We enter the ADP negotiations with equity as a major focus, and this really is no surprise. The climate negotiations were never going to succeed unless they faced the challenge of “equitable access to sustainable development”. Unless they faced, more precisely, the equity challenge: holding to a 2°C or even the 1.5°C compliant global emission budget while also supporting a common right to adaptation and sustainable development. These are preconditions of any successful climate transition. The difference today is that we all know it.

Under Workstream 1, the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP) in decision FCCC/ADP/2013/L.2, “invited Parties and Observer organisations to make further submissions, by 1 September 2013, building on the conclusions of the ADP at the second part of its first session”.

CAN welcomes the opportunity for Parties and Observer organizations to provide further submissions to the ADP and intends to respond in depth on the implementation of the elements of decision 1/CP. 17 in a separate submission.

Our purpose in this short document is to encourage both Parties and Observer organizations to consider two questions, both of them central to the design of the future climate agreement, when they make their 1 September 2013 submissions. The single goal that underpins these two questions is to operationalize equity in a manner that clears the way forward, by meeting the demands and expectations placed upon the ADP “to develop a protocol, another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention applicable to all Parties”.

How to operationalize the Convention’s equity principles?

We believe that this round of submissions presents us with a critical opportunity to shape the Warsaw discussions on the design of the future agreement, and by so doing to position ourselves for success in Paris. To grasp this opportunity, we must recognise that while the continued salience of the Convention’s core equity principles has been strongly reaffirmed, even the best principles are not enough. To really matter, they must be captured within a set of well-designed equity indicators, and these in turn must be operationalised in a manner that helps to build trust and momentum, and drives increased ambition on all fronts.

Our view of the Convention’s core equity principles can be found in the attached discussion paper. But it does not hurt to reiterate them here.

1. **A precautionary approach to adequacy**, referring to the collective obligations of countries to undertake and support urgent and adequate global action to prevent dangerous impacts of climate
change and provide effective adaptation to unavoidable impacts, without which there can be no justice. (Article 3.3: “The Parties should take precautionary measures to anticipate, prevent and minimize the causes of climate change and mitigate its adverse effects.”)

2. **Common but differentiated responsibility and capability**, in which obligations to take action and provide support, are accepted as functions of both historical and current emissions, and of capacity to act. (Article 3.1: “The Parties should protect the climate system for the benefit of present and future generations of humankind, on the basis of equity and in accordance with their common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities.”)

3. **The right to sustainable development**, which we understand as the right of all countries to not just lift their people out of poverty, but also to provide their citizens with sustainable living standards, these being equivalent to the sustainable living standards available to the citizens of any other country. (Article 3.4: “The Parties have a right to, and should, promote sustainable development.”)

What’s needed now is a step forward from the inevitable ambiguity of principles towards quantifiable indicators that can give those principles life. To that end, this next round of submissions is an excellent opportunity for Parties to clearly propose quantifiable indicators that allow the Convention’s core equity principles to be objectively and effectively captured. We therefore encourage Parties to propose specific indicators by which national pledges can be meaningfully and simply assessed.

**Question 1: Which are suitable equity indicators?**

In particular, we ask Parties to propose specific equity indicators, which can be debated, and refined, and ultimately agreed as a set of shared equity indicators. To that end, Parties should propose simple and well-designed indicators of, inter alia, historical responsibility, standards of living, development need, national capacity, and intra-national income inequality. These can then be combined with measures of adequacy – including a global emissions budget and pathway that ensures a high probability of limiting warming to 2°C or 1.5°C – to yield an Equity Reference Framework that can guide the Parties *ex ante* as they formulate mitigation actions and financial / technological support programs that must, in the end, be both fair and adequate. And that is useful *ex post* to both Parties and Observers as they evaluate and refine commitments in equity-based and science-based terms.

**Question 2: What process is suitable to lead action?**

At the heart of CAN’s asks for Warsaw is a clear workplan with a timetable and key milestones up to 2015 to give confidence to Parties and citizens of the world that the ADP is indeed on track to deliver a fair, ambitious and legally binding agreement no later than 2015.
As Parties continue to negotiate under the UNFCCC, some Governments are already determining the level of commitments they plan to make under the Paris agreement. Clear and early guidance is required from the international community to enable countries to formulate commitments that represent a fair share towards the required global effort. We advise that this process should involve independent expert input. Agreeing a set of shared equity indicators in Warsaw is one step towards this goal. But an Equity Reference Framework which translates those indicators into broad parameters and expectations of effort by different Parties is ultimately also needed. We advise that the process of developing indicators, and crucially, an Equity Reference Framework should involve independent expert input.

We also advise that Parties submit views on how a process for reviewing initial commitments on the basis of equity within the shared Equity Reference Framework be carried out and when it should take place.

**Question 3: What timetable does an Equity Reference Framework require in order to contribute to success in Paris?**

We urge Parties to support the need for an accelerated timetable and process in 2014 to agree an Equity Reference Framework that can transparently evaluate mitigation and finance pledges and commitments, and be used to organize and structure an equity review that will be necessary to raise overall ambition to the level demanded by the climate crisis.

**Requesting an Equity Workshop at Warsaw**

As a focus for this effort, CAN calls for a structured process in Warsaw designed to yield an agreed set of equity indicators, one that can robustly represent the Convention core principles. Such a process should include a workshop(s) leading to agreed outcome that is ready for adoption in COP19 on (1) a set of shared equity indicators and (2) the accelerated development in 2014, involving an independent expert process, of a common Equity Reference Framework that is applicable to all. We encourage Parties to request the Secretariat and COP Presidency to plan such a process for Warsaw.