to other countries.	No
1365251	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce emissions ASAP	NULL

1365252	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	CO2 emissions do not cause changes in the weather. These reduction targets are a way to send us broke and control our choices and lives. Of the 0.04% of CO2 in the atmosphere, only 3% is man made. Of that %, Australia contributes 1.3%. You are up-ending the economy for Australians contribution of 0.0000156% of CO2 in the atmosphere. What will the impact be of these changes? Has a cost benefit analysis been done?	No
1365253	Jules	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are well behind and need to catch up. Option C is the most ambitious and the clear choice.	NULL
1365256	Carolyn Attard	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to have a fast transition as emissions are still rising and they need to be brought down. Australia's emissions per capita are higher than the OECD average.	NULL
1365258	Jacob Sephton	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	Reducing vehicle emissions is important. It is particularly important that whatever scheme is chosen does not incentivise people to buy larger cars than they need for safety and environmental reasons, so LCV allowances should not be generous	Yes
1365259	Catherine	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is no time to waste in reducing emissions	NULL
1365264	Matt Way	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I chose option C because bringing in emissions standards faster will encourage car manufacturers to actually supply efficient cars instead of paying a fine	Yes
1365271	Abigale Raeck	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	These are decisions that should have been made years ago, only an aggressive target now can improve the situation in a human timeframe.	NULL
1365272	Joseph Conway	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Action to limit climate change is now urgent. Australia is not a car manufacturer so it is relatively easy for car importers to select from the many suppliers worldwide who already produce low emission or zero emission vehicles. A fast start to the process as in Option C is therefore preferable.	NULL
1365276	Brian Wythes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Australia needs more fuel efficient internal combustion engine vehicles	Yes
1365281	Kamil Polat	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1365285	Freda Erlich	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	We need to bring our emissions down urgently. Things take time and if we start now we can get somewhere in the short to medium term	No
1365290	Janice Haviland	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B is my most preferred choice and I support the government's proposed target. This proposal avoids excessive credits and loopholes, and it properly designates SUVs as 'passenger vehicles.' It is more achievable and has flexibility to achieve these targets as long as the intended outcomes are not sacrificed. These are meaningful targets that should become law. The Albanese Government has proposed pollution caps that will have a real meaningful impact on climate change. Thank you.	Yes
1365294	Jesse McNelis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we're behind and we need to catch up. Increased vehicle costs are ok because we need to reduce the number of vehicles anyway to achieve the required emissions reductions.	Yes
1365298	John Moratelli	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe that Australian VES need to catch up with those overseas asap to reduce emissions and ensure that Australian consumers are given a wide choice of fuel efficient and electric vehicles asap, to reduce costs to consumers and meet our climate change targets.	No
1365300	Carol Welsh	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have been too slow in our response to climate change. Our efforts must be faster and have more impact	Yes
1365302	Sandy McCathie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Carbon abatement for transport sector is important and urgent. New scientific understanding re: global warming (Feb 2024) i.e. world has already passed 1.5 degrees of warming and likely to pass 2 degrees by end of 2020's increases the urgency of rapid	Yes

			progress towards net zero. On climate grounds I prefer Option C. However, as the policy makers recommend Option B, I choose good policy. That said, if opportunity to strengthen the policy exists once implementation begun, this should occur.	
1365312	Aaron	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need an aggressive change from inefficient vehicles, we should be a leading nation like EU, it will provide much greater health and climate benefits. These benefits are more important than the extra costs associated upfront costs.	No
1365313	Kristen Ripper	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia does need to transition as fast as reasonably possible.	Yes
1365316	Jamin Drummond	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I support the creation of higher fuel efficiency standards with the view to accelerate the health benefits and long term reduction of emissions from more and more road transport sooner than later	Yes
1365319	Alex Mungall	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are further in to climate breakdown than the government recognises. We are losing 1.5C as the only safe level possible in the short term. Going slower than option C is dangerous and will cost lives and livelihoods. No options reduce the burden of existing cars on the road on our atmosphere. The science shows we need to urgently draw down carbon not get to net zero by 2050.	Yes
1365327	Martin Derby	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Australia has been an international laggard in setting strong pollution caps for cars for too long. Congratulations to the Albanese Government for proposing new pollution caps that will have a real, meaningful impact on climate change and the availability of EVs. This proposal avoids excessive credits and loopholes, and it properly designates SUVs as 'passenger vehicles.' The Australian community want more progressive lawful targets to move us away from the use of fossil fuels. Thank you.	Yes
1365337	Carol Wakely	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reduction in emissions needs to be meaningful in reducing CO2 levels . I would prefer a lower target in start in 2024 and even lower in 2025. Standing still for 2 years is not benefiting anyone.	Yes
1365346	Jim Tippett	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I'm sick of climate disasters. let's take real action.	No
1365348	Logan Shield	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reducing transport emissions as rapidly as possible is the safest option to reduce the escalating and extremely dangerous impacts of climate change.	Yes
1365353	Alanna Sherry	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1365355	Holly Way	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	While I would love to have the more progressive and environmentally-friendly policies, I realise this will be harder to find consensus and agreement across the country. Therefore, I am prioritising the choice which is more financially viable with the highest benefit.	Yes
1365370	Jeremy Russell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe the faster start will help reduce the risk that comes from having far too many inefficient vehicles on the road during the shift towards electric vehicles. Health impacts are vital as well, ensuring we are healthier at such a minimal loss to the cost benefit ratio just makes ethical sense.	No
1365401	Jeff Giddins	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is my first choice: A fast start is overdue, like we needed it started a decade ago.. Option B is better than A	Yes
1365402	Stephen Bruce	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The faster we achieve lower emissions, the greater benefit to our health and climate. Car companies have taken advantage of our lax laws for many years and have made massive additional profits as a result. They should now be prepared to contribute some that towards a healthier, safer environment for their customers	No
1365406	Nancy Otis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As of yesterday, international climate experts have suggested that the earth has surpassed the Paris Treaty goal of a maximum temperature increase of 1.5 degrees C to a possible 1.7 degrees. Already! Years before expected! This is a catastrophic development. We must transition to the strictest emissions standards possible as soon as possible.	No
1365407	Domonic Breikreutz	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As the rest of the world is adopting newer, cleaner vehicles, car manufacturers are giving everybody but Australians cheaper, cleaner cars. All while we are treated as a dump for more polluting vehicles.	NULL

1365411	Karl Fahey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Urgent need to reduce CO2 emissions.	Yes
1365414	Marina	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1365421	Carol-Ann Allen	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1365425	Roman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Rapid adoption of low emissions vehicles will bring the most benefit to the economy and the environment as well as enhancing the infrastructure required to support electric powered transport so that perceived barriers are minimised and removed	Yes
1365431	Andrew Woodroffe	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have treated car exhaust as clear air, it is not. We are way, way behind Europe, here. The health benefits of breathing cleaner air are absolutely going to out weigh whatever costs people come up with.	No
1365446	Thomas Wearne	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia dramatically lags other developed nations in terms of EVs despite having the greatest reasons to be a world leader. Electric transport works with Australia's abundant renewable energy rather than keeping us dependent on foreign oil which is associated with conflict areas like the middle east. Our foreign oil dependence is arguably also a security risk. EVs are great for Australia, for mining, professional services etc. We should absolutely lean into this opportunity.	Yes
1365450	John Heywood	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Last year I submitted a submission on the FES discussion paper. At that time my thinking was more aligned to the 'fast start' option (Option C above). On reviewing the analysis provided above, I can see that Option B is also effective and is more likely to be accepted by the public without overwhelming resistance	Yes
1365455	Kat	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in the midst of a climate crisis which is driving up prices and piling on non-financial negative effects that lead to reduced quality of life in a way that cannot be avoided. We need to take action to reduce these negative impacts as urgently as possible. Also option A is worse than useless because people can say they are doing something when very little is happening, blocking other actually useful strategies being implemented. Also separately we need better public transport as an alternat	Yes
1365459	Tom Sjolund	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need halt Climate Change faster.	No
1365468	Oliver White	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	We have to decarbonise the economy and putting off efforts to do so will cost us in the future, environmentally and economically.	NULL
1365493	Jane Page	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	This is long, long, long overdue. Needs to be done ASAP, for a multitude of reasons, most importantly it will deliver an improvement in our environment and air quality, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the fight against climate change.	Yes
1365500	Janina Papas	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to choose a target that is achievable but NOT SLOW. There is not time to waste but it needs to work financially	Yes
1365502	Leo Brewin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1365503	Jon Elkins	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cleaner air for my children	No
1365506	Bruce Easton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Greatest benefit faster. We are so far behind the rest of the world (our equivalent) already that the car makers will not blink as they just adopt what they are already doing in Europe and US anyway. Easy for them and better for us!	Yes
1365508	Joby Larsen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change effects on all aspects of life on earth are becoming ever more obvious. The sooner we try to reduce it the better. And the immediate benefits of option C to Australian society are also apparent.	NULL

1365512	Ian Peattie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Australia is way behind other advanced countries, we need to catch up quickly.	Yes
1365517	Vicki Thomson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to take the climate emergency more seriously and this is one way we can all participate in this much needed improvement in our response to the climate change crisis	Yes
1365525	NULL	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	The steep penalties in Option B and C will only worsen car affordability for the majority of buyers, as manufacturers will be forced to pass on these costs to consumers. Affordable EVs are only able to be supplied and manufactured currently by Chinese brands due to Chinese government subsidies while Japanese, US and European EVs are prohibitively expensive for the majority of Australians. Penalties will shift the market to be reliant on Chinese auto manufacturers which i don't support.	No
1365531	Paul Peteson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	A is pointless, B has unnecessary delays. C is reasonable outcome and will closely match organic adoption anyway.	No
1365534	Garry Kemm	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Need to curtail CO2 and other pollution as fast as possible due to Australia being late to start the journey to net zero.	Yes
1365537	David Rowlands	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Accelerating climate change requires that we invest in the most rapid action to abate CO2 emissions.	NULL
1365544	Phillip Baron	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1365546	Basil Gijbers	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To improve air quality and hence people's health as well as reduced human induced Climate Change	Yes
1365548	David Wade	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Need to move to reduce greenhouse gases. Selected Option B as it matches US standards, which vehicle manufacturers will meet. Option C appears to get ahead of US standards, which will be expensive, if the standards can be met. This may not be the case, as the Australian market is small, with little incentive for manufacturers to meet a standard ahead of major markets. Option A does little to reduce greenhouse gases.	Yes
1365551	Gary	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To accelerate to cleaner emissions, to make up for time lost during the past 10 years.	No
1365553	Bruce Bowden	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need strong fuel efficiency standards urgently.	Yes
1365555	Murray Wilkinson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must move with maximum speed to reduce/eliminate the very harmful exhaust emissions from petrol and diesel engines.	No
1365563	Ross Gregory	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Just look at Norway. We can replicate that.	No
1365564	Ian w	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1365574	David Mitchell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	No place to hide. The early start sends a clear signal that business must respond in 2024, not delay and hope for a change of policy.	No
1365576	Laurie H	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Considering the climate crisis, we can not afford to be slow. We are already at, or near, climate tipping points that will drastically affect our way of life and the economy.	No

1365578	Mary Maher	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are so far behind other countries, we have to play catch-up fast	No
1365581	Gary Buck	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	The numbers tell the story	Yes
1365582	Geoff Johnson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Berst sustainability value to society	Yes
1365585	Tim	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We don't have time, our transport emissions are a huge problem and we need to transition to smaller, more efficient cars as soon as possible	Yes
1365586	Stephen Simpson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	greatest overall benefit to the country	No
1365589	Axel Dalman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are so far behind that we need drastic action to catch up.	NULL
1365602	Deanna Hayes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1365603	Richard T. Watson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	After years of being a laggard, we should be a leader. We should aim for the healthiest, cleanest air in the world. The savings will be immense.	No
1365605	Scott Sneesby	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do as much as we can to reduce the carbon emissions and start saving money	Yes
1365606	Rose Tehan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C seems like the most sensible option based on the information provided.	NULL
1365612	Iain Clarke	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are a laggard nation and need to be doing as much as possible as quickly as possible to remediate the 10 years of inaction under the previous Coalition government. Australia needs to be ambitious and the current federal government must be courageous.	No
1365613	Ms Chris Connors	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Huge benefits and a quicker transition, which I believe is essential given the continued climate-related disasters we are all experiencing.	Yes
1365617	Joseph Zagari	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to turnaround the emissions of the current fleet of cars in Australia very fast to meet our goals for reducing CO2 emissions in the atmosphere	Yes
1365620	Tom Danby	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Overseas manufacturers already have suitable cars in their ranges - I would prefer a faster transition and don't feel it will cost more than the other options	Yes
1365622	Paul Goonan	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Improved quality of life	No
1365624	Dave Keenan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes

1365625	Michelle S	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1365630	Joe Zammit	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want the fastest transition as we need to quickly get on top of further Climate Change deterioration. I would prefer not to support the Govt's Option B in Q5. I keep track what the IPCC is saying about the impending climate crisis which fills me with dread for the future of this planet and and my children.	NULL
1365639	Callum Radcliffe	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1365641	Laura Carey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The delay in introduction of efficiency standards and slow action on carbon reductions generally by the Australian government has left us with a very short runway to act to meet our targets. I support option C to accelerate the transition.	Yes
1365645	Stephen van Akkeren	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I think Australia is always behind when it comes to innovation and development of new technology. Why don't we become the change drivers in the world for once. I think even option B is not enough...	No
1365646	Jude Burger	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C gives individuals greater cost savings, and provides a greater financial return at the national level. An extra \$12.26 higher spend gives us an extra \$30B in benefits. Option B is an OK option, but it's simply not as good as Option C. Why wouldn't we do it right the first time?	Yes
1365647	Peter Pierce	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C provides the best long term cost/benefit as well as the best environmental benefit while also doing this in a hurry, as demanded by the climate emergency. Surely it's a 'no-brainer'.	NULL
1365652	Oliver Mayo	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The faster, the better. Option 3 is conservative.	No
1365653	Colin Liebmann	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have a climate emergency, and we will be more secure by avoiding importing fuel. The faster the transition, the better	Yes
1365654	David Grieve	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe that Australia has a good bit of catching up with other developed industrialised nations, act quickly, implement asap	No
1365657	Ferenc Jakab	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The options A and B are too weak!	Yes
1365661	Stan Holmes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Even Option C is too slow, but is the best on offer. Don't be mugged by the incumbents (particularly the Japanese giants who have been living in denial and have suddenly realized that they have missed the wave. Toyota in particular have been living in a dream world and now pose a real threat to the global financial markets as they simply will not be able to service their multi-billion dollar debt.	No
1365662	Peter Johnston	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Sooner it's done the better	Yes
1365673	Joanne Warren	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have no time to have a slow start at anything that will create a positive change to emissions. Our energy must be on creating fast and sustainable options for all Australians to access EVs	No
1365675	Dexter Irvine	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is so important, and we are so far behind most of the world on vehicle standards, we have to move as aggressively as possible	Yes
1365676	Michael Locke	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do everything we can to reduce our carbon emissions as soon as possible.	No

1365677	Chris Harris	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C provides the greatest environmental benefits, greatest economic benefits (savings) and, very importantly provides more stringent standards for larger vehicles which are dangerous and polluting, take up too much road space.	No
1365679	Anton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I drive an EV and I don't understand why anyone would buy a car with combustion engine in 2024. And people just need to stop burning and polluting. A strong government policy on this will benefit everyone in a long term.	Yes
1365685	Sharyn Murphy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is urgent that we proceed to carbon neutral. This must be done more quickly than proposed - it is apparent that the world is warming much faster than expected and therefore we must respond faster than expected. We need to act on the fastest possible track to make up for the lack of action over the last 10 years. Pretending the middle road is good enough is not good enough and not why I helped vote in a Labor government.	No
1365687	Samuel Fraser	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is no reason why Australia should not be as ambitious as possible in the face of overwhelming climate change. Take the lead on the world stage and drive high ambition substantial change. Zero emission vehicles are a no brainer in a country with immense renewable energy potential - for Australia's economy, energy security and respiratory/cardiovascular health.	NULL
1365691	Wayne le Clercq	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to encourage adoption of BEVs and also force car manufacturers ensure cars sold in Australia are efficient and non-polluting. It's time for Australian politicians to get serious about this issue and not pander to car and petroleum companies! h	Yes
1365692	Tony Hill	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Global warming is accelerating, carbon dioxide levels must be reduced quickly for any chance of maintaining a livable environment.	NULL
1365693	Richard France	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to treat the climate emergency seriously and reduce GHG emissions as quickly as possible. ICE vehicles are a large contributor to the problem and we need to follow the lead of EU and US in mandating the use of cleaner fuel and more efficient and less polluting vehicles. Do it as quickly as we can	No
1365702	Andy Hart	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have no time to waste in reducing emissions. Australian need more choice in EVs and hybrid cars now. I understand the need for an achievable goal however, and would also be supportive of the Government's preferred option.	Yes
1365703	Michael Honey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As a nation we are lagging behind in our global responsibilities. We have waited too long and done too little. I am strongly in favour of deeper and more effective policies. Option A is pointless. Option B is acceptable, but we can do more: Option C is preferable. I would support an Option D which went further.	Yes
1365704	David Luckett	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must decarbonise ASAP. We want to be driving the cleanest and best cars in Australia - not the polluting models that the legacy car companies can't sell anywhere else!	No
1365706	Charles G	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want Australia to move as quickly as possible to match both EU and US standards	Yes
1365707	Roderick Stone	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C helps address the perverse incentive to operate utes that comes from their FBT exempt status.	NULL
1365709	John Bluhdorn	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option B still provides too much leeway for large, polluting ICE vehicles	No
1365711	Julian Viola	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia must now pay the price for having allowed itself to fall so far behind the rest of the world. Private car affordability has been subsidised for too long and lead to sub-optimal health and urban structure outcomes.	No
1365713	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Delay in introducing vehicle standards has made action more urgent. Choice is important but does not override the need to reduce carbon emissions as soon as possible.	No
1365716	Mark Thomann	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has been sitting on its hands with this issue for decades. The BCR for options B and C is essentially the same at 3 after rounding. Option C sends the clearest message for change which needs to be heard loud and clear by the vehicle industry with no ifs, buts and maybes.	Yes

1365720	Arthur Wilkinson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to get on with the task of reducing emissions as fast as possible now	Yes
1365726	David Grogan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We live off-grid for water and electricity on a 5 acre block near Brisbane. Our power is from solar, batteries and a backup diesel generator. We want to replace my wife's diesel SUV with a battery electric vehicle but are waiting for a better option (than Nissan Leaf) for an EV with vehicle to grid/house (V2G) capability so we can use the EV instead of the diesel generator. V2G will provide all Australian owners with a sustainable power base with the increasing natural disasters and blackouts	No
1365729	Kaylee Ann MacKenzie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Has the biggest impact on restricting larger vehicles	No
1365732	Michael Pitcher	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis means we need to reduce emissions from every sector. With poor VES low emission vehicle manufacturers are not encouraged to supply the low emission vehicles to Australia	No
1365733	Chris Ryan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is no good reason not to go as fast as possible for this. Australia will be playing catch up with the rest of the world and will not be leading the way with this change. Vehicle manufacturers are already producing vehicles that meet the guidelines for other markets, so they are not impeded by this change. And the faster rate gets more fuel savings to the end consumer quicker, which given the cost of living issues would be welcome.	NULL
1365740	John Duxbury	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	What is it about \,existential crisis\, that isn't utterly compelling?	No
1365746	Karl Warschau	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To reduce the harmful pollution emitted by ICE vehicles from where most people live, especially children, as soon as possible.	NULL
1365747	Anna	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate emergency and we need to act as fast as possible. Our net monetary gain is the greatest for option C also, so it's a no-brainer!	NULL
1365752	Mike Westerman	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Australia has lagged other countries in efficiency standards. The result is higher cost logistics, greater risks to national security thru dependence on imported fuel and poorer air quality.	No
1365754	Richard Little	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1365756	Dorryl Mahon	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Growing numbers of diesel vehicles and their toxic stinking fumes	No
1365763	Glen Philpott	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to catch up to europe	Yes
1365765	Howard Cairns	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I am an EV owner and I want to see the heavy polluting vehicles off the road as soon as possible.	No
1365769	Douglas Seath	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As a very higher polluting country per capita and a relatively wealthy country per capita (our wealth generated largely by exporting high polluting fossil fuels) we have a high moral responsibility to as much as we can to abate climate change. We cannot afford not to. Climate change impacts are already costing the country (and the world) dearly.	NULL
1365771	James Hodgkinson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Doing this faster is worth any cost. The government tried to \,save money\, doing the multi-technology mix with the NBN and it cost more and left us as a technological backwater. Don't make this mistake again.	Yes
1365775	David Thorp	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B is the minimum that should be adopted, but it needs improving and complementing with consumer incentives to encourage better than the bare minimum (see attached upload).	Yes

1365777	Christopher Maher	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I am keen for car companies and major purchasers of vehicles to be encouraged to have incentives or rules that led to cleaner and more efficient vehicles being sold in Australia. Cleaner air, less future maintenance costs, less reliance on foreign fuel.	Yes
1365786	James Ottaway	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Given how far we've fallen behind we should pick Option C to be more aggressive in catching up	Yes
1365787	Allan Mills	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to come in line with the rest of the world	No
1365788	Kerry Mills	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is need to cut our Co2 emissions	No
1365797	Carol B	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to transition very fast to catch up with the rest of the world	NULL
1365800	Errol Kowald	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Option C is kinder to the environment, so it would be my preferred option, except that it begins in 2025 with the status quo. Given the wait times for new vehicle delivery, there is no need to begin at 2023 levels in order to clear stocks. There is no stock. I would prefer that all vehicles built in 2025 and supplied to Australia be limited to emissions reduced from the 2023 fleet average, to 103 g/km, or at least 117, and scaling down yearly from that level.	No
1365803	Graham Blair	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reduce dependency of imported energy, Cleaner air.	No
1365805	Laurens Wildeboer	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	With Australia trailing the world with regards to emissions control and the stat of climate change I feel option C is the best and only option	Yes
1365806	Oscar	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The policy must discourage larger vehicles. Greater vehicle mass even if more efficient will result in more deaths. This consequence has not been considered.	No
1365811	samuel Robert sissons	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want to support a fast transition to electric cars for positive health, economic and climate impacts	Yes
1365823	Greg Keough	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's the least we can do for family, future generations and our planet.	No
1365829	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Why settle for conservative given we are on the brink of a climate disaster? The extra cost of Option C isn't even significant in any case.	Yes
1365834	Joe Peisker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To catch up to the World leaders.	Yes
1365837	Ken	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Morer effective	NULL
1365838	Bede Doherty	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1365843	Wendy Cox	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C has greater emission reduction. The urgency to address climate change and delay costs need to also be factored into the cost benefit ration. Delays in climate action cists Australia more long term.climate change would prove	No

1365846	Roger Williams	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is third world in this as in many other things.	No
1365852	Sean Thomson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Quicker transition to clean air	No
1365857	Stephan Schwiebert	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1365866	Andrew Braun	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I would buy a new electric car tomorrow if there were the options available to us here in Australia that other countries have. I have solar and a battery so will be doing 95% of my charging from my home solar system.	Yes
1365869	Chris McGuigan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Time is running out to implement these changes, a change in government could reverse decisions made now. Go hard now & see the benefits become a reality asap. The net benefits outweigh the costs by a large factor-it's a no brainer !	No
1365873	Barry Lambooy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1365876	Brett Johns	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australian VE standards have been delayed for too long. An aggressive approach is required to move us into line with international markets.	No
1365877	Stephen Lawson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The sooner we incentivise the transition to low carbon vehicles the better. We need to migrate as soon as is possible.	Yes
1365878	Peter rykenberg	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Australia has challenges of low population density and large distances between major centres and regional towns. Increasingly strict emissions standards effectively tax industry. I dont intend to buy an electric vehicle until Victoria stops burning coal and diesel to generate electricity. Let the consumer decide not the government. The right outcome ill happen at much less cost. maybe over longer time. This wont change the climate outcome.	No
1365884	Nigel Shearer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Best benefit to cost ratio.	Yes
1365891	Donald McAllister	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe urgent action is required. We have procrastinated for decades about fuel efficiency and it is time to stop dodging the issues	No
1365895	Matthew	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Whilst I support the increase of EV's and reducing emissions I am pragmatic that an aggressive approach will meet too much opposition.	Yes
1365908	Michael Doyle	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Our kids have a right to breathe clean air and to a planet that nots cooked by the greed of their predecessors	No
1365910	Roger Richards	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	reduced emissions, cheaper EVs for Australians	No
1365914	Cate Peterson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is no time for a slow start...there has been a slow 'boiling frog' attitude to our health status...both individual and County in general. The cost benefit analysis shows that Option C is preferable -CLEARLY - and this is the sort of engagement that we need our young people, coming into the workforce to have , rather than upholding the current sick sttus quo. Australia has lost so much ground in terms of our status in the planet as a progressive force - lets take this opportunity,	No
1365915	Ross McGough	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Less CO2 production	Yes

1365920	Margaret Clough	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	The need to reduce emissions from transport is urgent	Yes
1365922	Roger ferrett	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have to encourage people to buy EVs. Also it is self evident that having more efficient cars is desirable.	Yes
1365923	Brock	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to catch up to the rest of the world.	No
1365926	David	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We're slow to this issue and we need to make up some time. We cannot take a middle ground we need to go hard. EV adoption is accelerating and we need more choice of EVs and cheaper models. Having a higher NVES will help us get more choice in EVs and manufacturers need to bring more in to balance their petrol guzzlers.	No
1365928	Chris Maybury	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Strong and achievable but with sufficient flexibility	Yes
1365929	Stephen Salleras	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is real and we must do all we can with urgency.	NULL
1365930	Sam	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Decarbonise as fast as possible. Protect Australian peoples health.	No
1365935	Sean Johnson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We either act fast or we die slow.	No
1365936	Tim Day	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1365941	Joshua	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1365944	Ananda Garin-Michaud	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1365946	Karina Orth	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Maximal environmental benefit	No
1365950	Clarissa	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis will not wait for us to \adjust\. Action needs to be taken now. If the government truly cares about environmental impact, the money won't matter and there will be ways to make it work.	Yes
1365953	Granton Smith	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to not only catch up with Europe and USA but should aim high to exceed their existing targets and timeframes. We must rapidly transition sway from fossil fuels, there is no time to lose!	Yes
1365959	John Ulrichsen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Personal health. Option C is the most worthwhile course of action.	No
1365960	Sally clarke	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Transport is biggest polluter so we must pay if we are to drive.	No

1365964	Helen Pow	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1365968	Michelle Keegan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1365971	Michele Grubnic	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C offers the highest net benefits. It achieves the highest emissions abatement which is urgently required as global heating is accelerating, and poses an existential threat to the future of humankind. The government must ensure that the new arrangements do not contain loopholes that would incentivise the purchase of larger, heavier vehicles.	Yes
1365974	Eryk Nielsen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Electric cars are the future and we are living in the past. It's time to move.	No
1365977	Thomas Latimer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I am part of the generation that will suffer through climate change. Doing this will help reduce the potential worsening impacts to me, my partner, my friends and family, and their children. To not act, is to sentence them to an unbearable life.	No
1365985	Robert Briggs	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Briefly, two words. Climate Change. And another two - Existential Crisis. I'm going to tick YES in point 5 even though I'd prefer option 3.	Yes
1365987	Michael Hofmeyer	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1365990	Lester Sickerdick	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	The more efficient vehicles are already in production overseas and we MUST cut down our emissions from vehicles, as well as other carbon emissions from all sources to ensure sustainability of the planet.	No
1365992	David Christopher Murray	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Community consensus	Yes
1365996	David	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	To address the need to take responsibility for providing a cleaner environment for future generations.	Yes
1365998	Julie Taylor Mills	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want to see the transition out of fossil fuels to occur asap	Yes
1366001	Mark Hetherington	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	New car purchases essentially lock in the emissions for the life of the car. Cars sold today will be in service in 2034, so we need to consider our transport emissions targets in the future when setting today's efficiency standards.	Yes
1366005	Keith Harkins	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are twenty years behind, we need strong commitment to best best practice, stop being beige	NULL
1366006	Chris Dolman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is way behind the world on vehicle efficiency and we need to catch up after years or poor policy in this area. The climate is getting worse so more action is needed by everyone.	Yes
1366007	Gregory Andrews	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate emergency demands swift and decisive action.	NULL
1366010	David Clark	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	If we are serious about meeting our emissions reduction target, Option C is the best way to achieve it.	No

1366012	Anthony	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Other countries are already beating these targets Australia should strive to be the top of the clean energy game.	NULL
1366013	Mary Barram	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Sensible progressive implementation of the required changes to reduce carbon pollution from vehicles in Australia.	Yes
1366014	David Lightfoot	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to have the highest level standards to push forward with the transition off fossil fuels	NULL
1366017	Stephen Beaty	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Best option	Yes
1366019	Kristyn Hart	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The benefits cost ratio is effectively the same for options B and C.. The benefits for option C are improved over Option B. The reliance on fuel (imported) is reduced in Option 3. The move to full electrification is accelerated in option C	No
1366022	Sarah O'Connor	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Actions we can take on reducing CO2 emissions and reducing pollution are of utmost importance right now and into the future.	Yes
1366033	Lincoln Turner	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1366037	Chris Kelman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is already behind on this initiative, hence option C justifies a slightly smaller CB ratio by implementing changes sooner	NULL
1366039	jenny smith	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We absolutely need to do something to stop Australia rushing towards catastrophic emission problems. If we won't do option 3, option 2 is a step forward.	Yes
1366041	Luc	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to accelerate our transition away from fossil fuels urgently therefore option C sends the clearest signal to the market. Option B is a good second choice.	Yes
1366042	Ron Groves	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reduction in respiratory disease in people. (Health benefits)	No
1366044	Peter	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have to make up for 10 years of inactivity on this issue.	No
1366053	John Muchan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are already decades behind virtually all other developed nations in this space. We need to get serious about ways to cut our greenhouse gas emissions and strong fuel efficiency standards are a relatively straightforward means to do so with mountains of evidence from other nations that it will not have a major impact on car prices. Not to mention the health benefits of cleaner vehicles.	Yes
1366054	David Bindoff	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	less risky overall, even though higher cost	Yes
1366055	Mark Fraser	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1366059	Daisy Amanaki	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To meet net zero standards asap to prevent climate change escalation around the world, prevent loss of coral and flora and fauna and sea rising. Reason is based on evidence from scientists from around the world as I work at a University.	No

1366060	Ian Smallman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	C Delivers the best results all round but B is a reasonable compromise. A should not be an option	Yes
1366061	Robyn Christofides	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I want to see action on reducing vehicle emissions as soon as possible.	Yes
1366075	Kenneth Smith	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option A is inadequate - it will take too long to achieve too little. Option C is the best, but may encounter too much opposition (or Opposition?). Option B is, I feel, a reasonable compromise.	Yes
1366082	colin hamwood	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we must act as soon and as strongly as possible to avert greenhouse gas emmissions	NULL
1366086	Guy Kretschmer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The economic analysis does not take into account the large impact costs of global warming and therefore the urgent need for immediate large emissions reductions. Excessively large vehicles bought predominantly for ego reasons (looking at you Dodge Ram owners) impose many social and economic costs beyond high emissions. There are no valid reasons to try to carve out exemptions/concessions for them and their slightly smaller cousins. costs	NULL
1366088	Simon Dodds	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Health and environmental benefits	NULL
1366103	Simon G	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I think we need a fast transition as soon as possible. The extra costs will be saved in so many other areas.	No
1366110	Bruce McMillan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The sooner we reduce the pollution the better health outcomes for all.	No
1366123	Venugopal	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Longterm benefits for the people and environment.	No
1366124	Tim Colley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have only one choice: the greatest good for the greatest number. Immediately.	No
1366127	Bill Gresham	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must speed up the transition to clean cars.	Yes
1366130	Tracy Skippings	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because Australia should have introduced standards years ago and now we need to progress it quickly to beat CO2 targets for 2030/32.	No
1366131	Brian Smith	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Urgent action is needed, or we will be a dumping ground for inefficient vehicles for longer	No
1366133	Howard Scott	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It feels shameful that it has taken so long for Australia to develop vehicle efficiency standards. The EU and UK have higher targets that the US so if we are to benchmark ourselves against the US we should at least aim to catch up as soon as possible.	NULL
1366134	Chris	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We don't have time to take the slower options, we need to catch up now.	Yes
1366135	Andy Siers	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1366140	Alan Pattison	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Tipping point may have already been passed, speed of reduction is essential.	No
1366164	Laura Acklandiene	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We won't meet our CO2 targets if we avoid drastic measures. Let's follow leading examples like Norway - it's been done and can be done	NULL
1366165	Matthew Kennedy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The transition away from hydrocarbons underpinning energy and transportation is required to protect our environment and kids future is a necessity. Delaying exacerbates the issues, acceleration I believe unlocks opportunities which we have yet to recognise.	Yes
1366167	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The planet just can't take anymore CO2s	No
1366168	David Hamilton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The window to limiting global heating to less than 1.5 degrees C is almost shut, and we need to reduce emissions as quickly as possible. Option C reduces emissions faster,.	No
1366170	Stuart Watson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need act urgently on carbon emissions and option offers the best abatement	No
1366186	Gabriella Hont	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Will pressure companies to import more electric models sooner giving us more choice and reduced costs .	NULL
1366189	Ken	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We're well behind the rest of the world when it comes to fuel efficiency standards so we need to catch up as quickly as possible in a sustainable manner. Selecting Option C should also result in car manufacturers sending as many EV options as possible to Australia which will give consumers more choice and hopefully put downward pressure on car prices and running costs.	Yes
1366199	Chazza	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It gets us to the current US targets as soon as possible and then moves us past their future targets earlier. Overall, I want to meet both US and EU targets as soon as possible.	NULL
1366211	John Martin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Environmental.	No
1366218	Guy Redden	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1366223	Jonathan Miller	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1366230	John Skillicorn	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	the bigger the reduction in CO2 the better in the long term	NULL
1366231	Damien Quinnell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1366233	David Lord	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate action is needed as quickly as possible. Option C provides greater emissions reduction for a similar cost, and I would love to see my home country take a leading position in the international reduction competition.	Yes
1366234	John Edwards	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Don't give in to the Neanderthals in the Liberal/LNP Parties we need to reduce emissions as quickly as possible where there are reasonable options	NULL

1366244	Paul Cooper	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I do not believe the costs of transition per Option C will be as high as current modelling predicts. The history of technology innovation shows this, especially with lower-cost China entrants which will greatly reduce fleet costs. I also think the initial 2025 CO2 amount is lame and very affordable and should be a more aggressive fast-start target	NULL
1366246	Peter Lindenmayer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is clearly accelerating, as are its negative impacts. Australia's high per capita emissions mean we need to do much better, and good policies will encourage other nations. Option C is the most climate-friendly. Option B would be good, but its benefits will come too slowly. It could be significantly improved if the targets were moved forward - after all, the industry has known for years that emission changes were inevitable so smart producers should have been prepared.	Yes
1366249	Greg Seymour	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to aim high as the lobbyist (backed by Toyota, Fossil Fuels) will attempt to reduce whatever standards are finally agreed.	Yes
1366252	Lauren Victoria Cameron	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I urge the government to take immediate action to try to meet our net zero targets as soon as possible, but want the transition to be just and realistic.	Yes
1366257	Julian Peterson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	It is essential that Australia come into line with other developed nations on matters such as fuel efficiency - and make meaningful change, a slow start is not an option.	Yes
1366267	Arthur Rowling	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C provides the highest CO2 intensity reduction. It also provides the highest benefits.	No
1366276	Kent Taylor	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Man made climate change and polluting exhaust fumes	No
1366277	David	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate emergency. We should have done this 10 years ago. I have been waiting for it before buying electric, but gave up and bought last year. So I will lose value on my new car, but I still support it.	No
1366278	Phillip Baron	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is behind by 15 years at least, the auto industry therefore should see this coming and has had plenty of time to prepare.	NULL
1366282	Douglas Burns	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I am hugely concerned by climate change and believe we must make the greatest effort possible as soon as possible.	NULL
1366289	Chandana De Silva	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B seems to strike a reasonable balance	Yes
1366290	Dan Padiaditis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Many other jurisdictions have had effective FES in place for years and some, such as Norway, have proven that it is more than possible to achieve Option C and much lower emissions per vehicle. A moderate or slow FES will leave Australian drivers worse off in the medium term and will not send a strong enough signal to auto makers. Let's join most other developed countries, and save Australians money while reducing vehicle emissions.	NULL
1366292	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is decades behind international counterparts on introducing a FES and should introduce the most ambitious standard to catch up to markets like the EU and US and make up for lost time.	No
1366299	Graeme	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is a need to rapidly reduce emissions	No
1366300	john	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	In 2030 we will be pleased to have taken this option. Going straight to the solution is cheaper and better than a so called transition period.	Yes
1366303	Wayne Bowers	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C provides; a) the quickest way to reduce our reliance on oil imports; b) provides almost equivalent benefits cost ratio to option B; c) a bigger reduction in particulate matter and pollutants in urban and regional areas; d) a method to bring down new	No

			vehicle emissions in a responsible, expeditious and achievable manner; e) Australian families and businesses the opportunity to choose from the best fuel reduction technologies available.	
1366326	Brendan Mulgrew	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Option A would cause the least disruption to the Australian population and not impact low to middle income earners	No
1366333	Graham Michalk	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To ensure new cars meet the strictest and latest emission standards and to optimise net benefits to consumers	No
1366377	Sandy Thompson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	No time to lose. Get on with it.	Yes
1366398	Warren Linton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Benefit-to-cost ratio of b & c are close. And if they are close, why wouldn't we choose the fastest option.	NULL
1366401	David Schwartz	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	The Liberal government failed to address this issue and we can't wait any longer. The pace of change must be accelerated. Climate Change isn't slowing down, quite the opposite.	NULL
1366418	George Tulloch	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Choosing Option C for the Australian NVEs is driven by its ambitious CO2 targets, streamlined regulatory approach, stringent penalty system, and the significant environmental benefits it offers. Option C positions Australia as a leader in sustainable transportation and climate change mitigation by setting aggressive emission reduction targets and encouraging innovation, aligning with global efforts and stimulating industry advancements.	Yes
1366435	Irene Kempa	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1366438	Heather Haughton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1366449	James Marshall	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The risks associated with climate change are far greater than any economic or social impact difference between A, B and C. Therefore, our only option should be Option C, address climate change risks as quickly as we can.	No
1366472	Richard Pagliaro	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is clearly the best. The technology behind EVs is improving rapidly. The literature is clear that these changes will deliver batteries and motors that are cheaper and with higher power densities in short periods of time.. The costs therefore will be much lower than predicted. The equivalent of Moores law is inevitable. IT IS TIME TO BE BRAVE and trust in technology.	NULL
1366484	Steven Williams	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Hurry up	No
1366489	Genevieve Kelly	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	this is very overdue and needs to be done as quickly and as big as ambitiously as possible	Yes
1366501	Gerald Porter	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cleaner air is good.	No
1366522	Brian Loffler	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are so far behind Europe and Scandinavia we need to catch up fast. Save money, improve health (e.g. reduce asthma etc), help arrest climate instability.	No
1366527	Ryan Mills	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Do the job properly and go with option C	No

1366528	James Westcott	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is the wisest choice in terms of the right thing to do for future generations, albeit at a slightly higher cost to implement. Option C is a braver decision but not an extreme one when compared with other OECD countries. Australia should be looking to provide leadership here, not just conformance. The lack of a vehicle emissions standard has been an embarrassment for Australia and made us a dumping ground for high polluting vehicles that other countries will not accept.	No
1366529	Casey Mills	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	If we are going to fix things for our kids option C is the only way to go	No
1366531	David Leek	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must do everything to save the planet for our grandchildren	Yes
1366534	Janet Lieber	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	The Chemistry of this planet is being polluted. No one can fudge, cheat, fool or deceive this Scientific fact for some material short term scheme. All the severe weather events world wide are evidence of the urgency of reducing global warming.	Yes
1366537	Dr Kelvin Wellington	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I strongly believe that we must electrify Australia and Option C will provide the fastest way to electrify the transport sector.	Yes
1366542	Mark Melocco	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to move as fast as possible to sustainable transport knowing that any vehicle purchased today has a 20 year life. Better to make as many of these zero emissions now so that the effects are sooner and more second hand vehicles are available to lower income families	Yes
1366544	Anthony	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I would like to see more support for Electric Vehicles and believe this is one of the levers the government can pull to speed up the up-take. The benefits of option 3 are clearly worthwhile, and I believe Australia has the affluence to cope with any short term cost pain.	No
1366550	Nick	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Improved local air emissions and reduce Aus greenhouse transport emissions. Encourage innovation and improvement in Aus available vehicle technology and encourage EV uptake. Keep more Aus transport \$ in Aus with transport energy going to Aus energy producers (not overseas oil companies)	NULL
1366551	Megan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As soon as possible will bring the greatest benefits to all.	No
1366570	Perran Cook	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reducing fossil fuel use in cars has clear environmental, health, economic and security benefits. Environmental, less CO2 means reduced climate change risk. Health, poor air quality from fossil fuel combustion results in many 1000s of premature deaths in Australia. Switching to EVs will reduce this. Economic/Security, oil price shocks cause inflation and under extreme cases threaten national security of fuel supply. Using electricity generated in Aus supports Aus jobs, reduces price shocks.	NULL
1366579	Richard Roberts	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We're so far behind where we should be that the only sensible step forward is all-in	No
1366593	Eric Huttner	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Need to take rapid action. Accelerate benefits and market development. Reduce prices	Yes
1366597	Stuart Venables	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We don't have time to do things at a leisurely pace given the state of the climate crisis.	No
1366605	Ben Rowlinson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to take strong steps to reduce transport emissions to limit our impact on climate change and give ourselves the best chance of staying on track to meet the science based targets.	Yes
1366606	Graham Thomas	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is a very serious threat we must address now	No
1366609	Rick Rowlinson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	While Option B is a considered choice, the world needs governments to invest in future generations before irreversible damage is done. The quickest response is worth the cost for the long term future.	Yes

1366614	Glenn Jacobson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We're in a climate crisis. There's not a big difference in price there folks. Again, crisis.	NULL
1366615	Jim Allen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change and volatility of oil prices in an increasingly unstable world makes it imperative that we select fastest of three options as a slower path exposes us to risk and the economics of the slowest path are weakest.	Yes
1366619	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1366622	Joshua Miller	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Envoronment matters more than the economy, by orders of magnitude.	Yes
1366625	Luke	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need a fast transition to less CO2 emissions.	Yes
1366627	Sandy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1366633	tasmin witkamp	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1366634	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Let's lead and not follow! - we've wasted so much time doing nothing. The planet needs ambitious targets and, most importantly, vigorous action now.	NULL
1366646	Ryan Ward	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I don't believe the cost of climate inaction has been properly factored into this analysis. Every year we see greater climate related disasters destroying homes and towns. This effect can only be minimised through swift action (Option C)	No
1366650	Bernard Laufenberg	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia, one of the last OECD countries to adopt such Standards, has a great deal of catching up to do.	No
1366651	Michael Pilling	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The planet is burning, successive governments have gutsed out for years. We have to more than catch up if we are going to meet climate targets. We also need rego to charged by increasing fees for increased weight per axel, it is the weight that damages roads the most. Car park sizes should not be being increased. I don't support option B even though it is better than option A because is to gutless. You've had years to get this done and the new rules should start 1-Jul-2024, no car industry here.	No
1366658	Brenton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act as quickly as possible - climate change is real!	Yes
1366673	Bruce Stewart	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to accelerate the switch away from ICE vehicles. This should have happened decades ago! Australians are being held back from having a full choice in EV models and this lack of choice is keeping prices high.	NULL
1366674	Avey	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1366685	Tim Rowlinson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Win win for everyone	No
1366688	Ande Bunbury	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because the net benefit you are looking at is only financial (and option C is best at this too). Transport emissions are now one of the largest sectors for CO2 emissions and we need really strong action NOW to help combat the huge future costs involved with runaway climate change	Yes

1366696	Neil Harris	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reducing emissions is an urgent national priority.	Yes
1366697	Cathy Browne	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are so far behind where we should be, & with an Opposition keen to remain with their icon, John Howard, in the 1950's. Please use your time in office to behave in our national interest & in our planet's interest. in our	No
1366698	Rowena Skinner	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option b provides a good balance between positive health and environment outcomes but at a reasonable cost.	Yes
1366702	Rowan Hillard	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Future generations deserve better. There is no Plan(et) B.	NULL
1366728	River Clarke	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are already experiencing the impacts of 1.5C warming on the planet, and this will only worsen. If we wanted to take a steady approach i.e., option 2, we needed to start 10-20 years ago. Also, the benefits of better health and reduced greenhouse gas emissions cannot be overstated.	No
1366740	Sue Gilbey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we need haste, we can't wait the evidence is clear	No
1366741	Lyn Longo	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	If we are serious about climate change there is no time for caution.	No
1366744	Michael Flaherty	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe that the government must do as much as possible to address the effects of Climate Change even if this results in higher short-term costs.	Yes
1366751	Léonie Ebert	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to take immediate action regardless of cost. We do not have time to waste to save the planet in every way we can.	Yes
1366752	Keith Boxer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is moving too slowly to avoid the worst impacts of climate change and must urgently improve our CO2 reduction by what ever means are available.	No
1366771	MR STEPHEN BOWER	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C net benefits are greater. Australia must leap forward to catch up with other countries and quickly reduce our transport carbon emissions, provide Australians with reduced costs and improve health conditions for all Australians.	NULL
1366778	Monique baber	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have to go fast and hard to make up for the sluggish and non commitment previously	Yes
1366813	Sky Croeser	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate crisis, and a cost of living crisis. We should be doing everything we can to reduce emissions, and also to provide more fuel-efficient vehicles to Australian consumers.	NULL
1366814	Peter Grear	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C will be the biggest step towards emissions reduction, relieving cost-of-living pressures and improving air quality.	Yes
1366848	Josh	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option a doesn't go far enough and we need to start hard and fast before it's too late. Australia has taken too long get to onboard with what is normal just about everywhere else	Yes
1366851	Matt Champness	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option 3 has the greatest environmental benefit, with B/C ration almost the same as B. Embrace change, inspire the next generation to do what they can to mitigate the effects of climate change.	No

1366853	Eric Illy	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	I strongly disagree that Australia is ready for such a change. Firstly the debate about excess carbon emissions from vehicles and the levels of CO2 in the atmosphere has not been resolved. Global warming has now been attributed to increased solar radiation / magnet reduction of the earth's field and location of the solar system in current space time. I believe that battery technology is poisonous / dangerous and detrimental to the environment - Lithium production and disposal is not considered.	No
1366857	Babette Thomas	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Altho I've chosen C because I firmly believe we have to be ambitious in combating climate change, I realise we live in the real world and if the costs are too high for individuals & orgs, it may not be feasible. Therefore if the govt's preferred option of B is the only option that will realistically work, I would accept that.	No
1366858	Ali	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are already years behind the rest of the world. The faster the better! It will save Australians money long term.	NULL
1366860	Phil Bradley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have a climate crisis and need strong urgent action to reduce emissions. The benefits of reducing greenhouse gas emissions are much higher than in your analysis, which appears not to include the cost of externalities like exacerbated extreme weather, health and government subsidy costs	No
1366861	Ed Stephens	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Aligning to existing standards will leave us behind by the time we implement them. I believe we should go for the strongest measures as soon as possible.	Yes
1366863	Alex	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Need a more rapid approach to reducing co2. There'll be other benefits around air quality too	Yes
1366871	AdrianGraham	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Very keen for Australia to get on with the job and catch up with the rest of the world	Yes
1366884	Alma Dawe	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is near impossible to reverse. The real COSTS of the transition are estimates and, like all estimated costs and changes in the last 30 years have been exceeded in the real world. Therefore urgency is the pathway	No
1366905	Reginald Pallant	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 1st	Hope B is achievable, A is a waste of time, C is something to aim for	Yes
1366909	Janet Wellington	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to make up for lost time and do as much as we can, as quickly as we can. We have been lagging behind and need to catch up.	Yes
1366911	Wolfgang Krause	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	There needs to be balanced approach to benefits. Currently health and climate risks are not sufficiently considered and Australia is the dumping ground for old technology cars. This has to stop.	Yes
1366912	Roland Hunter Howlett	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reduce the unreasonable use of large carbon powered vehicles in the cities eg. large duel cabs and \,RAM\, type vehickes. We are going backwards not forwards, and all hybrids need to be rechargeable.	No
1366913	Chris Ford	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We're already behind. These standards should have been implemented years ago - as fast as possible!	NULL
1366919	Dr Hannah Middleton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1366921	Tom Jamieson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have waited way to long for action in this area, now we must move fast and take strong action. Climate change is real and I worry about the future we are building for my grandchildren. I have been embarrassed by our lack of meaningful action.	NULL
1366924	Phillip Quirk	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia used to be a leader in leading by example in taking on new technology - we used to \,punch above our weight\, . It's more than time to reclaim this mantel by rapidly decarbonising our nation - by going with Option - C. In addition 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, but also higher costs\,	No

1366930	Evelieng Ward	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Environmental goals should also have financial benefits. That excludes option A. The financial benefits with option C are the largest.	Yes
1366933	Matt Vickers	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There's a climate emergency. We need to make the biggest changes possible while an amenable government is in power. We already have a problem with huge, wasteful cars being tax writeoffs and creating danger on the roads. Options A and B further incentivise these when we need the opposite. If utes get a higher emission allowance, they must also lose the tax benefits. I suspect the health benefits of option C are understated, especially if we also factor in non-fuel downsides of large SUVs.	Yes
1366937	JoAnne Boxer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Should have been implemented much earlier	No
1366954	Gaynor McGrath	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I have grandchildren and want everything possible done to lower emissions and global temperatures.	Yes
1366955	Nicolas Pascal	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want the fastest option to protect our climate and our health from toxic pollution and fossil fuel emissions to protect my family's future. Australia has already delayed this policy way too much compared to other advanced economies. I had to settle for an hybrid for my current car as electric vehicles were too expensive, I would like to save even more money on fuel and use my solar panels to power my car. It's a win for my wallet, health and our environment.	NULL
1366956	Emily	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	THERE IS NO PLANET B. We need to take climate change seriously!	Yes
1366957	Billy hancock	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The earth can't wait, we're going for 2 degrees in the next few, sea levels will be a metre in less than 100 years check the real science	Yes
1366958	richard frawley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1366960	Althea Hancock	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It accelerates the reduction of CO2 into the atmosphere.	No
1366962	Raymond Kennedy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The quicker the change the better the outcome	No
1366968	Michael Chamley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	With the largest net benefits I would say it is the way to proceed. Australia has prevaricated enough, it's time to catch up and exceed expectations for the planet.	No
1366969	Tobias	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I think the cost of climate change will be a lot higher if we act not fast enough to reduce CO2 in the atmosphere immediately. I think we can already experience more weather extremes.	No
1366984	James	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need fuel efficiency standards as soon as possible to meet our GHG target but need to give people time to adjust there purchasing preferences.	Yes
1366985	Michael Taylor	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We're already behind, and as a country we should be leaders	NULL
1366988	Jordi	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's the most effective option, we need direct action NOW, we can keep wasting time with weak middle-ground policies.	No
1366996	Richard Hill	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are a long way behind the OECD in vehicle emissions policy	Yes

1366998	Charlotte Ostrowski	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Although C seems most appealing as it seeks to most rapidly resolve the issue, B is simply more realistic and meets the principals of being 'equitable', and 'enabling',	Yes
1367001	Peter Kilby	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I support the option with the highest net benefit. As someone who cycles to work most days, the reduced fuel costs benefit me less but I will greatly welcome the reduction in poorly maintained ICE vehicle exhaust fumes that I contend with (I was diagnosed with asthma in my thirties, having been a regular cyclist since high school). I also welcome the increased liquid fuel security (& current account) provided by B and C, allowing more to be preserved for difficult-to-electrify transport sectors.	Yes
1367013	Chris Hopkinson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change must be urgently addressed	Yes
1367015	Mark Mills	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has delayed action for so long and now needs to move faster. Further delay has costs which are not in these numbers - we are running out of time and must take the fastest options available to us.	Yes
1367022	Richard Maguire	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C produces the greatest benefit to 1. reducing emissions, savings to the owner, reduction of sending money overseas for petrol, d. making getting EVs more attractive. The only losers would be the fossil fuel industry. Car manufactures already have made cars more efficient for markets like California for over sixty years. Australia is way way way behind. I would much rather the gov't would take option C but B is much better than A	No
1367023	Luke Hall	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	option C is much better for people and the planet and is only slightly more expensive from a cost/benefit ratio. seems a no brainer	No
1367025	Jill	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are way behind as it is; the planet is already warming, we have to move fast.	Yes
1367026	Phill Boyack	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	C puts us in a much better position in the long term, and at only slightly lower benefits/costs ratio	Yes
1367038	Kelly Mills	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to have the fastest transition	NULL
1367045	Palitja Moore	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B strikes a good balance by giving high benefits without costing too much. It recognises the critical situation we face from climate change, the associated costs of climate change due to extreme weather events, and allows more time for the transition to EVs to occur, along with the infrastructure changes required. Importantly, higher ambition will deliver greater respiratory health benefits to all Australians with less air pollution sooner.	Yes
1367048	Annalisa Koeman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I have been waiting for this day! It is a no brainer to impose fuel emission standards. We must catch up with other developed nations. Hopefully the standards also help counter SUVs/dual cab utes negative impact on emissions, air pollution, road safety and road deaths. These standards have been a long time coming and should be NO surprise and are NOT overly ambitious or onerous. Any lobby group or vested interest opposing Option B cannot be considered credible.	Yes
1367054	Kathleen Davies	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option A does nothing useful. Option B is better but not ambitious enough. Australia is so far behind the rest of the world we should be aiming higher than this. Option C would stimulate greater EV sales and further cut transport emissions. Vehicle importers have had plenty of notice and can begin to plan their adjustments. NOTE: dodgy question below. I support Option C, but of course that implies I also by default support Option B. Question 5 is a leading and mis-leading question.	Yes
1367059	Auvijit Banik	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Overall benefit	Yes
1367062	Janet Lieber	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Don't think we actually can fudge or have much choice with our climate chemistry	Yes
1367066	George Moore	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes

1367068	George Moore	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1367069	Michael Marsh	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	the government needs to implement the strongest possible fuel efficiency standards in order to send a message to the legacy vehicle manufacturers that Australia is serious about transitioning to low emission vehicles that can provide them the confidence to invest adequately in the required research, development and infrastructure. Also, for question 5, I support the government's proffered option begrudgingly.	Yes
1367072	Phil Bond	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	I fail to see how Australia can set vehicular standards when we don't manufacture but import only. Countries that manufacture the majority of cars have higher standards than Australia has ever had. Australia if it starts dictating to manufacturers will kill imports, as our market share is so small. Net Zero is not needed and there is no definitive proof that anything Govt are legislating will make any difference, except to the back pockets and bank balances of those who receive subsidies.	No
1367074	Don	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	B is Doable. Don't let the perfect get in the way of the good	Yes
1367077	Peter Doogue	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Air pollution from motor vehicles is causing a lot of health issues for Australians and on a per capita Australia is one of the top 10 emitters of GHG. It is an absolute disgrace that Australia, a very rich and advanced economy, is doing so poorly. How can we expect other countries to reduce their GHG emissions when we are such a laggard. I mean, only Russia and Australia have not done anything about their vehicle inefficiencies. I thought that Australia was much better behaved environmentally th	No
1367081	Ralph Hack	Option A - 1st, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Minimise the co2 impact on the climate otherwise Australia will be in a lot of trouble with climate change when sea levels rise and flood most of our cities around the coast	No
1367085	Leighton Jenkins	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Quick is best	No
1367086	David Rowe	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are already 15 years behind the EU. We need to get moving on this as fast as possible. Options C will provide the greatest health benefits, CO emissions reductions and fuel savings. The extra cost of Option C over Option B is not huge in the scheme of things.	NULL
1367088	Henry Sarunic	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	While the government's preference is a step in the right direction that I do support, we need to make a habit of acting on policies that reduce pollution as soon as they come up. The irreversible damage of pollution can snowball to an unpredictable level far too quickly.	Yes
1367089	Jeff Brooks	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Global heating is the greatest moral challenge of our time. It's effects are already felt by Australians, but it is the people of the developing world and the plants and animals of the natural world that are most severely impacted. Australia, as one of the world's wealthier and higher polluting nations has a responsibility to reduce carbon emissions as quickly as possible even if this means increased costs. Policy can be tweaked to reduce the costs for Australia's most disadvantaged people.	Yes
1367095	Rick Sarre	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The quicker the better. Pay now or pay twice tomorrow.	No
1367104	Derek	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Will force car manufacturers to bring in more efficient car options	No
1367106	David Roden	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Please see the attached statement for rationale	Yes
1367115	Graeme Ambrose	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The faster we move to higher efficiency vehicles the better off we will be	Yes
1367120	Ann Hoban	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL

1367123	Simon Hackett	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is worthwhile because the stated risks of supply constraint will in fact create opportunities for additional manufacturers to gain viable market entry. Australia is super late to the party so we need to catch up *fast*. That said, I can see the rationale for option B as being the government's preferred one and if that was the outcome, that would be fine too.	Yes
1367128	Angela Pollett	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change needs a rapid response. Currently change is occurring at the upper end of projected estimates and so requires a more rapid response to avoid extreme climate that will cost a lot more than any vehicle industry transition.	Yes
1367130	Paul Murphy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must follow the EU and USA with emission targets.	Yes
1367137	Rahul Prasad	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	We are the only other country in the developed world, apart from Russia, to not have a emissions standard. We need to catch up quickly to meet the rest of the global targets for zero emissions by 2035. 2050 means we are still going to be behind by 15 years to the rest of the world	No
1367139	David Turnbull	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is already behind most countries for these standards, a fast start is required to catch up and send a clear signal to the market.	Yes
1367140	Robert Bearne	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do everything we can NOW to make sure Australia is a leader and not the reluctant follower the world sees us as.	Yes
1367142	Daamon Parker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Action is well overdue. Not just on efficiency standards for consumer benefits, but also anything which materially helps the climate crisis. Option A is a virtual "do nothing, do it slowly" choice - unacceptable.	NULL
1367148	Paul Casbolt	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	After a lost decade of misinformation and delays it was very refreshing to read the Consultation Impact Analysis which provides a clear and fact based analysis of why Australia needs to introduce a New Vehicle Efficiency Standard. We also need to catch up and align our standards with other developed countries. Option B appears to be achievable while delivering multiple benefits for Australians at the lowest cost.	Yes
1367152	Ian Wilcox	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need the fastest transition to cleaner cars and as the analysis points out the cost benefit is the same as option B	No
1367154	Ian Millner	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australian motorist will save money from the improved efficiencies and the public in general will save even more do to improved health outcomes.	Yes
1367173	Jorge Alejandro	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	A fast transition will also open up economic opportunities.	Yes
1367179	John Dowdall	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Health benifits	Yes
1367182	Dylan Verheijden	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Need to act decisively now to catch up with other countries around the world. Get greatest benifits	NULL
1367184	Dr Peter Kinrade	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	See attached. In summary, while Option B has some merits, Option C is the preferred option. This is because it is likely to achieve a CO2 emissions reduction pathway from the Australian passenger and light commercial vehicle fleet that most closely aligns with the international imperative to achieve rapid emission reductions and avoid a 2 degree C increase in the global temperature. It will also result in the greatest net benefit.	NULL
1367187	MICHAEL WILLIAMS	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we need the benefits as fast as possible as we are so delayed in moving to improved standards	Yes
1367189	Wendy Lamond	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	There is no factual evidence that these measures will improve fuel efficiency, however the technology will result in slightly better vehicle emissions. This will have a minuscule effect on Australian based vehicle emissions. It will unfortunately increase the cost of targeted vehicles. This whole survey is a waste of time, as Mr Bowen, driven by his blind ideology will implementit..	No

1367194	John Mann	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is well behind in its efforts to reduce emissions. The time for easy solutions has passed. The vehicle fleet will take a long time to turn over into low emission vehicles. All of this points to the need for immediate and large-scale action.	Yes
1367208	Viki Perry	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Best way to go long term	Yes
1367209	Debra	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 0th	NULL	Yes
1367212	Francelina Sobral-Coelho	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need a transition time to change the way we do things, but unfortunately it has to be now a short one. At least the governments are finally willing to do something even if it is on the urgency now.	Yes
1367213	Ben	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This seems like a total no-brainer, particularly in the context of a cost of living crisis. Any policy that helps the transport sector reduce emissions, while improving health outcomes makes total sense. My only complaint is that the government hasn't moved more quickly to implement this important piece of policy, and election commitment.	Yes
1367215	Ray Johnston	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Need to urgently address health and environment concerns	Yes
1367218	Patrick Myer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It would have the quickest impact and be less able to be wound back by a conservative government	No
1367225	Barbara Landsberg	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We MUST choose Option C, the long-term co-lateral costs to the country of pollution and accelerated climate change are not included here and are immense. Other countries have proven it is possible, worthwhile and critically important to convert successfully to higher vehicle efficiency standards. We should be investing in this above many other things.	No
1367227	Robert	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are so out of step with what needs to be done and are playing catch up. It may cost more doing option C, but we already seeing the result of a warming planet and unstable extreme weather events. I want my grand children to be able to breathe clean air, not choke the fumes caused by legacy vehicle makers dumping polluting vehicles in our market.	No
1367247	Max	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate emergency. Carbon pollution must be reduced immediately.	No
1367249	David Balding	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Concerned about loopholes leading to a policy not being effective unless it is sufficiently strong	Yes
1367251	Lois O'Connor	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Most other countries have had this in place for decades. Time to catch up.	No
1367254	Jason Page	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Transferring to electric vehicles will reduce living costs, improve community health, and make roads safer.	Yes
1367262	Oliver Coleman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1367265	Nate Pedrotti	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Balance of economic cost and environmental benefit	Yes
1367272	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1367315	Adam Lewis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The C/B ratios are not significantly different. Option C provides greater benefits. Half-way approaches risk underperformance and undue complications, e.g., though increased compliance cost and complexity	NULL
1367328	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	How is the value quantified when the health effects and costs from car emissions is omitted. e.g. cancer dementia etc..	No
1367333	Poul Grage	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Taking the numbers on face value, option C is a no-brainer.	Yes
1367337	Mark Eaton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is already far behind Europe, the US and most of the world when it comes to fuel efficiency standards that car manufacturing companies already need to meet for these far larger markets. To not pick the option which aims to catch up with those standards as fast as possible is just slowing down the adoption of more fuel efficient vehicles and the rate at which those newer vehicles filter down to the people who can least afford to pay for fuel.	No
1367353	Fiona Bettsworth	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do more, faster. Larger cars also have other negative impacts including on road safety.	No
1367371	Brian Mollan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is no time to waste. Far too much time has been lost already. The climate science is very clear - we must stop burning fossil fuels if we are to have a chance of retaining a liveable planet. To use a house fire analogy, dribbling a garden hose won't fix the problem, it need the full force of several fire hoses.	No
1367381	Grace Hodson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's NOW or NEVER. It's not a difficult concept to grasp. We need to speed the time it's taking to act on climate change, It truly is life or death. What the government is doing currently is NOT GOOD ENOUGH for your children. IF our government does want to protect their people and the next generations, now is the time to act. ITS NOW OR NEVER. SAVE US OR WE DIE.	Yes
1367382	Adrian	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	NULL	Yes
1367383	dudley siviour	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Global warming is real and Australia has been dragging its feet for too long. I remember Bob Hawke talking about planting a million trees to reduce CO2 back in the 90s. Our Coalition governments have been anti renewables and pro big fossil fuels in every term since then. Change needs to be implemented very quickly while we have a government that is not controlled by fossil industries. Make the quickest change now so we catch up to the rest of the world. This is too important to delay.	NULL
1367387	Steve	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is preferred only. We currently have one of the worst Vehicle Efficiency standards in the developed world. This is not good enough and needs radical change to ensure current and future generations benefit from the higher level of standards.	No
1367391	Robert Dunn	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This option will reduce greenhouse gases by the greatest amount. There are also health benefits. The faster polluting vehicles, especially heavy vehicles, can be removed from the fleet the greater the health benefits will be. It is a well known fact that electric vehicles have less moving parts than \ice\ vehicles. Less parts means lower maintenance costs which is huge win for all Australians. There is such a convenience in charging a vehicle at home and it is also much cheaper than buying fuel	No
1367394	Alan Ide	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Highest benefit, similar cost to 'B', urgency of action on climate change	Yes
1367398	Craig Klement	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is lagging behind the rest of the world and we need to catch up (at least)	Yes
1367399	Bernard Sheppard	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Due to the lack of policy to date, we are well behind other nations in average fleet fuel efficiency (and thus also health benefits). In order to catch up to the average, we need to move quickly. As has been shown with things like solar roll outs (both residential and commercial), the right incentives can kick start a process that, once started, becomes self sustaining and requires reduced or no incentives)	Yes
1367400	Dianne Brooks	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change represents a great moral challenge. People of the third world are baring the brunt of climate change and Australia should doing everything it's power to reduce greenhouse gas emissions for the sake of those who are suffering most.	NULL

1367405	Peter Ball	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to catch up as a nation to what the vast majority of our counterparts have had access to. It will benefit all vehicle users.	Yes
1367406	Peter Frank	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Long overdue catch-up to rest of the world. Will stop Australia being dumping ground for gas guzzlers no one else wants while encouraging manufacturers to import more fuel efficient vehicle in future. While I'd prefer Option C I'll happily support Option B just to get this started.	Yes
1367413	Shaun Cunningham	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have 5 years to avert 1.5c. This needs to be a war time effort.	No
1367427	Christopher King	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I'd really like to live in a world similar to that of my parents. Climate change is serious, and we should have been on this from the beginning.	Yes
1367431	Russell Crawford	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	This is good for the planet, for consumers, and for Australia's reputation in the global community.	Yes
1367433	Ruth Russell	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	I believe we should reduce our emissions as soon and as much as possible.	Yes
1367439	Mark Fischer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need the fastest possible action!	Yes
1367449	Patrick Sinclair	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Aiming for setting the global standard to reverse Australia's "laggard" past on climate action	Yes
1367450	Dougie Wight	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to decarbonise fast and this is low hanging fruit. The difference in the BCR between options B and C is minimal and given both are based on modeling assumptions there is no meaningful difference. In these circumstances the right choice is to pursue the greatest benefits.	No
1367452	Timothy	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	We don't have unlimited time to help the climate. Australia has stalled on this policy for far too long; we are morally obligated to catch up to the rest of the world, and that means forcing industry to adapt. The fast start option is the least worst option. Please think of our children's future.	No
1367458	Judith Ohana	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1367461	Emily Edwards	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1367471	Michael Fogarty	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to decarbonise as quickly as possible to reduce our carbon emissions and to improve the health of individuals, especially our children.	No
1367474	Phil Johnson	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	All options are bad. The government should have no influence in determining the vehicles working Australians voluntarily purchase.	No
1367478	Ben Viney	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	30 billion more in benefits for option C against 12 billion more in cost - 18 billion dollars better plus climate benefit of faster action	NULL
1367480	John	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	Yes

1367484	Brian Petersson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	If Australia incentivised Hydrogen/Amonia production for export and powering shipping which will significantly lower shipping costs from Australian. This intern will support the financial case for battery manufacturing in Australia and for local use and export for grid scale storage and manufacture EV's in both the international market and Australia. Australia is reliant on importet fuels for our transport needs, both commercial and private use being a snificant security risk to the country.	No
1367492	Stephen Britt	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We really have to minimise the already disastrous impacts that burning fossil fuels will have on our kids.	No
1367493	Leigh	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate climate climate	Yes
1367496	Garry White	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The policy is essential in meeting emission reduction targets	Yes
1367513	Daniel Renton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	No half measures if we are to have any chance of avoiding further climate catastrophe for ourselves and the planet's biodiversity.	No
1367514	Andy Judson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is imperative to achieve our reduced emissions targets as quickly as possible, as the longer we wait the more potential damage is done. Overall though, it is far better to at least change to the new standards on the governments proposed timeline than on a slower trajectory.	Yes
1367520	Ian Wingfield	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fastest path to net zero	NULL
1367525	Ben Sawley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Reduce Australia's emissions whilst at the same time increasing our choice of available cars for Australia.	Yes
1367539	Philip Beale	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	whatever can be achieved through the political process to improve our efforts to influence climate change	Yes
1367540	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	C-because at the end of the day best climate outcome and quickest way to get in line with the rest of the world. B-because it gives people with less money more time to transition and most likely more people will come on board. So not very firm regarding the choice between B and C.	Yes
1367541	Sarah Sims	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we need to decarbonise our economy as fast as possible, and follow Norway's strong leadership	No
1367544	Philip O'Brien	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	A fast transition is necessary to reduce climate change impacts, clean up the pollution in our cities and reduce our dependence on imported liquid petroleum products.	Yes
1367546	Aaron McDonald	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This should have been done years ago so we should be doing everything we can to make up for lost time.	Yes
1367548	Rod Whittle	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	most climate action	No
1367564	John Bendel	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	For the sake of climate change and good health we need to gain the benefits from the new vehicle efficiency standards as quickly as possible	No
1367567	Alison Bendel	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I would like to see Option C introduced to help climate change and reduce pollution of the air. This needs to happen urgently to maximise the benefits of the VES option C.	No

1367572	Jess	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I understand you need to spend money to make money but if we continue in the slow lane on reducing our admissions, our recovery costs are going to be far greater than any of those outlined above. Spend the money now, future'selves will LOVE US!	NULL
1367600	Julian Conrad	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	All Australians have a right to breath clean air with the associated health benefits. Everything possible should be done to fight climate change. Option C will result in the largest reduction in the need for imported fuel which will help the economy and enhance our security.	NULL
1367605	Dr Helen Hutchinson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to clean up our vehicles to stop heating the world even more. Stop supporting diesel fuel rebates and that will help to pay for the cost of Option C.	No
1367618	Patrick Marwick	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fast start to effectively and efficiently decarbonise through electrification.	No
1367623	Andrew Everard	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reducing greenhouse gas emissions is vital to avoid the worst effects of climate change. I can't understand why people put their desire to drive a bigger scarier car before the future of their children and grandchildren.	Yes
1367634	Dave Archer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This needs to be done asap, we are already way behind and paying the increased emissions price, it cannot happen fast enough	No
1367642	Dianne Rawlings	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is so far behind other countries with fuel efficiency standards and has taken so long to take action that we now need to make up for that and progress as quickly as possible.	NULL
1367645	Peter Mason	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Act NOW, it's already too late!	Yes
1367667	Michael	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1367668	Steve Smith	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Government must take strong action now!	No
1367676	Rob Hartill	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	time to catch up	No
1367682	David Baldwin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reducing emissions is a the highest priority, and encouraging manufacturers to offer a wider range of vehicles rather than dumping polluting vehicles is something that has to change.	NULL
1367688	Graham Franklin-Browne	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to catch up. Option C presents the quickest return, and maximises the benefits. I suspect it will be politically unpopular, and I can see this questionnaire is somewhat rigged, but I will support Option B in Question 5.	Yes
1367698	Dan Hockin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is time for Australia to be bold and take the lead. We have a long way to catch up, and the faster we start the quicker the benefits will be realised for all Australians. We all deserve cleaner air, better health and financial outcomes and so does our environment in this time of climate crisis. To do anything less than Option C is to forgo our duty of care for the next generation and we will be held accountable. This is an opportunity for positive change, we should aim aim and dream big.	No
1367786	Anne	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want to buy an EV but the choices available are out of my price range. Second hand vehicles are being imported into Australia by the Good Car Co. but few have the range to be suitable for longer distances and there are few charging stations in some parts of Tasmania, so charging infrastructure needs to catch up. Higher standards and a faster transition will speed up the importation of a wider range of EVs and bring the price down and also apply pressure to install more charging stations	Yes
1367790	Des Soares	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Highest efficiency and best health outcomes	No

1367794	Shaun	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Urgent, bold action is required to tackle climate change and the true costs of fossil fuels are not currently being factored in	Yes
1367795	Christine Cook	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in an existential crisis. We need to be acting quickly and effectively to ensure a safe and healthy planet for future generations. So my first preference is for option C. However I appreciate the realities of our democracy and the need to ensure the majority of the voting public are on board. If it's possible to bring the voters along the fastest and most effective option is the best.	Yes
1367797	Michelle	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate emergency *is* an emergency, and we need to act like it. With the government's own figures showing (a) that passenger and light commercial vehicles are responsible for 10% of our total CO2 emissions, and (b) Australia being a wealthy country, we can and should go fast. We can and should also encourage more low/no emissions mobility options, including rail and active transport (appropriate since the vast majority of journeys in Australia are less than 10km). Finally, we need to use these fuel emissions standards as a way to also address the 'bloat' in Australia's vehicle fleet: our cars are getting progressively larger, with a host of terrible human and environmental externalities. Please ensure that our standards do not contain loopholes (as do some other countries') that encourage unnecessarily large vehicles.	Yes
1367806	Ian Burns	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Let's get going	Yes
1367822	Phil Page	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	See attachment	No
1367824	Long	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As the cost of option C and B do not differ considerably, it is likely worth it to go for C. An ambitious goal will also push electric vehicle adoption in Australia, opening new opportunities	Yes
1367826	Richard Chapman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The science is stark - there is no more allowance for any more carbon in our atmosphere, which does not care about our politics or our economics. I only selected Option C as it was the least-worst option - if there was an Option D with zero vehicles that produce emissions allowed to be legally sold from the 1st of January 2025 I would have selected it.	NULL
1367827	Xanthorrhoea West	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has taken much too long to implement this policy. Option B would only match the US. Australia can do better to save costs associated with moving across the country in a car, especially as we have the highest per capita update of solar and the most fuel efficient vehicles are electric.	No
1367834	Lorraine Amos	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1367837	Michael B	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1367838	Lou Pynenburg	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This will suit people and save more. Easier on the grid is both short and long term	No
1367839	Brian O'Neill	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Will give the greatest reduction in carbon emissions & fastest transition to EVs	No
1367840	Gordon Grant	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to move as quickly as possible. Manufactureres already have cleaner models so it will not be too hard.	No
1367841	Connor Montgomery	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Climate emergency	Yes
1367844	Tony Gonzalez	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are so far behind the rest of the world. Manufacturers have refused to bring fuel efficient models to Australia even though they are readily available in other markets. The Manufacturers have also failed to meet their own voluntary efficiency standards, as agreed with the FCAI. The only way to encourage the supply of efficient vehicles is to provide strict targets and penalties.	Yes

1367849	Julie Heath	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's incumbent on all of us to reduce emissions wherever possible and as fast as possible, particularly in the transport industry. We have been without vehicle emissions standards for way too long so now need to act quickly.	Yes
1367863	Warwick Gardiner	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Absolutely assential.we need the best solution to reduce emissions.	No
1367867	David	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to start moving as quickly as possible on this matter.	Yes
1367874	Chris Johansen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The urgent need to reduce GHG emissions	No
1367877	Mark	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want to buy an affordable EV as soon as possible	No
1367881	Margaret Korn	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Clean energy groups such as the Smart Energy Council, are calling for Australians to vote for Option C to promote a better selection of more efficient cars with bigger cost savings and to reduce health-wrecking air pollution as fast as possible. In a country with chronic health worker shortages and long surgery waiting lists, why not prioritise initiatives that WILL bring health benefits to all Australians?	No
1367882	Gareth	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Efficiency is key to reducing our CO2 footprint. No longer can we blow smoke to bump up our little egos.	Yes
1368230	Robert Shorrock	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Urgent need to decarbonise	NULL
1368390	Daniel	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	Australia has fallen too far behind the world and is fast becoming the automotive dumping ground	No
1368594	Mark Headland	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Australia is not a large enough vehicle market to make any difference in global emissions. This will unnecessarily limit options in outer suburbs for people who can least afford to pay. Hybrid vehicles are already available achieving fuel efficiency of order> 100/mpg and these provide ample opportunity for anyone wanting to limit emissions without putting cost constraint on those least able to pay.	No
1368626	Mike Harvey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	People will always make choices within their given options. Make the options more fuel efficient or better yet zero emissions and people will still choose those.	Yes
1368644	Kellie McMaster	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	More needs to be done faster, to prevent Australia being a dumping ground for GM and other manufacturers, old models and inefficient vehicles. We need to demand better, sooner.	Yes
1368646	David R E Hughes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The cost is immaterial in comparison to the ongoing damage incurred. Australia should also not be seen as a 'dumping ground'; for 2nd vehicles from overseas that have no fuel efficiency standards.	No
1368648	David RE Hughes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The costs are immaterial. See reasoning in the attached support documents that go with the Environmental & Socio-Economic Savings Usage from Cancelling the Nuclear Submarine Contract and Mining Company Subsidies report already submitted under the name: David R E Hughes.	No
1368651	David Hughes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The cost immaterial and easily affordable. See the attached supporting document for the 'Environmental & Socio-Economic Savings Usage from Cancelling the Nuclear Submarine Contract and Mining Company Subsidies' report already submitted under the name: David R E Hughes.	No
1368652	Silas	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Being fast, bold and ambitious will give us benefits beyond those listed. It will also jumpstart new clean energy jobs, attract global talent, and deliver better environmental and health outcomes. It will give each person an extra \$1207 of benefit for only \$467 of additional investment.	No

1368693	Catalina	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Greenhouse gas emission reduction and health	NULL
1368713	Ian Saunders	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It has the highest net benefits	No
1368731	Rowan Sainsbury	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is the route to actually putting Australia out ahead to be properly positioned for the future.	No
1368785	Jordan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Tax the fossil fuel companies more. Stop pollution and use of fossil fuels.	No
1368924	Jenny	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Climate change abatement is the highest priority but you have to take the people with you.	Yes
1368934	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There may be higher costs but this is an urgent matter	Yes
1369013	Helen Lawry	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cleaner air and less asthma.	NULL
1369087	Brett Irvine	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe Australia has kicked the can down the road on emissions for far too long. I don't want my kids to have to make all the sacrifices when they have done none of the damage. I am willing to forgo a little to hopefully make things a bit easier for them - assuming of course we have not already left it too late.	No
1369106	Frank Robertson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need do to everything we can, as soon as we can. When is Australia going to get ahead of the game instead of following like a dumb puppy	Yes
1369132	Peter Logan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are lagging behind the world but the world can supply anything we need now because their standards work	No
1369206	James FitzSimons	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are so far behind already. We urgently need to move on to getting bi-directional charging implemented.	Yes
1369215	Paul McLisky	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Maximise carbon emission reduction.	No
1369248	Gottfried Otting	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	the hidden costs associated with climate change and health impact of pollution far outweigh the cost of option C	No
1369289	Matthew Cox	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need urgent action on climate. We no longer have the luxury of take the easy path. Rapid and radical change is our only hope of reducing the harm to come.	No
1369321	Dean Leggo	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The vehicle market is very competitive and auto makers are putting their best tech into EVs first. I don't think the US should be our guiding post and meeting them is the minimum standard, so we should go for Option C. Toyota has their hydrogen vehicles they should try and sell them here and now. If Toyota fails, that is because the other auto makers out maneuvered them, and they could not keep up. They won't fail because of the government policy.	Yes
1369364	Meredith Woods	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is becoming increasingly urgent and any new vehicles will still be driving around producing emissions for many years to come.	No

1369366	Sophie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to get enormous, petrol-guzzling, carbon-emitting, dangerous cars off our streets, and stop Australia being a dumping ground for these inefficient vehicles.	No
1369371	Roger Stamford	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have been lagging the rest of the world for too long. Time for us to lean in and catch up.	Yes
1369378	Bailey Morris	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Enthusiasts require vehicles with higher fuel consumption levels to not only enjoy (such as ICE performance vehicles) but also larger 4x4's with higher towing capacities and longer ranges. Proposing new vehicle fuel efficiency laws will see the end of many of these models, killing Australian local tourism and the 4x4 industry, the longer this can be delayed the better for all enthusiasts, all of whom these laws will have a dire effect on, given how many of our lives are dedicated to vehicles and the automotive industry. New laws encouraging manufacturers to introduce more efficient vehicles for those who want them, while allowing manufacturers to continue selling enthusiast aimed vehicles should they wish would be the best option, providing a larger car market and more consumer options, keeping everyone happy	No
1369387	Naomi Mawson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1369389	Chris Jones	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C results in the fastest improvement in new vehicle efficiency with minimal extra cost. B is fine so long as you bring the start date forward 6 months or 1 year..	NULL
1369390	Rohan Byrnes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I'd personally prefer if full Diesel and Petrol vehicles can be banned or pay a premium import tax based on their Carbon footprint (Pollution Carbon Index-PCI) for all non-compliant vehicles. I personally think that all vehicles now entering Australia ought to be Hybrid vehicles which may also be Diesel-Hybrids. Some exemptions can apply for Mining equipment and Trucks and Building Site and Plant equipment. I believe the Commonwealth needs to explore and encourage the potential of minimising all high pollution vehicles moving towards 2030 and 2050.	Yes
1369392	Jason	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The upfront cost is worth the long term benefits. I chose the fastest option particularly because of the immediate public health benefits, alongside the rapid reduction	Yes
1369396	Tom Hodgins	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1369400	Rob Hills	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We needed affordable EVs a decade ago so now have to go for the quickest possible option	No
1369401	Romi K	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has been a dumping ground for far too long so now we need to act as quickly and decisively as possible. If manufacturers are able to supply to other countries, there is no reason why Australia should have to wait. I also think some consideration should be given to credits for vehicles that are converted from ICE to full BEV. Electrification of Heavy Transport also needs to be considered, especially the conversion of existing trucks such as is done by Janus based in Newcastle NSW. In fact, this would be a great technology for the Australian Government to support through swap stations along popular routes. I have no connection with this company but can see its merits and the possibility for Australia to export this unique solution.	Yes
1369402	Rose Grant	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The cost- benefit ratio of options B and C are twice those of option . Furthermore, option C has a stated net benefit almost a thousand times greater than option A. So despite the additional cost, option C is the better investment. Apart from economics, sometimes you just have to do the right thing.	Yes
1369412	Ross Lanyon	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 0th	NULL	Yes
1369428	Simon Dunn	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has abundant renewable energy and can easily achieve a more rapid transition.	No

1369431	Karon Lekeu	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is lagging behind the world and needs to fast track vehicle efficiency standards	Yes
1369464	A Taylor	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are decades behind emission reuction targets and we are the highest polluting, per capita, advanced country in the world, due to government inaction. Now we need to compensate for our failures to regulate unjustified vehicles and fuel consumption.	No
1369481	Brett Tobin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I selected option B as my preferred choice as this option has the best Benefits to Cost ratio and gives car manufacturers sufficient time to meet the fuel efficiency standard. The legacy fossil fuel car manufacturers need to be incentivized to do the right thing by the planet as unfortunately there are too many car manufacturers who seem to prefer the Business as Usual approach. As a society we shouldn't be continuing to pollute the planet and change the climate just because it's been done like that for over a century. People that don't accept that climate change is real are just like Ostriches with their heads in a hole. Climate change due to manmade emissions is an established scientific fact which is continually being denied by the fossil fuel lobby and the far right politicians that appear to support them. I have developed my views over my 4 decade career as an electrical engineer in which I spent significant time working in the fossil fuel industry and have seen with my own eyes the pollution and emissions of that industry. I have spent a large part of our lifetime savings on 2 electric cars for my wife and I and installing a large solar power system and a battery on my house in order to significantly reduce our emissions for the last decades of our lives. I implore those that can afford to do the same thing to do it now as the Australian Government needs as much help as it can get to reach Net Zero by 2050. The excess power from our household solar system is used in a Tesla Virtual Power Plant and is helping to stabilize the operation of the electricity grid as the transition to renewables occurs.	Yes
1369492	Ryan Jobse	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Power Infrastructure isnt ready for EVs and will take time to improve. Even America's EV charger infrastructure doesnt currently keep up. No point pushing for EVs when we are shutting down powerstations, making our grids ability to handle the demand even worse.	No
1369501	Liz Harris	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The need to reduce emissions from our transport sector is urgent and has been left for too long. The benefits of cleaner air to breathe and reduced fuel bills will mean that everyday people benefit.	Yes
1369507	Andrew Scott	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Need to act with maximum urgency and maximum scale of effort.	No
1369511	Michael Golden	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Drastic action is required to address climate change.	NULL
1369520	Adam Budd	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The most pressing issue of the future is climte change. The costs of option C are relatively small and the gains are huge for the people of Australia if we can transition away from fossil fuels as much as possible. I don't think petrol and diesel vehicles should be banned in Australia but there needs to be choices and incentives so that most vehicles can be non fossil fuel powered.	Yes
1369524	Jo Swanson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Most efficient	No
1369571	Mark R	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are too far behind. We need to work faster to catchup on lost ground.	No
1369574	Oliver Jarman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Need to reverse the damage caused by carbon emissions on the planet ASAP. Won't be mad if you go for option B but option C is better and history will remember us fondly for it.	Yes
1369578	Adrian Cowan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Avoiding emissions from new cars is one of the easiest paths to accelerating or emissions reductions. By meeting and better exceeding the targets set by the majority of other markets we not only avoid being the dumping ground for cheap low efficiency cars but also push the global market further towards decarbonisation.	NULL
1369586	Stan Baker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to get to net zero carbon asap	Yes

1369588	David Hoadley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The transition to zero emissions (economy-wide) in this country has been delayed so long by vested interests, that maximum possible transition speed now is actually a minimum requirement. Nothing less than the most stringent standards will do.	NULL
1369598	Deborah Best	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to move quickly to introduce vehicle efficiency standards but should try and bring the community on the journey which is more likely to happen with option B	Yes
1369604	Diana Combe	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The benefits to the health of people, the environment, and the planet, by the fastest possible transition to the best fuel standards are overwhelming. there has been so much delay already, we can't afford any delay now. As a country we can afford to do this properly and to do it now. We owe this to our children, on whose behalf we've been very neglectful in letting the world get to where it is at the moment.	No
1369607	Angela Michaelis	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The slow start due to previous government inaction calls for an accelerated response to catch Australia up to the rest of the world. The call for transition to cleaner fleets sooner avoids the incentive for importers to dump older	Yes
1369610	Chris Durrell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must rapidly reduce our ever-increasing transport sector carbon emissions. Option C offers significantly greater \$ and community benefits across each key measure area for a relatively modest cost difference compared to Option B (net benefit Option C over B is approx \$31b for a cost difference of approx \$12b). Please be brave and implement Option C.	No
1369612	Jennifer Nei-Smith	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia urgently needs to reduce our transport emissions if we are to stabilise our climate. Option C does this the fastest.	Yes
1369624	Dr Lucas Webb	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	My understanding of the scientific consensus is that the fastest achievable transition away from fossil fuels will reduce the potential future impact of CO2 emissions. With cost benefit ratio similar to B, Option C is best for climate whilst still providing a very impressive expected benefit albeit for a larger input. Bold policy is required and will be rewarded, plus there will be additional benefits in other areas concurrently benefiting from investment in the energy transition.	Yes
1369628	Ilya Mandel	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Starting to move now toward a more environmentally friendly future is critical and cannot be delayed; at the same time, a pragmatic choice that mitigates extreme up-front costs is desirable.	Yes
1369639	Ian Neil-Smith	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The risk of a bad climate outcome predicates maximum action now.	Yes
1369665	Marcia Timmers-Leitch	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I am in favour on moving on new fuel efficiency standards quickly and with gusto. Australia needs to take responsibility for their transport emissions and cannot become a dumping ground for the cars that cannot be sold in other jurisdictions	Yes
1369668	Ulrik Egede	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Getting as strong a fuel emission standard in place as is achievable.	Yes
1369693	Tim Maguire	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reducing pollution as quickly as possible will stop more people dying from vehicle related pollution and will help maintain our precious natural world for a little longer. Only Option C does this and we need to resist the calls from lazy incumbents who want to continue selling us their crappiest products that don't meet any standards, pollute more and use more fuel for no good reason.	No
1370174	frank	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	CO2 reduction has been delayed 30 years. Now must be proactive rather than appease.	No
1370303	Joe	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	The NVES should set emission targets and a timeframe that reflect the urgency and scale of the climate change challenge. 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, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, multiplying 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. Option C and B have the same initial target in 2025, which gives car companies a year to prepare for the stricter targets under option C (which kick in from 2026 onwards). Two years is sufficient time to adjust their supply, given the number of ZEVs already on the market and the many more under development. Delaying the transition to ZEVs will not bring any significant advantage. If there is a short period where a number of the most	NULL

			polluting vehicles in Australia increase in price due to penalties under Option C, that can be managed through car companies buying credits from ZEV car makers, further subsidising their price, and encouraging the overall shift. Option A is inadequate and ineffective. It will maintain the status quo and lock Australians into polluting, old cars for longer. 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 Government should consider lowering the breakpoint for heavy vehicles, or eliminating the weight based adjustment altogether, to encourage the purchase of smaller, lighter vehicles. The EU has a penalty of \$197 per g/km (AUD equivalent) for exceeding the target. Australia should match or surpass that penalty to ensure that car makers comply with the targets and supply more ZEVs to Australia. A low penalty will not induce any change. The Government should also implement real-world testing of vehicle emissions to prevent manufacturers from misleading with their laboratory testing, as they have done in the past.	
1370408	Emily Rowe	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to catch up with the rest of the world as fast as possible. The climate is depending upon it.	NULL
1370411	William Rowe	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It has taken Australia so long to get to the point of having a Vehicle Efficiency Standard. We need to be moving away from polluting vehicles as fast as possible.	NULL
1370474	Anne McLean	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Having read the impact statement and weighing up the options Australia can strive for better outcomes than just the status quo of countries such as US. Evidence of best outcomes from Norway lead the way and prove their approach has worked.	Yes
1370475	Nils Dreyer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1370476	Andrew Foster	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370478	Steve Geddis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370479	Patsy McKee	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370480	Gavin Nicholson	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370487	Julie Smith	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need the fastest and farthest reaching response possible as the climate crisis is extremely urgent.	NULL
1370488	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370490	Andrew	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	the sooner the world cuts down on emissions the better the world will be for future generations	No
1370491	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	No
1370493	Darren Cook	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The environmental pollution needs addressing ASAP	No

1370495	Warren Massey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Better for the environment	Yes
1370497	Justin Wright	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370500	Michael Hunter	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Better for everybody overall, as soon as possible.	NULL
1370506	Dan Morgan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It Option C will quickly put Australia on track to beat the pollution targets in Europe and the US and still save driverrrs money.s money.	No
1370508	Veit Bader	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370511	Jonathan Kear	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370518	Ovidiu	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370519	Renato Toffanin	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Health benefits matter	No
1370520	Ivica	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Hope	No
1370522	Betty Abadía	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Speed is of the essence; nothing else is really an option.	No
1370523	Piedad Navarro	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370526	Anders	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1370527	Mark walker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370528	Anna Lejfelt-Sahlén	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1370529	Charlotte R	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate emergency and fast tracking something like this will ensure we reach CO2 targets as soon as possible	No
1370531	Ute Katschthaler	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1370534	Nicholas Forde	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1370536	Vishal	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1370537	Beverley Taperell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is late in the emissions to be still prevaricating. There is only one choice, Option C	No
1370539	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370540	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370543	Caroline Newton	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370544	Paul Korczak-Krzeczowski	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We don't need new high polluting cars to be sold in Australia. The best, clean energy cars are needed asap.	No
1370549	Lena Sjöberg	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Faster is BETTER! It is time to quickly put Australia on track to beat the pollution targets in Europe and the US.	No
1370550	Rachel	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370552	Hyren	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	Quicker transition	No
1370554	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370557	Jordan Curran	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	NULL	Yes
1370559	Matthew Lumley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370567	Jim Beaney	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370568	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370575	Robert Kelly	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because Australia needs to catch up with the rest of the world on carbon emissions.	Yes

1370576	John	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370577	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do all we can to catch up to the rest of the world. Our climate response is embarrassing and puts out future at risk.	Yes
1370579	Joe McClure	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370580	Paul Young	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370587	Derek Bodey	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	This is the only option that helps safeguard my grandchildren's future	No
1370593	Patrick O'Callaghan MBE	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1370595	M. Porter	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1370599	John Catsoulis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change can't be ignored, and action is not optional	No
1370601	David MacKay	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are falling further behind the reduction trajectory to avoid 2°C warming. Cost benefit of option C is obviously superior, as the cost of avoidance is always lower than the cost of rectification and adaptation after the event. All corporations and engineers know this and operate their businesses on this principle. And so should government, in the interests of its \shareholders\, the Australian people and their children and grandchildren.	No
1370609	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370612	david james	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	mathematics stack up	No
1370622	Rob Blair	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Option C is only option that makes sense!	No
1370624	Lee sowter	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370625	Marttiina Rantala	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370628	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370630	Nikoli Radoš	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1370635	Troy Dawson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1370636	Kate Hegarty	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C drives unavoidable change which can't be dodged, getting us closer to where we must be.	No
1370637	Tilly Evershed	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The world needs reduced emissions as soon as possible.	NULL
1370638	Michelle Clarke	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reduce emmissions quicker	NULL
1370641	Ross	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370643	Ellie McGuire	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370644	John	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Save the planet	No
1370646	Jon	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C provides highest net benefit in long term from an ethical, environmental, health, and economic standpoint. Planning for long term is most important. Option B is clearly 2nd choice and Option C is barely worth consideration. I strongly urge you to adopt Option C asap.	No
1370650	D FitzGerald	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is an existential threat to our species.	No
1370651	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370654	Lizzie Gent	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370655	Dean Wharton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370656	Alexandros Chatzis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1370657	A Pemberton	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Clear cost benefit	No
1370659	Ryan Oostrick	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Why do you even need to ask this? Get on with governing already	No
1370662	André Faria	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL

1370663	Rhidian Harrington	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It would match similar standards overseas and accelerate dealing with climate change	Yes
1370664	David Liebhold	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is no time to lose	Yes
1370669	David Mills	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1370673	Ben Both	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Do it fast!	Yes
1370679	Michelle Fern	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is behind all industrialised countries and needs to become a good world environmental citizen. This is one small step in the right direction.	No
1370680	Wes Kilham	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Long overdue	No
1370683	Milan Kanuritch	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To save the Planet	No
1370684	Leslie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate factor	No
1370686	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cars account for 45.1 percent of emissions. Cutting them quickly will help get to zero emissions earlier.	No
1370687	Caroline Cass	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370688	John Gorrie	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	We are way behind the rest of the western world and some third world countries. We need to catch up quickly.	NULL
1370690	Shane McMinn	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370691	Herbert Gantschacher	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Save Climate and Nature! There is not Plan(et) B.! see below also further informations.	No
1370693	Tabby	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are cooking our planet and therefore ourselves, it must stop.	NULL
1370695	Anderson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The quicker, the better, the world needs action now!	No
1370697	Asphodel Denning	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL

1370698	Jo	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Our world is dying and I have cherished Grandsons	No
1370700	clement	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370705	Gary Bryson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370707	Viktor Vajda	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1370708	Rachel Gregg	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	More money into saving our planet and less money into supporting genocide.	No
1370709	Laura Raison	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate Emergency	No
1370710	Sue	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This should have been implemented years ago - let's just get this done	No
1370711	Anth mckenzie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to sop pollution and tackle climate change	No
1370712	Nicholin Wagner Quackenbush	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fast action is the only one that will save our planet. We are past the tipping point now.	No
1370720	Annie Delaney	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C provides the cleanest outcome and the most benefits	No
1370721	Greg Jones	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As seen by the weather conditions so far this year, we have a desperate need to move to more climate-friendly vehicles. We cannot be held back by costs as the future costs will far outweigh the costs of doing things quickly now	No
1370722	Mittendorfer Peter	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370723	Michael Sinden	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's the best plan with the best outcomes environmentally.	Yes
1370724	Berten vanhee	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	A healthy planet	No
1370729	robert	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	speed	No
1370731	Lynette Pyer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must lower emissions instantly to save the planet.	No

1370732	Cllr Dr Christopher A Birt	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is really urgent to reduce GHGEs asap, certainly within the next decade.	No
1370733	Jan-Helge Larsen	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	To stop climate change	No
1370735	Darren Lawrence	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	It is the most effective option	No
1370739	Hannah	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	A swift transition to a less polluting society and economy is the only way to ensure future economic stability and the only responsible approach given the climate crisis.	NULL
1370741	Isabella Cardona	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	it will reduce pollution from vehicles.	No
1370742	Richard	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Save the planet	NULL
1370746	Jane Collier	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370747	Rita Whinfield	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Benefits to the Planet and people	No
1370752	Baker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370753	Kim Riddle	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Conservationist	No
1370754	Paul	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1370755	Jeremy Wright AM	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce emissions ASAP	No
1370758	Mike Benson	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	We're in a climate emergency	NULL
1370759	Alex Chapman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have no time to lose!	NULL
1370761	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370765	Matt Baker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The Climate Crisis is an urgent and existential risk that requires the fastest possible response from everyone.	No

1370766	Robert Schroeder	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	To save the planet and life theron	No
1370767	NULL	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	Yes
1370769	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	The world can't wait	No
1370777	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Need to urgently catch up with the rest of the world and prevent all the cars that fail the test overseas from being imported into Australia for us to buy	Yes
1370780	Todd Levi	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Air quality. Greenhouse gasses. The sooner, the healthier.	No
1370787	Anthony Foy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reducing emissions is urgent	Yes
1370789	Patrick Martin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's what i believe	Yes
1370790	Tim Walker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370798	Luca Bersanetti	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370799	Ian Dance	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is absolutely obvious that Australia must do everything possible to reduce greenhouse emissions. The climate tipping points are getting much closer. Electrification of transport is a vital component of this effort. Australia needs to be part of this industrial revolution. We need to understand that acceptance of the higher costs of option C now will avoid even higher future costs (dealing with climate disasters, health costs, lost opportunity costs).	No
1370801	Philippe Ducros	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370802	Helen Huszar-Welton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We don't have time to waste. Urgency is imperative.	No
1370804	eric voorhies	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	best plan	No
1370806	Jon Graham	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want to see Australia transition away from fossil fuels as quickly as possible.	NULL
1370807	Phil Woodhall	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Seems like the best option.	No
1370808	JD King	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The world is on fire why delay, if the environment is not going to survive?	No

1370811	Dr. Helmut Pflieger	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370812	Lara Caruso	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370813	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Because radical action is required	No
1370814	Christophe Vincent	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	it's much more planet-friendly	No
1370815	DOUGLAS	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have a lot of catching up to do: Option C must be the way to go.	No
1370817	Peter Cauwenberghs	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370818	Federico	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	CO2 emissions are continuously rising and it is important to reduce the emissions as soon as possible	No
1370820	ALDO CARLO SACHERO	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NON ABBIAMO PIU' TEMPO	Yes
1370821	Christopher Garner	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to clean the air or future generations will not survive	No
1370822	Graham Klerks	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370823	NULL	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370824	Eric	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The world needs to address the climate catastrophe quickly	No
1370825	Pam Wood	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Put the pedal to the metal and deliver Option C it's the fastest plan for driving down emissions. It limits on car pollution efficiently & cost effectively for the public. It's an ambitious but eminently workable plan that doesn't include loopholes for carmakers like Toyota to keep selling polluting petrol vehicles forever. A Cleaner world demands cleaner, cheaper cars. It will save drivers money and reduce pollution from vehicles. B will keep the government stuck in the slow lane unacceptable!	No
1370830	Luciel Morgenstern	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I feel this has to be done as fast possible. Anything but C is too slow in my opinion. Thank you.	No
1370831	Peter Mac	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1370832	Rachel Edwardes	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	We cannot delay	No

1370835	Nizza Siano	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's the fastest plan to drive down emissions.	No
1370839	Lorenzo Giglio	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	there's little time to save the world from pollution, it's good to see the department working hard!	No
1370843	David March	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Stop wasting more time	No
1370844	Andrew Nisbet	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370849	Katie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I care about the environment	Yes
1370850	Glenn Sanders	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Stop mucking around	No
1370851	Chris Evans	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a desperate position with climate change and habitat and species loss, only option C is ethical.	No
1370852	Julia Cook	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	C is the option that will benefit people and the planet more quickly and is most cost effective.	No
1370853	TERENCE DOYLE	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I WANT TO LIVE.	No
1370854	Mark Jones	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	No
1370855	Philip Lee	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Global warming started in 1698 since then CO2 has risen faster and faster every year. We have the knowledge and the means to firs stop it rising. Then we need time for nature to reverse it. Don't let a few rich people get richer by stealing every living things future. Remember rich or poor extinct is still extinct.	No
1370857	Merv Renton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to move on this as fast as possible and extra costs will be offset by the benefits	Yes
1370858	Kathy Mansfield	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We all must do our very best for our grandchildren!	Yes
1370865	Tony Simpson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Greater benefits	No
1370866	Petteri Ylikotila	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To keep our common planet earth sustainable for humans	No
1370868	paul crooke	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Save the planet	NULL

1370869	Robyn McLachlan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have to do everything possible to ameliorate climate change.	No
1370870	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1370871	Burnett Kann	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must do everything we can to bring down carbon emissions to address the pending disaster of climate change. we are experiencing the effects of global climate change, and it is frightening.	Yes
1370876	Linda Spence	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Urgency to reduce CO2 is required.	NULL
1370877	Peter	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	No Planet B!	No
1370881	ileano cerroni	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370884	Jessica Wilson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is no time to lose. Australia is already so far behind. We need commitment to change.	No
1370885	Vit Masare	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We can not afford to be slow in implementing safety measures fac to face the climate crisis.	NULL
1370887	Sylvia Litvack	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	No time to waste.	No
1370891	NULL	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	We need to get our act together ASAP!	No
1370892	Cameron mcIndoe	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to transition to renewable energy in every field, but in particular transport, asap	No
1370895	BRUCE	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370897	francesc	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	no time to waste - already PAST 1,5C warming	No
1370898	Andrew Fellows	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are already experiencing life and livelihood events due to global warming caused by increased release of carbon from burning fossil fuel,	No
1370900	Mathilde Graf	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370904	Dr Holliman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have one chance at this. If we get it right, we all have time to earn more money. If we get it wrong, we will be paying far far more in disaster response and firefighting, literally and metaphorically. There is data missing in this costing. You have not costed the disaster management funding which will be required if transitioning more slowly.	No

1370906	Bonnie Arbuckle	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
1370908	Pat	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There's no time to waste	NULL
1370909	Nick Carmichael	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370911	Dave Abbott	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There's a bloody climate emergency and Australia's lagging woefully behind!!	No
1370912	Milojka Vidmar	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1370917	Kirsty	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The whole planet is in a state of emergency. It is long overdue to act fast	No
1370919	Mark James Fraser	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cleaner air	No
1370920	Lynette Ryan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Our planet is in trouble, we don't have time for a slow transition anymore	No
1370921	Simon Braxton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we must act as swiftly as we can to improve our environment despite the short-term financial cost	No
1370928	Tomek Gorka	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we are far behind .. these standards should have been implemented years ago .. i only drive EU cars as they have better fuel efficiency	Yes
1370929	Neil Armstrong	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Best for public & cost benefits	No
1370930	Rebecca	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	Yes
1370932	Anne Dowling	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The sooner the better for the sake of our planet, for our country, for our communities. Change is needed now.	No
1370933	Susan Lupson	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370934	Carlos André Viana	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370937	Susan Loomis	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1370938	Rick Mason	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do everything to reduce carbon emissions asap. Look at the Floods, fires storms, loss of life and property. It also costs Billions to manage so lets spend money to make things better.	No
1370941	Katy O'Brien	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have fallen behind the rest of the world with our high car emissions. We should be taking the best option rather than appeasement.	No
1370945	Julian	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The sooner we transition to clean vehicles the better for everyone	No
1370946	Wolfgang Baumann	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370948	Stephanie Brancaforte	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1370949	James Brown	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	A and B too slow, option C has biggest benefit	No
1370951	Simon Stroud	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act now, not later.	No
1370954	Alison Cameron	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370956	Merrin	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370957	George Nelis	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Actually, we do not have another choice.	No
1370958	Simon Cook	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	C provides the greatest net benefits	No
1370959	paul cullerton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	seems the sensible middle ground	Yes
1370960	Wayne Teel	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need this in the US. Having Australia do it will help pressure our reluctant politicians to do the same. It is time for countries to set a good example and lead.	No
1370961	Robin Sykes	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Environment	No
1370964	Marian Haire	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	While option C will cost more it will deliver much better outcomes for the community and the planet. Lets show we are serious about fixing this problem.	No
1370967	Heidi	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Long overdue. Let's give positive programs the sense of urgency they deserve. We need to outrun all the negative urgencies that rob us of creating a brilliant future.	No

1370969	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1370970	Anna Fletcher	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I choose option C as my favoured way forward. It's perhaps the hardest choice but will be the most beneficial for the earth and for population health. It requires thrashing the nettle of change which is difficult and people fight against - but it is the wisest choice. Option B is my second choice and is very acceptable but it takes longer which is less good for pollution, CO2 and health of the population. As the change is slower it will popular though. Option A totally lacks ambition - no!	No
1370974	Martin Herzog	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	No time left	No
1370975	Sofia	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1370977	Kathleen Carlisle	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to get on board with the rest of the world with fuel standards. Russia and AUSTRALIA are the only laggards! That's disgraceful! We need to catch up. Thousands of Australians die each year unnecessarily because of pollution caused by fossil fuels in cars! The cost to the health system caused by this pollution is enormous and preventable. The fossil fuel industry and car manufacturers, particularly Toyota are way too powerful and have too much sway as lobbyists over politicians.	No
1370979	How Keith	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	May be too late	No
1370983	David	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	For the sake of a relatively small greater investment, the net benefits are greater, and address the issues immediately. That is precisely what is needed.	No
1370984	Jon Beresford	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate emergency, we have the proven technology, we cannot wait. I have had an EV for over 8 years, there are no excuses for the fastest transition.	No
1370985	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1370992	Georges Coomans	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1370996	Paul Harris	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need ACTION as quickly as possible!	No
1371000	Eli Sky	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To kick start our reduction from Carbon emissions from vehicles asap	No
1371005	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371007	Aaron Mason	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1371009	Professor Emeritus Robin Attfield	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Mitigating greenhouse emissions is the biggest global challenge, and requires urgent action. In addition, there is also an urgent need to cut air pollution, which is damaging the health of large numbers of people in all the world's cities and along most of the world's highways.	No
1371012	Pat Quinn	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	One Planet, One chance	No

1371013	Simone	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371016	Anita Hansen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I think we need rapid action	No
1371020	James Wright	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This is an emergency situation. Delay is not an option	No
1371021	William Watts	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The environment is important and we must protect it as quickly as we can.	No
1371027	Shenae	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371028	Karina kjeldsen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371037	John Bryant	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must transition out of fossil fuels as fast as possible	No
1371038	Colin Campey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Global warming is an urgent issue	No
1371040	Mark Brown	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To become more eco friendly.	No
1371044	Chris	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371046	Wendy Orams	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate emergency and the government needs to invest in the most effective strategy to reduce our emissions and transition Australia to a sustainable way of living.	No
1371047	Judith Sluglett	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is a climate emergency	No
1371050	Peter Moylan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We've already delayed too long, and need to catch up with the world.	No
1371051	Bob Bell	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	The money saved in the Option C will justify it's use	No
1371052	Jon Temby	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This is serious. Speed is needed	NULL
1371056	Dr. Robert Brooks	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	What's best for the planet.	NULL

1371057	Anna Maria Busuttil	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Cost effective and cleaner environment	NULL
1371058	Ron Deane	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to accelerate the reduction in pollution, not only for cars but also for trucks	No
1371060	James Wyatt	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have waited far too long for these Vehicle Efficiency Standards. We should aim to receive the benefits as soon as possible.	No
1371064	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Fastest transition to get us in line with the rest of the world	No
1371067	John Toubourou	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C will drive down vehicle emissions quickly.	No
1371069	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371071	Bruce McQueen	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Australia is lagging so far behind other developed nations on this matter that we now MUST take the FASTEST way to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions from transport - that is, Option C.	No
1371073	David Everett	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to get on with the transition, quickly	No
1371074	Muhammad	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	For a first world country, we are lagging far behind the rest of the developed world in car technology. And given how much we rely on personal transportation to get around, I believe the quicker we rely more on locally produced solar to charge our cars, the better, as opposed to relying on imported fuel, supply and cost of which has no certainty.	Yes
1371075	Steve Whitaker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 0th	Emissions are a global problem and Australia needs to show leadership in making the most helpful choice	No
1371080	Tiziana	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371081	Ken Watson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It should be treated as an emergency.	No
1371082	Richard Williams	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Stop screwing around and get the job done. Climate change is the most important challenge facing humanity and the planet	Yes
1371084	David Schwartz	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The best time to start this work was 20 years ago. We're out of time for gradual changes. Option B will help but it is inadequate.	Yes
1371085	Gene Pierre	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	In order for Australia to lead the way for countries with respect and responsibility towards the environment!;	Yes
1371088	Vivien Smith	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C has the highest net dollar benefit so I put it first. Option A is the cheapest, but has the lowest net dollar benefit so I put it last	No

1371089	Jennifer	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	No planet B	Yes
1371093	Birgit Gunzl	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Can't go fast enough. You know the old argument of money not tasting particularly fancy...	No
1371097	Paris Kirby	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Lead the world by example	No
1371106	Brian Davies	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe that option C will be cheaper for road users in the long run.	NULL
1371109	David Roe	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because various governments have delayed tackling climate change for so many years we are forced to take maximum action now. Had governments acted earlier the weaker options may have sufficed, but now the more expensive, most effective option is our only choice.	NULL
1371110	Karen Sanchez	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Greater benefits	No
1371111	Fergus Dowding	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Slow down climate change	No
1371112	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Australia is unique in the world based on our relatively small population but vast expanses of arid, semi arid and dry country side. We do not have the development, infrastructure or population to support a rapid move to electric cars or other green technologies which are yet to be developed. We do not have the public transport systems in Australia, especially rural & remote communities to support a rapid transition away from petrol and diesel cars and trucks.	No
1371114	Jim Ross	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371118	Bert	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371119	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371120	Donna Coleman	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	To assist with saving the world	No
1371121	David Kissam	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371122	Ian Edmondstone	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to move quickly away from our high fuel and high polluting vehicles and provide the best return via option C to consumers.	No
1371123	Johanna Grey	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371125	Bev Cowan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Emissions need to come down fast. Talk to climate scientists. What is wrong with you people. We have no hope if we are going to try to mitigate the worst of climate impacts if you just operate off surveys. Like doing a survey on the genocide in Gaza - just warped and sick. We need leadership to do the right thing, inform people and bring them along, not cater to the lowest common denominator	No

1371128	Susan von Schmacht	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371129	SJ Cooke	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371130	M B Andison	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to do something quickly. Their environmental policies are deplorable.	No
1371131	Kyle Opie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371132	Iranpour	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371137	Helena	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I am very conscious of what we must do for our planet and now is not the time to hold back on tough choices and tough actions. This is an emergency and must be treated as such.	No
1371140	Stevenson Graham	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The current cost seems high but the long term cost is inestimable and since many lives depend on this being done quickly it's a necessity like war ... win whatever the cost.	No
1371143	Nessy Allen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371147	Dr. Jon T Hoeft	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371148	Geoffrey John Cranwell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	FOR THE SAKE OF THE EARTH THE SOONER EVERY CHANCE TO CUT POLLUTION FAST IS ESSENTIAL.	No
1371150	Michael Begg	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371152	Mike Greenaway	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	the planet is dying. We need to do everything we can prevent it ... regardless of the cost	No
1371153	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371155	Susi Westwood	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To reduce carbon emissions as quickly as possible, before there is no going back.	No
1371156	David Athron	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371157	Tom Whyte	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1371159	Loki Carbis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I do not think that this is a matter that we can afford to take our time with - we must act as soon as possible	No
1371160	Richard	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The globe has broken it's 1.5 degree limit. There is next to no time if irreversible climate change is to be avoided.	No
1371161	Marcus O'Higgins	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371164	Peter Chandler	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is the only option that makes new vehicles the most fuel effective,therefore reducing emissions	No
1371165	david myer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The problem needs urgent attention	No
1371166	Patrick Tracy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate catastrophe is bad for business!	No
1371167	Donny MacKay	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I have kids in my life. Climate change is my number 1 priority	No
1371168	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The most beneficial as quickly as possible	No
1371178	Laura Tilton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371179	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371180	Mattias Cocco	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371183	Holly Buckingham	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371184	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371187	Sean	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is the obvious and best choice for our future generations	No
1371190	Christopher Wildon	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The fastest way	No
1371196	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1371197	Henrik Harding	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371204	Astri Skarveland	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The fasted transition is the best	NULL
1371205	Hilton Bennie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C provides the greatest financial and health benefits to people as well as the environment, and the BCR is only marginally lower than Option B. On the other hand, Option A should not even be considered as it puts Australia far behind the rest of the developed world and offers the lowest overall benefits as well as the lowest BCR, so it does not make economic sense.	Yes
1371206	Zoe Morgan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Important to tackle climate change as soon as possible.	No
1371207	Linda Lock	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	It is imperative that we move on protecting our environment and do whatever it takes. We need to prioritise our planet and not profits/corporations/car building industry.	NULL
1371210	Alison Jones	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371211	Dominique Matintika	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	For a most Just transition	NULL
1371212	Wendy Delaney	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371213	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371214	Hannah Negri	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Wanting to reduce Carbon emissions quicker	NULL
1371215	Catherine McMahon	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate emergency	Yes
1371220	Paul Martin Edwards	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371222	Jonathan Toye	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371224	Chris Davies. A sometime visitor to Australia and an admirer of its people and it's natural wonders.	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371225	Pawe Walewski	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	to save the world from a climate catastrophe	NULL
1371231	Nick Handley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Form having paid attention to climate scientists, and trusting in their expertise, I understand that the strongest climate action possible is required immediately.	No

1371232	Holly Shrestha	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is a climate emergency. Please show the rest of the world the way forward.	No
1371233	Chris Lawe Davies	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Enough delay already.	No
1371234	Andreas Hemming	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want a greener world	Yes
1371235	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371236	Ionut	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1371237	Sylvia Schrock	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1371238	Elizabeth Ann Thurbon	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to catch up with the rest of the world on vehicle emissions so we are not a dumping ground for rubbish other countries won't take.	No
1371241	Monika Doepgen	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371243	Ross Thompson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is becoming increasingly serious and we need urgent steps to address this.	No
1371245	Mary MacNamara	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371246	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Let's get started and save more	No
1371249	Mark Lohmann	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371250	Nicolas de Jong	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371253	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371255	Ronald Maenhout	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should opt for the fastest transition	No
1371260	James Gallacher	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1371265	Philip	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	The planet is warming at an ever increasing rate & there is no Plan B	No
1371266	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce pollution!	No
1371267	Léon van Heijkamp	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fast	Yes
1371268	Denise Davies	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	It is the best option to meet the laid out targets for CO2	No
1371269	Roe Sybylla	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Better for fuel savings, health, greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle maintenance costs.	No
1371270	Talia Hoysted	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because we need to reduce our emissions ASAP considering the current climate emergency.	No
1371276	Ellen	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371277	Liam	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Leave us to do what the people want. We will not submit to your climate hoax crap.	No
1371279	Charles Lowe	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The monetary dfference between B & C is fuck all. The benefits far outweigh the additinal cost.	No
1371280	Mary Robertson	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371286	geoffery lang	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	its the only option that will do anything to reduce pollution and return air health to humans	No
1371287	Jane Morgan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change and human health	NULL
1371289	J van der Kolk	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	urgency	No
1371293	Jeneane Wright	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B avoids excessive credits and loopholes, and it properly designates SUVs as 'passenger vehicles' to ensure they become more efficient over time.	Yes
1371294	Ekaterina	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1371297	mar	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	for the climate	No

1371300	Samo Lapajne	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371301	Martin Thrower	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Appears to offer major benefits while still being flexible	Yes
1371303	Andrew Miller	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371304	Bruce McKelvie	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371309	Peter	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 1st	global crisis	No
1371314	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371315	Richard Harris	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Best protection for the environment and human/animal health.	No
1371318	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To try to slow down emissions	No
1371319	Rik Drabs	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate change.	No
1371320	Julie Smith	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371322	Susan Pipe	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Greener option	No
1371323	Richard Zwama	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371324	Bretton Little	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. It will drive down vehicle emissions quickly and save drivers money.	Yes
1371332	Peter	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	For yours, mine, everyones future, we need to be doing absolutely EVERYTHING we can to comprehensively address the CLIMATE CRISIS.	No
1371333	Heather	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Need to do the most quickly	No
1371334	Geoff Garside	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1371337	Jane	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate emergency and ever measure that drives change must be adopted. The industry has too much power and we need our government to act in the public interest.	No
1371340	Mikey Bacchus	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1371343	PAM ROSLING	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	A QUICK TRANSITION LIKE OPTION C WILL SAVE DRIVERS A LOT OF MONEY AND GREATLY REDUCE POLLUTION FROM VEHICLES AND RESULTING DAMAGE TO THE ENVIRONMENT & CLIMATE	No
1371344	Robert Brinkman	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371347	Nick Walker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Respond fast to global warming.	No
1371348	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are already. so far behind	Yes
1371351	Robert Dawlings	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	What is most important at the moment is maximum abatement. At 26% higher cost than option C, the extra cost is well worth the spend	NULL
1371352	Jon Rodman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need more action on reducing our carbon footprint, now.	No
1371355	Reynir Gannt	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371356	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371357	Daniel O'Sullivan	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	Just do. Sick of being beholden to energy companies profiteering, tax-avoidance, and lobbying that has held Australia back and continues to influence public policy at our expense	No
1371358	Liz Steele	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has been lagging in cutting emissions. We need to start bending the emission curve to avoid overstepping the planetary boundries	No
1371359	Gaynor McGrath	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I have grandchildren and I want climate action to save their lives	No
1371360	Luke	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change	Yes
1371362	David Jenkins	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371363	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Urgency	No

1371364	Victorino Díaz Fernández	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371365	Kim Dahl	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371366	Christina Henry	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The government is already dragging its feet in getting out of fossil fuels and option C would show some leadership and concrete action in reducing fossil fuel use quickly as an off set to all the new mines. It would also accelerate a sustainable electric future for Australia. I have just experienced the most debilitating summer in Northern NSW with really high temperatures and humidity. We seem to have gone from living in a subtropical area to a tropical area - climate change is happening!	NULL
1371367	Lou Taylor	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Vehicle emissions are enormous. The government has lagged behind on climate solutions for too long. We need to act like it's an emergency because it is.	Yes
1371368	Dennis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to move fast to reduce climate damage	No
1371372	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1371373	MJ House	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to transition as quickly as possible	No
1371375	Emil Jervin	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371376	Kerry OMeara	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371380	Sandra Haynes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	To make a cleaner environment as easy as possible without to much disruption.	Yes
1371384	tony wilson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	rapid effect is essential	No
1371385	Mike Lundberg	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This is an urgent situation that demands urgent action.	Yes
1371387	Margit Sørensen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must take action today, tomorrow might be too late	No
1371389	Olivier Hespel	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371390	Ginny helsen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371395	Hari Ho	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1371396	Caroline Tennent	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371398	Anthony Edmestone	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change, Australia having a slow start from Liberal party BS, Fossil fuel cars are bad for your health, your wallet and your kids future.	No
1371399	leanne scicluna	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371402	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Please start hard and fast. Only option B, help with more EV cars and EV car conversions or hydrogen. Reduction in emissions has to be very fast, short and then long term gain. The wild and unpredictable weather is causing untold stress on everyone. Please action option C weather is getting	No
1371404	Ralph	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is a climate emergency. We need to dramatically reduce our CO2 emissions.	No
1371405	Donald W. Henderson	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	The debate is over. The science is absolutely clear. Climate change is real. It is an existential threat to human society and the biota of our planet. It is caused by th human use of fossil fuels.Th world must move away from the use of fossil fuels with all possible haste.There is no othr tenabl strategy. None.	No
1371406	Ian Pershouse	Option A - 1st, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1371407	William Cline	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The benefits are greater for option C	NULL
1371414	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	No
1371417	Evelyn Asaftei	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act, NOW	No
1371419	Mary	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Too easy to backtrack and then B Becomes A	No
1371420	Veronique Verhagen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371422	Bernard Abadie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The best result for the environment is needed .	No
1371424	Philip Lineton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	While some of the benefits can be readily quantified and costed to an extent the health benefits I think most important and less readily evaluated by costings	No
1371427	Sharon McGregor	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Our planet is already in a crisis. Something needs to be done sooner rather than later, when it is actually too late.	No
1371428	NULL	Option A - 1st, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 2nd	NULL	No

1371429	Hugh T KELEHER	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need the fastest action!	No
1371430	Michael Searle	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371431	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371433	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371435	Anthony Poutsma	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is the biggest challenge we currently face. Whilst the cost is higher, the cost of not doing enough will be a lot more in the long run.	No
1371436	Paul Anderson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want to see the pollution from vehicles in Australia drop as fast as possible for the sake of both the climate and our health.	No
1371437	Tim Preston	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There are great examples of efficiency standards to learn from: it works and is a great tool to have a controlled transition to low carbon / pollution transport. Our lives and cities are designed around the car, changing cars with fuel efficiency standards is an easy transition to make rather than redesigning whole cities. Efficiency standards have been disappointingly slow to be introduced here, among many benefits will be insulating our transport from external impacts (eg price or war)	NULL
1371440	John Drayton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Max Impact asap	No
1371441	Malcolm Stewart	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	Sooner the better for next generations and wildlife	No
1371442	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371443	Casey McKenzie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	global warming will only continue to get worse if we drag our feet. Will dealing with it be a shock to the system? Sure. But a shock now is better than a shock that just keeps getting worse. We need to mitigate the damage now for our children's sake.	No
1371446	Jackie.douglass	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1371450	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	The urgent need to reduce pollution	NULL
1371454	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371458	Jann Gåsedal	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1371460	Herach Ignatian	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Our planet needs action now.	No

1371461	Susie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is already here, the situation is desperate	No
1371463	Jeanette Hammett	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Vehicle emissions are a massive destroyer of clean air. With the vast detestation of the environment for housing with a lack of infrastructure. The unnecessary need for more and more vehicles including heavy vehicles is unacceptable.	No
1371464	Richard Bundy	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371467	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371470	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371471	Nicola Tomlin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I support Zero emissions by 2030. Option C is the only way to get there.	NULL
1371472	Gary Opit	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The costs to our community from inaction on human-created CO2 emissions are rapidly rising to such a degree that our society is already suffering from rapid climate change and so we must accelerate all activities that reduce emissions..	No
1371474	Dr Allan Robins	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need the quickest possible transition away from fossil fuels	No
1371475	Carlos Acosta	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371476	Sarah Stewart	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Let's QUICKLY save drivers money and reduce pollution from vehicles.	No
1371480	Bria Ryder	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Global warming is already in full swing. We needed to cut emissions yesterday, second to that NOW,	No
1371481	Shani H	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have the knowledge so we must put it into action.	No
1371485	Kris Joslin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371486	Andy Mannsfeld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	cant wait while the world is burning down around us	No
1371488	Jennifer Grounds	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This is a global emergency and Australia has lagged behind on vehicle emissions. Successive governments have facilitated a culture of larger vehicle loving and excessive petrol coning vehicles. We have a lot of ground to make up.	No
1371490	Mark	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Moral thing to do. Best option in the long run.	No

1371493	Andrea Mitchell	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	To sustain a planet	No
1371494	Maynard Heap	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Time is of the essence. Option C optimises the benefits.	No
1371495	Marina Dimo	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371498	Emanuel V. Borg, Malta	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	NULL
1371499	Carl Griffin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to the quickest result and there is little difference in the benefits cost ratio between Option B & C.	No
1371501	Iain Sexton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371502	Charles Gar	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371503	David Jnr	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need greener energy for less pollution for protection of planet environment and all living on this planet	NULL
1371506	Michael O'Brien	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It has the greatest BCR, the greatest end benefit, the most efficient way to achieve our carbon goals, the best financial return on investment, will create jobs and wealth quicker and better for the economy therefore tightening the labor market and driving up wages to catch and overtake the cost of living pressures, this could be cost negative if we used the current fossil fuel subsidies \$11,000,000,000 to pay for this it would be fully paid for by 2030!	No
1371508	Malcolm Robins	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Minimising GHG emissions	No
1371510	Shirley Franklin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371512	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371513	Jochen Schubert	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Change can't come fast enough !	NULL
1371515	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371516	Maggie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate crisis. If humans want to survive as a species, we need fast decisive climate action. Any delay means that my peers and I will not live to retire, will not be able to leave our grandkids to continue our legacies. Government has been dragging its heels while young people are feeling existential anxiety/panic/depression/dread. We want to enjoy our youth, but instead we are having climate catastrophe induces panic attacks, wondering why we should continue down this doomed path.	No
1371517	Shanon Bell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1371518	Sven Wraight	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	A) It's an emergency. B) The costs argument is fallacious: people will be employed to do useful work.	No
1371519	Helen Myers	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371520	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Does 47C ring a bell?	No
1371521	Nils Alwall	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371523	Scott OConnell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371526	kjell westerdahl	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want my grandchildren to survive on this planet.	No
1371528	Hannah	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act big and we need to act fast- we don't have time to waste	No
1371529	Alexander Petrovansky	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are starting at least a decade behind most countries' efforts.	NULL
1371537	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1371539	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1371540	NULL	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371542	Damian Prestidge	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371546	Chris neal	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371548	John S Harris	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	NULL
1371551	Pedro Guerra Alemán	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Más ecologica	No
1371554	Aaltje Terpstra	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 2nd	Justice delayed is justice denied as they say.. Just push on trough it's important	No

1371556	Diederick Sprangers	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is no time for doing this slowly - it is 'ten past twelve'.	No
1371560	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371563	Darin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The World needs help now, and Australia has stalled too long on omissions.	No
1371565	Moritz	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Highest benefits	Yes
1371567	Jeremy Philipps	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The need is enormous so the response needs to be as fast as possible	No
1371568	Robyn Milne	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We deserve to have access to fuel efficient vehicles that will lower emissions. We need to stop car makers from dumping inefficient vehicles into Australia.	Yes
1371569	Steven	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	We are in a climate emergency and all emission reducing actions need to be taken now not later.	No
1371571	Hubertus Jersmann	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We were asleep at the wheel for too long, this needs to be done effectively now.	No
1371573	naida faulkner	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Best cost benefit ratio.	Yes
1371575	Mark Hollinrake	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371576	Dougie Orr	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	It is the only way to help prevent global climate destruction	No
1371582	Ken Canty	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C will give us the best opportunity to save the planet as we know it.	No
1371584	Carol Mcguffie	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371585	shan bramley	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	The quicker the better for the planet	No
1371591	RD	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Lets proactively accelerate out push to reduce emissions and advance our technologies for a better future!	Yes
1371592	David Woolley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reduce pollution as soon as possible	No

1371593	Ariel Valent	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We've been too slow for too long. Let's fix this.	NULL
1371596	Boaz Shacham	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371599	Simon Cook	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Climate emergency	No
1371603	Stephen Kress	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Best option for the future	NULL
1371604	Leonie Holmes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Let's get emissions down as much as possible as soon as possible	Yes
1371605	Beverley Baker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Environmental concerns	No
1371606	Jane Bassham	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Let's get emissions down as fast as possible. We're smart people, together we can make it happen!	NULL
1371609	Christine	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Ice vehicles are massively polluting, inefficient and expensive to run. It's too late to go slow. Pollution is destroying the environment and making us sick. Going slow only benefits the profits of fossil fuel companies. And Australia is a dumping ground for polluting vehicles. We need to be as fast as possible.	No
1371610	tony björklund	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The faster the stronger outcome	No
1371615	Joel Porter	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371617	Judith de Vries	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Lets put planet health first	No
1371623	Marianne Ehrhardt	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to start the changes urgently before another Liberal government is elected and repeals the acts.	NULL
1371627	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	NULL
1371631	Mandy Toczec McPeake	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Let's get back on track, we've already wasted a decade or more.	NULL
1371639	Stephen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	While I believe in flexibility, this issue requires urgent action if we're to avoid a worst-case scenario.	Yes
1371640	Jeffrey Barlow	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Action on toxic emissions and their impact on health and climate change are very serious so very quick action is required and we have to find the money to bear the cost.	No

1371642	Timothy Donovan	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The world needs to realise there is a climate crisis now not in years to come. Option C is a requirement to help save the planet!	No
1371645	Peter Lawrence	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The sooner the better	No
1371647	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is being affected by climate change already to a major degree! We must move rapid to save not only ourselves but also the planet because it's the only one we have!	No
1371649	David Dugmore	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	I feel that time is running out. We seem to be moving in the wrong direction and I want to alleviate the situation as much as possible.	No
1371652	Gareth Rego	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is driving the world towards environmental destruction to help the richest companies in the world get richer; this proposal is the smallest task to start turning around this gross negligence of basic human decency	No
1371653	Adrienne Alexander	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371654	Ivy Edwards	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This action is very late happening in Australia. It is important to move quickly to reap the benefits that result.	No
1371658	Gaia Cole	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1371660	Alain M. Gaulin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's essentiel to act now according to the IPCC.	No
1371661	Miguel Perez	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's the future and we have no time to waste	Yes
1371663	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	No
1371664	Mark Quealy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We don't need to be a dumping ground for overseas car manufacturers to make profits on environmental polluting old technology	No
1371666	David Tomkins	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want to see emissions reduced as fast as possible!	Yes
1371667	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Porque al consumir combustibles fósiles contaminan más	Yes
1371669	Malcolm Storey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	You can't opt out of climate change	Yes
1371670	Sara Thomas	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Quickest way to curtail emissions	No

1371671	Suzanne Rutten	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371675	shan	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	need to get there quickly	No
1371676	Rocky Henry	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Lower polluting cars is one of many ways to cut CO2 emmissions. It's time we caught up with international standards.	No
1371677	Susanne Rivoir	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The water currents in the ocean are slowing down and are heading towards a climate tipping point. If the Gulf Stream stops completely, this will have fatal consequences for the entire world. This must be slowed down by means of ambitious restrictions!!!	No
1371679	Marilyne Tremblay Coutu	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are already running out of time!	No
1371681	Andrew Glencross	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371684	Daniel Howard	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371688	Juanita Hardy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reduction of emissions which are harmful to our health and to the environment can't happen soon enough.	No
1371690	Jim Martin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371693	Roger Cook	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has lagged behind most developed countries for too long. We have been poisoning ourselves for too long.	No
1371697	Kerry Baker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We don't have time to do anything other than make the maximum effort we can to reduce our GHG emissions.	No
1371700	Collin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The most effective	No
1371701	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371702	Richard Kinkead	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To reduce overall emissions into our finite atmosphere	No
1371703	Kevin Gallagher	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371704	:Palmeta Baier	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Better for the environment	No

1371705	Paul Allen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Clear knowledge of environmental and biological impact, that is destroying as we breathe the remains of the natural world, with a total lack of care for the shocking impact towards global warming and destruction	NULL
1371711	Craig Daniel	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Emergency	Yes
1371713	Jo Leung	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To save the planet for my children and grand children. To ensure a clean and sustainable environment for future generations as a matter of urgency.	No
1371717	Tony	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	My study of economics led me to the obvious conclusion that our most valuable economic asset is the biosphere, which underpins all economic activity. You can't buy shiny things if you are dead. The concomitant of this reality is that The only difference between an environmental issue and an economic one, is time; and time has become a very rare resource.	No
1371719	Dawn	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371720	Rich Edwards	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are already massively behind where we need to be in Australia thanks to decades of inaction. We must act now and act fast. This is the unavoidable future, so let us not try to avoid it, but instead align ourselves with it. Fear-mongering from vested interests cannot be allowed to block Australian interests - and the interests of humanity as a whole.	Yes
1371721	Rod Teale	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Australia is behind most of the world with efficiency standards and it's past time we caught up. Having high standards like most countries should simplify the import of compliant vehicles.	Yes
1371722	Tash	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	climate change is destroying our country - we need to slow car pollution immediately as option 3 is the only way to do that. It will protect our planet and the health of our people so it is the only choice. Financially, the costs are outweighed by savings in health problems, emergency relief and disaster repairs from continued climate caused issues.	NULL
1371725	Thomas Gressly	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371727	Erik Hedlund	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371728	Jo Looker	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371729	Don Hutton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is the most effective.	No
1371730	Francine	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371732	Angela Callis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371733	Ida Tegby	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371739	Sekeeta Crowley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have to move faster to halt climate change. Looking at the cost in this was is misleading as the cost of doing nothing is literally the Earth	No

1371740	Karin Malmgren	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The future fo children	No
1371744	Peter Temby	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we have been given poor choices for years and have paid dearly for it. time we caught up to the rest of the world, despite what Toyota and other manufacturers say to try to slow everything down.	No
1371745	Raymond Gibson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371748	Ted Neumann	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must act fast to save our planet, this option does that.	No
1371751	Xavier Duponcheel	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371752	Jarek Stencel	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1371753	Tony Dickson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I have always framed my ecological arguments in economic terms. My reasoning is that only by using the lingua franca of that doctrinaire discipline, which holds our society in its vice grip, can any traction be gained among those responsible for public policy. The whimsical goal of my argument is, in essence, to promote awareness that the only difference between an ecological problem and an economic one, is time; and time is rapidly becoming a very finite resource.	No
1371754	Nimisha Raja	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We're in a climate emergency - we don't have time to dawdle.	No
1371755	George Dion	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It makes the most sense	No
1371759	Joe Boin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have run out of time to take gentle measures. There's no point in saving money or effort in the short term if the long-term result is devastation (at huge cost). Those who will pay that cost are future generations - our children and grandchildren. That is not fair or just or responsible.	No
1371760	Fiona K	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	No brainer!	No
1371763	Lyle Carroll	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	we've waited to long already.	No
1371767	Dave Duchene	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is abundantly clear that urgent and committed action is required NOW. But also, option C also provides the highest benefit.	No
1371770	Vicki Bedford	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371779	Louis Northey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371780	Ian Smith	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1371782	Simona	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 2nd	NULL	No
1371784	Brian Hoepper	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Urgency of the climate change challenge. Strongest action that is feasible should be adopted.	NULL
1371786	Matthew Croker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Running out of time to ensure a future for the generations that follow.	No
1371787	Keith Johnson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371788	Marja	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to go fast on this stuff. We have delayed too long and the rest of the world has used us as a dumping ground for inefficient vehicles. This means we are contributing unnecessarily to climate change.	No
1371790	Damon Matthew Wise Â	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Best option in short term saves Billions in long term.	No
1371794	Charles Paquin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371795	Darren Johnson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reduced emissions	NULL
1371798	Dr Jeremy Walker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in the midst of an utterly catastrophic irreversible acceleration of planetary heat accumulation caused by fossil fuel combustion. Every tank of fuel burned is another nail in the many millions of children that will be killed the fossil fuel industry.	No
1371801	Colin Edwards	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must accelerate action to reduce emissions more quickly than otherwise.	Yes
1371802	Michael embling	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	No time to waste	No
1371803	Amy Griffin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Improved fuel economy standards will help to clean our air and also reduce carbon emissions. They will also save money on fuel.	NULL
1371804	Leigh Newton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We don't have time to take it slowly. We are fast approaching proposed tipping points from which we will not be able to return. It is far wiser to spend the money now rather than to try and avoid costs only to pay for generations to come in the form of climate disasters.	No
1371805	Anne Gorrie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371806	Kathy Green	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371807	Gill Osborne	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The Earth cannot wait	No

1371808	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371810	Jane Richter	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371811	James Eaton-Brown	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371812	Liz	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371814	BRIAN HIBBERT	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	PLANET FIRST	No
1371818	Guillaume Rousseau	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Obviously because climate colapse has already begun.	No
1371820	Michael Anderson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371822	Alina	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371825	Ken Allen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to transition as fast as possible. The horrendous effects of climate change are already upon us.	No
1371827	Mary Baker	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Emissions reduction	No
1371828	Richard Page	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	We have no time to waste	No
1371829	Peter Hk	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	less pollution	No
1371831	Janice McEwen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The environmental and health benefits of Option C	Yes
1371835	David Hirschfelder	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This transition is years overdue. Any further procrastination is in my opinion irresponsible, if not dangerous.	No
1371836	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371837	Tania Orum	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1371839	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	NULL
1371840	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371842	Dan Caffrey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Wew need to get to zero emissions ASAP. We cannot keep putting fossil CO2 into the atmosphere and expect global temperatures to drop. This will not happen until the level of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere falls significantly and by having more fuel efficient cars the sooner we reach this point. The other thing is that electric vehicles can be virtually zero emissions if powered by renewables. Option C will speed up the sale of EVs.	No
1371844	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Best for the environment.	No
1371845	Michael	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	i want the highest benefits possible on this important topic. Health benefits are great as part of that, and obviously fuel (which means security) and greenhouse gas and important too. Reduced vehicle maintenance is a nice side benefit.	NULL
1371851	Emilia Petkovska	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I would like to have the same option to reduce the pollution in my country. Good practices give a relevant feedback.	No
1371854	Richard Carty	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	must stop co2 emissions	No
1371855	Olga Ros Celis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	For health	No
1371859	ANDREW FLETCHER	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371860	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371866	Adolfo Ros Lozano	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371867	Evert Ploeg	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371869	Jon Hayenga	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Go big or go home, as the old saying goes. Show the rest of the planet you mean business and lead the way to saving the planet.	NULL
1371870	Paul Oboohov	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	With fuel prices in Australia having risen markedly since the Covid pandemic, and the relative shortage of oil globally leading to prices for petrol and diesel fuels for motor vehicles rising to, and being anchored around the two dollars per litre level since then, there is an urgent imperative for owners of petrol and diesel powered vehicles to seek the lowest price in Australian cities. Therefore it is in my clear interest to demand a preference for Option C to be implemented immediately.	No
1371872	A Hunter	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The quicker the better. And the Costs table above fails to include the BIGGEST and MOST RELEVANT cost of all: namely the cost to the whole planet of NOT going faster: the massive 'Social Cost of Carbon'. It's not just short term action costs, it's long term/perpetuity costs we need to consider in order to make any sort of informed choice!	NULL
1371873	Ed Fiedler	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1371874	AGNESE LANEVE	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371876	Trevor Omara	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fight Climate Change NOW. Before it's too late.	No
1371879	James Brooks	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	1/ Australia has shown that it is gifted with the resources necessary for the clean revolution, whether, solar, wind or mined materials. 2/ The disastrous wildfires in Australia give a warning of our children's future if we do not mitigate effectively. 3/ The health impacts of fossil fuel pollution in cities is being understood and cited increasingly in court claims. 4/ Local and central governments would be negligent in not accepting their responsibility for urgent action.	No
1371883	Beth McHenry	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The earth cannot wait while man continues to pour more emissions into the air. We must protect our environment and our lives now before it is too late!	No
1371884	Linda Galton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The quicker the better	No
1371888	Sandra Ros Celis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371889	Simona Vigil	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371890	Kelvin Bland	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The planet is at tipping point. The effects of Climate Change are already evident and the longer we delay the worse it will get!	No
1371892	Allison Lambert	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371893	Emma	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371894	Harold Macfarlane	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371895	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371896	Luca	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need action fast!	No
1371897	Olga Celis Outumuro	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371898	stefanhiele	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1371899	Heidi Wollum	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want the government to be ambitious and courageous about these matters.	No

1371900	Jos Ruijs	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Most future proof	No
1371902	Rosa T. M.	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
1371903	Robert Rutkowski	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371905	Danielle Scherer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371906	anne simmonds	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we are already late startig	NULL
1371908	David Baggs	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to transition as fast as possible away from fossil fuel emitting vehicles, but high efficiency vehicles are an interim option in the short term and the difference between option B and C is negligible compared to the damaged created to the climate, ecosystems, infrastructure and waterfront or flood prone lands	No
1371910	Michelle Reid	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Be environment leaders	Yes
1371912	Martyn Walker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have kicked this new vehicle emissions standard ball down the road for far too long. It is a national disgrace. So many other counties have legislated this years ago, yet we have bent to the wishes of large car corporations and allied Australia to be used as a dumping ground for the vehicles that can't be sold in countries that have already passed good, sound vehicle admission reduction strategies. We need to stop this practice immediately.	No
1371914	Peter Nguyen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The planet can't wait	NULL
1371919	Ricardo Gonzalez	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371923	David B	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	A chance for Australia to set an example for the whole World and to improve the living conditions of its people and the Australian and planet's environment. Time to be brave.	No
1371926	Geom Fremouw	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371927	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Best option to lessen the effects of global warming.	No
1371928	Sara Filbee	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371930	Erica Munn	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It helps towards saving our environment.	No
1371933	Bonnie Krauskoff Belfy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we are in trouble if we don't start doing our best now to deal with climate change.	No

1371935	Paulo Coutinho Deitmann	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Efficiency, ecology and savings.	No
1371936	Brandon Kozak	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371937	Graeme Clement	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371942	Brad	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371943	Katherine Palmer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371944	Mike and Susan Gail Raymond	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371946	Gavin MacLean	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371947	Hans Leo Hansen	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371951	Ray Verna	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371955	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371957	Nicholas payne	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371959	Mr Munier	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371960	Fiona	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371962	Helen Mcgreary	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Better for the future	No
1371964	Christine West	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1371965	Charles D Beard	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Time is of great importance.	NULL

1371966	Wayne Mill	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Money saved on health outlay more than makes up for other costs. Go electric!	No
1371970	Elaine Burton	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Crisis situation needing urgent attention.	NULL
1371971	Sebastian	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371972	Robert Illingworth	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate emergency is nearly beyond solving.	No
1371973	Rita O'Sullivan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C will drive down Vehicle emissions quickly.	No
1371974	Nicholas Vaughan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The sooner, we curb emissions and hence climate change, the lower the long-term costs will be. Option C is the most costly, but slower options will end up costing the government, insurance companies and citizens more money in the long run due to worse impacts from climate change.	No
1371977	Daniel Olson	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1371982	Stephen Woof	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have a climate crisis and we must act quickly.	No
1371986	fiona mackay	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	accelerated trajectory to reach emission goals.	No
1371987	Elaine Donovan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Quickest way to diminish emissions.	No
1371990	Diane Coles	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1371993	Ronald Blakely	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Save the world	No
1371995	Robert Douglas Jamieson	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Such change is essential	No
1371996	Dianne Fahselt	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We all have to live on this planet and there's no sense in damaging the atmosphere any more than it already is.	No
1371997	Ken Faulder	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Of all the issues facing the world now, this is the one that is going to affect our future generations the most.	No
1371998	Anna Smyk	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1371999	ANDY MEIKLE	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372000	Denise Inkel	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	It is urgent to accelerate the passage to cleaner energy. The car builders had more than enough time to make a transition, they knew that it was coming but were lazy and took things for granted. Now they have to catch up.	Yes
1372005	Dinga Bell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Expediency.	Yes
1372007	Anders Hofer	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372010	Peter Boet	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372011	Jason Miller	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372012	Joshua Jennings	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There's nothing to be gained by dilly-dallying on emissions and pollution anymore, with motor vehicles or anywhere else. Slow walking green transitioning will just incur even higher costs further down the track. How many billions or even trillions will need to be spent in the course of a runaway climate catasrophe instead? Spend the money now and move quickly.	No
1372014	Ben Martin	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372016	Doris Applebaum	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are already past the tipping point in climate change. Half measures like Option B are too late to do any good.	No
1372020	Cionin Lorenzo	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372021	Alan Crook	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372022	Gregor Macmillan	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate emergency and need to act fast	No
1372023	Jean Santirosi	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Must transitkionn fast for future generations	No
1372024	Luke Asher	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis is worsening with every passing month and year. We need to swiftest possible transition to mitigate catastrophic effects of climate breakdown.	No
1372025	Marie Konzack Møller	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372026	Matthias Zöltsch	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	like explanation above: - Provides a strong, ambitious and achievable policy. The policy settings provide enough flexibility to avoid extremely high costs, with an opportunity for suppliers to adjust and invest in infrastructure to support the transition, and delivers considerable abatement and fuel cost savings to Australians.	Yes

1372027	Shane Windatt	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372031	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to save the planet. Now.	No
1372035	Janny van Rooij	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Beat CO2 as fast as possible for the best benefits for the planet and therefore for the human race and animals.	No
1372036	Nancy Moore	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372037	Catherine	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do the best possible to reduce emissions	NULL
1372042	Sandra Gifford	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to transition to cleaner, cheaper options for cars as quickly as possible	No
1372043	Charles Froelich	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372048	Marc Baggiani	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to go for it as fast as it can, the planet can not wait!!	No
1372049	Terry Kuzyk	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are already behind in doing what's required to affect climate change so we must do everything we can as quickly as possible.	No
1372051	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372057	Annelie	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Option C for the environments health is necessary for the worlds future	No
1372058	David. Bass	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Leave a better environment for next generation	No
1372062	Dan Hughes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I would like my children to be able to live happy, healthy lives, without constant fear of climate change, rising sea levels, and natural disasters.	No
1372068	Tobias Forster	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It will reduce the effects of climate change.	No
1372069	Ari Lewis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372070	Jane Herschlag	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want to protect our environment asap	No

1372074	Laborie philippe	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Pollution	No
1372075	Sophie Brind	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	NULL
1372076	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372078	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Do what's best for the environment, not for car manufacturers.	No
1372080	David Walker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372083	geoffrey saign	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The planet is in a crisis, let's act like it!	No
1372084	Charels Byrne	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Australia especially, and the world, are in crisis; Option C will reduce pollution that fastest.	No
1372086	Kathi	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because it's better for not only Australians but the planet as well!!	No
1372087	Vilde Furuhaug Westby	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372090	Biff	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.	No
1372094	Maria Clara Leitão	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The planet needs quick answers.	No
1372100	Arild Andervad	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are out of time, and we must do what we can as soon as possible. The cost of climate disasters is worse than a few dollars extra now.	NULL
1372102	Liza Degli Angeli	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	No
1372104	Allisyn L Heiberg	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372106	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372107	Coleen Clark	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Go for maximum benefit	No

1372109	Nicole	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Global warming	No
1372110	Gerhard	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1372111	Steven Wheatley	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	This should have been sorted last decade. The U.S & the E.U have been doing this for years, therefore we (Australia) need to catch up, quickly.	No
1372112	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372114	Molly Hauck	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372116	Christopher Barwell-Cook	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372117	Douglas Sedon	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The costs of destroying the earth's biomes are unmeasurable.	No
1372119	Roger Plenty	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The most effective response to the climate crisis	No
1372122	Paul Reddy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	2023 was 1.5 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial, time is not running out, it has run out. Just do it now!!!!	No
1372127	Isabel Wood-Ayub	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372132	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372134	Richard Flynn	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	2030 is only 6 years away. And no government in the world is doing enough yet.	Yes
1372135	Albert Coffman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372139	steve geary	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372140	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Air pollution harms all living things, all around the world, costing the health care systems etc.	NULL
1372141	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are running out of time to save what we have.	No

1372142	James R. Herman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Watch the movie 'An Inconvenient Truth'. There is NOTHING more important than addressing climate change. NOTHING.	NULL
1372145	Barbara Coy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Save the world	Yes
1372150	william davis	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	urgency	No
1372154	Kenneth Ruby	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is the most comprehensive	No
1372155	Claude Cellier	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372156	Rosalind Herbert	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372157	Jayne	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have a responsibility to use the clean technology available to us as an intelligent and wealthy nation, in order to show the greatest respect to the needs of the Earth and Biodiversity we rely on for Life.	No
1372158	Janek Zdanek	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372159	Dave Hornstein	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372160	dina zanders	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372164	Melanie Thride	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The health benefits and greenhouse gas emmisions reductions are the greatest with option C	No
1372165	Anne Ringnes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To stop as much pollution from cars as possible	No
1372166	Jan Morren	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Zo snel mogelijk naar zero emission	No
1372170	Alex	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372172	Michael Robertson-Cook	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372173	Gerald McGrath	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1372175	Leif Wahlqvist	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1372176	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's the quickest and most economical solution.	No
1372177	Christopher Pont	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate emergency and the sooner we transition to renewable energy and cut fuel emissions in line with scientific opinion the better	NULL
1372180	Gary Gover	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Time is critically important as is greater abatement, making the greater cost worthwhile.	Yes
1372181	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372182	Anik	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is the most expensive, true, yet also has high net benefit and greater abatement and a faster transition.	Yes
1372185	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia should do its part to stem climate change as quickly as it can.	No
1372188	Christopher Shirley	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372190	Kevin Russell	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372194	Anna Liu	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	We are in an emergency for which our actions need to be swift, decisive, and transformative. We must demonstrate that we are willing to and capable of radically reforming our behaviours and our mindsets. We cannot afford to be in denial nor allow commercial pressures to compromise our resolve. We must act for the wellness of our children, our children's children, for generations to come. We must ensure a future without deep regrets, knowing that we have done EVERYTH	NULL
1372195	Eleanor Rigby	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 1st	Every thing each individual can do for the climate is important and essential. Go Aussies!!!	Yes
1372196	Bruce Lowrey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Needed for climate change saving.	NULL
1372199	Ian Axon.	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The need to remove fossil fuels completely.	No
1372200	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372204	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	The situation is critical and requires faster solutions and decisions.	No
1372205	Miss Green	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1372207	Jim McPhail	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372208	Frank Kane	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	It's the right thing to do	No
1372212	carmelo militano	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The current carbon imprint cannot be sustained. We need collectively action to win back our relationship with th nature, to create a healthy future for oou kids.	Yes
1372213	Steven burbidge	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We simply don't have the time to waste. We are already in a runaway greenhouse effect and we need to immediately stop using fossil fuels, we already have the technology and resources to be completely fossil fuel free in under 2 years but we lack the intelligence and willingness to just do it.	No
1372217	Debbie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372219	Paul J Fillery	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	the quicker the better for the planet,but allows time for change,which could be a better adjustment	Yes
1372221	Juan Carlos.	Option A - 1st, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 2nd	NULL	NULL
1372222	Jon Dawes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to end our reliance on fossil fuels.	No
1372227	Ryan Houlette	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The planet does not have time for half measures or delay. We are moving too slowly on our carbon reduction goals and the planet is warming faster than expected.	NULL
1372229	Julia	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	NULL
1372230	June O'Connor	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Time is of the essence. We cannot afford to waste anymore time, it is too urgent	No
1372231	Sarah M	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option A will keep Australia stuck in the slow lane, Option C will drive down vehicle emissions quickly, and Option B is somewhere in the middle	No
1372234	Glyn Bailey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Stop auto pollution	Yes
1372239	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372247	byron kelly ward	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because I have common sense	No
1372248	Greg K. Whittington	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Clean air!!!	No

1372249	Roger Malouf	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Rapid transition is needed	No
1372250	Claire Harrison	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act now	Yes
1372254	Susan Brisby	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must all act quickly to make our goals of 30% reduction by 20by 30	Yes
1372256	James Keats	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372258	Ad de Groot	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372259	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1372260	Wendy Koran	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372261	Michelle C.	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372263	Tim	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372265	Linda Guthrie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cars are big polluters. Governments must quit dragging their heels and start ACTING!	No
1372267	Hugo Ranerås	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372273	George Hasapidis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Last year the planet already pretty much hit the 1.5 C temperature increase scientists have been warning us about for years. The above does not consider the costs to Australia of runaway global warming. We've already seen unprecedented wildfires and incredibly hot summers. We can't afford to not reduce our carbon emissions as quickly as possible.	No
1372275	Sam Butler	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is a no brainer from a financial, societal and ecological perspective	No
1372276	Duane Gibson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must work to heal the Earth a quickly as possible. There is no second chance and no other Earth, Time is of the Essence!	Yes
1372278	John Dervin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372279	Mark Saich	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No

1372280	Jay Endean	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372281	Judy Matthews	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The faster the better for everyones sake, especially the planet	No
1372282	David Hoyle	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372283	Laurel Kornfeld	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to transition away from fossil fuels as fast as possible.	NULL
1372286	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The world is at minimum 40 years late in getting started.	NULL
1372288	Kim Horvath	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372290	Earl Grove	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	DUH!	No
1372293	Anil Dajee	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372294	Iben Lidstone	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372295	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372304	Charlotte Senay	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Nothing is more important today than climate impact	NULL
1372306	Tim Cooper	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372307	Kimberly Swenson-Zakula	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	NULL
1372312	Paul Hostler	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate emergency.	No
1372314	Evan Fulmer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1372315	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1372316	Breinner Pico	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372317	Glen Anderson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We MUST protect the climate!!!!	No
1372324	Caryn Graves	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372325	Theresa Hebron	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1372327	Richard Guier	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372328	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372329	Bridget Flynn	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Money means nothing if the planet is destroyed	No
1372330	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	fast start needed to slow climate change, needed everywhere	Yes
1372333	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	We need to go green now	No
1372334	Linda Hope	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372337	Shirley Aeria	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	There is an urgency to reduce fossil fuel emissions. Option C seems to be the quickest approach to take.	No
1372342	Chuck Taylor	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372343	Hitesh Bhanabhai	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	We are already behind schedule to avoid the tipping points for climate change.	No
1372345	Rob Vil	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372346	LEONARD SCHOCH	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Aggressive action is needed by as many as possible.	No
1372348	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	effort to save the planet	No

1372352	Ann Kemp	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372353	Jane Beall and Pat Wolfe	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Let's clean up the world for the next generation! ASAP	No
1372356	Gillian Hazleton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	greenhouse gas reduction is the most important factor	No
1372357	margo may taylor	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	fossil fuels are what is at the core of causing emissions into the atmosphere thus affecting our environment & above all causing climate change . it does not matter where we live on this planet as all are being affected by climate change whether they have contributed to this reality or not . every country on this planet should be working with true diligence when it comes to the health of our people & this planet .	No
1372358	Andre Bartczak	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We do not have time for a slow transition to reduction of pollution. Reducing as quickly as possible car pollution is a great plan. However, the biggest issue of Australia is coal mining and using for electricity generation. Elimination of coal is the most important of all.	No
1372360	Carolina Ross	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372361	Elaine Baker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in climate crisis	No
1372362	Mark Rowland	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is happening now and and at an accelerating pace. How many more summers of out-of-control wildfires are needed to hammer this home to the government?	No
1372364	Chris brown	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372365	Sharon	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We can not wait any longer to address the effects of climate change. Further delay means more people will die.	Yes
1372366	Ana Aguiar	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372367	Diane-Michele Petrillo	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	It's a positive environmental move	NULL
1372368	Michael Fuller	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372369	Lukas Friedel	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372370	Steve P	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372376	Constance Knudsen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1372377	Jakub Zmajkovic	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372378	Richard Nelson	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 1st	Sooner the better	No
1372379	carlo	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372381	Zoe Strassfield	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372382	Will Cartwright	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The fastest way for a progressive nation with reasonable wealth to cut emissions	No
1372385	Per	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	No time to loose, let's go.	No
1372386	Hermione Farmer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is with us requiring we act decisively to stop use of fossil fuels	No
1372387	Angie Robbins	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372390	al shayne	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	anything less is regressive, counterintuitive	Yes
1372392	Maria Jamieson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The environment is in crisis	No
1372394	Johannes van Staveren	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372395	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There's no time to lose the planet's burning	No
1372400	Robert Garthson	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	The world must stop producing, exporting and using fossil fuels immediately	No
1372402	Ian Moth	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372403	Naomi	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372404	Catherine Stack	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1372406	Susan Purseglove	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372407	Jacky Hendley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to minimise global warming. Australia has made very little contribution so far.	No
1372408	Kevin Crupi	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372410	Neal Steiner	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	This is the best choice for Australia and our environment.	No
1372411	Katharine Litt	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372412	Raoul Facchin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Time's up.	No
1372415	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Saves the mist fuel	No
1372417	Mark Flynn	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372418	Gwen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is critical	No
1372422	Janet Fenton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Slowly working towards a goal takes too long and the effects of climate change is being felt and killing already. The time to act was yesterday and we were complacent.	No
1372424	Anthony Hunt	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372426	Jeannine Colvin	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372427	Chris Abele	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fossil fuel use must be reduced to zero as quickly as possible.	No
1372430	Stelios Sifneos	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1372432	Ernest \,Steve\, Sutherland	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1372436	Connie Duchene	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate emergency requires immediate action.	NULL

1372437	Konstantinos eL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372439	Ash Turner	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372442	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372443	Michael Victor Béchard	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Simply put, the New Vehicle Efficiency Standard, it will save drivers money, and reduce deadly pollution from vehicles. It's a win-win situation – and we have absolutely no other choice in the matter!	No
1372445	Arbi	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372446	Anastasia	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372449	Steven	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Most straightforward transition	No
1372450	Terry Morgan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate and species extinction emergency. Cost and convenience are secondary to survival.	No
1372451	gloria gariglio	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372452	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	For our survival, we all need to cut emissions as quickly as possible	No
1372453	Peter van der Wiele	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Act before it is too late!	No
1372455	NULL	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372458	Anton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Clean air and to fight climate change	No
1372459	Heather Laurie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want the Australian Government to be ambitious, and fast and implement Option C, as Australia is already behind other countries in implementing Vehicle Efficiency Standards and we need to catch up and fast! The car lobby has already started its scaremongering spin – spreading misinformation and trying hard to keep roadblocking the transition to cleaner, greener cars.	No
1372460	José Fidalgo	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372462	Penny Oyama	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is NO TIME LEFT to act!! Big car corporations have TONS of finances to pay for rapid change!	No

1372465	Evan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372466	Richie Brian	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372467	Alisha Mercer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Deliver Option C: the fastest plan for driving down emissions. Be ambitious, fast and implement Option C. 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
1372468	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	NULL
1372469	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	The time for climate change action is now before we past the tipping point.	No
1372471	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372473	Jeff Karbonik	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372474	Marian Klokkers	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372475	Andrew Donnelly	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C offers rapid transition to clean cars and strengthens your hand with the car industry	No
1372476	Paul Moser	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Because it actually makes a difference in the battle against climate change	No
1372477	Mitchel	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we need immediate action	No
1372479	Mark Hayduke Grenard	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372483	Susan McIntosh	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372484	Peter Wolstencroft	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As much as possible needs to be done to mitigate the climate emergency.	No
1372485	Scott J Tucker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372489	Russell Anderssen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is behind the curve here. We need to catch up. And option C isn't much more expensive than B. Let's do it properly.	No

1372491	Bronwyn Best	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372494	Marina Ely	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Global Climate change needs URGENT and most time efficient action to reduce its effects, for societal & healthy & ecological sustainability. The Best option is that which will create change the most quickly, therefore option C should be the only choice.	Yes
1372497	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372498	Mathieu Robitaille	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to combat climate change AsSP	No
1372501	Michael Holmes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Austrlai needs to move forward as fast as possible to reduce emissions, as climate change is already impacting our country significantly	No
1372505	Barbara Bradbury	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 0th	Climate Change is happening. Wild fires have decimated the animal population in Australia and will keep happening. These fires are different from the regular fires, they burn hotter and deeper.	No
1372509	Gerry Butler	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Australia has missed a decade where politicians dithered and took the donations(?) from polluters. Time is tight and action is needed quickly and it can be done if we look to the example of a country like Norway.	Yes
1372510	Allen H. Gibas	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis is urgent	Yes
1372512	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372514	Helen DRINKWATER	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, 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
1372516	Ken Peachey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must cut pollution for our children	No
1372521	Bruno Broll-Barone	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372522	Richard	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This should have been done a long time ago and the sooner it starts the better it will be for all of us.	No
1372525	Sean Knight	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372527	Peter L. Maly	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	If we don't leave fossil fuels and LNG in the ground NOW, I believe this planet will NOT support life, as we know it now!!!	NULL
1372530	Michael Dunsmore	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are doing such an amazing job of murdering the planet and all living things.	No

1372531	William Nelson	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	No fossil fuel use as soon a possible.	No
1372533	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1372534	Chris Doyle	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372535	Michael Ashbrook	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372539	Christopher Brooks	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Maximum savings - Shortest time	Yes
1372542	Michael Abler	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1372546	Noemi Racz	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372548	Geoff Allan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Future generations can't wait	No
1372552	Matthew Campbell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Flexible means open to lobbying influences.	Yes
1372558	Paulo Joanes	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372559	Damien Leith	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis needs to be addressed as urgently as possible	Yes
1372560	Rob Jones	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's economically and environnmentally beneficial and as it's an inevitable change why not impliment it as soon as possible ?	No
1372561	Mark	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	For the planet's sake, we need to move quickly on anything that can contibute to the reduction in atmospheric carbon	No
1372563	Guy Pelletier	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1372564	Diana Henderson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Our planet doesn't have time to waste.	No
1372565	Paul Ainsworth	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is undeniable now.	No

1372566	liris	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Snabba på utvecklingen av förnybara drivmedel. Skapa teknik för att bygga om bensindrivna bilar till att drivas med förnybara drivmedel till rimlig kostnad.	No
1372567	Alice	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The benefits eclipse all other alternatives	No
1372569	Sue Vader	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is vital that Australia should play its part in reducing fuel emissions as quickly as possible	No
1372570	Kim Soepnel	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1372571	Mark Healey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372572	Jo Humphreys	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372573	Jason Ware	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	No time to lose. Why delay?	No
1372576	Kim Sampson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have wasted so much time already, now is the time to act and make a real difference	NULL
1372583	Susan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372585	Salim	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372586	deb dare	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I advocate for Option C because it 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, but also higher	No
1372587	Isabel Picado	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	We are drowning in pollution in the world.	No
1372589	Fred Granlund	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Time is running out to control our emissions and save the planet. Implement the new rules as quickly as possible.	No
1372590	Louis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The sooner the transition is made, the healthier we will be and our planet will be. We need real change, with no loopholes.	No
1372591	Alan Townsend	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372592	Kiara	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The faster the better for us to see the benefits. The net benefits clearly show this is the way to go for the Australian public	No

1372593	Gilbert GRACE	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fastest transition to make up for lost time. Should have happened in the 1990s. Cost is not an issue as longer wait time increases illness.	No
1372596	Rachael Treasure	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are destroying the planet on which we depend to survive. Major change and a shift away from corporate control and economics only policy is essential. Fuel fuels wars.	No
1372597	Jenifer Wilson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Just get this done. the entire globe has been dragging its heels and this needs to stop	No
1372604	Nancy Brown	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Transition is urgent	NULL
1372607	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate emergency; we must act like it!	NULL
1372610	Gavin Hirst	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are behind where we need to be, so ambition is required. I question how battery replacement costs are calculated, as most new vehicles will not require the battery to be replaced in what the ATO says is the useful life of a vehicle (8yrs). Electricity cost calculations also need to be understood and what assumptions are behind these numbers.	No
1372612	Bill Tucker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372614	Peter C	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We don't have time to \,save money\. We're 70 years behind on phasing out fossil fuel and it's siblings already.	No
1372621	Trish Rhodes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The monetary benefit.	NULL
1372622	Sam Luxemburg	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The higher cost in the short term will bring most benefits in the longer term	No
1372623	Ricardo Sarco Lira	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372630	Andre Cockburn	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Any cut in CO2 will increase the chance that we can avoid climate tipping points and extinction.	No
1372633	Corwin Khoe	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Option C will reduce pollution and put extra money into the public purse. Furthermore, option c will reduce maintenance costs and fuel costs for vehicle owners. Option c will also improve air quality and the health of millions of people in and outside Australia.	No
1372634	Peter M.	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	limits on car pollution as fast as possible	No
1372637	Emily Edwards	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	the climate crisis is bearing down upon us while the government is asleep at the wheel, there is not a second to waste	No
1372640	Rodney Molesworth	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	These are long overdue, and any further delay is unconscionable. All manufacturers have been complying in other countries for years -- there is no excuse for further delay	No

1372641	Paul Buijs	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372644	Martin Johnstone	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372646	Shawna Karras	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to take fast courses of action to slow global heating	NULL
1372647	J.van Dyk	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Environmental disaster in progress. Also Australia is lagging so far behind due to usual conservative mindset.	No
1372649	Nicky Brown	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372651	HildaMcLeod	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372653	Margaret Smale	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372657	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	NULL
1372659	Adrian Menhennitt	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Long term benefits.	No
1372660	Jonathan Rittenhouse	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Rip the band aid off!	No
1372661	Katie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Big bold steps is now what is needed!	No
1372663	Judith Carroll	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The benefit of opting for C from the outset are self evident in the context of climate change deficits.	No
1372666	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Decrease emissions	Yes
1372669	Linda Neumann	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must take every opportunity to mitigate the impact of climate change.	NULL
1372673	Peter Ireland	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372674	Peter Montgomery	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is always a laggard when it comes to setting rules for any industry, especially where there is an environmental impact. Start acting on behalf of the electorate and not your donors! We want cleaner, more efficient cars now! We also want better fuel standards.	No

1372679	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	The planet and its protection must come first	No
1372680	Brian Skelhon	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372681	Kevin Nash	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372684	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is faster and has higher net benefits.	Yes
1372685	Allan Bradshaw	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change	No
1372690	Elizabeth Honey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372692	Michael Krahl	Option A - 1st, Option B - 1st, Option C - 1st	Given the current situation of world climate, we need to reduce pollution as fast as possible. We don't have time anymore to diddle daddle. This would also put Austratlia to the front of the battle against climate change and win worldwide respect for the country.	No
1372697	Raymond wilkinson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reducing emissions should be a major priority of Australia and should be affected upon as quickly as possible. Option C also results in greater savings at an earlier date	No
1372699	C	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	1.5 degrees is getting increasingly less likely we need to do everything we can to reduce emissions today	No
1372700	Tony Mclean	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372701	Diana Pettersen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	to save the planet and improve pollution	No
1372703	Marcus	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act fast. We are already suffering the concequences of climate change in extreme weather events	Yes
1372705	William Mostyn Solomon	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The cleaner the better	No
1372708	Marcia Hoodwin	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Best for the environment	No
1372710	Brenda Tyrrell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372711	Judith	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	With the state of the planet it is urgent that we reduce pollution asap. We all have to do whatever we can to help.	Yes

1372716	Lauren Halse	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Why not move fast in the right direction and beat the emissions targets in Europe and the US?	NULL
1372717	Dwayne King	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1372719	Mikayla Williams	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372720	Mark Stoner	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have been too slow to implement this strategy so now must try to catch up. As quickly as possible.	NULL
1372722	Betty Sowter	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Its way past time that we have clean air to breathe.	No
1372725	Sharne Vogt	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Faster move towards real vehicle emission controls	No
1372726	Toni Pennicott	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option A still leaves us behind the rest of the world. Option B and C have similar cost benefit ratios but when you look at the breakdown the benefits of Option C are much higher.	Yes
1372727	Michael Hayden	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We only have one Earth!	No
1372730	Charmian Beabout	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372733	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	A really urgent need!	No
1372734	Joseph Wasserman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to move quickly to deal with carbon emmsions given the rapid accelertion of the climate crises. The poles are melting , powerful storms and floods are cuasing major damage and the world is getting dangerously hot	NULL
1372735	Jim	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372736	Jess young	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have delayed too long with the previous climate denialist government time to catch up to the rest of the world on this.	No
1372739	Anton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372740	Hermann Kerr	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To address climate change as aggressively as possible so that we have a planet that is liveable for humans and all the other life currently living upon it.	No
1372744	Sheena Worrall	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Impacts of climate change - (un)natural disasters, coral bleaching, extinctions, We can't wait a moment longer for the strongest action er	Yes

1372746	geoff	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372748	Carol O'Neill	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372753	Diane Davies	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate situation desperately needs action.	NULL
1372755	Janine Loh	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is already lagging behind the rest of the world, it's time to match our actions to our rhetoric. The faster we reduce our emissions from fossil fuel use, the better life will be for my grandkids.	No
1372758	Edward Robinson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Everything that can be done must be done.	NULL
1372759	Elizabeth Brownlie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is slow to act on this, so now we need to act fast. Option C provides the greatest benefit.	Yes
1372761	Tom Desautel	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The world needs to adopt this plan ASAP. Or lives and our future depend on action.	NULL
1372762	Mark Taylor	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do this ASAP; Because of the Liberals & Media Barons - GREED; We are way behind the Industrialised WORLD	No
1372765	Len Hobbs	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Saving the environment. Getting us in line with other OECD countries.	No
1372769	Rob S	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to move towards our reduced CO2 goals as quickly as possible	NULL
1372770	Julia	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372774	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372777	Henrietta Camilleri	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The world has surpassed 1.5° of warming and is on track to a disastrous outcome for all of us. This should not be something measured in dollars, this should be measured in terms of the ultimate cost for mankind and the planet. The Amazon is almost at the tipping point - the \lungs\ of the world. This matter should not be up for debate. Governments should be taking decisive action as they did in the time of the Pandemic. This is more crucial. Show leadership and look after us and your world.	No
1372779	Ann Potter	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	the quality of the air we breath affects all of our health. Better air quality saves money in health costs in the long term.. We also need to rapidly reduce the carbon emissions we are emitting. We are seeing the effects of these emissions already and the science tells us it will only worsen as we continue to put more carbon into our atmosphere.	NULL
1372782	Julia	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1372784	Mary Hedges	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want cleaner air a more liveable planetu	No

1372787	Ross Gleeson	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372791	Burke Rogers	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because I believe in climate change	No
1372792	Harri Timonen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I work with EVs and know that we need fast change.	No
1372794	Gemma Michalandos	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372796	Chris Price	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Better for the country	No
1372797	Diana Langley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's a fast start. I believe we must be prepared to pay to reduce the risks of climate change.	Yes
1372799	Anna	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Health is more important than costs, and the A option is unacceptable. And what are we talking about: \,total benefits 173.65\, - \,total costs 58.75\, = above 100, and You still asking?	NULL
1372800	Laura Hegyesi	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate is in crisis and we must act quickly and urgently to do whatever we can to support slowing down the climate catastrophe.	No
1372802	Scott Species	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	It's the quickest way to lowering emissions.	No
1372804	Helen Killeen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are laggards on vehicle emission standards compared with other rich countries and need to do our bit. Vehicle manufacturers have been profiting from selling petrol cars here for far too long and all the while climate change is worsening.	NULL
1372805	Keir	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because plan c is realistically the only option.	No
1372809	Allan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need rapid emissions reductions, which also give maximum \$ returns.	NULL
1372810	Simon Jenkins	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is a massive threat, things need to be done now quickly	No
1372811	Gisela Jackson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372812	Alan Corven	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must act quickly to reduce emissions for health and climate reasons. If it already works in other countries there is no excuse for us! Don't let the vested interests scare us (FUD) into further delay.	Yes
1372813	Barbra Norris	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Action to reduce pollution and climate change is needed urgently	No

1372817	Cheryl Frank	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to cut carbon as fast as possible for the least destruction to life.	No
1372819	Arwen Sutton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The costs for option A and to a lesser extent B are deceptive as they do not include the costs of emissions damage they cause (not immediate health costs from emission pollution as well as environmental damage(No
1372824	Sharon	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Obviously we need to protect our environment for our future generations	No
1372835	Marian Sumsala	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	In order to prevent climate change disaster we should have stopped all greenhouse gas emisions.	No
1372837	Sapphire McMullan-Fisher	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is real & we need improvements fast	No
1372841	Peter Carmody	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372844	Adam Burke	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	The benefits of electric cars and other low emission vehicles are clear. But charging infrastructure rollouts will have to keep up with the number of electric cars for people to keep confidence in the change.	Yes
1372845	Elizabeth Dew	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	I want a smaller car	Yes
1372847	Meredith	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to get on the leading edge of reducing fossil fuel use and option 3 gets us there quicker.	NULL
1372849	Valeri Belasev	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372851	Stuart Adair	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We as a nation have the responsibility to reduce our CO2 footprint as soon as possible, and one way is the reduction of vehicle pollution with the aid of vehicle efficiency standards. This is a policy previous governments should have done years ago which shows how lobbyists are listened to before the general public.	No
1372852	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Pollution control is long overdue and the welfare of our children an, country and planet should be a priority and urgent. We need to catch up with others and do the best and right thing sooner	No
1372855	Allan Beesey	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372859	Demi Liapis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act fast on all options to reduce greenhouse effects.	No
1372860	Jonathan Halls	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I'm sick of Australia being a laggard on climate action	NULL
1372861	Lawrence Griffiths	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should be the leading nation with this. Why is this even a question? We have a small population that should be agile and able to change rapidly. We have an abundance of resources which should enable Australia to be the leader when it comes to renewable energy and clean manufacturing.	No

1372862	Lynne Coombs	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	C is by far the best option for long-term improvement.	Yes
1372864	Jo-Anne Kelder	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I prefer the most ambitious option in line with my significant concerns about the cost of failing to limit and motivate climate change. Option C is not significantly more expensive and will deliver accelerated benefits, sooner. I appreciate the elements of option B (flexibility) but suggest that decades of denial and delay by the former government mean this government needs to take maximum and concentrated effort now.	Yes
1372865	David Bacon	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I'm sick of breathing in fingers and our country being polluted.	No
1372871	Kim Zegenhagen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must not be a dumping ground for highly polluting cars which endanger our citizens health. Highly pollutign cars also prevent us from meeting our net zero targets as quickly.	No
1372873	Denyze Toffoli	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fastest transition best	NULL
1372875	Geoffrey O'Donoghue	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This needs to be tackled as fast as possible	No
1372876	Mats Nilsson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's urgent to stop the increasing CO2 level.	Yes
1372879	Kieren Purnell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372885	Antony Johnson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	C is best for the Environment	No
1372890	Selwyn McFaul	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C provides the greatest CO2 abatement which is needed as part of Australia's contribution to tackling climate change, as well as providing the greatest fuel savings	NULL
1372893	Karen Rendell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372895	Elizabeth Young	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The public needs government push for this to happen - it is not happening fast enough with vehicle companies and consumer choice.	No
1372896	Sue Mathews	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The use of fossil fuels must be phased out as soon as possible. As a very vehicle-dependent society we must change our emissions profile in this area along with all our emissions-producing activities. Electric cars are a good alternative and with greater adoption driving a more mature market will become cheaper and more sustainable in their production. Other countries are way ahead of Australia on this. Pollution from fossil fuel powered vehicles has serious impacts on health.	Yes
1372898	Cj	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372899	Neil Rasmussen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C achieves a quicker reduction of emissions	No
1372900	Stewart Turnbull	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to stop burning diesel, petrol, coal, gas and get on with saving this planet and ourselves	Yes

1372904	Linda Visman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to get carbon neutral asap	NULL
1372905	Peter Hallinan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Gaia cannot wait!	No
1372907	David Lee	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	It's a no brainer. It contributes to lowering co2 emissions. The only developed country without a FES. The fossil fuel and car industry have vested interest given the intense lobbying, keeping Australia dependent on fossil fuel and offloading cars into a country that will accept them. I'll be waiting for a strong standard before purchasing a new car.	No
1372908	Russell Coker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change and toxic exhaust gases cause serious economic and health problems	Yes
1372909	Trisha Jarvis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372910	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1372912	Judith Leslie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is accelerated by vehicle pollution	No
1372913	Narelle Dean	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has delayed this process far too long and we need to urgently ramp up efficiency standards	No
1372918	M Lawlor	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The world is a long way behind where it needs to be to prevent catastrophic changes so we need to move very fast, and Australia is already behind on vehicle emissions. There's no point in trying to protect parts of the economy now if it results in devastation across the country for future generations when we could have moved faster.	No
1372922	Leendert Noort	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	Tackle the climate disaster NOW!	No
1372923	Peter Morris	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The increasingly evident effects of climate change show that we need this change to happen as soon as possible.	NULL
1372924	Jmcc	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1372925	Kay Hage	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372927	suzanne dance	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	lower polluting emissions	No
1372929	Kate Gilson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1372932	Tess	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	NULL

1372933	Rita Beenker	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	I think the problems with climate have become so urgent that further postponing drastic action is counterproductive.	No
1372941	Michael and Susan Wright	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The emission standard need to be improved as soon as possible.	Yes
1372944	Robert Durham	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Keep pollution to minimum and use better vehicles	No
1372945	Kesta Fleming	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The greater total benefits of option C outweigh the greater cost of the other two options. Australia has been lagging behind on environmental issues for a long time, and it's about time we started pulling our weight on this, not just for the benefit of the world, but also for the benefit of all Australians. It would be nice to think our country was actually taking more of a lead for once. It's embarrassing to constantly be trailing behind on something so important.	NULL
1372946	susan dew	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372948	Erin Byrne	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372950	Ailsa	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 1st	Fastest	No
1372952	Massimo	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372956	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372957	Glenda Shomaly	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372959	Matt	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This has taken far to long to bring in.	No
1372964	Judith Cluley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372967	Alicia	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	Yes
1372969	Mark Taylor	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Best practice standard	No
1372970	Moira Nelson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Saving planet	No
1372971	Wes	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	need to be serious about climate change	No

1372972	Mark Duggan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C brings the biggest benefit	No
1372976	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372980	Val Earle	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372984	John Dugan	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	The environment must be uppermost in this strategy.	No
1372985	Sylvia Bain	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1372991	Calvin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Better to start now	No
1372992	D Hopgood	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	C is the only option	No
1372994	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1372995	David King	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	If we are serious about improving air quality and reducing emissions from vehicles, then it makes sense to select the strongest option to get there.	No
1372996	Nigel Tanner	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Benefits for the planet, consumers and the general public.	No
1372997	Rachel Matthews	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	Australia has been dragging its feet on climate change since the science was first proved.	No
1372999	Ellie Sherrard-Smith	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do as much, as rapidly, as possible to protect the planet best	NULL
1373004	Craig Arnold	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we need to limit pollution and have much cleaner air	Yes
1373006	Rick Cavicchioli	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I support Option C because it provides the fastest transition to clean cars with an accelerated trajectory to beat emissions targets in Europe and the US. Vehicle efficiency standards should have been introduced in Australia many years ago so there is a lot of catch-up required.	No
1373011	Fay Waddington	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This needs to be done ASAP. It is embarrassing to say the least that only Russia is as bad as us. This should have been actioned decades ago.	No
1373012	John W. Miller	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change as a result of burning fossil fuels is an existential crisis for the planet. The wealthiest nation-states in the world should take the lead in aggressively moving toward clean energy economies.	Yes

1373013	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373014	Bruce Dymock	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe that it is essential that Australia reduces its Greenhouse Gas emissions as quickly as possible and Option C provides the best chances of ensuring this happens.	NULL
1373016	Simon Eggleston	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is no time left to delay. Technical and societal changes are urgent to address the climate crisis	Yes
1373017	Mandy Gange	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to take effective action as soon as possible! The health of our planet is dependent on effective action!	No
1373018	jeremy fryberger	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Humankind has delayed enacting effective action to counter Climate Change for decades. There's absolutely no time to waste! Meanwhile, as a citizen of the US—a nation that has failed repeatedly to effectively help counter Climate Change—I applaud ANY country which takes effective action.	Yes
1373025	Gail Cartwright	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373028	Niels Bro	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373029	H	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It gets Australia closest to the goal of the least amount of pollution available.	No
1373033	Jane Morgan	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Australia needs access to efficient cars. Australians are the only ones hurt by allowing this deception to continue.	No
1373034	Neil Stewart Hardie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Rapid reduction of emissions is critical	No
1373037	Jackie O	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	We can see climate change happening already. We need the fastest approach possible to get rid of fossil fuel use.	No
1373046	Sandra Woods	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The higher level of emissions reduced the more money drivers save and the higher level of emissions cut	No
1373050	Trevor Richardson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Our climate is crisis and we are very close to the tipping point. I will leave behind 3 children when I pass and I want a future for them, their children and their grandchildren. I want them to know that we did everything we could to mitigate the climate changes that my generation have contributed to creating.	No
1373051	David Elliott Williams	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373052	alan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373057	George	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need fast transition	No

1373058	Paul Magarey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Greatest societal, health and environment benefits are found in option C. It's a no-brainer unless government is overly influenced by the auto-lobby. The real costs of climate change are not being reflected in Government policy. For this reason, I've attached the Climate Council's report \COMPOUND COSTS: HOW CLIMATE CHANGE IS DAMAGING AUSTRALIA'S ECONOMY\.	No
1373064	Sandor Horvath	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is going to cost us billions and billions of dollars. The cheapest long term option is the highest vehicle efficiency standards. This will give the greatest health and environmental benefits.	NULL
1373065	Andrew Harker	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	The other options are providing no net benefit with minimal fuel savings, questionably this is not really a valid option. Option C provides support for technology transition, and I most definitely want clean vehicles in the city, smaller in size (no tradie trucks) and a transition path to electric vehicles that has some real direction. I am also strongly against the lobbying by fossil fuel companies, also feel strongly they should not have their products subsidised to preferred industries.	No
1373067	Michael Murrell	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373069	Susan Sheehan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change	No
1373070	Neville Walsh	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Must reduce emissions, ideally as soon as possible but acknowledging that some consumers will likely struggle to cope with option c	Yes
1373071	Tim Ambrose	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Better bet benefits	NULL
1373072	Jorge Gaspar	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is too late for slow changes.	Yes
1373074	Ingerlise	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option c ist the fastest	No
1373075	Thomas Magarey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C clearly provides the greatest benefit for the community, through environmental and health and other benefits. It should be a no brainer. The cost of climate change is going to overwhelm governments in the near future. We need to prepare as fast as possible.	No
1373077	Marco Rudek	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is decades behind!!!	Yes
1373078	Patricia Neil	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do everything possible to slow climate change. For our sake, for the planet's sake.	No
1373081	Reg Tydell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is an existential crisis for life on Earth. Radical action required.	NULL
1373083	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373087	David Wingfield	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1373089	Yvette Watt	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must go with option C - we are experiencing a climate crisis and there is no time to waste. The cost to the environment of any delay is something we can't afford.	No

1373094	Graham Proctor	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	The quicker the better, there is no point listening to car dealers who have lumbered themselves with unsalable vehicles.	No
1373095	Sharon Fetter	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373096	Madeleine Gisz	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	That option C is not the Government's first choice is very concerning. Option C clearly offers the greatest benefit for the community. The upcoming costs of climate change are going to overwhelm all government and community services: we need to stop climate change happening as fast as possible and dealing with vehicle emissions is a key way of doing this. Option C should clearly be the preferred option.	No
1373100	Abigail Humphreys	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Options C is faster, and is linked to CO2 emissions and abatement	No
1373103	Elizabeth Bassett	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is well past time to bite the bullet on this one. After decades of delays, there is no time left in the system and, as the Au government can ensure enough money is available to pay for it, either directly or as rebates/incentives (eg to consumers), there is no good reason to continue to exacerbate global pollution by delaying effective action for some indeterminate future.	NULL
1373105	Matthew O'Sullivan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The faster the better. Should have been done years ago.	No
1373107	Eric Troupe	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373108	Richard Clarke	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This is not the time for half measures.	No
1373110	Kate Bartlett	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fast track less pollution now	No
1373113	Michelle Roadley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's the fastest option and the best option for our future. It's time the government starts to work for the people and our environment and not for the profits of big business. I	No
1373114	Jennifer Dimmock	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373116	Jiva	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need a fast start	No
1373120	Diane Judith Bos	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must tackle emissons and hence climate change as quickly as possible. We have as a country delayed this transition for far too long and so must quickly catch up to other comparable countries as quickly as possible.	No
1373121	Kathryn Teagle	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Wasting time reducing emissions will cost us dearly in the near to far future. It's our job to fix this so our future kids have half a chance.	No
1373125	Brian Miller	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373127	George Howe	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	NULL

1373131	Alba Vignolo	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373133	margaret notaras	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373136	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to cut down emissions quickly, before it's too late! The future of the planet depends on it.	No
1373141	John Robertson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change and pollution.	No
1373143	Steve Bellew	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373145	Annie Duncan	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Urgency of tackling climate change.	Yes
1373149	Kerri M	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	Yes
1373153	Beth Groombridge	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373154	B M Hammet	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Health concerns	No
1373156	Sierra L	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373157	Jennifer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reviewing the BCR analysis, Option 3 is definitely the way to go, best for our planet. However, Option 2 is infinitely better than Option 1, which is definitely not where near good enough. So I'm left sitting on the fence, and I guess if Option 2 passes into law, it will go some way into mitigating the emissions problem, and put the brakes on Toyota continuing to bring highly pollu	Yes
1373158	Marcus Mohler	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	it's time.....Should have been years ago	No
1373160	Derek O'Reilly	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	Seems the way to go	NULL
1373161	Martin Nicholls	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia must catch up to international standards	Yes
1373162	Dario Marchionni	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373163	Pamela Harris	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	progression of climate change	No

1373164	Robert Bruinewoud	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373165	Catherine Levy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	looks like the fastest, best one	No
1373168	David	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	We have to save our environment as a matter of urgency	No
1373169	Karleen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We don't have time to mess around with bureaucratic nonsense while the planet is burning. Let's just get on with it!	No
1373175	John Hudman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is, by far, the better option and will drive down pollution & costs more quickly	No
1373177	Melinda belfield	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373181	Michael Elsohn Ross	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373185	Dr Brent Davey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reduces emissions sooner, and reduces the risks associated with global heating. Option B is not as effective and Option A will be disastrous	NULL
1373186	Dale Leach	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Brings Australia in line with the best practices in the world.	No
1373189	Alenka Burley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce emissions as quickly as possible.	Yes
1373191	Gary Blidook	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is really hitting us hard here in BC Canada. We all need to do our very best to slow it down.	No
1373192	Jean Smith	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do more as a country to reduce our emissions for Australia to remain/become one of the cleanest countries in the world.	No
1373193	Ross Griffiths	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C reduces emission the fastest and could put Australia in the driver's seat as an example to the world. It also promises, on the figures provided, the greatest net financial benefit. There is much to gain and very little if anything can be lost.	NULL
1373197	Ben Stafford	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Health benefits of option C are well worth the cost.	No
1373206	Jeff Reid	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Both economic and environmental - just look at the figures!	No
1373208	Valerie Philpot	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1373211	Dr. Richard Smart	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has some of the dirtiest, least fuel efficient cars in the 1st world, we are paying far too much in fuel costs and servicing and creating far too much air pollution. We must catch up with Europe and the US as fast as possible.	No
1373216	Barbara Coker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Time is running out for anything to save our environment, we must do everything possible now.	NULL
1373220	Julie slight	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The planet appears to not b waiting for the squabbling	No
1373222	Eric West	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because we can't continue to pussy foot around our obligations to save ourselves and our planet. We don't need anymore cowards in government.	No
1373224	lingrid Müller	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C will provide the fastest transition to clean cars and still save drivers money.	No
1373228	Penelope Stapleton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373235	Tony Hatch	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to get serious about the effects of motor vehicles and climate change.	No
1373236	ROBERT DETTMAN	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reducing CO2 emissions from vehicles is crucial for Australia to meet its international climate commitments and contribute to global efforts to limit warming to 1.5°C. Transportation currently accounts for around 18% of Australia's total emissions, with most of that coming from light vehicles. Regarding public health concerns, Vehicle emissions also contribute to air pollution, negatively impacting public health. Stricter standards aim to reduce harmful pollutants like nitrogen oxides and particulate matter. Premature deaths due to these pollutants are estimated to be more than 11,000 per annum. Cleaner air will improve respiratory health and reduce medical costs for Australians. Climate change already brings economic costs through extreme weather events and impacts on agriculture. Lowering emissions can help mitigate these costs and potentially reduce future insurance premiums linked to climate-related disasters. Stringent emission standards encourage manufacturers to invest in cleaner electric vehicles.	No
1373237	Rob Davies	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option B would have been fine if implemented 20 years ago. It wasn't and now we have a relatively young high emission fleet. We do not have enforceable air quality standards, and poor air quality affects us all, but affects poorer people more. Option C will help redress that situation.	Yes
1373240	Juli Kring	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C offers the fastest plan for eliminating emissions and saving us money.	NULL
1373242	Katharina Lejona	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Global carbon emissions from fossil fuels have risen in 2023 to record levels. We only have one planet and need to act now. Oil lobbyists are undermining climate action for profit. We need people over profit leaders in the government.	No
1373247	Nicholas Routley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has been stuck in the slow lane because of the stranglehold on government policy exerted by the petrol lobby. We need our own nickel processing plant, and the same for other metals too, and if we have these we can get out of the slow lane fast enough not to suffer any of the drawbacks of Option C	Yes
1373250	Darryl Nelson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373252	Chris Flynn	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Pollution kills people	No
1373254	Massimo Dario	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL

1373255	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	NULL
1373261	Alex Stavis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is the best for the environment and the people.	No
1373262	Martin Borri	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	It has the best benefits to costs ratio. It is also more likely to be accepted by the broader Australian community. This is important because no matter how effective a policy is, if it can't be legislated and implemented, it is of no use.	Yes
1373267	Wendy Rawlings	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	stop wasting time	NULL
1373268	Andreas Dalman	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	After decades of inaction it is imperative that we move fast to reduce emissions in Australia. We are at the back of the pack for new low emissions technology in the automotive sector. To provide Australians with the most choice for reducing their emissions when they drive option C is the way to go. Car makers have been making millions from selling emissions intensive vehicles here and it's time they tightened their belts.	No
1373270	William Jeffreys	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373271	Philip Andrews	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I'm happy to take the middle road.	Yes
1373272	shaughan Terry	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Bigger savings, healthier humans, healthier planet. The Sunshine State is happy and willing to protect the South from devastating effects of climate change	No
1373274	Kevin Allan Tranter	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	People need time to adapt to the new technologies. Need option C for the enviroment, but you will get too much resistance if you puch change too fast.	Yes
1373276	Peter Dibbs	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Possible. Less resistance	Yes
1373277	Rowena Edwards	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is the most logical and beneficial.	No
1373280	Linda Bryan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The sooner and faster that we introduce these changes, the faster we help to heal our planet. We only have one of those!	NULL
1373286	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373293	Alexey Zimenko	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373294	Mike	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The quicker, the better - there's no time to waste!	NULL
1373299	Benjamin Simon Carey Joel	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I have a grandchild	No

1373301	Jim Malone	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	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, but also higher costs.	No
1373304	Peter buch	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	this should have happened already	No
1373307	Angelika Knoerzer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need strong action on climate change	No
1373309	Ed Dixon-Valk	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to transition as quickly as possible.	NULL
1373310	Quentin Dresser	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Action on climate change is urgent.	No
1373312	Trevor Scott	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Re carbon emissions the level is already way too high. We need to act immediately to achieve the greatest result.	No
1373315	Massimo Dorelli	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373324	Maurice Lang	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1373327	Leonard Schein	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373331	Barnard Ward	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Only the best option will do. Option C is the best.	No
1373335	Bolshibob Bronstein	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is no planet B	Yes
1373337	Kim Farmer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's about time, Australia needs to do a lot more to drive down our emissions or we will all be in very serious danger	No
1373339	Alan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Sooner the better, we are already lagging nearly every other country!	No
1373340	Peter Enge	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia must move away from fossil fuel powered road transport as soon as possible, and make a just transition to sustainable energy for our whole economy.	No
1373343	John English	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373345	Sven	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reduce climate change (Extreme weather), reduce pollution in cities/ Australia	No

1373347	Barbara Daniel	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Emissions need to come down fast	NULL
1373348	Fiona Webb	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have to reduce our emissios as quickly as possible to ensure Australia has acfuture.	NULL
1373351	Julie slight	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The planets does not appear for us to b waiting to tick a box. Get going go ernment	No
1373353	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The time to act was 20 years ago, Option 3 gives a small window to make up for lost time.	No
1373355	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This is in the best interests of the environment and our future	No
1373356	James McCaughey	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	At the moment Australia is being used as a dumping ground for vehicles that would not be marketable elsewhere	No
1373357	Leonard Spyker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Save the world for my grand children	No
1373359	NULL	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.	No
1373360	dayna thomas	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373362	T Schneider	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	We must stop new petrol cars!	No
1373363	Julie Roberts-Smith	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Health and climate benefits	No
1373367	Steve Boyce	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has been lagging behind countries such as Canada and Singapore in combating vehicle emissions.	No
1373368	James Buchanan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Faster emissions reduction and better cost benefits.	No
1373371	Alex Vickery-Howe	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	We cannot afford to wait.	No
1373372	Tracy Feldman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373374	David G Lloyd	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes

1373376	jonnine wilson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Im concerned about climate change	No
1373382	Gillian Lord	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are running out of time to change. The slower we are and the longer time we take will mean much more cost down the track. I don't want to put our mistakes on to our children and grandchildren	Yes
1373383	Jason Abela	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We just lived through the 12 hottest months in recorded history. We don't have time to take things slow, we need strong action now to reduce emissions. I support option B tacitly, but only because it is some action rather than none. B is not enough, we need C.	Yes
1373385	Dave Burrows	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Extinctions are accelerating. We need to take all steps possible to slow the pace of global warming, including through adoption of more efficient vehicle standards	No
1373386	S Mohan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373387	Belinda Jermyn	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I think we need to do it as soon as possible. Our planet can't wait any longer	No
1373388	Michael Tarrant	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373391	Stephen Hale	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has been too slow in introducing fuel efficiency standards for the transport sector. The faster the better,	Yes
1373392	Denis Golding	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a Climate Emergency so swift action is essential.	No
1373396	Robert Day	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Scientists have found we are already past the 1.5 degree target, and catastrophic tipping events are now likely. Thus the benefits of reduced greenhouse gas emissions are undervalued. For example faster reductions might possibly avoid total loss of the Greenland ice, which would raise sea levels catastrophically. Even one less catastrophic fire in Australia would make option C's benefits much greater.	No
1373397	Shaheen Badat	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Is it the best and makes the most progress	NULL
1373403	Rob Smith	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to catch up with the rest of the world to help reduce climate change damage. Plus Australians deserve better, more fuel efficient cars, during the transition away from fossil fuels, especially given the ever increasing cost of petrol . I only support option B as a last resort, but firmly believe we should be going with the best option, option C	No
1373405	Doug Limbrick	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373406	AllanD	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The sooner the better, time is running out.	No
1373414	Robin Hall	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C delivers the best outcomes	No
1373416	Warren Clay Hodgkiss	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to consider the coming generations and reduce emissions that are damaging the world we'll leave them as much, and as quickly as technologically possible.	No

1373417	David Oakden	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	3rd Option. Considering benefits of ~\$30B vs increased cost of ~\$12B there is scope for the government to provide targeted financial assistance by up to ~\$18B. This not only would make the transition more equitable, but it would also make the transition quicker as cars from lower income individuals & families can be replaced more rapidly. This may not be those people getting a new car, rather a \cash for clunkers\, & help to buy more efficient 2nd hand cars.	Yes
1373420	Gavin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Maximise the reduction in toxic pollution	No
1373423	Kelly	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must move fast to catch up with the rest of the world! There is no time to waste.	No
1373425	Ted Hume	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373427	Suzanne Holt	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe we must move quickly to lower emissions. although initially expensive, however in the future it will be cost effective for our health and well being of the population and country.	NULL
1373429	Gavin Oliver	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	We need to push harder to reduce our emissions	NULL
1373432	Kevin	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373433	Janice Raven	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is no time to waste-we are already passing the point of no return. Focused action is needed on every front.	NULL
1373434	Peter L Higgs	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to go fully electric where technically possible. If we lag we get the world dirtiest cars dumped her	NULL
1373435	Sue Jackson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373437	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373441	Maureen Frances	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has left it very late to do anything about fuel efficiency standards, so we need a fast start.	No
1373450	Marilyne Turcotte	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373454	Marcus Coghlan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We are far behind. It's embarrassing and not actually helping the people of Australia as might be suggested by vested interests. I'd like emissions standards to align to EU standards as soon as reasonably possible. I'll take what's being offered as it's better than do nothing option. I suspect economics will naturally drive change to low/no emission vehicles in this same timeframe if government settings are appropriate in the broader economy. As such these efficiency standards will have decreasing influence as time goes on. Thus move somewhat faster immediately and catch up with the least best option. Option B.	Yes
1373455	Walter Knowles	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reduce air polution and cardon dioxide emmissions and help achieve Australia's target for 1.5 to 2 degree temperature rise.	No

1373457	Donna P.	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373458	Diana van Driel	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Faster is better plus the overall cost:benefit ratio is absolutely in favour of option c	No
1373462	Peter St Clair-Baker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Our climate is in crisis. We need urgent responses.	No
1373470	David Ridout	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Get a move on already, it's embarrassing being the worst developed country.	NULL
1373472	Rod Mitchell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need rapid emissions reduction and we need to be adapting to a fossil free transport asap	Yes
1373473	Mauricio Perez	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Acting faster now will reduce costs on environmental and financial impacts later	No
1373477	Jacques Urech	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373480	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Quicker route to: saving drivers money on fuel, having a greater variety of fuel efficient cars in Australian market, and actively doing something about greenhouse gases and air pollution.	No
1373484	Paul Willey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Implementation of vehicle emissions standards is long overdue.	No
1373485	Pete Stevens	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Time is running out fast	No
1373486	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We've already taken decades too long to do something about dirty fuel and emissions so let's just get on with it. We'll all cope with the changes because we know they are necessary and urgent.	No
1373487	Ann McCoy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate Change is occurring now! We need to do something about it now! The more we can reduce carbon emissions the better for all of us. now	No
1373493	Dexter Davison-Ling	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Financial and interim social disruption costs are still eclipsed by the cost of not reducing global carbon emissions ASAP	Yes
1373495	Jasmyn	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Because it time to get this moving as quickly as possible	No
1373499	Oliver Griffith, PhD	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change, induced by green house gas emissions is the largest threat to Australia's future and ongoing economic prosperity. We need to act and act fast. We also have a lot to gain by moving ahead of other nations, as it will support an innovation based green economy that could support new industry exports.	No
1373500	Sandy King	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I don't believe we have time to play with. I also believe people and technology is largely present and attitudes and behaviours will respond to changed circumstances, leading from behaviour and attitude change as a start point is a very slow approach that will cost more to our planet in the long run	No

1373502	Grant	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I think Option B offers the best balance and is less extreme for the industry. It will provide benefits to Australians, whilst also accelerating our progress to meet emissions reductions without imposing too much stress on the industry to adapt infrastructure which as we know is challenging and time restrictive in Australia due to our distance from most of the developed world.	Yes
1373503	Laura Garner	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373506	Jonathan Keren-Black	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do as much as we can and as fast as we can, and prevent manufacturer loopholes	No
1373510	Ian Buchanan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I 83 years old and believe that the true reality of climate change is much more severe than the world understands and that severe measures need to be undertaken to TRY and alleviate the future consequences. ds and that	No
1373514	Jill	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Fast and possibly more flexible.	Yes
1373515	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373522	Allen Shrimpton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Common sense.	Yes
1373524	Margaret Farmer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Least polluting	No
1373525	Robert Weingart	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373526	Lora Steiner	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Climate warming isn't slowing down	Yes
1373528	lynnellejellyman@hotmail.com	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373529	Mark Heydon	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	No time to waste. We have procrastinated long enough.	NULL
1373530	RJohn Carter	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373531	Graeme Inchley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The Australian Government neds to show leadership and get ahead of the game insteqd of being a johunny come lately follower.	NULL
1373535	Paul Bergsagel	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The world's ecco-system is in crisis; we have to act now, full steam ahead.	No
1373540	Marylyn Mount	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	Climate change is not slowing and Australia has been very slow to take action.	No

1373548	Ian Temby	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to use all means available to make the transition away from fossil fuels as fast as possible. Option C is a good initial step, far superior to the other options.	No
1373549	Bernard Terry	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373555	Ashley Barnes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We've fallen way behind in fuel emissions standards so it makes sense to choose the most aggressive option to catch up. There's also a worrying trend of Australia adopting larger cars in urban areas. A larger penalty of g/km might curb this trend and reduce pollution in urban areas. I'd support making exceptions for larger or less efficient vehicles for their job so as not to pass of the cost on them.	Yes
1373556	Aan Pursch	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to encourage as rapid as possible a transition to zero emission vehicles to help us to do our part in keeping global temperature rise to under 1.5 degrees.	No
1373557	Rohan Bernett	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Provides the greatest benefits. I don't care how much more tax I have to pay if it gets better results and gets them sooner. When it comes to the trifecta of \,Good, fast, cheap. Pick Two.\,, governments should always go with Good and Fast, and not worry about the up-front cost. It'll be a better investment in the long run.	No
1373559	Aaron Densham	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We don't have time in regards to climate change. It's a serious issue. We need to be fast and ambitious	Yes
1373561	B	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We owe it to future generations	Yes
1373566	Tracey Ali	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's time to act now	No
1373569	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373570	Tanya Clarke	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C provides the fastest transmission and the greatest saving long term.	No
1373574	Peter Tosi	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to catch up to the rest of the world. We need to get cleaner more efficient cars on the road	No
1373576	Margot Watkins	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Urgent need to fix emissions	NULL
1373577	Amanda Moore	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have to keep up with other countries and stop climate change now	No
1373578	Zachary Lyons	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to transaction to more efficient cars ASAP. Inefficient SUVs and utility vehicular are retorting out chances at a healthier community and environment	Yes
1373581	Jo Lamont	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373582	Cheree Amess	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	It makes good common sense	Yes

1373585	Howard Tankey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373586	Amy Hiller	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Transport emissions in Australia are rising. It is imperative that we align with the rest of the developed world and encourage fuel efficient ICE and EV cars into the Australian market for climate and also health reasons. As a healthcare professional, I believe the health costs of exhaust pollution in Australia is unacceptable. Option C is consistent with New Zealand's policy and therefore should be achievable. The inclusion of the SUV in options C and B is essential. Overall, very happy with the government's proposals to avoid loopholes and achieve environmental, health and cost benefits to Australians. Thank you.	Yes
1373591	Mary Anne Ayliffe	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373593	Etel Fletcher	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	The world is already at a tipping point, we need to go in hard and fast! no time wasters. Option C will give us the best and only chance at survival.	NULL
1373595	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373596	Philip Eastwood	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Needs to happen quickly to protect peoples health and help save the planet	No
1373601	Julia Underhill	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to step up and start leading in all things climate/environment/energy related.	No
1373604	Anders Ross	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Put simply, I choose Option C as we must act fast; we have been laggards for too long.	No
1373606	Ruth Barcan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are so far behind the rest of the world, with most to gain and most to lose in all the upcoming climate scenarios. Australian consumers are famous for being early adopters and it is hard to believe that we have been put in a position where we are unable to use our purchasing power to help the nation's climate goals. Consumer desire is there, and in some quarters very strong, but latent. Strong market mechanisms are urgently needed to allow us to catch up and face the future..	No
1373607	Henry Bartlet	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Most beneficial	Yes
1373614	Kathryn Fletcher	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373617	Rebecca Dunsdon	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373619	Hannes	Option A - 1st, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	I prefer for the least amount of \$billions to be printed by the government stealing value from existing holders of \$	No
1373620	Josefine Singh	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we are in the middle of climate emergency crisis, the fastest we can reduce CO2 the better	No
1373621	Sue Richardson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I love my children and grandchildren, and all life on Earth, our home	No

1373623	Carol Fly	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373627	Kate Whitbread	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1373629	Peter McInnes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act quickly on reducing emissions. Particularly as we have acted much slower than almost all developed nations up till now. We need to catch up with developments in advanced economies so we don't become a dumping ground for highly polluting, low efficiency environmental death traps.	No
1373632	Geoffrey Andrews	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to go harder than Option B to get the extra health and vehicle cost benefits at only a marginally lower benefit cost ratio. Reducing CO2 emissions as fast as reasonably possible is vital for a sustainable future world.	No
1373639	James Hansen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must reduce transport emissions as a matter of urgency without further delays and greenwashing.	No
1373641	Jane Wing	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because I believe it is essential that we do the most we possibly can to rectify this harmful situation ,	No
1373642	John Godfrey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is serious and urgent.	Yes
1373644	Philip Dooley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Stop Global Warming NOW, or nothing else we do will matter.	Yes
1373645	Peter Campbell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I would like to see a fuel efficiency standard that is as strong as possible, so I would prefer option C ahead of B. A is obviously ineffectual and not remotely acceptable. As a long-term EV driver since 2009, exclusively electric since 2019, I can assure you that the fuel cost savings estimates are at least realistic and probably underestimated. It is also essential that we not just meet but exceed our emission reduction targets in the areas that are relatively easy to abate such as land transport because other areas will be harder. For anyone anxious about 'the weekend', my wife and I have had no problem towing our very comfortable pop-top camper trailer, camping off-grid (even using the car's large battery via its vehicle-to-load function to run mains appliances), and easily managing travel days of 600km while towing with just two short stops for partial charges. We have suffered no 'consumer welfare loss' from choosing an EV. I see no reason why we could not see a parallel trend towards smarter, more efficient caravan designs that fold down to reduce frontal area like our camper does to minimise effects on range. The number of people who really need to 'tow a block of flats across the Simpson Desert' are very few. I note that all proposed options start with the same g/km target. Given that the decision to have a fuel efficiency standard was announced a year ago and the industry has had its voluntary scheme going since 2020, I don't see why options B or C could not start in 2025 with lower targets. The car importers have had plenty of time to get ready. All the proposed annual targets could be shifted forward by one year. The cumulative emissions and cost savings would be substantial. I also suggest legislating the inclusion of a 'ratchet' so that reviews of the targets for later years can only reduce and not increase the g/km targets.	Yes
1373652	Meredith Luke	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373658	Gerry Ligtermoet	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Co2 needs to be reduced sooner than later.	No
1373661	Chris Brownell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to contribute more to help reverse the worlds warming climate as it is accelerating now	No

1373662	Matthias Boer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Currently carbon emissions are not falling (quickly enough) to meet Australia's obligations under the Paris Agreement. The Australian Government should put additional measures, as proposed under Option C, in place as a matter of urgency to reduce emissions from vehicles. Australia is one of the biggest per capita carbon emitters and has therefore contributed disproportionately to increasing GHG concentrations. Australia should stay within its 'fair' carbon emission budget, which is running out.	No
1373663	David Bryan	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's all hands on deck to mitigate climate degradation ASAP. Option C will provide the fastest transition to clean cars with an accelerated trajectory to beat emissions targets in Europe and the US. Option C gives the government a popular mandate to stare down the car lobby.	No
1373665	Brian Crozier	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	More effective transition	No
1373666	Kerryann Peat	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Provides the best health and environmental benefits	No
1373670	Pamela Forte	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I actually found the options order confusing: however I hope I red it correctly because Option C was for me the quickest and best outcome. As I am closer to the end of my life than the beginning, I hope to leave behind great legacy for my descendants. It's time the entire population woke ump!	No
1373674	Vivienne Jackson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to move quickly if we are to try to secure a future for next generations.	NULL
1373684	Jeff Renner	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373686	J.Morganti	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Maximum result	No
1373687	Graham Shepherd	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We musty accelerate to net zero or the costs will bne vastly higher than these piddling amounts.	No
1373689	Julie White	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This is a climate emergency. We need to take action now.	No
1373692	Steve Hyde	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Doing nothing does nothing. Doing little does little more than nothing. Whatever the government sets out to do they will fail to achieve it so it is essential for them to aim high.	No
1373694	Richard Mount	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	These rules are far too late and so the cost, as predicted repeatedly, has gone up! We need the fastest way of implementing the transition and, as a super wealthy country, we can and should do it asap!	NULL
1373697	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need serious standards	No
1373698	Dorine Vis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe we need to act as quickly as possible to reduce Co2 emissions	No
1373699	Jim Taggart	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373703	Michael Oldfield	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1373705	Edith Mateljan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is last on the vehicles emissions standard adoption. Also behind in acting on renewable energy resources whereas we could have been a Leader more than a decade ago. Australia's emissions are increasing. So many large petrol driven vehicles on our roads, especially in the last 3 years. This is irresponsible and accelerating the impact of climate change with tragic, irreversible environmental damage: floods, fires, droughts, iconic Australian flora and fauna extinctions and threats.	No
1373706	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373711	Peter Wiebe	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373717	Mervyn Neilson	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	I do not wish to have my choice of vehicle transportation limited to underpowered expensive metropolitan vehicles. Living regionally I need to travel long distances frequently and to tow heavy loads of equipment.	No
1373720	Lindsay Peters	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reducing pollution, saving valuable oil reserves and limiting carbon emissions are critical issues. We need to achieve the highest efficiency in the shortest possible time.	No
1373723	Jolanta	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	For the cleaner world	Yes
1373725	paul power	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373726	Phillip Kairys	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Extreme Climate conditions are occurring more frequently than in previous history. Historical weather event records are broken each consecutive year. The obvious urgency for swift change in transport emissions is self evidentary. Option C is the quickest of the suggested actions. We the voters can be part of the change in transport emissions it is available to us. I would purchase a lower emissions vehicle	No
1373728	Jackie Williams	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1373730	Matthew Smith	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373733	Peter Maurits Van de Graaff	Option A - 1st, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	There is no empirical proof that CO2 influences climate. CO2 is a vital to ALL life trace gas and plant growing \,h0t houses increase CO2 levels to far greater levels than atmospheric levels. IPCC 3rd Assessment page 771 clearly states that in climate modelling we are dealing with a coupled non-linear chaotic system which make predictions about future climatic states inherently impossible.	No
1373734	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	We must take the strongest measures right now to slow down the Climate Crisis!	No
1373737	Margaret Matthews	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We urgently need improved standards	No
1373738	Jeffrey Irvine	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Get the job done sooner rather than later, regardless.	Yes
1373741	Jeff Wilson	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	The starting point for the NVES study was flawed - see attached file. Hence the outcomes are compromised. A doubling of EV sales as a percentage of all new car sales over the last three years indicates that EV sales could approach 100% as early as 2026. This has serious implications for ICE vehicle sales. The government must have the guts to stand up to an industry facing a bleak future of its own making. It needs to drive the transition to decarbonise the transport sector as soon and as rapidly as possible for the benefit of Australians, the planet and the industry. It should rework the NVES study or, at the very least, implement Option C.bles	No

1373744	Jamie C	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	This is the fastest way to get rid of emissions	No
1373745	Lou Flower	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To speed up transition of using renewable energy for the engines of vehicles	No
1373748	Emily Dunstan	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373749	Nils	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373754	Bernard Bezzina	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373759	Jonas Fehr	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce the climate change as fast as possible.	No
1373775	Nitai Terhanian	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I care about the environment. And I want to see an expedited shift towards a carbon-free energy economy.	No
1373777	Rob Passey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C has the highest net benefits, the highest total benefits and is the fastest to reduce GHG emissions.	No
1373781	Meredyth Woodward	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act quickly!	Yes
1373784	Stephen Jones	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Time is of the essence. MUST act now. to stop the rot	No
1373786	marton marosszeky	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we are lagging in our implementation and need to accelerate	No
1373791	J. Barry Gurdin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The world including Australia needs to stop using fossil fuels for the safety of the Planet Earth and it inhabitants.	No
1373792	Richard Bishop	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Need to save the planet	No
1373793	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1373796	Steven Roberts	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	EV infrastructure has a long way to go.	Yes
1373799	PAUL ROSE	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1373800	Andrew Carvel Evans	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Planet and us included will suffer more harm if we don't reduce pollution fast.	No
1373801	Susan Fletcher	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1373802	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373804	Victor Alemany	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1373805	Nicky	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As a global community we all need to do as much as we can as fast as we can	No
1373806	Simone Booth	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We're running out of time and more must be done now.	No
1373808	J D'orville	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	What are you waiting for. Time is running out for our planet. Stop playing at politics and do the right thing	No
1373809	Kate	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373813	Kerrick Featherstone	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Vehicle efficiency needs to be improved as fast as possible for the sake of our decendants. Far too much time has been lost discussing if the ship is actually sinking, and if it is, arguing about the cause, rather than doing something about it as soon as a problem was suspected. Argue about it later if you still want to. Whichever side of the fence one is on, the reality is that fossil fueled vehicles will be phased out so the sooner the process of reducing emmissions is escalated, the greater t	No
1373815	Debra R	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373816	Charles Stone-Tolcher	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373818	alexandre godichet	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	it is important to do it as faster as its possible	NULL
1373819	Chris Betts	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has a long way to go to reach its obligations under the Paris and subsequent agreements - just get on with doing what you can and don't be persuaded by the siren voices of vested interests!	No
1373822	Craig	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cars are just the start in Australia's renewable transition this needs to happen fast so that all other areas of the energy infrastructure will begin to transition faster also. Our current situation in Australia is embarrassing we should be world leaders. More needs to be done with our renewable resources domestically.	No
1373826	Dr Ken Wilson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To achieve maximum benefit, especially in relation to greenhouse gas production, but also pollution and air quality in cities.	No
1373827	Anthony McCormack	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1373830	clelia koch	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Clean air will save lives	No
1373832	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373836	Laurence Stevenson	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1373842	Zoe Humphreys	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We urgently need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The health effects on people, particularly children, and the environment of fossil fuels are well documented.	NULL
1373843	Jan Mitchell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need the fastest transition. We don't have the luxury of time.	NULL
1373844	Ken Enderby	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want the maximum impact on CO2 emissions possible.	No
1373845	Tom Spaapen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Sustainability first	No
1373847	Andrew Le Quesne	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It has taken so long to get to this point that the country has now fallen well behind the leading jurisdictions, this has to be reversed and made up.	No
1373848	Andrew Le Quesne	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It has taken so long to get to this point that the country has now fallen well behind the leading jurisdictions, this has to be reversed and made up.	No
1373849	antero mappes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373852	Donato Perreca	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373853	Constanta Mihaescu	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373854	Dean Leadbetter	Option A - 1st, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 2nd	Absurd and ridiculous- nobody can afford new cars in the first place , there should be a complete removal of ALL luxury car tax and any import taxes immediately to make ALL new cars more affordable	No
1373856	Bettina Lauritzen	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	NULL
1373861	Jackie Wright	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act to reduce climate change now	NULL
1373862	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL

1373870	Jacinta Sheehan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Vehicle emissions need to be rapidly reduced. Toyota should not be influencing government policy.	No
1373871	Lisa	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to take the fastest route possible as time is running out - and I thought this Government wanted to be \,world leading\, in pretty much everything post Brexit, and currently we're not leading in anything, except may our support for Ukraine but even that seems to be falling short now	No
1373872	Kaye Cook	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The urgent need to reduce pollution.	NULL
1373880	Anna	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1373881	Isa Boog	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373886	Bob Crispin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1373891	Peter Gorton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option A is virtually BAU, B moves in the right direction, but C moves Australia to where it should have been five years ago. And, the timetable to implement C is too slow -the industry will bleat, but it has been watching EU6 been implemented years ago, as well as the US, China and even New Zealand get serious about transport emissions. Australia is a dumping ground for inefficient, ever-larger, high emission vehicles, which the industry has been happy to promote and grow, while a tiny number of community-minded individuals have purchased and benefitted from purchasing Electric Vehicles.	No
1373901	John McGill	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373904	helene Masson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	the fastest the better. we don't have time, earth don' have time	No
1373907	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Too long lagging behind other countries for so long.	No
1373908	Amy Standish	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are running out of time, we need to act fast for this planet	NULL
1373909	Felicity Crombach	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We really need a fast track to reduce carbon dioxide levels. The longer we wait the greater the cost. So, bite the bullet and reduce the carbon dioxide levels as fast as possible.	No
1373913	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Urgent action needed to reduce emissions	No
1373914	Fernando M.	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373915	Elizabeth Maddox	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fastest route to the reduction of carbon emissions	Yes
1373920	Josy	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL

1373922	Henry Davies	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373925	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373926	Mick Betterridge	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	If you change the catch frase from 'net zero' to 'pretend zero' so everyone realises its just a term for big corporations to offset their pollution with money, it would be more transparent. Our emissions from motor vehicle driving are considerably lower than manufacturing them. So we should dive them for longer instead of making new ones that use microscopically less fuel. Tax imported cars! Saying we are paying at the bowser for our inefficient vehicles is a lie, fuel tax is why we pay a lot for fuel, efficiency difference is negligable and if we happen to use less fuel after all this then the tax per litre will have to rise to cover the reduction. Following the rest of the world is not smart if they are recomending manufacturing more cars.	No
1373927	NULL	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1373929	Tadhg	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Too many cars everywhere	No
1373930	Phillip Brown	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We can't afford to take our time on this. We are already on track to well overshoot the 1.5 degrees warming target. Anything that puts pressure on the efficiency of cars will help drive the transition away from fossil fuels. Australia can't keep being seen as the dumping ground for inefficient ICE vehicles.	No
1373931	Heather Morton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do everything we can to slow climate change and reduce natural disasters including heatwaves.	Yes
1373932	Alison	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is already doing great harm, we need to act quickly	Yes
1373933	Linda Evans	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373938	Stephen Dewar	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Fastest	No
1373940	Maria	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373942	Kehan Harman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	A clear financial and sustainable advantage to joining the future.	No
1373943	Chris Wood	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373944	David B	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	We have to move as quickly as possible to have any effect!	No
1373945	David Hutchinson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is an emergency. We need to act fast. Some costs are reasonable and ultimately cheaper than floods, bushfires, sea level rise etc	NULL

1373954	Jim K	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373958	Raymond Potvin	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	It's better for the environment.	No
1373960	Gabrielle Gosselin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373964	Albert	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I lived in Australia for many years and was shocked that the people and the country as a whole care so little about the environment. It is the highest time to change that and to energetically cut down the very high CO2 emissions per capita (higher than in the USA!) in Australia!	NULL
1373965	Joe M.	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	An unlivable environment hurts us all. We have to prioritize ecology.	No
1373966	Simon Mesner	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	To safe guard the environment, which in term safe guards all living creatures including the citizens of Australia and as a bonus it save money in the long run.	No
1373968	Deborah Hofman	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373970	Atiya	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373972	David	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373973	Michal Jon	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1373976	Walt Sepic	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Better results sooner.	No
1373979	Ramona Forsman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The most important thing is to stop the global warming before it's to late. Also, the numbers of the benefits and costs are the best.	No
1373985	Jaromir Guzinski	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we need action on reducing tailpipe emissions and fast!	No
1373988	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1373989	Ernest S	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Faster to drive CO2 levels down, which is all important.	Yes
1373996	Ali Vali	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This is the wany to go	Yes

1373997	J Day	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	It's the fastest option, and our planet is running out of time.	No
1373999	Margot VanEtten	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	We are in a crisis, and only by drastic emission cuts will we survive it.	No
1374000	Louis Béchard	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 1st	To those responsible for this petition, THERE IS NO OTHER HABITABLE PLANET BESIDES OUR EARTH!! WHERE IN GOD'S DO YOU WANT TO BREATHE AND LIVE?	Yes
1374002	Louise Allcoat	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1374003	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This is an emergency, we can not wait.	NULL
1374004	Sue Hutch	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's obvious. We are already late.	No
1374005	Darren	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	There is no other option but C. The government providing additional options is an attempt to keep all partys happy.	No
1374020	Helen Holmes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1374022	Laura J	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1374026	Christel Lindner	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C provides the fastest transition to beat CO2 targets which is what we need to give our children the future they deserve.	No
1374032	Ian Dodd	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C gives the lowest greenhouse gas emissions for a moderately increased cost, and a larger net \$ benefit.	Yes
1374035	George Bannister	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1374036	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1374037	Diana Dee	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1374038	Tibor Kovats	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Time has come to get the transition to renewable base energy and low to zero emissions from all vehicles done.	NULL
1374044	Michael Grant	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The world is falling behind on curbing CO2 emissions. Politicians worldwide talk the talk but fail to walk the walk. Where a genuine possibility exists to achieve a real and lasting reduction in emissions, it should be siezed with both hands, and no half-hearted halfway measures taken. The alternative might be easier in the short term, but will result in our grandchildren cursing our memory.	No

1374046	Suzanne Brown	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to move as quickly as possible to catch up with the rest of the world and cut pollution.	NULL
1374055	Humphrey van Polanen Petel	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	cleaner air	No
1374057	Sheila Robinson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Greatest positive environmental impact	No
1374058	Troy Tutaki	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has been lagging behind other countries in the global north for more meaningful actions to address climate change. Option C would finally see our nation cease lagging behind on most actions to address climate change & utilise this plan to put Australia ahead in at least one area. Especially needed whilst multiple fossil fuel mining projects continue in this country & disturbingly some projects are even in the process of expanding (Beetaloo Basin & Scarborough energy project).	No
1374060	Sonia Barber	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Our environment is critical to our survival	No
1374061	angela buzzard	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	NULL
1374062	Matthew Boguske	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1374064	AJAY MARUTI CHOLE	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1374070	Chris Bird-Butler	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It makes sense to progress as quickly as is possible.	No
1374075	Will Taylor	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We cannot afford to delay on this. The environmental cost to future generations far outweighs any monetary cost. We need to be pioneers leading the way on this issue, to encourage the rest of the world to follow suit.	No
1374076	Christopher Ware	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1374077	George Vaubell	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1374079	Owen Gray	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1374082	Nigel Peckham	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1374084	Judith van de Mast	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We only have one home: Earth, and we have to proserve it for next generaties.	No
1374085	Etienne G.	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1374087	Rob Baigent	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The world is already facing tremendous trauma from our ever increasing greenhouse gas emissions and we must do everything possible to reverse this quickly. The proposed options are really very mild, Before buying an EV I owned a 2004 Citroen station wagon which had lower emissions than the starting point for all options, surely in 2024 we can do much better than 20-year old technology.	No
1374091	Chandra Shah	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Need to transform asap. We have waited too long already	No
1374113	David Williams	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need stronger vehicle emissions regulations now if we are to achieve our emissions reduction targets. All of us need to share the cost of a rapid transition to a cleaner environment. Manufacturers will adapt as comparable world vehicle emissions standards will lower production costs due to reduced number of variable builds to meet different rules in different international jurisdictions.	No
1374115	Aimee Said	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	For relatively little extra funding we can achieve much greater benefits much sooner	No
1374123	Ben	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe the climate crisis necessitates action as fast as possible, whatever the upfront costs.	No
1374141	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This is a climate emergency, we should act as fast as we can and do everything we can to save our environment from further bush fires and flooding events, even if it costs more. The lives, livelihoods, properties and biodiversity saved will outweigh the cost.	NULL
1374142	Owen Ryan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1374144	David McDonald	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is quite simply time to make the hard decisions and build a sustainable future for all.	No
1374146	Jenny Brown	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce emissions as quickly as possible.	No
1374147	Bert Morris	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	No
1374149	Julia Doucette	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is no time to spare - we need to act fast. People can adapt surprisingly quickly when there is positive leadership on issues!	No
1374166	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1374169	John Rigby	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1374171	Lilie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cut carbon faster. Higher upfront cost will lead to long term benefits.	No
1374179	DJ	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C has the biggest net benefit by quite some margin, without too much additional cost. For example, battery replacement costs are more of a long term cost so one should go for option C given it'll have the biggest benefit and such longer term costs can be saved by the benefits one gets by doing option C over option B. Option A seems like a really bad idea, particularly given the huge benefits one gets by following B or preferably C. Following option A would also put Australia further behind in the world on fuel efficiency standards. I also believe that such a plan should make sure to support low and non-fuel modes of transport as much as possible, such as cycling (rather than car) or train (rather than air) networks, in order to maximise savings.	No

1374180	Paul Osborn	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate emergency, we need to cut emissions as fast as possible.	NULL
1374183	Tom Gibson	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	We have reached a critical stage with global warming. We have not made the hard decisions regarding coal and gas. We need to control the use of carbon based fuels in our vehicles. The cost benefit analysis is not well structured. The rapid start of Option C is necessary.	No
1374186	Lynne and Christine Pettall	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's obvious that long term benefits of option c outweigh the necessary costs. And happen sooner.	No
1374200	Lincoln Kern	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to accelerate the carbon abatement of transportation and help Australians save money faster...	No
1374201	Dr Adam Lucas	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has had no effective policy in this space for well over a decade and its transport emissions have been growing continuously since the early 1990s. Australia has one of the world's highest emissions per kilometre travelled for passenger and light commercial vehicles, and is now one of the last developed nations to introduce compulsory standards. I would also like to see the assumptions informing the methodology for the cost-benefit analysis.	No
1374202	Kirsten Mackenzie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1374204	Heike Weber	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have to act fast to halt climate break down	NULL
1374213	Jerome Wong	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The greatest benefits are realised in terms of planet health, human health, consumer economic savings.	No
1374218	Alex	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	benefit - cost value is better	No
1374225	John de Figueiredo	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do all we can to limit global greenhouse gas emissions. We now know that it's not enough to leave fossil fuels in the ground and decarbonise our economies. We've left it too late. To limit heating to no more than 1.5°C, we also need to draw down some of the carbon already in the atmosphere. (George Monbiot Wed 26 Jan 2022)	NULL
1374240	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Obviously, I've long believed we've been hoodwinked by successive governments (including those I've always supported and I'm a member of NSW Labor), I can't help wondering why the bloody hell they've been so tardy in doing something to save the planet and every living thing on it from the inevitable disaster we're facing, unless, of course, they, too, are in bed with th	No
1374248	Anthony Douglass	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There's an urgency in this that Option A completely ignores.	Yes
1374254	Ruth C	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	It seems like the most feasible option	Yes
1374256	Sophia Brumby	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe we need to change over as soon as possible, we need the earth to survive for our own wellbeing.	No
1374258	Clancy Carr	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This is our once in a lifetime opportunity to overhaul the way Australian's get around via private transport. We are facing catastrophic climate-induced impacts of transportation, not to mention thousands of Aussie deaths every year attributed to pollution. It is unconscionable to take this action as a half-measure; the lives of current and future Australians depend on strong and decisive leadership that embraces ambitious targets described in Option C. There cannot be an alternative.	No

1374264	Mary Hendriks	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	A transition to new vehicle emissions standards is important to minimise the health impact of particulates from vehicle emissions, potentially impacting children, especially those living and attending schools along busy highways. As Australia has delayed this transition and is well behind many other similar countries, a fast transition the preferred option to provide the best health outcomes.	No
1374267	Armando A. Garcia	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1374269	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate has already become dangerous. We cannot remain out of step with the rest of the world or delay this important change.	No
1374270	Sharon Laird	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to prioritise bringing in clean cars, phasing out our polluting autos	No
1374271	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	the air quclity in our cities and suburbs IS BAD and action is URGENTLY needed	No
1374272	Jill Balfour-Smith	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	Environmental	No
1374273	Oliver saxby	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	action needed for better air quality -cars are heavily polluting with toxic fumes	No
1374274	Angela Frimberger	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
1374275	Luke Clark	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we need stronger environmental regulation with this topic	No

1374292	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	fastest plan to drive down emissions	No
1374294	Kevin Sweeney	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B is achievable and provides the highest benefit/cost ratio. Option A is insufficient to achieve the desired outcomes.	Yes
1374295	Jenni Kerr	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	The sooner the better	No
1374303	Courtney Venaglia	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
1374312	Louis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The average fleet age in Australia being over 10 years creates an importance of acting swiftly, the fact these rules operate on a fleet basis is loose enough. I would also love to see Euro 7 implemented alongside these rules.	Yes
1374373	Kirsten Anker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Both options B and C bring benefits to Australia and Australians, though C brings more benefits. I don't accept the costs figures for Option C: fuel efficiency technologies have been available around the world for so long that transfer of that technology should happen rapidly and with little expense: cars aren't more expensive overseas than in Australia, and Australian cars aren't made here. This policy doesn't requires that all cars are electric, so the costs for technology, electricity and battery replacement are not relevant for all vehicles.	NULL
1374433	Jane Watson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C has the most significant benefits	No
1374456	Peter Gillbank	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Urgent situation, we need to go in hard	Yes
1374482	Susan Christophersen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1374496	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C provides the fastest transition.	No

1374510	Sinead Francis-Coan	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must accelerate all trajectories of climate action. Australia has become the dumping groups for inefficient emissions-heavy vehicles. Option C will incentivise necessary cultural change. Many people would prefer to use/own an electric vehicle but the current policy setting inhibit this.	NULL
1374517	Peter Robinson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We do not have time pussy-foot around with climate change. The sooner EVs become the norm the sooner all Australians will see the benefits of electrification.	NULL
1374538	Vic Earle	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Saving the planet and avoiding species extinction	No
1374565	Zain Upton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Biggest net saving, greenest option. We should push hard and be a world leader!	No
1374567	Elmer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1374744	Berenice	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	How can you put a 'cost' on this? What is the cost of a person's life who dies from respiratory issues due to pollution?	Yes
1374769	Genevieve O'Brien	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need urgent action on runaway climate change and this is one more important measure available to both governments and private citizens to reduce emissions and our dependence on fossil fuels	No
1374845	Johannes Paul Lehmann	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Opting for Option 3, focusing on reducing Australia's dependency on fossil fuel imports, presents the most compelling opportunity in the current geopolitical climate. Escalating tensions in the South China Sea and potential disruptions to key fossil fuel supply chains pose significant risks to Australia's essential services, including healthcare, public sectors, and daily commuting. Leveraging Australia's abundant mineral resources, there is a considerable opportunity to establish a local electric vehicle (EV) supply chain. Initially, this could involve operating on a semi-knocked-down (SKD) basis for foreign manufacturers, eventually progressing to a completely knocked-down (CKD) model for Australian-designed and built vehicles. While the era of Holden as an Australian automotive icon has ended, the emergence of the EV industry offers the prospect of establishing a new Australian automotive legacy. Looking to success stories like VINFAST in Vietnam, which surpassed giants like VW and Toyota in its IPO listing, underscores the potential for Australia to create a thriving EV sector from scratch. Implementing an EV credit trading platform could compensate for lost fuel excise tax revenue, ensuring funding for essential roadside infrastructure construction. Manufacturers failing to meet EV quotas could be subject to penalties, incentivizing compliance and stimulating the growth of the local EV market. Moreover, stringent emission standards should establish clear benchmarks for EV performance, energy consumption, and real-life range to prioritize higher-quality EVs for a sustainable transition. While an immediate shift towards electric mobility may not align with the government's short-term interests, choosing the government-favored option risks squandering valuable time needed to establish a robust local EV industry. By prioritizing Option 3, Australia can reclaim lost advanced manufacturing capabilities, capitalize on the research and development prowess of leading Australian universities, and emerge as an innovation powerhouse in the Southern Hemisphere. This approach not only creates more jobs for Australians but also positions the country as a global leader in sustainable transportation and advanced manufacturing.	NULL
1374879	Peter Kolditz	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Health & Life for the all of us & Planet Earth	NULL
1374896	Carmel King	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	I believe we are running out of time. We need to act as soon as possible.	No
1374900	Leo Joosten	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cimate change is a very urgent issue	No
1374905	Thomas Luck	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act as quickly as possible.	Yes

1374929	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1374932	gavin hughes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe we need to catch up to other countries as fast as possible with option C or B as a minimum without super credits like VW and FCAI wants to prolong their profits at our collective cost. Transport emissions need to be reduced quickly and this is the best way to do that to enable more time for harder areas like trucks and planes.	Yes
1374950	Stephanie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	If we take it a bit slower we may benefit from technology that has not been invented yet e.g. better batteries, more efficient fuel	Yes
1374955	Mike Smith	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Doing it slowly will doom us. It's probably already too late	No
1374956	Bronwen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have had inaction for too long. As a consequence Australia needs to move as fast as possible and make every effort to catch up to the rest of the world. The climate is rapidly warming and there is no time to waste.	Yes
1374973	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1374978	Tom Anderson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Environmental reasons	No
1374982	Pier Giorgio Nicoletti	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Urgency. Our planet is showing increasingly acute signs of deterioration. There is no time to waste, environmental protection should take top priority over everything else.	No
1374986	Dirk Higgins	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The quicker action is taken, the better chance the planet has of surviving.	No
1374995	Robert	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have less than 10 years to turn the climate change ship around if we want to keep within 1.5 degrees of warming. Transport emissions are a substantial contributor to greenhouse gas emissions and Australia must do everything we can to reduce our emissions as quickly as possible given we are so far behind globally in terms of implementing any fuel efficiency standards	Yes
1375009	Luca Napolitano	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cars are a major source of pollution in Australia and putting strict control measures in to reduce this at a government level is crucial.	NULL
1375012	Oscar	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Lo más conveniente	No
1375013	Jan-Willem te Maarsse	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375017	Julie Walker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375022	Denise Sweetman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C gets us there faster.	Yes
1375027	Annita	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1375030	Jesse	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	Yes
1375032	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	NULL
1375036	Lesley Grahame	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Floods, droughts, wildfires, crop losses happening now.	No
1375038	Michael Cuff	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Every country needs to do more as quickly as possible	No
1375039	rob myers	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375040	Matt C	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Set targets high, not easy.	Yes
1375041	David	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375050	Capt. Victor V Hoisington	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We cannot delay the transition but we cannot afford the costs involved except for the cost of further delay and inaction.	No
1375070	Louise Mewton	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375078	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Biggest positive results is option C for the environment and drivers and their families.	Yes
1375086	Massol	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375093	Gillian Blakely	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The faster we act to reduce emissions the better	No
1375105	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375119	Kaspar Grossmann-Hensel	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	It acknowledges the fact of climate emergency. I prefer it because it will have a exemple-effect on the entire industry in the country	No
1375127	Chris	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Given the urgent need to not just achieve but exceed our current climate goals, and that any proposed standard will be watered down by political needs, we should be starting with the most ambitious goal.	Yes
1375141	Dorothy Wasson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Environment needs must move FAST	No

1375155	Graeme THOMPSON	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	There is a mention of benefits to the community. This is a very open question, it cannot benefit when costs are increasing. EV's are not the answer as the costs outweigh any pushed benefit. There are options such as LPG that has substantially less emissions than petrol or diesel and is a 100% Australian fuel yet the government has let this fuel waste as its mandate to follow other countries who do not have our characteristics down the ev line. It's ironic that Norway has made its billions out of oil but now spruce EV's as the answer. Lpg has infrastructure in place, there are many manufacturers making lpg vehicles for worldwide markets yet we don't have the vehicles available. Kia is one of those manufacturers. Australians have a love affair with their vehicles probably due to the necessity of long distance travel and they won't be told what they have to buy by any government. It is likely that any petrol, or diesel car purchased would be held onto longer if an ev mandate is pushed. If the costs of ownership increase due to government policy, these costs would be passed onto consumers if these cars were being used for business purposes. How can a government push work?... Australia is a unique country and we do not have to follow other countries. We have unique transport issues that are not replicated anywhere else in the world. Australians are not as ignorant as the politicians think, and they research government push and now question the purpose behind these pushes. There's always big corporations behind any government move and if this country is taxed just for an ideology then the potential for even greater social unrest is likely.	No
1375165	Milli ghosh	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375194	John Gare	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Convinced from Climate Change Authority's 2014 work that Australia has every reason to adopt world standard fuel efficiency standards. Failure to do so before now is shameful in my opinion.	Yes
1375206	Daniel	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Our car emmissions are heading in a a direction opposed to our carbon emmsion targets and need to be reversed as quickly as possible	Yes
1375221	Satya Vayu	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is an emergency!	No
1375227	Suzy Manigian	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is no time left to muck around. Lowering carbon emissions is urgent.	No
1375237	Ralph Cartwright	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	10 years of missed opportunity and we need to be much bolder	No
1375242	Carolyn Ingvarson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	C is better for the environment and health but has a higher cost and its impact on emissions is high. Most important is that SUVs are counted as passenger vehicles under B&C not A Utes still considered light commercial in all options	NULL
1375248	Charles Jones	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C maximises the benefits to Australians and is in the National Interest. These changes should have been put in place decades ago and it is a national disgrace that Australia is one of only two developed countries that don't have a vehicle efficiency standard (the other being Russia). SUV's must be covered by the the fuel efficiency standard. Any other approach is unacceptable to the vast majority of Australians who want concrete action on emissions reduction and climate change solutions. Option A is in fact the highest cost option to the Australian community in terms of economics, health and prosperity - in both collective and individual senses. Australia is over 90% dependent on imported transport fuels at a cost of \$50 billion per year and with only around 30 days supply in country. This is a major energy security risk and every effort must be made to reduce dependence on imported fuel and shift to electric vehicles as a matter of urgency.	Yes
1375260	Daniel Lester	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions ASAP	Yes
1375273	Genevieve Heard	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We don't have any time to waste on projects mitigating climate change. We need the fastest option.	NULL
1375277	Colin Lambie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C requires quicker action than either Options A or B. However none of these three Options require action in 2025. There has been discussion about the standards changing for over a year, and given the fuel efficiency standards already applying in USA & Europe, there is no reason to wait till 2026 to introduce better fuel efficiency standards.	NULL

1375280	Robyn Gray	Option A - 0th, 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. The car lobby want to keep Australia stuck in the slow lane and keep dumping their petrol-guzzling cars down under for as long as possible. Option C will mean Australia will finally join the rest of the developed world on new vehicle efficiency standards.	NULL
1375283	Ruth Bradshaw	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	It is the best option for reducing climate-change.	No
1375285	J. Muzza	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we need to avoid climate catastrophe	No
1375297	Darren	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are so behind the rest of the world. We need this change sooner rather than later.	Yes
1375301	James mumme	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	58b is a small price to pay for the potential benefits especially given how much governments are prepared to spend on obsolete weaponry like nuclear submarines. weaponyps	No
1375304	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375313	Nicholas Lawson	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
1375317	Anne Norman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The sooner we get rid of polluting cars the better. Any action that reduces harmful emissions is the way to go. The \cost\, is not just dollars, but also the health of the environment and all creatures living on earth, including humans. Australia needs to play her part.	Yes
1375319	Rachael	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	Yes

			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.	
1375320	Geoff	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	A is pointless. B is good but C is best, it seems to me.	Yes
1375322	Kristin Huntoon	Option A - 0th, 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
1375323	Derek Bolton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The difference between the ratios calculated for B and C is within the margin of error, and the trend in estimates of the cost of climate change is ever upwards	NULL
1375327	Malcolm Johnson	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375329	Lee	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change and air quality.	Yes
1375331	Lauren Sutter	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
1375332	Doug mathias	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are fast approaching a catastrophic climate tipping point, if not there already	No

1375333	Jurgen Lenz	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375350	Rebecca Howard	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The time to act is NOW! No more mucking around. We don't have time. Our health and the health of our planet are at risk and deteriorating fast. We don't have time to sit on our hands. If our transport emissions are already worse than the USA, then that's pretty bad. We take our clean air for granted here in Australia, but we really can't afford to. It's such a draw card for tourists to visit Australia, but once it's gone it's gone. I live on a major road (Pacific Hwy, Charlestown NSW) and need to shut all my windows so that the pollution doesn't blow inside. My health and the health of my family suffers as a result of this pollution (allergies, respiratory conditions, asthma.) My house gets filthy from the pollution. We have made the decision to invest in an electric car and reduce our household emissions, but we really need backup from the community and government. Why should our health and future continue to be put at risk just so some people who like driving enormous, diesel guzzling, polluting light truck style cars are able to keep driving them around the city?	Yes
1375351	Ken Coghill	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia will immediately benefit from technological developments and avoid the costs of manufacturing for unique Australian standards	No
1375362	Lee	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	The Government is not being realistic and are also being deceptive by imposing a fleet wide cap on a manufacturer's emissions. I believe the Government's legislation will actually reduce the choice of vehicles not increase the choice. It will also force up the costs of vehicles ,far greater than any predicted fuel savings. It will also increase the cost of fuel for everyone ,including the millions who cannot afford to buy a new car. This is excessive government market interference which is telling people what type of car the can and cannot afford to buy. Furthermore it will have absolutely zero impact on climate change because the Australian car fleet is a tiny insignificant percentage of global emissions. This plan is all costs , and no benefits for the Australian people.	No
1375364	Diana James	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must transition to the new fuel efficiency standards as soon as possible. While Option B seems reasonable we know from past experience that though government policy may change the implementation of change often takes a lot longer than anticipated. We cannot afford to delay.	Yes
1375366	Drew Robinson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The costs of Option C don't seem a lot higher than Option B, so we might as well go for the best net benefit outcome.	Yes
1375368	Lawrence Ingvarson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must move as fast as possible to reduce greenhouse gas emissions	Yes
1375370	Huw Rodgers	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The earth is warming incredibly quickly. We need to act as fast as we acted to the pandemic.	Yes
1375386	Heather Boulden	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	This is the fastest way to transition.	No
1375409	Sheila McInnes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We Australians are so far behind that we have a responsibility as a rich nation to catch up and push ahead for the sake of the whole world.	NULL
1375411	stephen david jensen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Scientific research papers from around the globe provide the facts on how the world's climate is changing faster than predicted. While there are no shortage of international committees willing to gather and \,promise\, to do better every year, the lack of material progress is clearly leading humanity to a premature extinction. We need to urgently do more, as the early indicators of climate change are becoming more evident, even to blind Freddie! Option B should only be enacted if C cannot.	Yes
1375416	George Cook	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This is not about hypothetical cost/benefit figures (as shown), this is about getting Australia's new vehicles (all imports) to comparable fuel usage/carbon emissions to those in most other developed countries. Most of all, it is about reducing new vehicle carbon emissions as part of the move towards zero carbon. So the priorities should be those which give the greatest emissions reductions.	No
1375419	Karen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are so far behind, we need to move quickly. Although the costs are high, the benefits will far outweigh them in the long term, particularly for individual health & the environment.	Yes

1375423	Fern Pendragon	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is no time to lose!	No
1375434	Rob Lawther	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C has the most savings, and gets us where we need to be the fastest. Seems like the best option to me.	Yes
1375436	Brian	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to reduce energy consumption and emissions as fast as possible	NULL
1375437	Bob Stensholt	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Middle course seems reasonable for the average person	Yes
1375440	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	option c	No
1375454	Sonia	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate emergency.	No
1375457	Mitchell Swann	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I feel the Government needs to act on this as soon as possible at the highest level. The previous Liberal Government stuffed around for twelve years.	No
1375461	Linda Bradburn	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
1375520	Annie Correy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375527	Jaap Zwaal	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375533	Gerd Ragette	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is the most effective one	No

1375566	Luke	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	NULL	Yes
1375571	Ron Anstis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cost is not the deciding factor when the environment is at stake. No amount of saved cash will buy it back.	No
1375574	Rod Hinds	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	An incentive to produce efficient Vehicles can only be good however it has to be done in a way so as not to disrupt economy and population. There is really no great hurry. We are not in a crisis.	No
1375576	Graham Taylor	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Australia has for too long failed to address this issue and should have simply adopted the standards applicable in the US or the EU. As it is, we have become the dumping ground for vehicles that would not meet the US or EU standards.	No
1375577	Kaye Morgan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is the biggest issue of our generation.	Yes
1375579	Gabriella Thompson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375581	Brendon	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1375589	Mike Hall	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Very similar cost benefit ratio but markedly improved reduction in greenhouse gases	Yes
1375594	Laura	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do what we can about climate change and not get left behind	No
1375595	Caron Peacock	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As we are so far behind the rest of the world, we need to urgently implement these new standards as still have a long way to go to catch up with the rest of the world	No
1375599	Colin Johnson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cataclysmic climate change	No
1375601	Prof Alexander Heger	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C provides the largest amount of net benefits. I fail to see why you would not want to use that. The government's preferred Option B is withholding almost \$20 billion from Australians compared to Option C. The cost-to-benefit ratio the government's preference seems to be based upon is an irrelevant quantity, likely introduced by some clever lobbyist and Australian politicians appear to lack the presence of mind to see through that.	No
1375602	Chris Dodd	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375603	Birgitta Persson	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1375605	Daniel Wimberley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Wouldn't be wonderful if Australia led the way on this, pointing us all towards a better future! By the way, I suspect that the figure for electricity costs in the comparative BCR;s are incorrect. With progressive policies on renewables, electricity costs will tumble down!	No
1375608	Jo	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reduce emissions	No

1375610	Ellen McCann	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375615	Aubouy Mireille	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375619	Blake Bennett	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is the biggest problem facing humanity	No
1375620	Mathew	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should be transitioning as fast as possible. We need to do what ever we can and anything but the fastest transition and best option is falling short. US are not the gold standard and we should aim higher.	Yes
1375626	Matt Mulligan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The net benefits and environmental impact make C or B no-brainer options	Yes
1375627	PJ	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Utilising solar which is abundant in Australia we can push for Electric vechiles that will help the environment. But more importantly help Australians. Subsidise solar battery's like solar is subsidised and we can really push Australia into the future as a responsible country.	No
1375629	Tim O'Loughlin	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	We need to move quickly to catch up with the other OECD members, and to get lower priced EVs into Australia. Option A does basically nothing. Option B is too slow, but is considerably better than option A. A real risk is that an incoming liberal government would remove these regulations. They need to be embedded and soon.	Yes
1375633	Luke O	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Of the earths atmosphere CO2 only equates for 3%, and of the 3% humans only cause 0.04%, and of that 0.04 Australia only causes 1.2%. We are a drop in the ocean, the law will not have any effect on how climates change around the world. This law is just artificially increasing the demand for electric vehicles. Electric vehicles are impractical in Australia, especially in Rural areas. We don't have the infrastructure to support them. Another note is the alot of electric cars come from China, as everyone knows China is the largest producer of CO2 emissions. The Chinese cars are made with Coal power. All the other car makers that produce the cars that Aussies WANT will be forced to pass the cost onto the consumer, therefore it will just add to inflation and increased cost of living	No
1375638	John Lang	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I have researched the information available not only with this petition, but through other sources. The current scare campaign by the Opposition and vested interests is a shameful reflection on our country	Yes
1375646	Rob MacFarquhar	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's the only sensible thing to do!	No
1375652	Daniel Kennedy	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	Yes

			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.	
1375674	Robert Worthington	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Passes the cost benefit test and there's little point in leading the world in emissions reduction given our contribution to issue compared to most other economies. To do so would cutting our nose off to spite our face.	Yes
1375675	Debra Dean	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C has a shorter time frame to achieve lower Co2 emissions and a higher percentage of Co2 intensity reductions.	NULL
1375676	Jay Tuckey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Going for the fast start will provide the biggest benefit, and should be achievable as car companies already have all the tech required to bring the emissions/fuel use down, they are just not shipping it to Australia. Also, it is the right long-term strategy.	NULL
1375689	Alice White	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis is really and is threatening human existence	No
1375691	Alan Reader	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B seems to best enforce the burden of responsibility falls to the manufacturer/distributor without overly inflating pricing for the consumer.	Yes
1375692	Lawrie Brown	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need prompt action on an efficiency standard to ensure that Australia does not become a dumping ground for inefficient polluting vehicles more than it already is. Option B, tracking to align with US standards is an effective approach, given their similar large geographic & vehicle profile. Option C would be better still for the environment and health, but acknowledging it will likely be more costly, and probably less politically acceptable. Option A doesn't provide sufficient incentive to promote the changes needed.	Yes
1375698	Gemma Prior	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375702	Anne Morris	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1375708	Rafael Branton	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

1375712	Sarah Busuttil	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 0th	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
1375713	Tom	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The world is burning! No time to idle.	Yes
1375714	KD Loughton	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	sounds achievable	Yes
1375720	Mark Twidell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to catch up with the OECD but at a pace that gives some initial relief to any unintended consequences of change.	Yes
1375721	Paul Doyle	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option B would probably have been the best option about 10 years ago, but as that decade has now been wasted, with no significant policies to drive down emissions in this sector, Option C is preferred to try to make up for some of the emissions which could have been avoided by earlier action.	Yes
1375722	Sean Beasley	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.	No
1375725	Terrie Lee	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1375726	Gary Collinson	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	Yes

			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.	
1375727	Bryan Rollins	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	If we are the newest standard on the block and are not leading the conversation, then we are just late to the game and showing ourselves as a slow learner. Option C provides a much wider range of benefits: Consumers do better. Net benefits from Option C are far greater (almost 20% better) Penalties need to be higher than the proposed Option B - manufacturers need to be held strongly to account - we can't afford anyone to violate the rules without strong penalties Keep it simple and keep out the loopholes out. Exclude technology credits. Wipe out multiplier credits. SUVs are passenger vehicles and should be treated as such.	Yes
1375728	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	more cost effective and more economical benefits over time.	No
1375729	Alex We	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	If the previous govt had implemented an efficiency standard, we could afford to apply this measure more slowly, but they didn't. Climate change is happening as we speak and Australia needs to do its bit now and pump the brakes on its emissions. My children and their children are already paying for the former liberal PMs' inaction.	Yes
1375732	Alison Wotherspoon	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We don't have any time left to dither around with this we are running out of time	Yes
1375733	Keith Allan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is so far behind that option A is totally unacceptable, option B is too slow, option C is by far the best option. 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). 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. 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. As the driver of an EV, I feel strongly that Australia is way behind in properly managing vehicle emissions.	Yes
1375737	Colin White	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia should have the strongest emission standards in the world	Yes
1375739	Ben O'Connor	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	Yes

			<p>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>	
1375740	Todd Norbury	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are running out of time.	No
1375741	Miriam harman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	It will achieve a realistic time for change and save fuel, have health benefits decrease greenhouse emissions and reduce vehicle maintenance	Yes
1375742	Michael Walker	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
1375743	David Banner	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I really want to see this legislation implemented. Australia has been too far behind the rest of the world on this front for far too long. We should be towards the front and showing the rest of the world how it should be done.	Yes
1375744	Susie Gentle	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The sooner that electric cars become very affordable and practicable, the sooner that CO2 Emmissiond will be dramatically reduced.	No
1375745	Tom Brodhurst-Hill	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are already behind other countries and need to catch up. Our health, especially of our children, depends on it.	Yes
1375746	Ian	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to catch up with the rest of the world in reducing fuel emissions. Option B provides a god balance of investment and return.	Yes

1375747	David Haustead	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
1375752	Jonathan Ebbage	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	<p>Australia should be a leader in green energy. We have all the natural resources we need to be 100% green and yet we are falling behind other, less fortunate countries.</p>	Yes
1375753	Robert Tunn	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
1375757	Stephen Foley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	<p>Australia should be taking courageous, accelerated steps to lower vehicle emissions due to the abysmal historical lack of performance by former governments and influence by the vehicle sector and related interests. Setting a strong standard leapfrogs Australia ahead, supports the case for COP hosting to the world, encourages substantial investment within the sector and related services, and provides the Australian consumer with more choice (due to confidence to import greater ranges of vehicles), more competition (and lower costs), and a healthier environment for our current and future generations. PLEASE show the leadership and courage to to adopt Option C which presents as a well thought out option with minimal detrimental impacts to the Australian people and society.</p>	No

1375758	Chris Curry	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
1375763	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B is the smartest most efficient and cost effective version	Yes
1375764	Susan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375765	Mark Reynolds	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is currently far behind almost all other countries that have large vehicle fleets. We need to catch up as quickly as possible which makes Option C the strongest choice, Option B acceptable, and shows Option A to be a pathetic offering..	Yes
1375766	NULL	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375774	Brian Wright	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	Yes

			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.	
1375776	Dave Wells	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The existing research is unequivocal that a strong NVES gives the greatest benefits to all Australian people as a society in terms of health, financial and technological. Government owe us this and should be representing our best interests instead of the industries heavily investing in influencing the outcome for their bottom line.	Yes
1375778	Susan Henderson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is so late in limiting carbon emissions, we should go hard now.	Yes
1375781	Deni McKenzie	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	to minimize Greenhouse gases/Climate change/rail transport to minimize the degradation of roads; to get goods from A-B by rail.	No
1375782	Brian Lockley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As a concerned Senior Citizen, I fear for we leave future generations.	Yes
1375785	Ian McGregor	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.	No
1375786	Joel Blacker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe Option C is the best option for Australians as the analysis does not seem to adequately account for the "externalities" of climate impact costs. We must transition as rapidly as possible.	Yes
1375791	Ray Calaby	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia should catch up to the rest of the world, especially New Zealand and Britain. We should not be the 'dumping ground' for inefficient vehicles, increasing pollution and the health issues that are associated. The car makers currently have to comply with Europe, USA, Britain and New Zealand, etc. so why would they consider that Australia does not require any Fuel Efficiency standards.. It will ultimately cost them no more to manufacture vehicles for the Australian market than for those countries with more fuel efficient standards.	No
1375795	Bill mcewan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we need to update to cleaner air	Yes
1375798	Graham Williams	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	When I came to Australia seven years ago I was appalled at the lack of any fuel standards. At last this country can begin catching up with the rest of the world and give it's cities cleaner air, it's citizens a healthier life and improve our chances of surviving the next 100 years without the climate collapsing.	Yes
1375799	A	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	Yes

			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.	
1375800	Liz Millington	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Given the accelerating impacts of climate change I think it imperative for any possible measure to reduce Australia's carbon emissions to be put into effect immediately. Given also the large contribution vehicular transport makes to Australia's carbon emissions, this is a very good opportunity to reduce emissions as transforming our power generation will take some time. We have to take some pain in this crisis!	NULL
1375804	Justine Pfeiffer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	everyone should have access to affordable ev's	Yes
1375805	Ross Mewton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has fallen behind the rest of the rich countries in limit vehicle emissions and we urgently need to make up for lost timed	NULL
1375810	Dr William H Leadston	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Our Planet is in Climate Crisis with vehicle pollution a huge contributor for us all but especially future generations	Yes
1375812	Marcus	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do something about climate change before it's too late	Yes
1375814	Susan Hawick AM	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As above	No
1375815	Andrew Braun	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is time for Australia to step up. I have travelled to a number of different countries around the world, and there is nothing like returning to the clear blue skies of Australia. For far too long we have naively sat on our hands and been deceived into thinking \,she'll be right, mate\,. It is not alright, and it is time for Australia to step up. The other day I was speaking to a friend in Sumba, Indonesia. He lives a very simple life, but climate change is changing how he and his family survive. But there is very little he can do to change his plight. He uses very little power at home, lives a subsistence life style and rides a small motor bike to get around. He is really feeling the impacts of climate change but there is little he can do. Unlike, you and I here in Australia. Our family are trying to do our bit to make a difference. Choosing small economical cars, installing solar at home, and working to make our home more efficient, but we need government support. They should be making Australia's Standards 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. There has been talk about new standards for years. Manufacturers needs to accept this new world and stop burdening Aussies with inefficient vehicles. It is time for Australia to step up!!	Yes

1375817	Beth Charleston	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375819	Peter Sachs	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia sadly lags behind most of the developed nations in adopting Fuel efficiency standards which runs contrary the the current Federal Government's policies re Net Zero emissions. Even if there is not a majority of EVs on our roads the fuel efficiency standards will result in better environmental outcomes than the present situation with ICE cars.	Yes
1375821	John McKay	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The sooner the better - no time to waste. The rest of the developed world is way ahead of Australia. Climate change dictates immediate action.	No
1375822	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Best chance of a positive outcome	NULL
1375826	Giles Brunning	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We're behind the rest of the world and the environment doesn't care about costs. I'm certain there are more savings than stated with the quickest transition, so don't actually believe option c will cost significantly more in the end.	Yes
1375827	Mario Bugeja	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
1375828	Ekkehard Groskreutz	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Net benefits and total benefits stand out at only marginally more total costs in comparison to option 2	No
1375829	Leonie Dorrestein	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375830	RON RENTON	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have waited long enough to catch up with the rest of the world, we should not have to wait any longer	No
1375831	Pete Star	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Optimal approach	Yes
1375833	Peter Procailo	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to move fast after decades of inaction.	Yes

1375835	richard swinton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The need to slow climate change is urgent - a higher cost is more realistic if we want to aim for a better future for our children.	Yes
1375843	Anthony Learmonth	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The faster we make the transition away from fossil fuels, the better for Australia, and the world. Australia is already lagging badly in this area, compared to similar nations. We need to make an effort to catch up as quickly as we can facilitate the change.	Yes
1375846	Don McMahon	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Now it's time for action. There has been more than enough time to get sorted any delay is just a stalling tactic. We must go for the greatest impact possible. Fortunately the benefits for the climate and the public and personal budgets align, so this is a no brainer.	Yes
1375850	Liz Thornton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Having used Solar energy for over 20 yrs.I understand the urgency for the world to switch to renewables now not in years to come.Australia has allowed itself by the excessive influence of fossil industries to be exploited by car manufacturers who had a dumping ground for their cars which were not required to have a fuel efficiency rating which might have enabled our renewables industry to provide us with either solar or hydrogen batteries as prices started to reduce .That was a criminal ,deliberate oversight by politicians to receive cash for elections rather than passing bills which looked after our environment and our childrens health now and future.	Yes
1375858	Peter Youll	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
1375864	Mungo	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The quicker we get this done the better for the future for everyone.	Yes
1375865	Deni McKenzie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The government is not fulfilling the promise to meet the global emission by 2025	No
1375874	Dave Connell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option A should definitely not be considered - it is too weak, and nowhere near ambitious enough. Option C is clearly the best given the environmental and health benefits. Plus it puts us on par with the EU and UK, whereas Option B is only equivalent to the US (which is obviously better than we have now, but still could be a lot better).	NULL
1375878	Jason Halliwell	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	B or C targets will be missed, car prices will rise, labor will lose the election and we will follow NZ and repeal the legislation just like we repealed the excellent carbon tax legislation.	No
1375881	Jason Halliwell	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Legislate option B but only to 2027 then reassess. If we've failed to hit targets pause until we do. Option B goes too far too fast and will be attacked as a \ute tax\,, labor may lose the election and the libs may follow NZ and repeal the legislation just like they repealed the excellent carbon tax. We risk such a terrible failure for nothing?	NULL

1375882	Thomas Griffin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To save our health system billions of dollars in the future due to lung disease & cancers from polluted air, To save the planet from ever increasing extreme weather events due to man made climate change. The science is fact.	Yes
1375885	Chris Adams	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Rapid climate change is undervalued world-wide. Australia has the means to rapidly move into low carbon business systems and governance.	No
1375887	David Freeston	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is a climate crisis.	Yes
1375891	Carin Goldwaser	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must stop Climate Change ASAP or it will cost billions in natural disaster recovery and displaced people.	NULL
1375895	Michael Leane	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C will help Australia to catch up to the global market for efficient vehicles, making the Australian market 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. Benefits to consumers should be a priority. The benefit-to-cost ratio of Option B and C are very similar, but the net benefits of Option C are far greater. The shorter expiry of credits in Option C means that overperforming manufacturers have a shorter time to sell their credits to other companies, making a slightly fairer playing field. 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.	Yes
1375896	Mrs Jaye ALLAN	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
1375902	Don	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Given that the information supplied says that c is the best option we have government still failing its constituents	No
1375903	Don	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Given we wasted 10 years to implement this best that we correct the imbalance asap	No
1375904	Kerry Nice	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia's vehicle efficiency standards are some of the worst in the world. \,Opportunity for suppliers to adjust\, mostly means \,won't bother until forced to do so\,. It is well past time for Australia to adjust to the reality of climate change and actually begin the transitions needed. Besides, the upfront costs will be more than offset by the benefits.	Yes
1375906	Rosalind	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia benefits most from a fast change to cleaner cars	No

1375909	David Hudspeth	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is a major threat to the well being of Australians and reducing our transport emissions is essential if we are to avoid a future of deteriorating outcomes. 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
1375910	Dinesh Piskala Mahadevan	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
1375913	Palmira ARIAS SIMSON	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We can no longer procrastinate, we must take action on climate change now.	No
1375915	Paul Hutton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1375916	Carly	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	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	Yes

			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.	
1375918	Deanne	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	National security , health outcomes for citizens. reduce suffering and premature deaths from using ICE vehicles.	NULL
1375928	Benjamin Prak	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Best for the environment	No
1375931	Hari Vijayaraghavan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1375932	Thanasis Avramis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Refer to Submission	No
1375933	Mark Thorp	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

1375934	Karen	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
1375935	Tim Clarke	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
1375945	Mark Thorp	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

			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.	
1375947	Michael Lever	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	save the world	No
1375948	Martin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The sooner we align ourselves with the low emissions standards of the EU, New Zealand and the UK to better we and the world will be.	NULL
1375949	Lou Pynenburg	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To soon can't come quick enough!	No
1375952	Paul Groves	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	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).	Yes
1375954	Paul Slade	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should make Australia's Standard the strongest in the world	Yes
1375957	ABEveritt	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1375959	Ian Taylor	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 USA.	No
1375960	Jonathan Peter	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Having lagged behind the rest of the OECD country efficiency standards, it is time to become a leader, which will assist in the uptake of EVs and, hopefully a reduction in imports that can't meet the new standards	Yes
1375962	Noel Maud	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 0th	Australians are inherently cautious about change. Given the negative campaigns being run by interest groups it would be too easy to scupper the more ambitious target whereas it should be a comfortable exercise to persuade most people to the wisdom of option B.	Yes
1375965	Judith Manitzky	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The importance of improving emissions standards has been recommended for over a decade. The benefits of these improvements being for consumers, less fuel costs and for reducing emissions and climate impact. The car companies have also know that the fuel standards were going to happen, no surprises for them. As well run businesses and good corporate citizens they should have already been improving efficiency standards of cars imported to Australia and preparing for the new standards.	No
1375969	Richard French	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Previous government was negligent in not introducing vehicle emission standards and left Australia with a limited choice of vehicles with low environmental impact we need to act now to reduce our CO2 and particulate emission quickly.	No
1375971	Matthew Beiers	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	Yes

			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.	
1375972	Asher Percy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1375973	Matthew Mackenzie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I strongly believe we should be implementing policy that transitions us toward net zero as fast as possible. The science is in and this is what our environment and economy requires for long term prosperity.	No
1375975	Greg Norvill	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe it's important to be aggressive with the introduction of the NVES to keep Australia relevant in the race to adopt EVs and be competitive in attracting EVs to our market	Yes
1375976	Kane	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1375978	Keith	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	The cost of EV's is out of most peoples reach. They are much heavier than ICE cars, causing road damage much faster & therefore drain Council funds at a faster rate. They are unserviceable in a few short years. Take rare minerals to create. Have Child Labor attached to the mining of that ore. Extra infrastructure is required at a rate that will have millions of people paying for it though indirect taxation further chipping away at their quality of life for a product only the rich & fanciful think is a great idea. Surely your body can be more effective in the renewables space without chasing this McGuffin down the rabbit hole?	No
1375984	Kathleen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	More Catch Power	No
1375987	Marcus Barber	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Greater overall benefits and faster uptake	Yes
1375992	Jonathon Van der wijngaart	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are massively behind on vehicle efficiency requirements and need to catch up ASAP	Yes
1375996	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Science tells us climate is rocketing towards being unlivable for human beings. The faster we decarbonise the better.	No
1376000	Samuel Rosser	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want access to more affordable EVs and believe we need to accelerate to net zero emissions	No
1376002	Anna Russell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I bought an EV several years ago, despite the difficulties in charging it when I live in an apartment where I can't organise a charger. So I have been awaiting these standards for years.	Yes

1376003	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have to do whatever it takes to avoid the 'hockey stick'.	Yes
1376007	Stephen Downs	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is extremely important to deal with. Many people who drive oversized vehicles dont actually need them.	Yes
1376012	Bob	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
1376013	Alison	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
1376014	Richard Nielsen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	the description given of the options. Quick is not always the best	Yes

1376016	Brett Jasper	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	I cannot find any evidence that there will be availability of LCV suitable for people and business located in country areas. Options 2 and 3 are city-centric and do not provide feasible solutions for the needs of tradesmen or the rural and farming industries many of whom must travel well beyond the range of EV for the conduct of their business. For people who still require ICE LCV there is no alternative offered for towing of caravans or horse floats, for example. The short term targets, if successful would see a significant increase in fuel costs for people still operating ICE - many of whom cannot afford the transition to a new vehicle of any type - no strategy is offered to address the social costs for those people. Furthermore, as fuel consumption is forced down, the cost of fuel will increase at least proportionally and that will impact the cost of operation of farming and transport sectors. an example will be the diesel electric trains currently operating on non- electric routes. Overall this will be a negative for the wider population of this country, especially those that do not live in high density urban settings.	No
1376017	Michael Lewis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To slow climate change as soon as possible.	No
1376024	Nicholas	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Alignment to stricter CO2 and Efficiency savings seen in the UK and other major markets is preferred.	Yes
1376025	Mike Purbrick	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to accelerate our emissions reductions to meet our 1.5 degrees warming target	No
1376028	Claire O'Kell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C will put Australia well on track to beat pollution targets in Europe and the US; and will still save drivers money.	No
1376034	Kieran Bowles	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The strongest and most ambitious policy makes the most sense. Technology has been advancing much faster than policy for a long time, as have the economics that drive it. Hence this new policy must be positioned to lead, incentivise, and further advance that technological change to achieve the goal of reduced emissions. A weaker policy will have a perverse and negative effect, inhibiting change and development at a time when we have to do all within our ability, as soon as we can. Climate change is accelerating, and negative human influences are increasing, not reducing as the	No
1376035	Maria McNamara	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need the quickest and most effective actions to reduce pollution and stop climate change now.	No
1376036	Travis Basford	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cleaner air, less health costs, less security risk	No
1376039	James Morris	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1376041	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1376042	Bob Klein	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The more ambitious, the better. We have been waiting too long for decent policy	Yes
1376043	Gary Storm	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option B is a risk. If we tie ourselves to the USA standards, there's a very good chance they will be weakened, as even now, Biden is considering watering them down. If Trump gets in.... Oh boy. Therefore Option C is the best one. The auto industry can't say they haven't known for at least a decade that Australia would eventually catch up and introduce emissions standards. They've had long enough selling polluting vehicles here.... Which, according to recent investigation, are much more polluting than they had claimed.	No
1376044	David Brown	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to commit to change	No

1376046	Peter Cook	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reduction of emissions to help reduce effects of climate change. Encourage the change to EVs to reduce effects of climate change	No
1376048	Benjamin Wilson Scott	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Enviroment	No
1376049	Louis Loveless	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1376053	Roger Duke	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have to take climate change seriously for our children and action must be taken as quickly as possible.	No
1376054	Sheila English	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option A is inadequate and Option c may be too expensive for Australia. Option C would be ideal otherwise.	Yes
1376055	Michael Crowe	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate crisis is critical. We need to move quickly on all fronts.	NULL
1376057	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1376062	Diamond J Legend	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
1376070	Noni Keys	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 0th	Australia has been dragging the chain on climate change action, despite knowing that its ecosystems, human communities and tourism industry stand to lose enormously from the impacts of climate change. Using slower countries, e.g. non-OECD countries, in the past, as an excuse for doing the least does is pathetic given our sporting heroes, scientists and others clearly perform at the highest international levels and we expect that. This time, with fuel efficiency standards Australia is way behind. The Labor government has recognised this (with nudges from concerned citizens) and needs to get out of the starting blocks FAST. Just ask Torrie Lewis.	NULL
1376074	Ann Ellis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	B is a middle path with good benefits and will be effective	Yes

1376075	Margaret Carey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change needs to be addresses in substantial ways as soon as possible	NULL
1376084	James Rizzato	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	If we have a path identified that improves our health faster than another option than regardless of cost we should do it.	No
1376088	Stephen Young	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is years behind - we need to catch up fast.	No
1376091	Paul Eisenberg	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	Yes
1376092	Mark Christofides	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The financial and environmental benefits outweigh other options	No
1376093	Mark Evangelou	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
1376094	Trevor Ockenden	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	EVs are so much better in almost every respect that it is simply a NO BRAINER. Option 3 gets us to a better place quicker and has the advantage of attracting more and often better options for Australian consumers. What are we waiting for? Finally, provide incentives to the undeserving fossil fuel industries to switch to renewables. We don't need them to be against us but to help the inevitable transition away from fossil fuels. We'll all benefit in the end.	No
1376096	Jane Gilchrist	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Keep fossil fuels in ground. Less air pollution	No
1376097	Amy-beth Yeo	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	A fast but fair transition is essential to improving our fuel efficiency and working towards decarbonising our atmosphere.	Yes
1376101	Michael Baer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Best cost to benefit ratio	Yes

1376104	Michele Barker	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
1376105	Anna Munster	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
1376115	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	NULL
1376122	Nicholas Cummings	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is too far behind, climate change is an existential emergency and we must do everything we possibly can.y	Yes
1376132	John Garnett	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Although polls repeatedly show up to two-thirds of Australians recognise climate change is a major problem, inexplicably many of them aren't prepared to accept mitigation policies if it means any sacrifice on their part. No matter how minor like power lines or offshore wind turbines detracting from their distant view. This is fertile ground for the serial denialists and naysayers that	Yes

			overwhelmingly constitute the LNP. In a country where federal elections are only won with 1-3% two party preferences, the fear of a baseless scare campaign is the only reason I haven't put Option C as my preference. Also, it should be easier for Labour to promote Option B given back in 2016 the then LNP Energy Minister (Frydenburg) pushed hard for vehicle efficiency standards before backing away under pressure from the car industry who are at it again with their slimy, self-centred arguments.	
1376134	Ablock Masters	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Every action to-day has a significant influence later on and steers us towards having a workable future.	Yes
1376136	Brian Jervis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Hardest for industry, but the best for industry, over quicker and probably in the long term the cheapest. Of course the best for Australia and the planet.	NULL
1376145	Tim Davidson	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
1376147	Peter Ross	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	No
1376148	Jay Banyer	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The need to reduce CO2 emissions as rapidly as possible is clearly established, refer to the IPCC. Where possible and reasonable we should be pursuing this objective, especially when the net benefits are favourable, as is the case here. I support Option C, which allows Australia to catch up with other advanced economies on this issue.	Yes
1376151	Phillip Baron	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1376157	Greg Nugent	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We, as a country, need to do our bit to alleviate climate change. Option C addresses this the best and will also save most people money. We should also introduce flat emission standards for all cars, regardless of weight. This will not encourage heavier vehicles.	No
1376163	David Smith	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have to stop mucking around regarding action on climate change! We have to stop pandering and providing escapes to people who for no good reason are driving petrol/diesel guzzling vehicles. Australia is way behind every other developed country- apart from Russia! in regard to GHG emissions. We still have manufacturers being able to dump their dirty cars in our country! Instead of providing billions of dollars to support international fossil-fuel companies, let's spend some of the billions trying to get rid of one of the sources of our greatest direct and indirect emissions - that is fossil-fuel driven totally inefficient road vehicles - and that includes no escape clauses for SUVs, trucks or utes!! And why not battery powered public transport - as in most other developed countries. Have some guts and do the right and best thing for Australia, the health of its citizens and the health of its environments and its native animals!	No

1376164	Simon	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Bring Australia out of the dark ages ASAP, promote safety, health and efficiency standards to help educate the masses.	Yes
1376168	William Hancock	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Firstly the car industry already has cars that will fit the requirements for option C. Now some of my reasons with hi fuel efficiency standards we use less fuel which requires australia to import less fuel which keeps the money in Australia. Next reason some idiot in government agreed to have Australia's strategic reserve of fuel located in the USA! So when the shit hits the fan and we need that fuel it's not coming. So having more fuel efficient cars will allow us to have move fuel available when China blocks our sea lanes. Now for the racist right wing people using less fuel stops a larger percentage of our money going to OPEC countries of which half are corrupt. With less money going to Saudi less money will be sent around the world to build new mosques and spread Islam. So at the end of the day having high fuel efficiency standards is a win win for both greenies and right wing nazis! So anyone opposing high fuel efficiency standards are terrorist and non patriots.	Yes
1376171	Peter Pierce	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The real experts have been telling for along time we have to reduce emissions. We are beyond the point of accepting compromise solutions	No
1376172	Wes Baker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia lags behind Europe and some US states. It is important that a serious effort be made to cut pollution from fuel as soon as possible.	No
1376180	Dr Hugh Butler	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	4 Assumptions in Analysis are challenged. 1. Electricity prices. 2. Adoption of EVs in absence of NVER, 3 Abatement is priority, 4 health costs have equal rating to dollars with no social cost.	No
1376183	Rob Hunter	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I belive Option C is the best option as it will reduce emissions much more than the other two options and that is what we need.	Yes
1376184	Paul Desmond	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is clearly the best option for the environment	NULL
1376187	Mark Newhouse	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
1376188	Jan Ratcliff	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fast is essential. Climate change is a disaster.	NULL

1376189	Massimo Dario	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1376197	Georgios Rizos	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1376204	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1376206	Adriana Pracas	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is the most urgent and pressing issue and we need to act fast.	Yes
1376209	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1376213	Lin Perry	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	1. We must make up lost ground, so A is poor choice. 2. C would achieve better outcomes but the greater risks and costs mean it may not be possible to recruit support for it. Option B is clearly feasible and has almost as good a profile..	Yes
1376220	Renee Thibault	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 0th	cautious but still worthwhile and will not scare so many people... we , older couple do not intend (cannot afford) to purchase an ev... but anything to make it possible to more people is A GOOD THING .	Yes
1376221	Kain Gold	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	climate change!	No
1376225	Julius Areskoug	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1376226	Anthea Larke	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	More environmentally friendly	No
1376229	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1376230	George McLaughlin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Australia needs to get moving. Option A is almost "do nothing" . I'd prefer option C but that would result in stalemate between conservative and green politicians and further delays.	Yes
1376236	Esther	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Get it sorted asap!!	No
1376242	Glen Davison	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	existential panic	NULL
1376248	Paul Wilson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To electrify all road transport	No
1376249	Peter Hormann	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cleanest and healthiest	No

1376260	John Macpherson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Emissions have to be reduced as quickly as possible to help avoid climate catastrophe	Yes
1376268	Paul Draper	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	B is too weak, like US; C is more like sensible countries in this area: UK, NZ, Norway, etc	No
1376273	Rod Cripps	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are so far behind we need the highest target. It will also bring most financial and health benefits	No
1376285	Elaine Smart	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do as much as we can to mitigate climate change and it appears option C will do this quickly and efficiently.	Yes
1376288	Rachel Bailey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	In a climate emergency, option C makes sense as it is the fastest option.	No
1376291	Meredith Luke	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
1376292	Dr Sally Stockbridge	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	It is ambitious and sensible, allowing time to adjust to changes but we can not afford to go slower than this	Yes
1376293	Brittnee	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has the means to become a world leader in vehicle emission reduction and efficiency and could set an example for the rest of the world. It would also be an opportunity for the government to ACTUALLY directly help the people of Australia especially during this cost of living crisis.	Yes
1376295	Karl Jensen	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Lowers cost of living, healthcare and Australias reliance of foreign fuels	Yes
1376296	Ray Newland	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This reform is long overdue and will deliver lower emissions and lower costs for consumers.	Yes
1376301	Neville Williamson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This long overdue. The quicker we catch up to the best standards in the world (Europe) the better.	Yes

1376306	Stanley T	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I'm a young Australian who cares about climate change and have been deeply affected by the cost of living crisis. To me, the most important factor is the impact this policy has on climate change which I want to be the fastest implemented option	Yes
1376310	Mateus Brandao	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Being a young Australian, I'm deeply invested in the future of our country and I know that we will need to transform the way that we will live. I support Option C as I'm already seeing the effects of climate change in my communities in my day-to-day life and I think that the fastest-acting, highest-impact measures should be implemented as anything less is to resign ourselves to making it worse. However, I also understand that the perfect should not be the enemy of the good, and Option B would also be a satisfactory outcome. Option A would be a completely inadequate response to the issue at hand and only offers a thin veneer of ineffectual action. Thankyou for your consideration of the topic and the opportunity to provide feedback. Kind regards, Mateus.	Yes
1376311	Lexi Rohrer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I live in the Inner West, where the frequent and pernicious heat waves affect my health and well being on a weekly basis. The consequences of higher emissions will only get exponentially worse, and as a 24 year old, I'm extremely concerned for my generation's ability to live and thrive in Sydney, with the impacts we're already seeing. I strongly support the maximally impactful plan to reduce emissions over time, option C. I don't find option A acceptable at all - it would be a waste of resources	Yes
1376312	Ellie Cooper	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I support a faster transition with an accelerated trajectory because Australia is lagging behind in international fuel-efficiency standards. With 85% of the international car market already covered by strong vehicle efficiency standards, it's crucial that Australia implements these as rapidly as possible. Personally, I live on a major road where I have seen air pollution from traffic affect my daily life. Soot builds up on the exterior of my home and, since moving in, I've experienced an array of respiratory symptoms when the windows are open during rush hour or if I need to go on a walk during heavy traffic times. Implementing strong fuel-efficiency standards as soon as possible will have a positive impact on the health of Australians, the cost-of-living crisis, and climate change.	Yes
1376314	Abraham Irhia	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe acting fast is the best way forward. I'm a young driver and am looking to purchase a new car. To be honest, it would be of a short-term benefit to buy a second hand. But with this standard, I can confidently say I'll align my purchase with a car with a strong NVES, and save on costs and emissions in the long-term.	Yes
1376315	Celine Goh	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	My name is Celine and I'm a 22 year old student living in Oatlands, Parramatta. Like many young Australians, the cost-of-living crisis is affecting myself and my family, and I feel very strongly about the need for an urgent and aggressive shift in our infrastructure decisions to enable cost savings. Furthermore, the ramifications of climate change have been felt throughout my whole life, but more so in recent years - I still remember waking up to ash and smoke during the 2020 bushfires, my parents concerned about my being outside and the impacts of this on my health, and I have also had friends and family members unable to go to work and therefore earn income, or go to school and access their education, due to the floods in other areas of Sydney that happened during 2022. I can only imagine that these impacts are even more severe for those in higher-risk areas such as rural NSW, or for those who may not have the socioeconomic ability to weather such events. With the effects of climate change growing increasingly pressing, and the cost of living crisis growing, this New Vehicle Efficiency Standard presents a strong opportunity for consumers to not only benefit from cheaper fuel costs, but also enable Australia to catchup and see cleaner cars on the road. I feel strongly that option A is not aggressive enough with both issues shaping the quality of life for Australians day-by-day, and for years to come.	Yes
1376318	Zo	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This summer I've already experienced increasingly severe climate induced impacts, like many people across Australia. Catastrophic fire conditions in VIC (the worst since the Black Summer), complete with widespread power outages. Cyclone after cyclone in QLD, and another world record set in WA for heatwaves. If you think moving fast on this is going to be hard and disruptive, wait until you experience a record breaking flood, or several floods in a row. As the government's own modelling shows, the faster we act, the bigger the benefits. Let's do this!	Yes
1376319	Alex Horton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As a young person that is heavily impacted by the cost of living, I am encouraged to choose Option C as every dollar counts for me to be able to cover my week to week living expenses. I also feel that rapid action is needed to put Australia on track to be a leader in personal transport. I feel that this could be a competitive advantage for Australia in our region as well as being the most environmentally friendly option available. I'm excited and emboldened by the action the government has decided to take on this issue and look forward to hearing of the outcome that it lands upon.	Yes
1376320	Jon Fettes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option 3 has clearer and more effective signals to business participants than option 2. Any resistance from industry is with the aim to keeping old outdated lines and old tooling running for as long as possible and is irrelevant to the role of government in making decisions.	No
1376321	Kat Wu	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As an individual I believe that Australia should pursue the most ambitious new vehicle efficiency standard above all other options. As mentioned in the consultation paper, Australia is currently a laggard compared to other markets such as the US, the EU, and China. I believe it is not sufficient to simply aim to catchup to our comparators. As Australia is a wealthy developed nation, I	No

			believe that we must lead on the global stage - and that the only way to do this is through Option C - with strong targets and policy to lay strong foundations for sustainability in the vehicle market into the near future. Urgent action and change is required to solve the climate crisis - and I see the New vehicle efficiency standard as a small but significant piece of the puzzle where Australia cannot afford mediocrity. I would love to see a stronger standard being set as our North Star for the benefit of our climate and community.	
1376322	Vasilij Schlusser	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia lags well behind the EU and other countries on its climate change mitigation measures. We need a cultural shift in the way we are neglecting climate heating, and not being told that climate change mitigation actions will be painless, they will be painful once we are serious with our actions.	No
1376324	Pamela Reeves	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to fast track the move away from our dependence on fossil fuels. Half-hearted measures outlined in Options A and B will mean Australia will continue to lag behind the world in meaningful action on emissions reductions. It's embarrassing that Australia is in the same league as Russia for no strong emissions standards. only way we can do that.	No
1376325	Shanti Cantrelle	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The government needs to take action on reducing emissions quickly, and option C sounds like the best option!	NULL
1376326	Richard Whitfield	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
1376328	Rachel Jay	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	No time to lose	No
1376330	Ann Thorp	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	Yes

			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.	
1376334	Lis Shelley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Previous governments and car importers have been ignoring fuel emission standards for too long and using Australia as a dumping ground for fuel-hungry vehicles that ultimately hurt our country and others around the world. We cannot continue to delay. We are an embarrassment on the world stage when we have such rich supplies of free energy from the wind and sun. But fuel emission standards alone will not get us there. It needs to be coupled with other innovations, such as charging rights for people in apartment buildings, encouragement of car sharing (mobility) options for people who only need to use a vehicle now and again, making it simpler for shopping malls and large caraparks to install vehicle charging stations, installing solar panel covered roofs over open car parks to a) provide solar power for charging stations and b) shading car parks that raise the daytime temperature due to asphalt absorbing massive amounts of heat, working with state governments to look at ways of consistent ways of encouraging EV ownership through rebates on registration, tolls etc. 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.	Yes
1376338	Cary Rasmussen	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Best outcome	No
1376344	Bill Radley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is a serious problem and we should be doing everything possible to limit pollution from motor vehicles	Yes
1376346	Stephan Friedrich	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1376352	Peter Smith	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Lower emissions as fast as possible.	Yes
1376353	Heather	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	while C is ideal, it would become political and divisive. A achieves next to nothing, so B it is.	Yes
1376357	Mylene Turban	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1376358	Ruth	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1376360	Thomas Maple	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is the only progressive solution and aligns with progressive 1st world countries (eg not USA). Option C is where the Labor party can finally show that they exist for Australians rather than big corporation. Nothing will send a clearer message to ordinary Australians than adopting a progressive plan. Comparing Options A and B to the rest of the developed world's plans shows how simplistic they are. Lets be at the front of good policy rather than laggards.	No
1376362	David	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to move on this as fast as we can. Bringing down emissions but also building something that will create change as fast as possible.	Yes
1376365	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Only a radical shift from fossil fuels has any chance of protecting lives, livelihoods and biodiversity	No
1376366	Paul Hyam	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I would like Australians to have access to the broadest range of EVs at an affordable price.	Yes

1376373	Rosemary Johnson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	With climate change being our most challenging problem and having governments who have sat on their hands for so long, I think we need to act quickly.	NULL
1376377	Chris Betts	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has a long way to go to reach its targets re emissions reduction. It should just get on with it!	No
1376379	Clare Sheppard	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The difference in BCR between options B and C is small. We should go for the more ambitious target. If	NULL
1376389	Patrick Dodgson	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	We need to get away from petrol cars, and cars in general. Electric cars are part of the solution, but we need to design a transport system that does not rely on the extremely costly (accounting for all costs) of individual transport modules. Public transport needs to expand to provide for people getting from any A to any B as conveniently as possible. As long as we are wedded to individualised transport, we will continue to have an environmental, economic and societal disaster.	No
1376390	Derek Robertson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have a BEV and we have accepted that some \$ would need to be invested at some point if we are ever to reach Net Zero and motor vehicles are a quick and effective solution	No
1376393	Ryan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As a benefactor of rich natural resources, Australia has an impetus to lead the world in cutting carbon emissions.	No
1376396	Craig Guthrie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is already lagging behind other countries. Our vehicle emissions are currently increasing when they should be doing the opposite.	Yes
1376401	Neal Leggo	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C will lead to faster and deeper cuts in greenhouse gas emissions than A and B. There faster pace is justified to make up for the past inaction	Yes
1376402	Terry Marshall	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	I disagree with this proposal. Unless there is a suitable alternative and recharging stations in the country, this is just another stupid idea to save the world where in Aus we contribute stuff all to the world emissions. Good stuff, make us all pay to save the world which is going to hurt our country and do nothing in comparison for emissions. Typical bureaucrats that produce policy for votes, and could not care less if it kills the country in the process	No
1376409	MASSIMO DARIO	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1376413	Massimiliano Doria	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1376414	David Godfrey	Option A - 1st, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 2nd	I believe that there is no rush	No
1376417	Bill Meyers	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The net benefit of Option C outweighs the costs, particularly health and greenhouse gas emissions.	Yes
1376420	Tom Hunt	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce our emissions at a far more rapid rate. Transport emissions are growing, not falling. Climate change is accelerating. 93% of new cars relying on fossil fuels for the rest of their lives is criminal given we have had 1/3 century to get our act together. The future cost to our children is not taken into account in your figures. Greenhouse gas emissions cost cannot be based on cost of planting of temporary trees, it is the cost of locking it back underground. We can afford to do much better	Yes
1376422	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1376425	H Altaiar	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We can't afford not to reduce emissions rapidly for thr sake of our children and our own health. we need to improve vehicles efficiency which would help our climate action but also improve health and safety	Yes
1376439	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	vote for our global future	No
1376447	Thomas Timpe	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
1376457	sam dryden	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1376461	Harriet Warlow-Shill	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	Concerns re inadequate infrastructure	Yes
1376467	Maria Scurrah	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	the climate crisi is on, were expeirencing unprecedent ocan and land temperatures with exterme weather events almost every week, we cannot wait and msut do evertyhign possible to amelirate emissions which have huge health benefits.	Yes
1376469	Leeora D Black	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we need the fastest possible transition to support climate goals	Yes
1376470	Ann Cebon-Glass	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate emergency	NULL
1376471	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1376474	Judy Glick	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1376479	Valerie Anne Monge	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	Yes

			<p>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>	
1376485	Jarny Tirosh	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1376488	Ashley Densham	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. This 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 kicks 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 Light Commercial Vehicle 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 which acts as a more serious incentive for change – to get close to that, the penalty proposed under option C should be adopted in Australia. continued... Loopholes should be ruled 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
1376491	Robert Joseph	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to lift our game to an equivalent standadr with the rest of the developed world	Yes
1376497	Greg Bloom	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes

1376506	Peter Lawrence	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1376507	Jeremy N	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1376510	Shelley Marshall Lichtman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Every year the CO2 target will be lowered, encouraging these companies to provide more choices of low or zero-emissions vehicles to Australian consumers, such as electric or hybrid models. The standards promise to significantly reduce emissions from light vehicles. The government's proposal aims to achieve a reduction of 369 million tonnes of CO2 by 2050, equivalent to the last six years' worth of total emissions from cars in Australia.	Yes
1376517	Esther Takac	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 0th	NULL	Yes
1376521	Leith Hopkins	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	More efficient more dedicated targeted let's get this done!	No
1376522	Talia Zyngier	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1376524	Alexander	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C will allow us to match the UK's emission targets and finally contribute to stem our countrys woeful previous emission expulsions	Yes
1376532	Brian Gould	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate emergency and need to transition quickly to lower emissions.	Yes
1376533	Stan Rosenthal	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are facing a crisis. We need a strong response before we are overwhelmed.	Yes
1376534	Janice Sloan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because we are in a climate emergency.	No
1376546	Colleen	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

1376550	Kevin Lee McDonnell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate emergency is real and really urgent action is needed to arrest it.	No
1376551	Katherine Kimmorley	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	Yes
1376561	Alexander Crew	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia lack the commitment and meet even the lowest standards set out by existing nations and as such that contributes to a greater than average emissions output with vehicles. While infrastructure does lack for existing heavy vehicles there is no reason not to pursue targets inline with existing standards and make up for "lost time" in adoption	No
1376569	Hans van Hilst	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1376573	Ora-Tali Korbl	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Considering getting an electric vehicle	Yes
1376574	Diane	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	No
1376579	Fergus FitzGerald	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has more than a decade of in action on introducing fuel efficiency standards to make up for.	Yes
1376580	Julie Gouin	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	It will reduce emissions.	No
1376581	Stephen Sanders	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
1376587	john	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We will be left behind if we do not take up innovation and new technology. Plus the petrol industry supports countries with values that do not align with mine and I believe most Australians.	Yes

1376590	Peter Utting	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	This option being also the government's favoured option may be more likely to be implemented	Yes
1376592	Matt	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Need stronger standard to reduce emissions as we are in a climate emergency	Yes
1376597	Janet Hiller	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This is the response to what is an emergency	No
1376602	David Mendelovits	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Bring rapid improvement in emissions but at lower cost	Yes
1376611	Paul Fazackerley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	All efforts should be made to reduce toxic emissions, improve air quality and reduce the volume of petroleum imports. Industry and consumers have had enough time to get used to the idea that change to efficiency standards has been overdue. There is no more time to delay vitally needed changes to the transport sector and encourage retirement of inefficient polluting vehicles.	No
1376612	Alan Maddox	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Action is needed as soon as possible. We are already decades behind.	No
1376614	Stephen Spencer	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
1376623	John Kelly	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	fast and better result	Yes
1376625	Maria Dredger	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1376627	Shannon Anima	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Imperative that Australia catch up with other nations in taking a strong and urgent stand on emissions	NULL
1376630	Graeme Hanigan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are residents in a small country town in Central Victoria. Tina and I have had our electric vehicle an BYD ATTO3 for 10 months, and in that time travelled 20,000 km. We can safely say, owning an EV has changed our lives, for the better. Had we travelled that distance in our previous car, our fuel costs alone would have been around \$5,000. Travelling that distance in the ATTO3 and charging from our solar with an electricity account in credit, it's cost us essentially nothing, yep \$0! .I just can't get my head around	No

			that! But this is the real kicker, as pensioners we would always take the cost of fuel into account, and limit our travel to essential trips only. That's now a thing of the past, and it's back to the good old days of "Let's go for a drive\,	
1376633	Claude	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have delayed for far too long and have almost missed the boat, so to speak. A fast start is the only option to mitigate the worst impacts of climate change. Also, Australia should provide leadership in this area - we shouldn't look to just merely mirror what other countries are doing, but instead they should be envious of our ambitious targets and plans.	No
1376635	Dalit	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1376638	Option c	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Car pollution should have been addressed in the 1970 Australia has been a dumping ground for the cars that the EU won't take. Adding to climate change it's about time we stood up the the fossil fuels industry and said this is it option c. For us and the planet.s.	No
1376652	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have to tackle greenhouse gasses as a matter of extreme urgency	No
1376659	Rob Robertson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to move as swiftly as possible to reduce atmospheric pollution - for the sake of future generations. We have the science and the technology to move swiftly - any delay at all is a dereliction of our duty to the future.	NULL
1376663	Brad S	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1376673	Leora	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Strong ambitions are the only way!	No
1376679	Luke Meehan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To catch us up with other nations and stop us being a dumping ground for inefficient vehicles as soon as possible	Yes
1376693	Suzanne Zyngier	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I strongly support the fastest track for the New Vehicle Efficiency Standard because I want cleaner, and cheaper to run cars for Australia.	No
1376706	Mitzi Tuke	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to lower emissions as quickly as possible	No
1376707	Andy Wang	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is lagging in its climate policy. We have started far too late in all domains - from power generation to transportation. This policy provides an opportunity for us to catch-up and make the hard decisions now, for the future benefit of all Australians. Option C provides a compelling case which will require some short-term adjustment, but a long-term benefit that cumulatively delivers a greater benefit than the other options. We must decarbonise and do so quickly. In the absence of a carbon price, the best and most ambitious version of this policy will do the most for reducing transportation emissions, compared to Options A and B. Option A is a clear non-starter as it delivers marginal benefit, for what would be a large administrative and change overhead for the government, industry, and consumers.	NULL
1376709	howard goldenberg	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	i'd like the planet saved, if possible, affordably	Yes
1376725	Philip Thompson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B seems to offer the best balance. It may not go as far enough as some people would like but it is significantly better than option A which isn't even worth considering. It will be a great starting point and if in future there is a desire to increase the standard, then this can be done relatively easily, compared with a jump from the present position.	Yes
1376736	Jaydon	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	Yes

1376738	Yoel	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1376741	St	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have wasted enough time already.	Yes
1376742	Johannes Pannekoek	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need an accelerated trajectory to beat CO2 global targets for 2030/32	No
1376745	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1376752	Susan Francis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The whole world needs to tackle climate change as quickly as possible, and Australia is one of the countries that can afford the initial outlay. The sooner you make the change, the sooner you'll recoup the costs, I reckon.	NULL
1376754	Henry Roberts	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1376756	Andy D	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Most beneficial option is C, then B, then A. Clearly that's the order.	Yes
1376759	Caroline Slaats	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Best for the environment	No
1376761	Paul Longden	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Environmental concerns	NULL
1376765	Turner	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1376768	Lara Heller	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is going to destroy our children's future	No
1376773	Valeria Colasanti	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1376784	Rifka Ash	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Lower our carbon emissions	No
1376805	Mick Nolan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we are behind with Russia as only developed countries without fuel effic stds - we need to catch up. And better for sovereign security vis a vis oil form middle east, better for economy	NULL
1376809	Andrew Rowe	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	No need to be slow to make things better. Vehicles that meet Option C standard already exist so why delay?	No
1376812	David	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	people need to pay proportionally for adding to global warming	No

1376841	Suzette Rodoreda	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is urgent. Vehicle emissions contribute approx 13% to Australia's emissions	No
1376882	Jeremy Taylor	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1376924	Rod Hornby	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We've wasted too many years and are way behind where we should be. It's time to step up and make the necessary changes in regulation to drive down transport related pollution and CO2.	NULL
1376931	Fiona Samuel	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	As much as Option C is ideal for benefit for the environment, realistic balance with managing costs makes option B seem most appealing at present.	Yes
1376955	Graeme Miller	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The world is heating up faster than expected. Worldwide greenhouse gas emissions are still rising. We need to reduce emissions as quickly as possible, after our poor efforts to date.	No
1377029	Rhett Morson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is a net importer of liquid fuels. A reduction in fuels used improves our trade balance.	Yes
1377032	Darren	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The quicker the bettrr	No
1377049	Andrew Smith	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The faster we can move away from fossel fuel the better. The costs listed will be seen as laughable when the sea begins to chew exponentially larger chunks from our coastlines, cities and beaches.	No
1377066	Marnie Slonim	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We cannot afford to wait, we have no time	NULL
1377096	Marjolein Kromhout	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fast transition is important	No
1377112	Ian Wallis	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	I expect that because the Australian car market is small, the manufacturers will achieve the same as option B over time - perhaps a bit longer but in a reasonable time. The suggested fuel improvement (6 %) is small in relation to the expected uptake in EV, the expected increase due to high migration and the expected improvement that could be achieved by higher registration costs for huge cars in the cities. I am concerned that we country persons may be faced with less durable and less reliable vehicles in a market managed by the government for objectives other than economics, reliability and durability.	No
1377130	George Carrard	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The outlook for life on Earth is dire. We cannot act too fast to mitigate global overheating.	NULL
1377133	Nicole gillard	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1377144	John Hannay	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australians deserve climate change policies that put the environment first. Option C will deliver benefits of fuel cost and vehicle maintenance savings, health benefits, and best emissions reductions.	Yes
1377151	Greg Denton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C offers the greatest economic gain. The wealth of all Australians will be enhanced by the reduction fuel imports Optio C provides.	Yes
1377157	Jozef Friedmann	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is capable of sustaining the strongest standards 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	Yes

			carbon emissions in the fastest way. The headline targets of Option B are impressive, but they would only allow us to catch up to the US, and stay behind most other car markets (including right-hand drive markets like the UK 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.	
1377174	A. J.	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia fails to protect its citizens from climate change and needs to make changes more hastily and more aggressively. Govt needs to lead.	Yes
1377177	Peter Coughlan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1377202	Mercedes Electra	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Transition to clean energy ASAP needs to be prioritised at all costs.	No
1377220	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to encourage clean vehicles as fast as possible. Import and burning of fossil fuels is a security, health and financial risk. Global warming has huge consequences for mankind and the planet. SUVs should be included so option B and C are much preferred.	Yes
1377224	Climate Action Burwood/Canada Bay	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We believe that a strong fuel efficiency standard is an essential step in reducing CO2 emissions, cutting the cost of living, delivering cleaner air, bolstering national energy security and improving vehicle safety. Option C offers the best chance of achieving these objectives, although Option B would still be effective.	Yes
1377226	Rod	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We should be ahead of the pack not behind, Australia is blessed with so many renewable sources, get on with it NOW!	Yes
1377253	Justin Hardisty	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	EV's are not feasible options for the majority of Australians. by implementing Option B or C you are giving a free kick to EV's that will not filter down to most Australians. Additionally you can't provide any concrete data on reduced fuel costs for more expensive petrol or diesel vehicles that will result from implementing either B or C. I currently drive a vehicle that requires 95 RON (or higher) fuel and currently pay a >10% premium to use a \,better\, fuel This won't change and in fact will increase under Options B or C. Just another misguided attempt to cripple our economy with thought bubble ideas for some unachievable electrical nirvana.	No
1377324	Chris McKENZIE	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have taken a long time and now need to go hard	Yes
1377483	Brandon Inglis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to do more to limit our CO2 emissions, however with the cost of living pressures facing average Australian's option B stands out as a fairer, more balanced option.	Yes
1377599	Roslyn Williamson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need the faster, higher gains policy. Especially as Toyota has now come out against a fast approach, saying it's too harsh and they haven't had enough time. Every car company in the world, including Toyota, have already comply with such standards as option C proposes, in most of the world. Therefore to allow them to water down the proposed legislation, is a travesty against all of us Australians as well as the environment. We need to move fast as we have wasted decades in this area, and need to catch up to the rest of the world.	No

1377604	Jessica Williamson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We cannot afford to take a slow approach to climate action	Yes
1377620	Boyd Pederson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Best option over time is often the most jarring. We are so far behind on climate targets... and transport is a huge sector, that we cannot afford to be at the forefront globally.	No
1377654	Bianca Sands	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As a parent I am deeply concerned that we are not reducing carbon pollution and emissions quickly enough to ensure a safe climate for our kids. Whilst I support the Government's preferred option, I believe we need stronger leadership on fuel efficiency standards and an accelerated option (C) that offers greater net benefit and higher abatement is my preferred option. We must make the decisions that will give our kids and future generations the safest climate possible.	Yes
1377670	Shane Rodoreda	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	The emission targets are too tight, of the top 20 cars sold in Australia in 2023 there are 2, yes 2 ICE cars that meet the 141g - the RAV4 and Corolla. The arguments in the document are ridiculous you can't compare the US to Australia. You intend to fine Mazda for selling the CX3, Hyundai for the i30. Seriously what planet are you on. I agree with emissions standards but these are just far too much given the market and infrastructure in Australia. Get a life.	No
1377678	Siobhain O'Leary	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate action and emissions reduction is urgent, option C is the fastest pathway to addressing emissions, delay only leads to more climate impacts the cost of which will be high. We should have ambition in line with the extent of the climate crisis, which is already upon us	Yes
1377679	Neil Middleton	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Doing nothing - not an option. Doing something but not a lot - half baked. Doing something fundamental - ground breaking and inspirational. We have to grab the problem and lead. Yes, people will moan and spread wrong info but change can happen and more importantly, NEEDS to happen. Sitting and waiting around for someone else to sort out the problem we all face won't work. Come on Australia, show us how its done. I'm backing you to introduce world leading change. C'mon!!!!!!!	No
1377698	Katrina House	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We urgently need to reduce emissions, it's important to prioritise doing this as quickly as possible	No
1377700	david yeats	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The difference in benefit cost ratio between option c and b is marginal. It's also possible that costs will come down faster if the scheme is implemented faster and so that ratio for option C may increase. The highest urgency is to exceed the CO2 emission reduction targets for 2030. Australia should be a leader in this area rather than a follower of our sluggish neighbours. It's time to adapt to our new situation.	Yes
1377703	Jim Romagnesi	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The sooner we faze out large, inefficient and polluting vehicles the better.	Yes
1377710	Chris Moore	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Encouraging better standards	Yes
1377734	Werner Theinertt	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's called Climate Change! It's for the Grandchildren! Just Do It!	No
1377743	David	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Costs to consumers already under financial hardships	No
1377744	David Tomkins	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions as rapidly as possible to avoid catastrophic climate change.	No
1377753	Adam Phillips	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Best value per dollar	Yes
1377768	Alison	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option a is not strong enough- will not have much effect. Option c would be the most effective but might be difficult to sell politically	Yes

1377775	Nathan Clift	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	After looking at the breakdown I feel this aligns with my values	NULL
1377783	Stephen Downs	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Will reduce reliance on foriegn oil, CO2 and other polutants most quickly	Yes
1377785	Phil Dwyer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reduce fuel imports, improve health	No
1377787	Elizabeth Dwyer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Health benefits and greenhouse gas emissions	No
1377799	Michael Jacombs	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is starting from a very delayed position and needs to catch up. The estimated costs for option C are only a relatively minor increase over option B. It is difficult to understand vehicle manufacturers claims of increased costs when they have already been producing low emissions vehicles overseas.	No
1377800	Craig	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	I don't believe that CO2 is a pollutant. We should not be wasting taxpayer's money on CO2 reduction strategies, but rather, should be focused on what benifits Australians and their families. Subsedies should not be provided for \green\, solutions at the expense of our economy or cost of living. Many governments are going into debt to appease \emission\, targets that won't change the climate by even one degree! Australia should allow nuclear power to provide base load electricity to our grid. I own a Tesla Model 3, not because it's \green\,, but because it's quick, fun to drive and cheep to \fuel\. Let's keep it that way, please! Australia is not ready for a 100% electric car revolution, because we simply don't have the charging infrastructure like the U.S. Let's allow the free market to choose electric cars as they become financially viable for the average Aussie, not remove their choice through CO2 targets that will cost billions and not make a scrap of difference to our climate! STOP WASTING OUR MONEY!!!	No
1377802	Dave Porter	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Social and health benefits are worth the cost.	NULL
1377803	Susanne Godden	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate emergency	No
1377804	Stewart Godden	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have been so far behind for so long that we need to do as much as possible - and as quickly as possible - to catch up.	No
1377807	A. J. D.	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change must be stopped. Technology must be adopted to make standards of living higher not old men sprucing old ways richer.	Yes
1377812	Dan Edwards	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The faster we reduce emissions the better for everyone. We need to invest heavily to quickly bring about change and commit to reducing emissions.	NULL
1377813	Joanne Oddie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have to act quickly to make any significant reductions in carbon emissions and doing this for transport is comparatively easy with batteries and EVs. the net benefit will be severely underestimated with no price on carbon. The costs will be severely underestimated without the cost of carbon and climate extreme weather event damage avoided factored in.	NULL
1377815	Paul	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Should already be up to standards of other countries	No
1377819	Ian Kilgour	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Transport emissions are growing and need to be curtailed as soon as possible if Australia is to meet its climate goals	Yes

1377823	David Sharpe	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	nc	Yes
1377825	Lynette Romagnesi	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do all we can to limit climate change, which includes making difficult choices now.	Yes
1377828	Duncan Quick	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Co2 is plant food and we need more of it, not less. Option 4, remove the entire world and Australian governments on charges of treason and allow the free market capitalism to decide what it will drive.	No
1377830	Neil Evenden	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option A is not worth doing. Option B seems well considered and brings Australia in to line with most economies.	Yes
1377834	Ian Malkin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we need more fuel efficient vehicles and it will give better availability to world class vehicles not the dregs leftovers	Yes
1377845	Katherine Legge	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	My opinion is based on where Australia is now with regard to vehicle efficiency, where we need to get to and the time we have to get there. 20 or even 10 years ago I may have agreed to take option B but too much time has elapsed with very poor standards and we have no option but to advance as fast as we can.	Yes
1377902	GrahamG	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to catch up.	No
1377932	Michael Hund	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Promoting rapid change to lower carbon emissions and to EV uptake.	Yes
1377939	Philip Laird	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Please see attached submission.	No
1377968	Richard Wilson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It appears that climate change is accelerating at an even faster rate than predicted by the experts. It's imperative that action is taken as quickly as possible to attempt to slow the global warming that is occurring. One of the greatest contributors to greenhouse gas emissions in Australia is vehicles, and introducing the New Vehicle Efficiency Standard is a major step forward towards reducing new vehicle emissions. Australia is one of the few first world economies that does not have a new vehicle efficiency standard.. One of the consequences of this is that manufacturers export to Australia new vehicles that have higher greenhouse gas emissions because they cannot export them to countries that have New Vehicle Efficiency Standards. In effect, Australia becomes a dumping ground for high emitting vehicles. Although Option C is initially more expensive it ultimately has a higher BCR and in the longer term provides better results, both economically and climatically.	No
1378013	Hannah	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I support the health benefits and emissions reduction benefits of strong vehicles emissions standards -as a mum with young kids I have skin in the game.	Yes
1378083	Laura Grufas	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1378087	Rainer Schnittler	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I do think that Option B provides the best balance between environmental needs and societal constraints. However, I do not see the need for two vehicle categories at all. All vehicles that are not vehicles above 4.5 T should be treated the same. Large 4WDs and Utes are abused by a majority for personal transport only, without any real need for driving such a vehicle at all. It is a free country, but those who make that choice should pay for it, punitively. There is all sorts of problems related to these vehicles, from parking over impact on third parties when involved in collisions, let alone the environmental impact. Society needs a paradigm shift to minimise the proliferation of these kinds of vehicles.	Yes
1378110	KINGSLEY SLIPPER	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is a game-changer. We need a game-changer.	Yes

1378164	Trish Elliott	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	My primary reason for supporting Option C over B is that climate change is happening more quickly than predicted. The risks are too great. We must do as much as we can as quickly as we can. My second reason for supporting Option C over B, is that having owned an EV for over 4 years I've observed that range drops significantly at highway speeds, especially 110km/h. Distances travelled at speed in Australia, combined with high ambient temperatures, makes it likely that the calculation of emissions reductions based on NEDC/WLTP are an overestimate. Going with option B might make us think we're doing enough, when we're not actually. Thirdly, having been slow to adopt an NVES, Australians have been denied access to more efficient vehicles for too long, leading to higher emissions for longer than in other countries. This means it is incumbent on us to do as much as possible to catch up as quickly as possible. Option C aligns more with recognising this. Additionally, the technology and manufacturing ability exists, so there is no real reason to go the slower option of option B over C. Labelling needs to be a large part of the scheme. New car buyers must see a vehicle's efficiency simply and frequently, without having to search for it. This will help efficiency become front of mind in car buyers' decision making process. Charging infrastructure needs immediate and rapid improvement in reliability and availability. Some form of queueing also needs to be developed as more users need to access public chargers. In 4 years we have gone from never having to wait, to frequently having to wait, to recently waiting behind others. Without improvements, Australians will not take up EVs quickly enough to meet the NVES requirements. To ensure vehicles continue to meet their emissions label over their lifetime, consumers need more information when purchasing replacement tyres. More expensive tyres may be more efficient and last longer. I recently found getting new tyres for our EV to be a challenging process in trying to find the most efficient tyres. (The first set did 80,000 km.) I resorted to using a lot of numbers from the EU and the US. There needs to be easier way to access this cost benefit information, otherwise consumers will choose cheaper tyres and emissions reductions from this scheme will be overestimated.	NULL
1378186	Tony Waugh, United Nations Envoy/ professore.	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	NULL
1378190	Christine Kelsey	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 1st	We need to catch with the rest of the world and get really serious about tackling our emissions and the environmental impacts	Yes
1378207	John Lee	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to move quickly to address the climate emergency and transition to clean vehicles.	Yes
1378211	Dion	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs a rapid transition to meet it's international commitment to climate change	No
1378215	Peter Ireland	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The planet needs help.	Yes
1378220	Zorica Purlja	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 B should be adopted in Australia. Loopholes should be ruled out. Ruling out	Yes

			<p>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>	
1378223	Sanjay Sircar	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 0th	<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
1378226	Neville Fraser	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Time is running out to make meaningful changes, and Australia is seriously behind the 8-ball	No
1378228	John Loh	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate crisis is proven and we need to speed up recovery	Yes
1378230	Anastasia Kyriakidis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1378234	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The need to act to deal with Climate change is too urgent for further delay; we all need to expect and cope with extra expense	NULL
1378235	Robert Boakes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	1. To reduce CO2 emissions by Australia as rapidly as possible. (I am writing this on Feb 29th as the temperature outside goes through the roof!). 2. To reduce air pollution in city streets to which large SUVs make a sizeable contribution. It is appalling that among OECD nations our standards are lowest, except for Russia.	NULL
1378237	Dr Julia Imrie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act as fast as possible to avoid as many of the negative impacts caused directly and indirectly by the climate chaos we are facing and already experiencing. The cost of climate change far outweighs the cost of acting quickly - while Option C as per table above is \$12.26 billion more expensive in upfront cost than Option B, the overall net benefits are more than double at \$30.7 billion.	NULL
1378255	Don White	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Need to take positive action. Catch up with rest of the world ... Don't be the dumping ground for poor emission vehicles	No

1378257	Ben Fawcett	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is essential that we make the most rapid progress possible. Australia is, and is seen as, a laggard in terms of emissions and, as a wealthy country we must do much better, quickly.	NULL
1378260	Will Belford	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option C is the best, but is unlikely to get passed, as reactionary politicians backed by industry lobby groups will no doubt scupper it.	Yes
1378262	Colin Imrie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cutting emissions is not optional. Cutting emissions is the main response to catastrophic climate change, an existential threat. We have had years of delay in effective action, this should be no surprise to people in the vehicle and energy businesses.	Yes
1378263	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	i want my grandchildren to grow up in a survivable world without severe storm's killing them or rising sea level's / extreme flood's taking there lives away and homes.	Yes
1378265	Kim Zegehnagen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I believe we must move in a sensible manner towards world standard emission controls on cars. Delaying is absurd and irresponsible.	Yes
1378266	Caroline Lurie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Austrlalia is lagging so badly, it needs to catch up FAST.	No
1378268	MELVYN	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	WE HAVE DELIBERATED FAR TOO LONG	Yes
1378272	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	i am extremely concerned about the impact of transport emissions on climate change and am both horrified and ashamed that we are lagging so far behind other developed countries in bringing in vehicle emission standards. In this case I feel that we have an obligation to make the transition as swiftly as possible as we are lagging behind	NULL
1378276	Dan Katz	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We want to be as clean as possible, but too high a cost will not only harm people economically, but will deter them from coming on board.	Yes
1378285	Wendy Davidson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Active campaigner on this issue, already drive an EV, charged from solar electricity from 18 panels plus battery. The quicker we reduce the amount of carbon dioxide being pumped into the atmosphere, the quicker we will start to turn around the effects on our earth and hopefully regain a liveable earth. I have been reading about this particular issue for over ten years.	Yes
1378289	Chris Harper	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Because it's achievable	Yes
1378294	Laurence O'Connor	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to limit high emissions vehicles asap. Our roads are full of them, and they are contribution to global warming intensely.	NULL
1378297	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cost benefits for Option 3 far outway costs. It is difficult to see the community paying higher vehicle costs, but requires the Fed government to enforce new regulations, including a fairness test of vehicle prices that reflect overseas costs. Delays in introducing these stanards will only encourage dumping & discounting of polluting vehicles.	No
1378299	Karon Lekeu	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is lagging behind and needs to accelerate these standards to meet targets	Yes
1378305	Mark Ferrington	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I strongly support rapid introduction of strong standards because we need to accelerate the rate of emissions reduction in our transport sector. Both Option B and C have a similar BCR, and I note the absolute net benefits are greater for c than B.	NULL
1378308	Ann Potter	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Air quality is a health issue. Climate change is a health, security and whole economy issue. We need to act on both of these problems as quickly as possible to mitigate the personal and finical costs ASAP. Cleaner exhaust fumes are important to achieve this	Yes

1378309	Peter Stevens	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I doubt that the CB analysis has allowed enough importance to the climate issue, which is more important than and indeed the sine qua non of any economic benefit.	No
1378311	Ian Uber	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to move as quickly as possible and downsize the size of vehicle on the roads, most people with big SUVs never tow and 4WD never leave the bitumine	Yes
1378316	Dr Thomas Francis Bunn	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	We should be at the Same Standard as the USA and EU.	No
1378318	Wayne Lavers	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B seems to give the best bang for the bucks, not cheap but rolling out at a cost and pace that will more likely be acceptable to the community	Yes
1378324	Mora Main	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The urgency to reduce CO2 emissions from all sources is essential. If government is not willing to go to Option C then at least start with Option B (not ideal, but may be politically achievable)	No
1378332	Paul Fathers	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Need to get this done quickly and net benefits are much greater for not much more cost. I would not even consider option A as it would simply kick the can down the road and this has been done now for far too long.	Yes
1378333	J Davis	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	This is bad policy. The net outcome will be fewer new cars sold - with older more polluting - less safe cars remaining on the road longer. This will also costs jobs with capital flowing into increased fleet costs resulting in company cost cutting. This will increase inflation by OVERALL increasing the total cost of all new vehicles sold. This could also result in poor choices for australian consumers with carmakers like Ford pulling out of the australian market- only to be replaced by chinese carmakers - and rest assured just like DJI drones - it is only a matter of time before the Department of Defence realises the risk posed by chines car brands on defence sites.	No
1378334	Victoria Rosx	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Without question we should confirm less costly option maybe more acceptable for now	Yes
1378335	Jeremy Eccles	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australians are paying too much for fuel. We're also driving vehicles that guzzle more fuel and spew out all sorts of harmful pollutants into the air. This is because we don't have national standards that make manufacturers send us their most efficient cars. With over 85% of the international car market covered by fuel efficiency standards, Australia is missing out on the cleanest, cheapest to run cars. Analysis commissioned for the Climate Council shows strong fuel efficiency standards could avoid 31 million tonnes of harmful transport pollution in Australia over the years to 2035.	No
1378339	Colin Smith	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I think we should be looking for the best and fastest results rather than trying to trim the costs.	NULL
1378343	Allan Medway	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should not be a dumping ground for Toyota and others to offload vehicles that many other countries have already banned.	No
1378349	Jim Sharples	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Needs to be as fast as possible.	Yes
1378354	Tony Caine	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to make this transition as quickly as possible. For the planets sake, and all beings on it.	NULL
1378360	David Hall	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's really simple - we have to clean up our polluted environment as soon as possible or else our children, and their children, will have a potentially impossible chance of surviving in this hellish world we are creating. Whenever anyone argues about the \,cost\, to the consumer they are really just talking about the loss of profit to the car manufacturers, or the oil companies. The world (that's you and me) must clean up our polluted environment NOW, not delay it to 2035 or 2050. NOW. By the way, the way that Q5, is framed undermines the answer I provided in Q4. Obviously I support Option B compared to Option A but I don't support Option B compared to Option C	NULL

1378361	Chris Ernst	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Government's preferred option means it will be done sooner. First steps only, I realise...	Yes
1378362	Elizabeth Elenius	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have recently purchased an EV at a reasonable price. Generally prices for EVs are falling.	NULL
1378363	Graham	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1378368	Edward Lynch-Bell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I support option B with certain caveats, namely the removal of supercredits from mature NEV technologies such as hybrids and plug in hybrids. My support is grounded in the fact that option B is a market mechanism analogous to the RET. The RET experience has shown that generating credits in the form of SGCs incentivised innovation, efficiency productivity and the ceration of a massive solar industry. Using a similar mechanism to share a dysfunctional car market, a market that fails to deliver the mobility needs of the vast majority of Australian drivers can only be positive. In my submission I provide some examples of how the super credit and tax systems can be used to further enhance the NEVs	Yes
1378369	Gail delucia	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I think we have been left behind feeling like a 3rd world continent	No
1378371	Murray Armstrong	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I believe that option B might have the best chance of making a difference in the short term.	Yes
1378372	Christopher Firmstone	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	This is vital to save our planet	Yes
1378374	Sarah McLoughlin	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 0th	Least disruption leadstoi least waste which is a long term danger which is overlooked	No
1378377	Anthony	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	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.	Yes
1378379	Geoff Lamb	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	EV adoption is the least cost way to rapidly decarbonise, and should be accelerated.	Yes
1378384	Nigel Pether	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1378385	Philippe	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	Yes

			<p>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>	
1378388	Lucy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1378389	John Thompson	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is ridiculous that our current lack of controls on car fuel emissions is similar to Russia's.	NULL
1378390	Norman Jackson	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
1378391	Richard Lawrence Light	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</p>	Yes

			<p>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>	
1378396	John Littleton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	<p>most advanced countries have these standards and we become the dumping ground for polluting cars.</p>	Yes
1378399	Richard Wilson	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
1378402	Eric White	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	<p>WE are so far behind the rest of the world and need to catch up ASAP</p>	Yes
1378403	Georgina Palmer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	<p>NULL</p>	Yes

1378404	Sheridan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to meet our climate targets!	Yes
1378407	Julia Croatto	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I chose Option C as it will help to achieve the needed reduction in carbon emissions most rapidly. It will enable more Australians to be able to afford clean EVs, resulting in cleaner air, and better health and economic outcomes. It includes SUVs as passenger vehicles and disallows super credits and loopholes. I put Option A last as it would not count SUVs as passenger vehicles and would not help to achieve the necessary emissions reductions or cleaner air for Australians. I put Option B second as it is a compromise; I consider it acceptable but not as good as Option C.	Yes
1378411	Neil Hamilton	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 laboratorytesting which is inaccurate, as they have done in the past.	Yes
1378413	NULL	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	Yes

			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.	
1378414	Don Smith	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	It is critical that we adopt the plan to bring in more efficient vehicles as quickly as possible without significant disruption. Most advanced countries in the world have done this already and the technology is not new and more efficient IC vehicles are already sold all over the world including right hand drive countries, so there is very little impediment from doing this quickly.	Yes
1378417	judith leslie	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 1st	Vehicle missions are a major contributor to Australia's GHG emissions and pollution leading to Climate Change and impacting citizen health	No
1378418	William Jones	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in the thick of a Climate Crisis! This requires the fastest transition to all new car sales being zero emission vehicles by 2035 at the very latest. Option A is way too slow because we are in a Climate Crisis - and SUVs are definitely purely a consumer lifestyle choice and we don't have the luxury of that in a Climate Crisis. Option C is the best because it will drive necessary change faster - and benefit more people with lower fuel costs over the medium term. If only Option B is politically attainable then I support this - but only until we can ramp up the requirements. Whatever we do you must ensure there are no loopholes like there are in out tax system - and on that, we HAVE to stop making giant utes tax deductible - that's the first step - remove any perverse tax incentives. And when the system is robust then we need penalties with real teeth - we are in a Climate Crisis and to be totally frank we actually have no choice but to do as much as we can, as fast as we can.	Yes
1378423	Jess K	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
1378424	Bryan Drummond	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Let's get on with it, as climate change issues will cost much more in the future, the longer we leave it	Yes
1378425	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Vehicle emmissions must be reduced in order to reduce the effect of climate change.	Yes

1378428	Vivienne Callender	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is a climate emergency on! Get cracking and do your part Australia!	No
1378432	Matt McHale	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.	Yes
1378434	Glenn Heers	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Should have been done years ago.	Yes
1378436	Brian Wythes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Delivers considerable abatement and fuel cost savings to Australians.	Yes
1378442	Peter Temby	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
1378443	Virgene Link-New	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reaping the benefits of clean energy and less pollution early with not much extra added cost.	Yes
1378449	Julie	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	Yes

			<p>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>	
1378450	Frank Noakes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	<p>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
1378452	Marco Hildebrandt	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	<p>Besides Russia, Australia is the only other country with weak emission standards, even the USA has more strict standards. We are also running out of time and far too behind in reducing carbon emissions. 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</p>	Yes

			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.	
1378454	Michelle Connolly	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
1378455	Kay Bird	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Options B and C are both very good but temp increases are higher than expected. I think we must now go for Option C .	Yes
1378456	Loic RUDOLF	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	Yes

			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.	
1378458	Alan Outhred	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Greatest benefit	Yes
1378461	Mark Benham	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The faster we move towards greater EV take up, the faster we will reap the economic and cost of living benefits of more battery storage available to home owners. f	No
1378463	Neal Salan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe option C has greater benefit for not a great deal more cost that option B	NULL
1378464	Brian John Wilcock	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I favour the most effective solution, and speed of delivery is crucial	Yes
1378467	Roy gilmore	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	From a health perspective. Vehicle pollution alone costs the community vast sums of money.	Yes
1378468	Darryl Fallow	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Briefly (a) The need for rapid reduction in emissions; (a) The difference in Benefit-to-Cost ratio for Option C (2.96) compared the government’s preferred Option B (3.08) is relatively small (-3.9%), but the abatement achieved by 2050 under Option C compared to Option B would be ~20% greater; and (c) The difference in Net Benefits Cost for Option C (\$114.9b) and Option B (\$96.46b) is relatively small - an extra \$11.81b over 25 years. See attached submission	No
1378470	Neil Marriott	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.	No

1378473	Maureen Fitzgerald	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option 1 will not achieve significant improvement for our climate. Option 2, being cheaper is a more acceptable proposal, however it is quite flexible and will not improve the situation quickly enough to be effective in the long run.	NULL
1378475	Greer Banyer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need ambitious targets to achieve real climate change progress. This will mean higher direct costs but the indirect costs of less ambitious policies means much more impact long term.	NULL
1378476	NULL	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
1378479	Maria Lang	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	the sooner the better	Yes
1378480	Karen Davis	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	Yes

			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.	
1378485	Corey Dennis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1378487	Elisabeth Brasseur	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need urgent emissions reduction and for everyone to breathe clean air.	No
1378488	Brian	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.	Yes
1378489	John Borojevic	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is incredibly important to reduce vehicle emissions as fast as possible and encourage take up of electric vehicles and greener transport options as vehicle emissions are a significant component of Australia's greenhouse gas emissions. This cannot be a cost free exercise and we should take as much up front action now, even if they cost more now, to accelerate emissions reductions and to offset much larger future costs from the effects of climate change (drought, floods, extreme weather, coastal flooding and associated deaths). Additional to its greater and faster Greenhouse Gas reductions, Option C has much larger benefits, and sooner, for consumers, including in fuel savings, health benefits and reduced car maintenance costs. It is worth the additional cost for these additional benefits even if the Benefit/Cost ratio is slightly worse.	Yes
1378490	Tony McNally	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Most and fastest Impact	NULL
1378491	Tim Harvey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I don't believe we now have much time due to the climate crisis. Moving faster will result in lower emissions and fuel savings for Australia over a longer period, compounding the benefits of the policy. By 2050 option C will reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 74 million tonnes, which will help the Government meet its climate targets. Car makers that are moving ahead should be rewarded 85% of the world is already covered by emissions standards, making this change foreseeable. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles and the NVES should encourage lighter vehicles. Ruling out supercredits and loopholes are good features of both B and C. Real-world testing of vehicle emissions should be implemented to prevent manufacturers from producing inaccurate laboratory testing.	Yes
1378494	jozef weemaes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	environmental concerns	NULL
1378497	Peter Mallen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Transport emissions make a significant contribution to Australia's overall CO2 emissions and this is forecast to rise substantially in future, especially as car importers seem to preference importing large SUVs and ute type vehicles rather than smaller, lighter vehicles (that have fewer emissions both in manufacture and operation whether ICE or BEV. Australia should be ambitious and move as quickly as possible to new emission standards (option C). Car importers have known about this move for ages and now want further delays to get systems in place. Sorry, not good enough! We need to make rapid change and seek to lower emissions ASAP and by as much as possible. Coalition scare campaigns about a ute tax are just that - the sky won't fall in when the standards are introduced and prices will not be affected much (as evidenced by transition overseas). We need to be bold and act to catch up to the rest of the world ASAP. And don't let SUVs be lumped in with commercial vehicles. They are passenger vehicles are deserve no special pollution allowing treatment. If anything there needs to be incentives to import smaller vehicles that don't clog up roads, parking spaces etc and that make our roads far more dangerous for everyone including cyclists and pedestrians and even other motorists. This legislation is long overdue and needs to be enacted now.	Yes

1378498	Tony McNally	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Most and fastest impact	Yes
1378503	Robert Parkinson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I believe Option B has the huge advantages of being realistic and balanced. Some vehicle suppliers will complain of course, and claim that the targets are too ambitious, however I would argue that these same suppliers could go a long way toward achieving the targets in Option B with a combination of shifting their marketing focus (currently described best as \selling trucks to people who really need cars\,), as well as shipping to Australia vehicles we are currently being denied. Option B strikes a reasonable balance - significant emissions reduction over a short period of time.	Yes
1378506	Simon Ball	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To reduce carbon and polluting gass emissions as soon as possible. Pollution is slowly killing the planet and ourselves.	NULL
1378507	Andrew Gustafson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Better to accelerate the uptake of benefits to reduce compound effects of climate change	NULL
1378512	Sarah Neal	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
1378513	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This is essential to reduce emissions rapidly	No
1378515	Andy Hine	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	Yes

			<p>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>	
1378516	Stephen Young	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	<p>There are climate change, health, security and economic benefits to adoption stricter vehicle emissions standards. It is the governments role to help provide these benefits to Australians which so many other countries already enjoy.</p>	Yes
1378517	Robert Raymond Coenraads	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
1378518	Peter Lyall	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	<p>The state of the climate crisis must be the main guiding factor when determining target strength and timeframe implementation. This would require 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</p>	Yes

			<p>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>	
1378519	Garry Moffatt	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe that option C will be more effective in transitioning to electric vehicles from internal combustion engines.	No
1378525	Julia Simpson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	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.	Yes
1378527	Ross Muller	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
1378529	Louise Johnston	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	It seems to me that modern progressive fuel standards where introduced have been key to lowering vehicle emissions, promoting the supply of more efficient and renewable energy powered vehicles , and driving the rapid deployment an electric vehicle fleet with charging infrastructure. It also has promoted the use of cleaner Heavy Transport Vehicles with significant health benefits to those living in highly populated urban centres. By allowing manufacturers to dictate products with dubious efficiency rating and	Yes

			every increasing size, we have set the national fleet up to be more costly, inefficient and polluting than in more progressive countries. The Australian love of the Ute (I own an old one) and SUV will eventually become a burden as fuel oil scarcity drives up costs in the long run. The sooner we transition a large portion of our fleet to renewable fuels (electric and potentially hydrogen) the healthier our society will be and the lower our Greenhouse Gas emissions. Most people want to see strong leadership on this subject, a move away for the self-centered and scare mongering viewpoint of those who are only seeking to preserve the status quo.	
1378532	Malcolm Thornton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are so far behind the majority of the other developed countries and should strive to catch up and even surpass those standards as soon as possible.	No
1378535	Jane Unwin	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
1378539	Jeff Helinski	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I am reaching out to express my support for the proposed New Vehicle Efficiency Standard and to urge the integration of global best practices into Australia's regulatory framework. My experiences driving similar-sized vehicles across Australia, the United Kingdom, and Europe have revealed stark contrasts in fuel consumption rates, despite the faster highway speeds often found in the UK and Europe. This discrepancy primarily stems from the more stringent fuel efficiency standards and the broader availability of fuel-efficient vehicles in these regions. The UK and Europe's rigorous regulations have led manufacturers like Toyota to offer a diverse array of highly fuel-efficient vehicles, enabling consumers to make environmentally conscious decisions and significantly reduce fuel consumption. Unfortunately, Australia's current standards lag behind, limiting consumer access to such eco-friendly options and consequently, contributing to higher fuel consumption and carbon emissions. To bridge this gap, I strongly advocate for Australia to align its vehicle efficiency standards with those of the UK and Europe. Tightening these standards would compel manufacturers to broaden their offerings of fuel-efficient vehicles in the Australian market, facilitating a shift towards more sustainable transportation options and diminishing our national carbon footprint. Moreover, adopting more ambitious efficiency standards would catalyze innovation within the automotive sector, spurring advancements that improve fuel economy and cut emissions. This shift would not only safeguard the environment but also bolster Australia's position in the international automotive landscape.	No
1378540	Richard Scherer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has lagged comparable countries for far too long, and needs to catch up as quickly as possible. A faster start will also encourage manufacturers to innovate. Option A is basically a do-nothing option which will allow manufacturers to continue dumping fuel-inefficient vehicles in Australia and leave us well behind the rest of the world, as well as perpetuating the use of light commercial vehicles as passenger vehicles.	Yes

1378541	Angela Carroll	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
1378545	Sheree McDonald	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Change must occur fast because we have already destroyed so much of this planet. Getting rich from this current situation aside, fast change is a no brained.	Yes
1378547	Triantafillia Memisakis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I feel we don't have a lot of time remaining on this earth due to how we've acted. We can't afford to take the slow way and we deserve to suffer to fix the future.	No
1378548	Lynden Macgregor	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Standard should set emission targets which reflect the urgency of the climate crisis- and that will require a rapid transition which must achieve all new car sales being zero emissions by no later than 2035. Option C and B would make that goal achievable, but option C is preferable as it ramps up faster, and has stronger targets. However, as we are moving from no standard and can scale up from a strong introductory base over nearly a decade, I am also prepared to back the Government's Option B to establish the system, with continuous review - and tighten progressively from there as seen as necessary.	Yes
1378549	Robert Glasson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B will provide an achievable policy and will prevent the dumping of highly polluting vehicles in Australia	Yes
1378550	David B	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must try very hard to keep the planet as we know it. We can't measure that in dollars.	No
1378552	Andy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Everything reasonable possible must be done to bring down our emissions	Yes
1378554	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do anything possible to limit CO2 emissions.	NULL
1378560	Michael Block	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	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	Yes

			<p>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>	
1378561	Pete Hegarty	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act yesterday	No
1378562	Michael U	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option c will speed up transition from fossil fuel burning vehicles	No
1378567	Peter Moss	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

1378568	Tony P	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1378572	Mick Lyons	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia and the world need to decarbonise as quickly as possible.	No
1378574	Mark Marusic	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As Australia is lagging behind most other Western countries, we really need to fast track this transition	Yes
1378576	NULL	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Australia contributes 1% of global emissions. This climate change scaremongering is symptomatic of our totally misguided Woke/cancelled culture. Whilst one totally supports the protection of our environment, these petty legislative proposals are simply a way of reducing choice and imposing underhand taxes. Australia should focus on the issues that matter such as the cost of living, interest rates and the broader economy.	NULL
1378585	Louise todman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Because I don't have a car but I think that if I did it would make sense to me	Yes
1378587	Rich Geoff	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	No time to waste. Should have occurred sooner.	No
1378590	Maree O'Connor	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
1378593	Graham Michaels	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B provides a good (but not the best) outcome in terms of time, while keeping the cost down for those that will suffer financially if we go for Option C. Option A does little to progress driving emissions down, and should never be considered	Yes
1378594	Jane E Osborne	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Australians have to do much more to reduce transport emissions. We are embarrassingly so far behind the other developed nations.	Yes

1378595	Rod McKellar	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
1378596	Hazel Key	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Speed and flexibility are a good combination as long as flexibility doesn't mean going backwards. I hope to buy an EV soon.	Yes
1378598	Gloria Claus	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Australia needs to honor the speed other countries are also attempting to lessen vehicle emissions	NULL
1378602	Lyndal Breen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The sooner these changes are implemented, the sooner there will be some reduction in vehicle emissions. We don't have any time to waste.	Yes
1378606	John Murray	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Efficiency is increasingly important to health, climate and the economy. Where a simple efficiency improvement can impact each of these areas and save money for individuals business and government then I see no reason not to do this and not to take the fasted pathway. WE have clearly delayed long enough. I'm about the greatest good for the greatest number. As automotive manufacturers already have to meet these efficiency standards in other countries I see no merit in their argument that it will cost them more to develop such efficiencies - they are already doing it. Would they take accountability for the harm their product bring to the Australian people, if these measures are not implemented?	Yes
1378607	Silvia Bertano	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1378608	Andrew Russlell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to catch up with the civilized world. It is a disgrace that we lag so far behind.	No
1378610	Guy Le Page	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do whatever we can to reduce greenhouse gases.	No
1378613	Seth Hinkley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Securing a safe climate for our kids has to the highest priority we have as a their guardians. To give us the best chance of doing this we have to limit greenhouse and reduce the amount of toxic gases we release into the very air that we and they need to survive.	Yes

			The scientific evidence is clear, this must happen urgently if we are to have any chance of giving them and the generations to come the freedom to live and enjoy our world without the immense climate related suffering that is likely if we do nothing.	
1378615	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to move quickly to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and hopefully keep global warming below 2°C. We've missed 1.5°C and it's evident in the weather we've been experiencing that we need to address our emissions now rather than sometime in the never-never	No
1378618	Dr Malcolm Altson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B is affordable and will make a significant impact on the health of all Australians. It also obviously increases the competitiveness of EV's and this will increase their market share encouraging manufacturers to market these vehicles in Australia	Yes
1378620	Judith Ohana	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to move as quickly as possible to lower vehicle emissions	Yes
1378621	Charlotte Davis	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
1378624	Caroline	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are already much behind in reducing emissions from vehicles. There is even talk in Sydney about increasing the size of parking spaces because cars are so big now, which is clearly the wrong way to go.	Yes
1378626	Zdenko Pokorny	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis should determine target strength	NULL
1378631	Heather Loomes	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	Yes

			<p>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>	
1378632	Aruna Manandhar	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	<p>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) 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
1378639	Sarah Redshaw	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to move fast after decades of doing very little	Yes
1378641	gayle burmeister	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Ww urgently need to step up for lost time & we deserve to be able to breathe cleaner air	No
1378642	Hannah Woolhouse	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This is not simply a cost issue, it’s about a future for humans and the planet. Australia is in a position to set an example of best practice and be among the world leaders in emissions reduction.	No
1378652	Jane Brownrigg	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need best practice legislation - it will be cheapest in the long-run. Additionally, cars must lose priority to smaller, personal electric transport such as bicycles and scooters. Public transport also needs mass improvement in scheduling and reach. All of these options can improve fuel efficiency overall, much more effectively than private cars will.	No

1378655	Ben Wood	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act now to catch up and chase down emissions targets. Rip the bandage off.	Yes
1378658	Lorna Bunney	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	urgency to address the issue	Yes
1378660	Gemma Charpentier	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We live in Australia where sun is plentiful and we don't have legislation that supports transition to cleaner cars. It seems to be contradicting the research that proves clean energy is better for our health and the health of our planet. I would ask, if the technology exists and car manufacturers are already supporting this change in other countries, why not in Australia?	NULL
1378663	Roger Lai	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The capacity is there to transition quicker	Yes
1378664	Ian Bourne	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is here, crippled transmission towers, deadly bushfires and floods every year. We needed to do this twenty years ago	Yes
1378670	Bruno Charpentier	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to take every step possible to combat climate change, and this doesn't seem to be a difficult change to make.	NULL
1378671	Dan Caffrey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Transport is a large source of Australia's carbon emissions. Less fuel efficient vehicles are being dumped in Australia now because we do not have fuel efficiency standards like almost every other nation. It is obvious that fuel efficiency standards can drive better outcomes for the climate and ultimately Australia's future. The sooner we act effectively on climate, the sooner we can relax in the sense that we have done our bit as a nation to protect the climate. Until that happens, Australians cannot claim to be doing the best for our children and subsequent generations.	Yes
1378672	craig kidney	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	common sense	Yes
1378675	Peter Oldenhof	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1378679	Michael Doyle	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Get bit done	Yes
1378683	Kevin Conley	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	Yes

			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.	
1378685	Nicholas O'Dwyer	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1378690	John Brentnall	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
1378694	Bruce Fielding	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Australia is far behind most of the world in this. Without emissions standards we are denying ourselves access to the latest technology and innovation.	Yes
1378702	Patrick Irwin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Currently Australia is the last Western country importing large gas-guzzlers. Due to a lack of emission controls we have become a dumping ground for gas guzzlers, and our fuel consumption is rising as result.	Yes
1378707	Meredith Baxter	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to urgently catch up on emissions reductions and strong decisive action is required. This will also give a strong signal to those companies who have used Australian as a dumping ground for high emissions vehicles.	Yes
1378709	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We don't have time to waste. It may not be as cost effective, but will result in savings elsewhere if it reduces the long term impact of climate change	Yes
1378711	Alex	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	Yes

			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.	
1378713	Jose Orellana	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australian is falling behind on the renewable energy and climate change front. It's time to catch up and lead.	Yes
1378714	Richard Sharman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because of the seriousness of the climate crisis, the more ambitious goals of option C provide the essential reduction of CO2 emissions.	Yes
1378716	Charlotte Meagher	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1378717	Rita O'Sullivan	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.	No
1378718	Chris T.	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	I support emissions reduction. I'm an environmental scientist that generally votes Green or Labour. However, I also love cars. I think that 4wd vehicles should be included in the same category as Ute's and vans. There is no alternative electric 4x4 on the market and no charging infrastructure for long camping trips up the WA coast. I would not support any legislation e.g. co2 averaging across a manufactures range, that restricts low volume high performance vehicles e.g Toyota Supra, Yaris GR, Ferrari, Porsche 911 etc. These enthusiasts cars should remain available and un-penalised. They sell in such low numbers it doesn't make much difference to national emissions, but are deeply valued by a proportion of the Australian population. .	Yes
1378720	NULL	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	Yes

			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.	
1378721	Rax Green	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 0th	NULL	No
1378723	Anna Huband	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
1378724	Sharon mccabe	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is the most pressing factor that needs addressing immediately, fossil fuel emissions need curbing asap. The technology in zero emissions transport is here it's beautiful it should be encouraged used and further developed . Fossil fuel reliance is destroying the planet.	No
1378725	Trevor Woolley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reducing fuel emissions is critical for the health of the planet and people. It is a \,must do\, urgently. It is not a \,do it quietly and not disturb the big companies\,. Option C is the right choice. Option B is only barely acceptable. Option A is out of the question.	No
1378726	NULL	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	We need to transition the renewable energy as a matter of e	NULL
1378733	Lindy Brennan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The cost of not moving forward to stop emissions will ultimately cost more in health issues and higher costs to insurance etc	Yes
1378734	Hendrik van Prooije	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate cannot wait!	NULL

1378735	Owen Gardiner	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The highest ratio of benefits to costs is given by option C. Option C provides 21.48% increased benefits over the only other realistic choice: option B at a cost increase of 26.37%. But time is of the essence. Australia supposedly only has one developed country as company with no vehicle emissions restrictions: Russia. Wow!	No
1378738	Rosalind Lewin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option A- extinction, Option B - probably the most realistic for the majority of people who are 'instant gratifiers' ie do NOT appreciate long term goals and cannot relate to them Option c essential but probably too 'expensive or long term' for the majority of people Option C	Yes
1378748	Robert Spaanderman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Instead of kicking the can down the road, we need to pick that can up and recycle it.	Yes
1378750	Fiona	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to transition away from fossil fuels as quickly as possible. Option B is not fast enough. Option C actually appears to provide more benefits, though it costs a little more in the short term.	No
1378751	Jennifer Smith	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 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
1378752	Derek Robertson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The response of Australian Governments to this point has been to avoid the ire of the coal, petroleum and natural gas industries and to support their interests at the expense of the Australian electorate at large.	No
1378762	Thomas Kaufmann	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to catch up to the rest of the world in regards to emissions standards. It's totally naive to think we won't be affected by the extra pollution our vehicles create.	No
1378764	Bo Whitten	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I would like to add . Hybrids as first step subsidised	Yes
1378765	Ruth Thompson	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	Yes

			<p>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>	
1378766	Helen Esmond	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Compromise is a political necessity	Yes
1378781	Norbert	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
1378785	Dianne	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	This option achieves a reduction in pollution and is not as costly as option 3.	Yes
1378793	Adrian MacMillan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We need to decarbonise as fast as possible but remain competitive	Yes

1378796	Jennifer Valentine	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	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
1378799	Kevin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option B seems the best option on offer for cost/benefit. Some group will always be disadvantaged, but it is time to move on from decades of neglect and/or corruption.	Yes
1378822	Jennifer Medway	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We dont need polluting vehicles dumped in Australia by Toyota and others that are already banned in many other parts of the world.	No
1378823	Margaret Bradstock	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1378834	Alison Cooke	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is necessary for survival	No
1378839	Xian	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change. We need to do something about this, and do it NOW.	NULL
1378840	Rob	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is way behind in adopting 'clean energy' strategies. This investment is much more beneficial than throwing billions at AUCUS	Yes
1378844	Brian Tomlinson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act swiftly	Yes
1378847	Seppo Rusanen	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Urgency to for ALL actions to limit CO2 emissions for any effect in my lifetime. to benefit our children, ie. next generations.	Yes
1378849	Shane	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes

1378850	Nigel Dique	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Benefits in terms of lowering greenhouse gas emissions and reduced vehicle maintenance seem to be achievable without too much disruption and cost.	Yes
1378852	Nivesh Ravindran	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I don't want the future of the country to be unlivable for my young family	No
1378858	TOM R SINGER	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is essential to do as much as possible, as soon as possible, to stop burning fossil fuel. Cost is irrelevant when the future of our planet is at stake. All the energy the planet needs is available from the sun.	No
1378860	Thomas Driftwood	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Global warming is costing us many billions of dollars each year from increased severity of droughts, floods, storms and bushfires, costs which are going to keep increasing the more the earth warms. The sooner we turn this around, the quicker these global warming costs begin to reduce and the more chance we have of maintaining a liveable planet for our children. Also, subtracting the costs from the benefits of the 3 options, option C easily leads with a net financial benefit of \$114.90 billion dollars, followed by option B with a net benefit of \$96.46 billion dollars with option A coming a distant last with a net benefit of only \$170 million dollars - a tiny fraction of options C and B. So for me option C wins on all reasonable criteria that I can think of.	NULL
1378863	Kanwar Plaha	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to catch-up with the rest of the world. Period. We are becoming a global joke of a country and, for once, profits must take back seat (no pun intended).	No
1378882	Julie Campbell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I already have an EV as one of the initiatives I'm taking in order to reduce my carbon footprint. It is of utmost importance that Australia moves away from polluting forms of transport ASAP. I believe that we should start fast but bring the public along with government decisions. More support for EV charging stations is urgently needed because this is holding back many in the community from transitioning to an EV	Yes
1378887	Benn Wolhuter	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	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
1378890	Carolyn Wilson	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1378894	Wayne Hobbs	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The sooner we get cleaner energised vehicles the better.	No
1378895	Jamnes Danenberg	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Bringing Australia into line with the entire rest of the OECD (except Russia) in terms of our fuel efficiency standards is a clear win win for Australian consumers, the environment and air quality. It will incentivise the up take if lower emission vehicles and help facilitate the transition's we need towards a net zero economy. We don't need or want to be a dumping ground for big polluting gas guzzlers and we don't want the thousands of deaths and illnesses that are associated with increased levels of air pollution from transport emissions.	Yes
1378901	Skye MacMillan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option C is the best option for the environment but least likely to be actioned upon through the democratic political process. The economic impact will create room for people to vote against the bill. Option B provides a good starting point that will create a precedent of action in the sector that can be added onto with Options similar to C later.	Yes
1378905	Jennifer Carver	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I think most people may opt for this one.	Yes

1378910	Jim/Margaret Edwards/Seydel	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to clean up our fuel toxicity issues asap	Yes
1378911	Volkswagen Group Australia	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Please see attached submission.	NULL
1378912	David Priddle	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
1378914	Phillip conro	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Need change fast	Yes
1378920	Vikki Lane	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe that Global Waarming is the single biggest threat to global survival and I believe that emmissions play a large part in contributing to that exponentially growing problem.	Yes
1378921	Jade Kemety	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Stop impacts contributing to climate change	No
1378922	David Hawson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is lagging behind in fuel efficiency and needs to catch up.	Yes
1378929	Sam Wilson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Without aggressive targets in easily achieved sectors like light vehicles for personal transportation Australians miss the opportunity for savings and continue to pay the penalty of dragging the chain on difficult to decarbonise sectors. Something has to go first and the global industry momentum is behind private vehicles. If the Australian government misses this chance we're once again putting Australians behind others through inaction and lack of ambition.	No
1378931	Timothy Tucak	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	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. My preference is for the most stringent and ambitious approach possible, to mitigate the impacts of climate change.	Yes

1378932	Louise Katz	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	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.	NULL
1378937	David McEwen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We're in the midst of climate and biodiversity breakdown. We are decades behind where we should be in the energy transition. Even option C is akin to shuffling deckchairs on the Titanic, but I'll take whatever crumbs of climate action I can get right now.	Yes
1378940	James Grose	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Watering things down and taking our time is a luxury we don't have anymore. We know where we need to be. We need to transition quickly and efficiently.	Yes
1378945	Nicholas	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1378947	Simon Wetz	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	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
1378948	John Blair	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Need to move fast on air pollution and CO2 emissions	Yes
1378951	Thomas Colley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fast transition to renewables is necessary for the survival of our societies. The difference in Benefits to Cost Ratio for options B and C is small. The types of benefits considered is quite limited and the benefits of fast transition are almost certainly underestimated.	Yes
1378955	Donna	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need urgent action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The trend for larger, heavier fuel consuming cars is alarming. Everyone should be moving towards no emission vehicles and the targets should be strong and achievable.	Yes

1378960	Julia Parkin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia should be doing everything it can to cut emissions and reach net zero. We need to be ambitious and act as quickly as possible in order to mitigate the harmful effects of climate change. Option C may be more expensive in monetary terms in short term, but the cost of not acting as strongly as possible in this decade will be far greater. I sincerely hope that the government chooses option C.	NULL
1378962	Peter Aubourg	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Faster, Cleaner. We do not have time for slow options	No
1378975	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to make changes now before it's too late. We are so far behind other developed countries. I'm sick of being stuck behind cars belching out carcinogens. These cars wouldn't be allowed on the road in the USA. We are 20 years behind if not more.	Yes
1378980	John Caldwell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do our bit with the rest of the developed world, having been such a laggard for so long. We need to make our contribution to reducing climate change dangers very clear, partially with reference to vehicle manufacturers who will, no doubt, prevaricate as long as they can and fossil fuel producers (ditto). A definite, clear and solid progression needs so be evident in whatever the final outcome ends up being.	Yes
1378988	Stan Gorton	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Electrification benefits the planet and the driver, the household and the economy - the faster we do it the better.	Yes
1378994	Thomas N Wyndham	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to act now and act quickly to make meaningful changes away from fossil fuels.	No
1379004	Adrian Corp	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This decision is not about cost it's about the future of the planet - on this premise Option C is the best of the three options	No
1379013	Daryl J Budgeon	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C provides the largest benefits in the shorter time period. Action on reducing emissions is now critical due to the total inadequate global response to date. Indeed the total benefits of introducing this legislation are likely higher and probably much higher than that calculated over time. Due to the inaction of the previous Government these standards are long overdue. As can be seen by the calculations the stricter the standards the greater the benefits. In addition, arguments against stricter standards are mostly spurious, as what is being aimed for is already in place or in progress in other jurisdictions around the world. As Australia has no local Automotive manufacturing, any argument for exemptions based on unique local conditions is invalid. Australia is benchmarking the US, but European standards are even stricter. In the light vehicle area, more than 95% of the transport task can be achieved with low emission vehicles available now from overseas. In the personal transport area, Australia is a land of transport islands. With over 95% of the population residing in large cities and travelling in urban areas. Plus, there are less visible benefits, such as improved educational outcomes as school students are less exposed to harmful pollutants. Fuel security and balance of payments benefits by replacing imported fuel with local electricity. The option of households charging off rooftop solar and further reducing cost. I calculate solar charging my car reduces fuel cost to 75 cents per 100km. Like the campaign to reduce smoking, the automotive industry needs to adapt to serve the public good. The overrepresentation of twin cab utes and large SUVs is driven in large measure by the intense advertising of these models. Big advertising campaigns work to increase demand. That is why companies pay for them. Over the past years 5 out of 6 TV ads are for these large vehicles, run multiple times per hour in prime time. Why do they do it? Because they make more money that way. To use the fact that this has resulted in selling more of these type of vehicles to argue for their protection is not good logic. Different promotion would result in a different outcome. 30 and 40 years ago these vehicle types were much less prevalent and people got along just fine. I believe the motor industry can adapt, and indeed must adapt. This legislation is the way forward to produce progress in this important area and should not be compromised on.	No
1379016	Robert Sims	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	Yes

			<p>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>	
1379026	Ty Christopher	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Highest benefits and best for the environment	Yes
1379030	Kym brown	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>	NULL
1379036	Rex Hanson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is very important to bring down total carbon emissions, and provide incentives for people to purchase electric vehicles.	Yes
1379044	Eric Sweet	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The effects of climate change appear to be accelerating, and with the delays Australia has had with taking any effective action thanks to the Liberal gov'ts complete inaction, THIS government can't afford to move at anything other than it's fastest possible pace, in order to have the greatest impact.	Yes

1379254	Simon Hamilton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has been an embarrassing laggard for many years in relation to vehicle emissions standards and it is high time we came up to meet international standard. It is an embarrassment for Australia to be ranked with Russia with the worst emissions standards in developed countries. The lying and bluster from the automotive industry body must be taken for what it is. Option C is by far the best option to proceed with though B is better than nothing.	Yes
1379359	Dione Scheltus	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.</p>	Yes
1379390	Carolyn Lee	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to transition away from ICE vehicles ASAP to mitigate the worst impacts of climate change.	No
1379486	Colin Logan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is already a dumping ground for cars that unacceptable in Europe. Carbon Dioxide needs to be removed from the atmosphere to have any chance of avoiding dangerous tipping points in climate change, polar ice reduction, loss of glaciers and sea rise. Just slowing the amount of CO2 put into the atmosphere is not enough.	No
1379516	Brian McKenna	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia should lead the world in this area. We have the minerals, the rooftop solar and the need to do a lot better. Electric vehicles are a huge opportunity for us and every dollar spent goes towards putting us further ahead than others.	No
1379562	Paul Jones	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.</p>	Yes

			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.	
1379582	Peter Newman	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Electric vehicles are the least environmentally friendly vehicles when considering ALL aspects of their production. It is clear from sale numbers that the public preference in Australia is for ICE vehicles at present. .	No
1379617	Benjamin Low	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to stop being the world's dumping ground and get on the front foot for a change. Also, SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles - they're bought as passenger vehicles, used as passenger vehicles.	Yes
1379645	Deborah Sykes	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
1379672	Cecilia Darboe	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We can't prolong a shift, it has to happen now.	Yes
1379754	John Lopez	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reducing carbon emissions. Promote BEVs. Electrify everything. Decarbonise the economy.	No
1379770	Peter Barker	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	Yes

			<p>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>	
1379775	Phillip Baron	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1379777	James Winters	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has lagged behind for too long in introducing vehicle standards. We can't be cautious now, when you start late you need to run harder. Option C is ambitious and should mean we catch up to the rest of the world. Failing option C, at least B gives us some hope to catch up. Option A is simply a cop out and we will continue to be a dumping ground for cheap and nasty vehicles.	Yes
1379798	peter cooper	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Large gas guzzling, dirty emitting utes are a blight on city streets. They are dangerous to pedestrians and occupants of other cars and need to be edicated as quickly as possible.	NULL
1379802	Dr Neville Lockhart	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need more EVs as fast as possible as a key element of Home Electrification, leading to Consumer Energy Zones (CEZs) that balance Renewable Energy Zones (REZs)	NULL
1379805	Julia Burns	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	We are already in the climate crisis. This has been talked about for over 20 years that this crisis was coming and not enough has been done about it. We now have to do all we can in the shortest amount of time possible. We should have been doing the work years ago. We must come up to and surpass the worlds standards. We used to be ahead of the world and we have been let down by previous Governments	Yes
1379844	Alison King	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</p>	Yes

			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.	
1379882	Melissa Fairman	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
1379905	Wesley Huck	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is not time to waste. Due to past inaction a fast transition is needed to reduce our transport emissions and toxic pollution.	No
1379909	Andrew Herron	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Health benefits are the most important for me. Not to dismiss the other benefits, but to me they are an outcome of choosing the best health benefits not the reason to choose Option C.	Yes
1379911	Andrea Braitto	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1379924	Haydn McCormick	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	I do not beleive that anthropomorphic causes are responsible for a large percentage of climate change and climate oppessed governments are swiftly inacting legislation that will directly make daily life more costly and inconvenient.at the behest of the world economic forum and UN are making climate change	No
1379929	Hugh Sykes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Greenhouse gas pollution is causing death, destruction and disruption to human life at an accelerating rate. So the pollution must be curbed at the fastest possible rate.	Yes
1379931	Margaret McDonald	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to be reducing greenhouse gases as fast as possible	Yes

1379935	Pat Schultz	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate change is now an urgent priority. We need the strongest possible action now.	Yes
1379936	Karen Sanchez	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I have a BSc(Zool/botany) and have observed climate change with alarm for a long time	Yes
1379963	Tim Owen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is vitally important that we reduce greenhouse gas emissions as soon as possible to minimise climate change.	No
1379964	Susan Gardiner	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C provides an extra \$30.7B of benefits over option B at a cost of \$12.26B. Additional benefits of \$18.44B that can transform Australia from keeping Russia company as the only 2 developed countries to have no vehicle emissions standards to being a country deserving of pride.	No
1379979	Mr Jonathan Wills	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want a healthier choice with less pollution	Yes
1379981	Neil Atwood	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are so far behind the rest of the world in this area, we need to catch up as fast as possible	No
1379990	Wolfgang Roffmann	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Environment, health, sustainability	Yes
1379995	Stephen SCHLOTHAUER	Option A - 0th, 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
1380002	Michael Simmons	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1380005	Angus Perry	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must lower all emissions without delay. Costs up front may seem high, but the price of delay would be staggering.	No
1380014	Fern Huck	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The climate crisis demands urgent action across government and private sectors of which transport is a major contributor. It looks increasingly obvious we will missed the Paris agreement 1.5 degrees. Our most urgent/effective response is critical to keep green house gass global warming to the minimum.	No

1380020	Michael Schaffer	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	It appears to be the more efficient choice especially if I were intending to purchase one battery powered car within the next 10 years	Yes
1380028	Craig	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	I own a caravan and I need a larger vehicle to tow it. At this point they can not get the emissions that low in the 4WD vehicle like they wood in large trucks, so at this point the penalties you put on the car makes are going to be forwarded on to us. The price of Rangers, Toyota Cruisers is starting to get out of touch for a lot of people so you are penalising us.	No
1380032	Steven Fechner	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
1380036	John Fuller	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia needs to catch up	Yes
1380050	Jane	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1380051	Richard Aldous	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	I don't agree with the extra tax. Full stop. There is no thought for people who purchase a heavier diesel car for there coountry needs.. why not just tax owners of big cars who live in capitol cities Once again a federal Labor Government has listened to inner city others who have laid on public transport at their door step.	No
1380055	Brian Jervis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1380057	Brenton Rasheed	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have a lot of catching up to do. If you consider what we haven't spent in the past decade, Option C with its benefits is a small price to pay. And the benefits over the percentage difference between it and Option B make Option C far more preferable to me. Why I believe in Option C? Change needs to build momentum now. Once change is being seen to happen the momentum picks up and assuredly so will public (and private) sentiment once the benefits of change are being realised. I most certainly support Option B, but simply see the timeline of change being slower than I prefer. Option C is better to me. I can only speak personally. I'm hungry for the misinformation stream from fossil fuel advocates, that confuse and prejudice the message the public media disseminates about transition to a cleaner energy future. Change it self, versus the narrative from the fossil fuel lobby, will be the harbinger of public realisation. Action over words! I think it will bring a public awakening, that they've been long manipulated by misleading, prejudiced, opinionated, often nonfactual information. Media are apparently either incapable of discerning fact from	Yes

			fiction or choosing not to, deferring to sensationalism over the presentation of peer reviewed researched facts and conclusions. This powerful, culturally nuanced narrative disseminated to date have not served the greater sustainability of public health, wealth, and overall general wellbeing of our society. This manipulation must end. This Change must come quickly! We've arrived at a time where technology has made the fossil fuel technologies redundant and simply not worth the investment. Let's not waste any more time or money on Energy sources that once served us well once, but at a cost to our world that is now well understood. If it only costs \$58.75 billion. The amortised benefits are well worth it!	
1380060	Tim Devereux	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have been to slow to act in the past and immediate action is required to give some hope. Our children and grandchildren will pay the price for inaction in the past. Australians are paying more for fuel because inefficient and polluting vehicles. My electric Hyundai Kona has traveled 145000km mostly on solar power from my roof . This has saved about 15000 litres of petrol being burnt. No fuel tanker truck required to deliver fuel and no ship required to transport fuel to Australia. My car battery will last 20 years and be recycled at the end.	No
1380063	Malcolm Eglinton	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	I do not support any of the choices since the whole exercise is unnecessary & is based upon misleading data.	No
1380068	Mark Hutchison	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Get on with it!	No
1380071	Helena Mills	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate action is urgent and all measures should be taken to make the transition to low emissions as swift as possible. Vehicle owners and buyers should be supported as much as possible to ensure willing and enthusiastic transition. The car servicing industry is a big employer and an appropriate transition program should be funded as servicing requirements drop.	No
1380079	Jerry Koliha	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
1380084	Peter Alves-Veira	Option A - 1st, Option B - 3rd, Option C - 2nd	I DONOT want government telling me what type of truck I can purchase in the future. We are 1% of WORLD pollutions please get out into the real world, we live here in this beautiful country DONT stuff it up.	No
1380085	Marco	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Thanks to our pollias asleep at the wheel for the last decade we have no choice but to go hard and fast to catch-up with the rest of the world.	Yes
1380102	adrian polhill	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have to transition renewable energy sources as quickly as possible to reduce our emissions, to conserve our beautiful planet for our future generations. If government must be brave and take Option C.	NULL

1380105	Milos Karapandzic	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Emissions from cars are the rubbish that we don't collect and process, and they are globally significant. Therefore the more reduction in emissions the better; it's about time.	Yes
1380115	John Healy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is already overdue and we want cheper evs.	No
1380120	Allen Shrimpton	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	You have to bring people along. If you price them out they will rebel.	Yes
1380129	Matt Smith	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We only have one climate, we must look after it for future generations.	No
1380131	Ron Coster	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want to see a fast reduction of emissions	Yes
1380138	Angela Cox	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C demonstrates the most benefits, the fastest most efficient transition and isn't even the most expensive overall! This feels like a no brainer, and it's not like Australia is starting with an advantage in this race	No
1380141	Richard Smith	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	Reduce emissions	No
1380152	Richard	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are far behind the rest of the world and need to catch up fast. The fast option also has the greatest benefit.	Yes
1380158	Anne Masters	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We should make Australia's fuel efficiency standards the best in the world	Yes
1380164	Robyn Simpson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	High time we had standards in Australia. Most aggressive option is necessary, as this is ONLY for new vehicles, from 2025. Existing vehicles will continue to be heavy emitters as Australia as a car-dependant nation, gradually improves over next decades. It would be great if there were customer/consumer incentives in place to reduce the average size of vehicles over time, or disincentives to upsize to large, heavy vehicles.	Yes
1380169	SamG	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have waited 50 years. Australia needs to catch up and show we are serious about climate change. Cost-benefit doesn't appear to take account of the damage caused to climate by excess emissions.	No
1380187	Catherine	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	Yes

			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	
1380188	Matt	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
1380191	Sophia	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To reduce our greenhouse emissions we need to move to electric vehicles (using renewable energy).	No
1380194	Daryl Harper	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Slow & steady wins the race, any faster will add excessive costs to new vehicles encouraging people to keep their older ones longer which defeats the whole purpose of the exercise.	No
1380196	Sue Carolane	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	Yes

			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.	
1380197	Marlow Lackner	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	With global warming becoming worse everyday we need to transition to Electric Automobiles as soon as possible.	No
1380199	Graham	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce emissions and reduce our consumption of fossil fuels. This will encourage the car manufacturers to import more electric vehicles and sell them at sensible prices so they would be available to everyone not just the wealthy.	NULL
1380200	Edward Drake	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Policy makers must not forget that Australia is a large country with many vehicles travelling vast distances. There are many thousands of kilometres of dirt or gravel roads that are traversed every year and there are many Australians who need to have a sturdy robust vehicle.. Every politician who makes rules or regulations to do with motor vehicles in this country should be forced to drive at least 200 km on a dirt or gravel road. Being chauffeur driven from the airport and around the suburbs doesn't cut it. Any person making decisions on motor vehicles should have at least a little understanding of what real Australians live with.	No
1380202	Mike Robinson	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
1380203	Marlene Eggert	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Prefer to take the middle course in policy approaches to reduce stress on the population and other systems involved.	Yes
1380214	Arthur Bradley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This is a climate emergency. We have to stop emitting CO2 as fast as we can. No nimbyism. Get it done as fast as possible. All other issues (wars, famine, inequality, domestic violence and others) are important but the climate emergency is critical and fundamental to our survival on this small blue dot we call home. A nuclear war will have the same effect, only quicker. Both outcomes are the same. Politicians: don't dither over a few votes. Show leadership. Your job is to get it done now!!	No
1380222	Kim	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Because Australia is only now considering this legisaltion , after so many years of neglect of this issue and allowing/encouraging so many many 'dirty' vehicles to be so cheap for Australians to purchase, Australia has to catch up. Australia is the global pariah with respect to so many well known environmental concerns, like we have nothing to lose. Wrong.	No
1380223	Michael Mitchell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I would like to see stronger legislative commitments that will help us reduce the amount of greenhouse gas emissions being released. Australia can and should do better.	NULL
1380230	Richard Proctor	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We just have to move quickly to reduce CO2 emissions	Yes

1380231	Doug Munro	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Support Option B, although with qualifications, particularly lack of post 2030 CO2 emissions intensity standards. Refer submission attached.	Yes
1380232	Gage	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Environment help	No
1380235	Rob Chan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce emissions from all sectors as fast as possible.	Yes
1380244	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1380246	Bridget Sack	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Despite the higher costs, we urgently need to make the fastest transition and be dramatic in our approach7	No
1380251	Alan Wardrop	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	A strong New Vehicle Emissions Standard is needed for the reasons given in the supporting documents: to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, improve health outcomes, reduce fuel costs and improve the choice of available electric vehicles. Option A is pointless. Option B is better. Option C is best. Climate action is urgent. Health benefits are very important. The best outcomes rely on the rapid uptake of electric vehicles, which would be stimulated by option C. The incremental benefit cost ratio of option C over option B is 2.5, which is still definitely worthwhile. Utes and vans should be subject to the same regulation as other passenger cars. The standard for all cars should be flat regardless of weight, which is both simple to regulate and will not encourage larger vehicles. Option B only is compared against the US regulations, which are less ambitious than others including the EU. With Australian cars being right hand drive it would make sense to align the emission regulations with the UK and NZ, which are also more ambitious and align better with option C. It is disappointing that the introduction of the standard is delayed until 1 January 2025. With the long time taken so far to get a standard in place I hoped it would commence from 1 July 2024, particularly since suitable vehicles are already sold overseas.	NULL
1380253	Laurie Derwent	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	This appears to provide the best value to the Australian community. Our cities in particular need cleaner air and this is one ay to achive that.	Yes
1380256	Iain m	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's bloody obvious do all we can to slow climate change.	Yes
1380258	Howard Pierce	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The costs of climate change vastly outweigh any possible costs of the 'ast start' option. I've had to increase the excess on my home & contents insurance to \$5,000 just to afford it. Also, I've been driving vehicles that emit less than 140 g/km CO2 since 1992, so that's hardly an ambitious starting point.	Yes
1380259	Céu Amaral	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1380261	Hester Slade	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As a matter of urgency, everything possible must be done to reduce climate change.	NULL
1380266	Jenny Hughes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	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, this has been coming for years!!! 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. So they should have seen this coming ages ago! 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). The	Yes

			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. 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. 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. 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.	
1380271	David Wright	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Australia needs to move now for cleaner air for all people	Yes
1380274	A.Highfield	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1380292	Jeffrey Wild	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There are sound environmental, market and personal reasons for my choice. The planet and all it contains are so close to the climate change tipping point that urgent action is imperative. If we lag behind the most forward-thinking nations, we will lose any trade advantage. Also, Option C will eventually make electric and other higher-efficiency vehicles more affordable, and, while I am on a low income, I will be in the market for one of these vehicles in the next few years.	Yes
1380298	Michael Chamley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1380302	Felix Rauch Valenti	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	It's important to move forward fast to have a significant impact on emissions and to reach our net zero targets.	Yes
1380305	Pete Petrovsky	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1380316	Shane Parker	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option A is far too little, far too late, and (I strongly suspect that) option C has a much greater BCR than shown if the cost of the increased incidence and severity of weather events due to the CO2 emissions were accounted for (increased insurances, repairs to infrastructure, costs to the health system).	NULL
1380319	Ben Lever	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C gives the most benefits in terms of emission reduction and household savings, and is very achievable with current technology. The report's assumptions about petrol and electricity prices are extremely conservative and as a result it's likely that the CBR for Option C would actually be much higher than Option B. Also, the government's preference for splitting vehicles into passenger and LCV categories, and for including weight adjustments within those categories, risks vehicle bloat undermining the program, therefore it's important to go for the most ambitious headline figure to compensate for this.	Yes
1380321	Hamilton Ian	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	Yes

			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.	
1380322	John	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Bring us in line with world standards and assist with energy transition. SUV's need to be included. Better for health and environment despite extra cost.	Yes
1380328	Marty McFly	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The numbers provide the answer	Yes
1380337	Justin barias	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1380338	Duncan Booth	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1380344	Ryan McArdle	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are to far behind with vehicle emissions standards and need to adopt aggressive policy sooner rather than later.	Yes
1380347	Brett Bond	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do everything possible to accelerate CO2 emission reduction.	No
1380351	Ken Taylor	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to move quickly so save people money on petrol	No
1380352	Peter Hunt	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is critical to beat CO2 targets for 2030/32 in EU. And to achieve a liveable country & planet for future generations. It will save many other industries that are here forever if managed well which they currently are and which are critical for our future. A bit more expensive initially but a huge cost saving in the near future.	No
1380357	Miranda Cummings	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	No

			– 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.	
1380359	Russell Bell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Just pull the band aid off. The longer it's left the more it will ultimately cost every Australian	No
1380364	V Colaci	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia should not be in the last of countries to do this. People are dying every day from exhaust fumes and other related illnesses from fossil fuels, let alone efficient engines. so the priority should be option C, nothing less.	No
1380365	Lim	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	NULL	No
1380366	David Simpson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have a climate crisis looming so we all must act very fast. Need to stop the spin from the fossil fuel lobbyists	No
1380373	Peter	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The benefits to cost ratio of option C is almost as good as option B, with the absolute benefits the highest by far. This is the only ethical choice to make.	NULL
1380374	Vanessa Horton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Ensures availability of electric vehicles to Australian market. Improves climate change impacts which will hit Australia hard if we don't have ambitious targets	Yes
1380376	Judy	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	EV batteries are very efficient batteries but they're heavy. Our power infrastructure is still coming from coal fired power stations. Put more money into researching car paint that be double to use solar power. Research into hydrogen fuels, alternative fuels. EV mustn't be economical when long distance haulage companies aren't using them. Australia is a huge country and distances are vast. It's not practical to only have EV vehicles to travel this wonderful country.	No
1380383	Libby Farrell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Global warming	No
1380406	matthew allison	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate crisis in case you needed to be reminded	No
1380407	Kurt Hardie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Although I personally would prefer C, I am afraid that a too radical approach may scare off many people who may then turn away from supporting it completely.	Yes
1380408	Jeff Hughes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are now at tipping point in the climate crisis. We must act NOW and as strongly as possible. Surely the fact that the Option C provides a much higher net benefit than Option B makes it the obvious choice.	No
1380410	Martin Harrington	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to go full steam ahead. In the long run, the cost difference is minimal between 2 and 3.	No
1380413	John Macgowan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Lets get this up and running, save the planet and save some money.	Yes
1380416	Tom Hollander	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must accelerate our transition away from fossil fuels to avoid catastrophic climate change	Yes
1380417	Tim Budge	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia must take strong, decisive action to reduce greenhouse gasses and to reduce the poor health outcomes associated with inefficient vehicles	Yes

1380418	Meredith Budge	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need a super fast transition to clean energy. Time is running out. We should have started this process 40 years ago.	Yes
1380419	Terry Lewis	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The sooner the better	Yes
1380424	Eveline Masco	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	A fast transition is required to avoid the most dangerous effects of global warming. There is no planet B.	Yes
1380425	Max Wagner	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Though Australia has a high GPT per capita, due to the lack of emission standards that most other advanced economies (aside from Russia) have, the last 20 years Australia has become a dumping ground for old and inefficient technology based vehicles here. The vehicles sold here are larger and heavier with older, inefficient and polluting engines than in other countries. The worst example of this are the 'yank tanks', American Utes such as the RAM, Ford F150 and Chevrolet Silverado which increase traffic congestion, waste fuel and, due to their high bonnets and increased vehicle weight, are 200% more likely to kill a pedestrian or cyclist in a collision (see ETSC report). Ensuring carmakers must follow standards will allow for more efficient vehicles, save Australians money in the long run, reduce harmful pollution and traffic deaths.	Yes
1380428	Sheraz	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1380436	Stacey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do everything we can to reduce emissions as quickly as possible	Yes
1380439	Cate Stirling	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
1380444	Denise Aubourg	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The efficiency stds are a win:win:win. 1) good for consumers (use less fuel, cheaper), health (fewer emissions) 2. good for country (reduced fuel imports) and environment. We've already waited too long for this, so lets get on with it.	Yes

1380445	Graeme Martin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Better fuel efficiency helps everyone. And we will get the better engines that the manufacturers make, not their old rubbish.	No
1380455	Ross Hetherington	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Clearly we need to decrease emissions if not for climate change but for cleaner air. As EVs become common place we need to have fuel standards to create uniformity in our approach to our clean transport transition. This transition will save health care costs as respiratory problems decrease, and removes fine air particles caused by diesel fumes. Money should not be an inhibitor as we need to focus on emergency action to prevent a possible catastrophe event occurring. We should not be gambling with the life of us, other fauna and flora, and our planet. We have an obligation to protect all life, not just ours. The fuel standards are one step to achieving not just a cleaner world, but a technological advancement that will open up new technologies and catapult us towards greater things including space exploration. Do this now, not by 2035 or 2050.	No
1380457	Nicholas Grebneff	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is a laggard and dumping ground for fuel hungry and polluting vehicles. To avoid falling further behind we should move to the highest global standards as quickly as possible. SUVs and Utes like the Ford Ranger that is everywhere must also be included in the standards. These US style trucks cram our roads and carparks and are unsafe to pedestrians and should be deglorified.	Yes
1380459	Chris Reeve	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I want to protect the environment for our children	No
1380461	Haydn Stammers	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Companies will always do the least possible to increase profits. Mandating standards, especially when they're capable of doing it, will be better overall for our society.	Yes
1380463	Daryl Maunder	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Faster EV rollout, higher climate impact reduction	Yes
1380464	Darren	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia should be a leader in this change, not a follower	Yes
1380468	Craig Hind	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to catch up as soon as possible to attempt to halt catastrophic climate change and to prevent vehicle manufacturers from dumping non-compliant vehicles in other jurisdictions on us.	No
1380469	Gerard Hodgkiss	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1380476	John Zubrickas	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	If Australia is to come close to achieving it's emission commitment there is no other option.	No
1380478	Robert Loss	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As a scientist with a research back ground in dust and particles the sooner we remove more particulates from the air the better.	No
1380483	Jon Real	Option A - 0th, Option B - 1st, Option C - 0th	Option B presents an ambitious but achievable set of targets. The exclusion of off-cycle and aircon credits provides greater confidence and transparency in the results by removing the uncertainties about the merits of such credits. I do think there is a case for limited supercredits for zero and very low emission vehicles, and some other changes, which I have outlined in the attached submission.	Yes
1380487	Michael Devey	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Healthy environment is a cornerstone of a happy existence.	Yes
1380489	Sue	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do everything we can to lower emissions as quickly as possible.	Yes

1380491	Keith Blackburn	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The consequence of failing to act and to implement a sound vehicle emissions policy has been multiple unnecessary charges against all Australians. By implementing strong standards now, Australia will benefit in the ways outlined in the government paper. Australia is currently an international laggard (shamefully only in the company of Russia). The benefit-cost of the Option B is \$31 billion in benefits forgone. Motorists will be the biggest losers (over \$26.5 billion) but deferral of health benefits is also significant both in economic terms (over \$1 billion) and in terms of poorer health outcomes. The reduction of green-house gas emission is a relatively small financial loser (less than \$3 billion) under Option B but personally I am deeply concerned about the legacy I am leaving for my grand-children and great-grand-children. I am 82 years of age and sadly I see a world climate that is in rapid decline. The increasing incidence of catastrophes such as cyclone, flood, fire and drought must be addressed as a matter of urgency. As global citizens, we must not lack ambition. Settling for second best is simply not good enough. We don't have the luxury of continuing to bury our heads in the sands in the hope that if we ignore what is happening around us it will some-how go away.	NULL
1380498	Brett Adams	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The benefit, acceptance, and usability of BEV grows with adoption. The faster we transition the easier the transition is on BEV owners.	Yes
1380500	Robert Durrant	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Benefits for quicker respiratory disease mitigation	No
1380501	Rohan Gunton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	A pragmatic transition	Yes
1380502	Hans Weidtlar	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
1380507	Martin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a 'climate emergency'. For the sake of our children's standard of living, it is the least we can do to minimise any threat to them.	No
1380509	Dave Wilson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1380516	Greg McElvenny	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C has the most benefits and we need to make up for 10 lost years.	No
1380517	Di Sylvester	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is best to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, for my children and grandchildren.	No
1380518	Paul Smedley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1380521	Tim Hoff	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to clean our air. Pollution is a huge problem and not having clean cars and trucks is the issue.	No
1380522	Alan H	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The faster the better	No
1380524	Tom James McLaren	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Seems likely a common sense middle ground	Yes
1380526	Kylie	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to be doing everything we can NOW. It will save us more in the long-term - there are many more benefits than above to acting as fast as we can.	No
1380527	Nigel P Rush	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1380534	Janet Wong	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C has the highest Net Benefit with \$115 billion dollars. Which is 20% more superior (= \$18 billion dollars MORE) than Option B.	No
1380536	Penny Lee	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I think we need to remember that energy is also consumed in constructing new cars. Old cars already embody energy use and can be kept on the road for a decent length of time before scrapping.	Yes
1380538	Nicco Wibowo	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1380541	Scott Morgan	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I support Option C as it results in the greatest absolute net benefits ie \$18 billion more, even if it has a marginally lower CBR than Option B. I am completely opposed to Option A and am against supercredits or a grace period as both would significantly reduce scheme effectiveness. Option C will be the best of the options in moving Australia towards fuel self sufficiency and improve resilience, which is an important factor given various geopolitical issues. While the Consultation Impact Analysis notes that there is some concern about technology advances given the standard is slightly more stringent than the US NVESS, the technology for such vehicles exists and is getting cheaper as supply chain issues are resolved. Suitable technology is available, though some manufacturers have been slower than others to adopt it. Option C tracks closely with the EU and UK trajectories, which a very large market in world terms and thus driving the increase in low emission vehicles. The Option C trajectory is well after that taken by Norway, where something like 90% of new light vehicles are low emission, so looks to be eminently achievable. As a cyclist I also want to see a faster rollout of low emissions vehicles due to the pollution generated by ICE vehicles, which also generates significant adverse health impacts.. The Impact Analysis notes a battery life of twelve years (ie warranty plus 50%) however latest technology batteries are lasting over 500,000 kilometres, so this life may be conservative. I have concerns about the mass basis for vehicles and that this could be a driver of an increased ratio of higher mass vehicles with worse emissions, more road damage and other impacts. Also I think there should be stricter eligibility criteria for what counts as a light commercial vehicle, so that vehicles which are often only used for private purposes don't undermine the effectiveness of the standard. I support the regulator function initially being undertaken within the department, though it may be better to have an arms' length body when the system is established. I would like to see a greater range of low emission models available in Australia, particularly in the more affordable	No

			price range and I think the best of the alternatives to achieve this is Option C. At question 5 I have answered No as I believe Option C is preferable, achievable, results in better health outcomes and generates greater overall net benefits.	
1380545	Echo Chen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1380549	Phil Newman	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	We need to reduce fossil fuel emissions and have vehicles that run as efficiently as possible to save resources.	No
1380551	Edwin	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	Most cars have one person inside correspond to overall efficiency of 1%. With a vehicle weight of 1600 kg. A 400 Kg vehicle would have 4% efficiency if petrol or 7% if electric. Such a vehicle would need a slow but would cost \$5000 and could be produced here good public transport is the obvious solution	No
1380553	Trevor Hoare	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Car manufacturers already conform to these standards in all other markets. They do not need more time. We need to reduce emissions and global heating as fast and far as possible. This maximises the benefits for all Australians in cheaper, more efficient transport and better health and a better chance of avoiding the worst effects of the climate crisis. It is in Australia's security and economic interests to eliminate our dependence on imported transport fuels as soon as possible. My children and grandchildren deserve a government that accepts and respects the science and acts decisively in their interests rather than the entrenched vested interests of the fossil fuel companies, the automotive industry and the climate change deniers in politics and media.	No
1380564	Moira Conley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	< Back to Posts How to make a submission to the Government's new car pollution standards 21 February 2024 facebook Twitter Email The Government has just proposed New Vehicle Emissions Standards to limit pollution from newly sold cars. This is a big win for the climate, because transport is the third largest source of carbon pollution in Australia, and most of it comes from the dirty exhausts of diesel and petrol cars. If we don't act, transport will become the worst polluter by 2030. Greenpeace has been fighting for these pollution limits on cars for years, and we are almost there. But the proposal is not law yet the Government needs to finalise the design of the standards and take them to Parliament. They are asking for your feedback until 4 March we need everyone to make a submission calling for strong standards. Making a submission is quick and easy. Here is a response guide for the form, with some points you might want to raise with the Government to make their proposal better. The answers below are a serving suggestion only feel free to cook up a response as you see fit! Step 1: Follow this link for an individual or an organisation Step 2: Fill out the questions with your name and email Question Response Guide Question 3: Please rank the proposed options in order of preference Answer: Question 4: Briefly, what are your reasons for your choice? (optional, 3000 character limit) Copy and paste into the open text box: 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	No
1380567	Lee White	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Environmental and health factors that impact Australia and its people	No
1380568	A Adams	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are in a climate crisis, we have dithered far too long, we must act and act fast. A slightly higher cost (and slightly lower BCR) is the price we must pay to catch up to where we should have been had certain politicians accepted the climate science over the preceding decades (and had had the spine to stand up to the various vested interests). Option A is essentially the Clayton's option: the option you have when you don't really want a policy at all and it would be little better than the status quo of the woefully inadequate and self-serving voluntary targets that Australia's polluting car lobby use as a cover under which they can continue to dump the dirtiest and least-efficient old technology on an unsuspecting public. As it will never catch the other major global standards, it would condemn Australia to remain such a dumping ground. The car companies already have the required technology, they're just selling it in markets that force them to; we should too. Option B would be better than nothing and by quite some way. If we had to 'settle' for Option B, things could certainly be a lot worse. However, as noted, because we have left	NULL

			it so late in the piece to do anything about Australia's emissions, we owe it to the environment and to future generations who, of course, will rely on said environment, as do we, to take the fastest possible path to significant and rapid emissions reductions in a large chunk of the transport sector. It is time to seize the opportunity and show that Australia refuses to be beholden to the self-interested, go-slow, clap-trap of the already-fragmenting legacy car lobby. It is well past time that Australia got the latest, cleanest, most efficient, healthiest and thus safest (in the broadest sense) car technology that the world has to offer. If some car companies are unable to meet the challenge then they will join the long list of failed car brands that the world has long forgotten. The sky will not fall if we embrace rapid and positive change. Indeed, it will brighter and more vibrant than it has been in a long time and the nation and the planet will be all the better for it.	
1380570	Janet Roden	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	The Government's option B is acceptable and much more effective than option A, one key reason is that larger SUVs are included in the Passenger vehicle class. However I would like to see option C but realise ti is more expensive Option C would delvier greater benefits in four main areas -fuel savings; vehicle maintenance ; health and Green House Gas Emissions.s.	Yes
1380573	Mark D	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I'm pragmatic. Option b is a balance between each extreme and we need something done now. Or roads are clogged with large, heavy, polluting cars and even larger vehicles from the US are making their way here. We need standards to allow down this antisocial influx.	Yes
1380575	William Bourke	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	net 0 needs to happen sooner rather than later	No
1380576	Craig Bates	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Greater benefits, sooner. CO2 emission reduction sooner (we are so far behind!). I would expecg greater health benefits that shon here based on the DELWP paper (https://www.climatechange.vic.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0022/421717/Final_Health-costs-of-air-pollution-in-Victoria.pdf) estiating over \$660M/Y in health costs due to fossil fuels in Victoria alone. SUVs should be considered passenger vehicles (most dual cab utes are not even used for commercil purposes).	Yes
1380584	Paul	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We shouldn't always be a lagging country, why not lead the change	Yes
1380585	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Greatest benefit in the shortest time. Not doing anything new so no reason to delay. Just catching up with what the rest of the world has already done.	No
1380588	Brendan Robinson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Time to clean up the automotive industry.	NULL
1380592	Matt Jones	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's too little too late. We need to move fast and now. We're playing catch up, not leading. Let's go!!!!	No
1380593	Jackson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1380611	Kristian Clancy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	As a strong believer that a ripple can turn into a wave, anything which can (and should) be done to combat climate change as fast as possible, needs to be done. I would also like to see R&D into affordably transitioning existing cars into more sustainable vehicles too, as means to reduce ongoing production costs and impacts on the globe. Let's remember the 3 R's are Reduce, Reuse, Recycle - they're in that order for a specific reason. Reduce waste and pollution. All which backs up why I believe Option C is better than nothing. Option B has benefits, absolutely, Option C would see bigger positive impacts for the government, and the people.	Yes
1380613	Sarah Reid	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	A faster transition to EVs is better for householders and the community in general. The financial, health and environmental benefits to the community are the greatest under Option C, justifying the additional cost.	NULL
1380617	Ian Moxon	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cheaper transport costs	Yes
1380632	Ted Catchpole	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL

1380633	Tony Nelson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Accelerated transition away from fossil fuel dependency	No
1380635	Brenda Selwood	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 3rd	NULL	NULL
1380637	Joshua Keep	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Option A has no break points - i.e. there is equal incentive to select a (relatively) efficiency heavy vehicle over an efficient lighter vehicle. Large fleet gains (CO2 reduction) can be made simply by reducing vehicle weight, or disincentivizing heavier vehicles. B&C incorporate this. Option A also limits impact through categorization of many high volume vehicles (Utes and SUVs) as LCVs, which have higher limit curves. This is one of the historical weaknesses of this type of model in the USA, and should be avoided.	Yes
1380640	Sue McCarthy	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Reduce pollutants and carbon	Yes
1380641	Mark Burton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Please see my attached submission. I suggest that the national welfare benefits under Option C are greater than currently assessed because the NVES success criteria being applied are too narrow.	NULL
1380645	Barbara Maguire	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 1st	My choice is made with the climate crisis in mind and the knowledge that we cut carbon emissions.	NULL
1380647	Claire King	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Makes more financial sense for the end consumer. Better result for the environment.	Yes
1380653	Libby Farrell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	global warming	NULL
1380656	Joe Booth	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are running well behind on this transition and need to move faster, not slower.	No
1380666	Barry Laing	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We already lag behind the rest of the world so we need to move as quickly as possible	No
1380672	Tim Dashwood	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia has been dragging its feet too long and needs government action to future proof sustainable life	NULL
1380695	Mark Tipping	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have delayed so long we must accelerate the transition immediately. People and business will cope. We always do.	Yes
1380696	Tom	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	We're behind so many other countries, so it's imperative to take the fastest path to introducing and implementing the standards	Yes
1380703	James Collins	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is imperative that we achieve this as soon as possible	No
1380711	Garry Roberts	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I've have lagged behind other industrialised countries for a long time now. I think pain in the short term will provide long terms benefits for the community and the environment.	Yes
1380722	Dr Philip Dooley	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No

1380734	Trevor Hutchison	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are lagging behind the rest of the world and we need strong incentives to move towards reducing greenhouse gas emissions.	Yes
1380737	edgar juarez	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we are already late to take care of environmental issues	Yes
1380739	Tim Pope	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Fastest transition;	NULL
1380742	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	NULL
1380757	Robert Trebilcock	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	First world country, third world efficiency standards. Auto lobby has politicised this issue!	No
1380809	Richard Simpson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is a laggard in the vehicle transition and must make the strongest possible choice to now move forward. This may involve some short term adjustments but we can draw upon the experience from Europe and the US to guide us to a healthier future.	No
1380822	Joseph Palmer	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
1380827	Kim Wagstaff	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	There is no time to waste the faster this is implemented the better	No
1380836	Alex Tewes	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Environmental protection, costs of driving, and making EVs more price competitive	Yes
1380841	John Chadderton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	In the current climate emergency, Option A is not a valid option. Whilst Option B is a bit cheaper initially it will necessitate higher expenditure in the long run and delays benefits to the environment. Option C helps to bring forward future expenditure at a lower	NULL

			cost and maximises environmental benefits. The additional \$12.26BN in costs of Option C, returns \$18.44BN in benefits and has the advantage of reducing intergenerational debt along with a more substantial contribution to reducing CO2.	
1380844	Paul Wayper	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have to reduce the use of fossil fuels and the emission of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases as quickly as possible. Options C and B would be even better if they started in 2024, not 2025.	Yes
1380849	Carbon Zero Initiative	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1380850	David Borojevic	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Every new internal combustion engine locks in 10-20 years of additional emission and locks in dependency on imported fuels costing the Australian economy in excess of \$50 billion p.a.	Yes
1380852	Don Norris	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I think we should be achieving the maximum possible impact on greenhouse gas emissions.	NULL
1380855	Murray W	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	No time to waste. We need to cut emissions FAST. Option C is the best way to do this	Yes
1380857	Marie Rosewarne	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We're facing an existential crisis. Government and industry have procrastinated for too long. We need to make up for lost time.	NULL
1380860	Sophia C	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.	NULL
1380873	Samuel Martin	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia should have access to the latest and cleanest technology that can help reduce emissions and save costs to millions. This will help make the economy more efficient and productive, fight climate change and save lives.	Yes
1380878	Volkswagen Group Australia	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	NULL

1380879	Graeme McCormack	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia is a late mover in this space, with much catching up to do. It is not sufficient to simply match US or European standards over time, we need to move much faster, to offset emissions we have already released by being slow to bring in climate warming abatement measures. Australia has been left behind by much of the world when it comes to climate change abatement. I encourage the Australian government to adopt option C as we need to move faster on reducing our emissions. I have outlined m	No
1380895	James	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Better consumer and climate impacts.	No
1380906	Chris Price	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	I would like to see more efficient cars on the road but also understand that the creation of new vehicles costs the environment significantly	Yes
1380909	Naomi	Option A - 2nd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 3rd	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
1380912	Toby Hede	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The mathematics seems quite clear. Option C costs \$12.26 billion more than Option B but provides an additional \$30.7 billion in benefits. We should be moving to reduce emissions as quickly as possible and given that the numbers add up, I don't know why we wouldn't take the fastest option. \$60 billion is only 20% of the AUKUS submarine program.	Yes
1380915	robert bird	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia's position is already at the rear of the field. Need to publicly promote the positives of the policy. No more tax subsidies of full tax write offs of these utes. The health benefits are not being promoted as a huge win for peoples general well being.	No
1380919	David de Groot	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We cannot afford to tiptoe around the issue of climate change any more. If we can afford to spend billions on submarines and fighter jets, we can afford to spend on this. As far as I can tell, the only thing against C over B is some additional costs, which at this point, are not something we can afford to worry too much about.	NULL
1380926	Graeme McDonald	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It is already long overdue Australia must move as fast as possible	No
1380930	Catherine Ryan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The health impacts of pollution caused by low efficiency vehicles and the cost of this fuel to the average motorist are already very high. It is shameful that we are one of the last countries in the world to have a standard and there is no way we can meet our net zero obligations without one.	Yes
1380939	Paul Williams	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to do as much as possible as soon as possible to stop putting CO2 in the air. Option b would be better than nothing but the difference in cost versus the larger benefit of humanity seems like a no brainer to go the faster option and potentially investigate doing more?	NULL
1380943	Rebecca Blackburn	Option A - 0th, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C is the fastest and most effective way to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. We have no time to wait (6 years according to some calculations).	No
1380949	Douglas Uwland	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Oversized vehicles are becoming more common in urban/suburban areas. Swift government intervention is needed to further discourage the use of these vehicles for those who do not require them. If there is a grace period or flexibility many will rush to exploit that to be the biggest car on the road.	Yes
1380956	Sundusit Snashall	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	The faster we get clean renewable energy vehicles, the more we will save and benefit. What are we waiting for?	No
1380969	Maureen	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Seems doable.	Yes

1380977	Edward Lynch-Bell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Please Withdraw my previous submission made on 29/2/24 and replace it with the attached submission due to an error in the text. I support a modified version of option B, there is still a role for the most efficient and best value new energy vehicles to generate additional credits. In my submission I lay out why we should award additional credits to the best value, lightest and most economical New Energy Vehicles	Yes
1380991	Andy Chapman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C puts us inline with other developed countries and provides the best benefit to cost ratio as well.	No
1381005	David Armstrong	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must act faster	Yes
1381011	Nicholas Barrett	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	No
1381029	Michael McGrath	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Australia should be leading the world not playing catch up. We need to clean up our act now! We need to go on a war footing and introduce strict petrol rationing. We are in a climate emergency that will make all previous wars look like walks in the park.	No
1381032	Catherine Mc Naughton	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C has the far greatest community and health benefits - some 4 times higher than option B with minimal extra costs. Australia has decades of catching up to do to the rest of the developed world and to legislate for our transport system to play its fair role in protecting our communities health, environment and climate.	Yes
1381038	Robert Padgett	Option A - 1st, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	This submission proposes that an aggressive mandatory New Vehicle Efficiency Standard (NVES) for Australia is unnecessary at this point. The Government's Voluntary NVES and National Electric Vehicle Strategy (NEVS) are together already producing significant Light Duty Vehicle emissions intensity reductions. This amounted to as much as 6.8% reduction since 2020. This trend is forecast to continue as Electric Vehicles (EV) continue to penetrate the Light Duty Vehicle fleet, with no need for the heavy hand of the proposed NVES (Option B). The proposed preferred Option B is unnecessarily ambitious and based on the inadequately supported contention that Australia's Light Duty fleet emission intensity exceeds international benchmarks and that the voluntary NVES is not working. Moreover, inconsistencies within the NVES Consultation Impact Analysis cast some doubt as to the magnitude of projected benefits. As a minimum it is recommended that the fundamental claims of the NVES Consultation Impact Analysis be more rigorously tested - especially through use of consistent and up-to-date data. A neutral strategy is recommended whereby the necessary regulatory framework for the NVES is set in place, but with initial control parameters set such as to allow the organic trend toward lower Light Duty Vehicle emissions intensity to continue with minimal market intervention and consumer impact. Accordingly, the Department's Option A could be adopted as an appropriate and manageable interim position while the market continues its natural progression to a lower emissions intensity Light Duty fleet with the option to tighten the control parameter settings held in abeyance. It is contended that the National Electric Vehicle Strategy is yielding a reasonable contribution to Australia's emissions reduction target through positive incentivitation and organic growth. On the other hand, the more rapid adoption of Electric Vehicles, as required to meet the aims of the preferred Option B of the NVES, would require substantial and unwelcome intervention in the Light Duty Vehicle market including strong price disincentives for heavier ICE vehicles.	No
1381040	Judy Gunson	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1381045	Bruce Grime	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are already a long way behind and need to catch up ASAP.	Yes
1381056	Andrew Best	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We must eliminate fossil fuels (FF) from our society as quickly as possible.	Yes
1381060	Will Farr	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Only the strictest policy will be even remotely capable of meeting our emissions targets, assuming a likely high degree of gaming the system through lax enforcement and loopholes such as increasing gross vehicle masses allowing for more emissions per vehicle.	No

1381081	Mae Hurley Bowe	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1381086	Bethany Carlyon	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
1381087	Owen Hurley Bowe	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1381088	John Cooper	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	we are lagging well behind the rest of the world with emissions reduction. this is an opportunity to gain back some lost ground.	Yes
1381089	Ben Stewart	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Cycling around Sydney is heavily unpleasant with the excessive emissions from commercial vehicles and buses. If you want modal shift and reduced emissions, it starts with reducing the impact of vehicles on pedestrians and cyclists. There's no reason we can't adopt tighter standards mandated by Europe and California; those emissions standards and compliant vehicles already exist. Australia's regulation around vehicle emissions and efficiency is utterly laughable by global standards.	Yes
1381091	Professor Jake Whitehead	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	From reviewing the government's impact analysis, it is clear that Option B is feasible, delivers the highest benefit-cost ratio, and will align with our climate targets. While the levels outlined in Option C would be great for Australia to aspire to, I recognise that the government needs to implement a middle-ground, that is ultimately feasible, and sustainable. Related to this, however, is the reality that Option B must be seen as a floor, rather than a ceiling, with respect to considering design changes, and/or changes as part of future reviews. While it is recognised some stakeholders will be seeking changes to the standard - undoubtedly in favour of their own interests - any changes should ensure that, at minimum, the carbon abatement forecast under Option B is not reduced. For example, if the headline targets for LCVs were varied, the overall impact should be that the carbon abatement projected under Option B is not reduced. This could involve weaker targets initially, offset by much stronger targets, leading to the same end goal target in 2029. I would also note that the design of the standard is technology-neutral, and from my assessment, can be achieved under a range of powertrain uptake scenarios, including a BEV adoption rate under 20% of new vehicle sales. While I personally expect that BEV uptake will be significantly greater than this, and that ultimately higher BEV uptake will be the pathway the market is most likely to take, it is ultimately up to the market to decide. I find it incredibly unfortunate that so many stakeholders have chosen to spread misinformation about the standard's design since its release last month. I remain highly sceptical of these parties' willingness to be reasonable, and am of the view that nothing short of delaying the standard for several years, or	Yes

			weakening it beyond recognition, will satisfy them. This is despite clear evidence that the standard is not radical, and will be able to met by the market via a range of technology/powertrain scenarios. I congratulate the government and the department on its hard efforts to carry the process of consulting on and designing a standard to date. This is a significant achievement that will see all Australians benefit from more efficient new, and eventually used vehicles, cheaper fuel bills, greater independence from expensive and volatile foreign fuel, as well as cleaner air for us all to breather. It is imperative the government moves forward without delay to legislate Option B with minimal changes, preserving the level of forecast carbon abatement under its preferred design. I look forward to Australia catching up to more than 85% of the global car market that already has a standard, and finally getting the decent range of low and zero emission vehicles that we deserve. Thank you again for the opportunity to respond to this analysis. I remain committed to supporting all Australian governments in meeting our climate targets through a decarbonised transport system.	
1381095	Bennet McComish	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have delayed this for too long and can no longer afford the environmental cost of any but the most rapid action	No
1381100	Rebecca Pfennigwerth	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	Seems to provide the best benefit for the cost. Long past time that we had this policy	Yes
1381106	Maria Law	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	NULL	Yes
1381113	Alan Vlahov	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Perth experiencing 7 days over 40degreesC demonstrating a fast start is required.	Yes
1381115	Richard Simington	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	See attached submission.	NULL
1381117	Joeline Hackman	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	O strongly support 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 acted decisively during covid and we need to act decisively now.	Yes
1381118	Jen Cuthbert	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Climate change must be addressed now	No
1381120	Toyota Australia	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	NULL
1381121	Toyota Australia	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	NULL
1381122	Dan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have left action too late and need to transition rapidly. Every cent spent note in transition saves money and lives (including other sentient life forms) in the future.	Yes
1381126	Olivia smith	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To achieve the most rapid reduction of transport related CO2 emissions possible	No
1381127	Kate Read	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 1st, Option C - 2nd	NULL	Yes
1381129	Steve Hunt	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	To stop dumping polluted cars in Australai that no one else wants to satisfy the profits of legacy auto at the expense of our children's health	No

1381130	Li Mei Brusey	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
1381131	Andrew Aitchison	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	Bowen and Albanese are zealot idiots and I don't trust a word that comes out of their mouths	No
1381138	NULL	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	It's time to pull out all the stops in the fight against climate change. There are also significant health and economic benefits.	Yes
1381140	Gael McLeod	Option A - 0th, Option B - 0th, Option C - 0th	NULL	NULL
1381144	Donna Matthews	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I believe we need an aggressive NVES that catches up with the US around 2026 and then brings forward US targets for 2029-2031 to the Australian NVES in 2028 and 2029 is best for Australia and our planet. Two CO2 targets, one for passenger vehicles and SUVs and a higher target for utes and vans (including pick-ups) in the light commercial vehicle category is needed for both Australia and our planet.	No
1381146	Tim Westcott	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We are well behind the rest of the developed world, we need to move as fast as practical to catch up.	Yes
1381149	Martin Mansfield	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	I support Option C because I believe that Australia should have the strongest vehicle efficiency standard in the world. Australia will suffer some of the worst effects of climate change in the world so it is appropriate that Australia lead the world in combatting climate change. Option C will make the Australian market extremely attractive for low- and zero-emissions vehicles. It will save consumers the most money in the long term compared to Option B and especially Option A. It will reduce carbon emissions in the fastest way compared to the other options. Australia is one of the last developed countries to implement a fuel efficiency standard so we have a lot of catching up to do. Option C provides the most benefits to consumers with net benefits 18% better than Option B. The penalty price of Option C is more comparable to that of the European Union and will force manufacturers to prioritise the Australian market. Option B will only enable Australia to catch up to the United States while leaving us behind most other car markets including the United Kingdom and New Zealand. Option A is clearly inadequate. It would be one of the weakest standards in the world leading to only 'negligible' reductions in pollution and petrol costs. It would provide very limited net benefits; the credits would last too long; and the penalties would be inadequate. The important thing is that the Albanese Government must adopt a vehicle emission standard that is best for the planet and for all its inhabitants not what is best for the petrol car industry.	Yes

1381155	Craig Askings	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to rapidly decarbonise our energy and transport systems. The best time was years ago, the second best time is now.	No
1381174	Deborah Stevenson	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.	No
1381180	Nik	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Climate catastrophe is real and present and we no longer have the luxury of a gradual transition.	No
1381186	Jodie Moffat	Option A - 1st, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 3rd	The sooner we get this happening, the better for all living things as we know them, in the universe.	No
1381187	Sarah Bowe	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	prioritising emissions reduction	Yes
1381194	Amy Blain	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Option C recognises Australia needs to show leadership to close the gap in current vehicle efficiency standards. We know that we need to have strong vehicle efficiency standards to drastically cut transport emissions, a vital step given we are in a climate emergency. We need the strongest standards that would greatly reduce vehicle emissions, have the greatest environmental impact and benefit Australians' health and financial savings. Australia needs to catch up to do to compensate for an automotive industry that has largely failed to implement necessary changes and improvements in vehicle efficiency. Australia needs to accelerate rapidly to make up for its lack of progress. Transport emissions must rapidly reduce this decade for Australia to meet its international commitments. 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 sector which is more easily addressed,. A New Vehicle Efficiency Standard will improve air quality, reduce the air pollution death rate and save the healthcare system billions. The New Vehicle Efficiency Standards makes good health and climate policy and will have huge health benefits, especially for children.	Yes
1381197	Danny Jowers Blain	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We need to have strong vehicle efficiency standards to drastically cut transport emissions. We need the strongest standards t Australia needs to accelerate rapidly to make up for its lack of progress. Transport emissions must rapidly reduce this decade for Australia to meet its international commitments. 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 sector which is more easily addressed than most.	Yes
1381198	Bill Avery	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	We have waster 10 years in implementing this. We can't delay any longer!	NULL
1381200	Greg Campbell	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	High standards mean lower emissions and greater environmental and health benefits.	Yes
1381201	Sean Grogan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	Doing more quicker has greater long term benefit for the environment, both in terms of greenhouse gas emissions and exhaust byproducts and reduces the need for more costly abatement of the effects of climate change in later years. Health benefits would also follow a similar principle of preventing health problems is much cheaper then treating health prolems later on.	NULL
1381202	Chris McGuigan	Option A - 3rd, Option B - 2nd, Option C - 1st	No time to delay, let's get this done asap	Yes