

more different framework data and corresponding results at: <http://results-espmsave-the-climate.info>

framework data (input values here: yellow fields)			determination
<b>global CO2 budget 2020 - 2100</b>	Gt	<b>550</b>	global budget
land-use change (LUC) emissions 2020 - 2100		<b>0</b>	
international shipping and aviation (ISA) emissions 2020 - 2100	3%	-17	
global CO2 budget 2020 - 2100 to distribute here		533	
<b>weighting population</b> key in the weighted key		<b>100%</b>	national budget
scenario type used for the reference values		<b>RM-6-abs</b>	paths

Calculation **global budget** to distribute here:

LUC and ISA emissions are not considered here. Global LUC and ISA budgets are therefore offset against the global budget.

A value of **zero** for **LUC** means that by 2100, in total, net positive LUC emissions are offset by net negative LUC emissions.

reference values for the countries with the highest emissions					emissions 2019 in Gt	per capita 2019 in t	share in global emissions 2019	accu- mulated share	year emissions neutrality	normalised change rate 2020
target year:	2030		2050							
reference year:	1990	2010	1990	2010						
China	79%	-53%	-100%	-100%	11.5	8	31%	31%	2035	2.2%
United States	-100%	-100%	-100%	-100%	5.0	15	14%	45%	2028	-2.4%
EU27	-61%	-57%	-100%	-100%	2.9	7	8%	53%	2041	-4.5%
India	274%	28%	153%	-14%	2.6	2	7%	60%	2091	1.5%
Russia	-96%	-95%	-100%	-100%	1.8	12	5%	65%	2030	-0.7%
Japan	-69%	-70%	-100%	-100%	1.1	9	3%	68%	2034	-3.0%

largest national budgets 2020 - 2100	national budget	weighted key	emissions 2019	scope years
	Gt		Gt	
China	99.1	18.6%	11.50	9
India	94.4	17.7%	2.56	37
EU27	30.7	5.8%	2.93	10
United States	22.7	4.3%	5.04	5
Indonesia	18.7	3.5%	0.65	29
Pakistan	15.0	2.8%	0.22	69
Brazil	14.6	2.7%	0.48	31
Nigeria	13.9	2.6%	0.13	104
Bangladesh	11.3	2.1%	0.11	102
Russia	10.1	1.9%	1.78	6
Mexico	8.8	1.7%	0.49	18
Japan	8.8	1.6%	1.14	8
Ethiopia	7.7	1.5%	0.02	406
Philippines	7.5	1.4%	0.15	50
Egypt	6.9	1.3%	0.28	25
Vietnam	6.7	1.3%	0.33	20
Democratic Republic of the Congo	6.0	1.1%	0.00	1,725
Germany	5.8	1.1%	0.70	8
Turkey	5.8	1.1%	0.41	14
Iran	5.7	1.1%	0.69	8
Thailand	4.8	0.9%	0.27	18
United Kingdom	4.7	0.9%	0.36	13
France and Monaco	4.5	0.8%	0.32	14
Italy, San Marino and the Holy See	4.2	0.8%	0.33	13
South Africa	4.0	0.8%	0.47	9
Tanzania	4.0	0.8%	0.01	314
Myanmar/Burma	3.7	0.7%	0.04	99
Sudan and South Sudan	3.7	0.7%	0.02	158
Kenya	3.6	0.7%	0.02	191
South Korea	3.5	0.7%	0.66	5
Colombia	3.5	0.7%	0.09	38
Spain and Andorra	3.2	0.6%	0.26	13
Argentina	3.1	0.6%	0.19	16
Uganda	3.1	0.6%	0.01	493
Ukraine	3.0	0.6%	0.20	15
Algeria	3.0	0.6%	0.18	17
Iraq	2.7	0.5%	0.21	13
Afghanistan	2.6	0.5%	0.01	218
Poland	2.6	0.5%	0.31	8
Canada	2.6	0.5%	0.60	4
Morocco	2.5	0.5%	0.07	35
Saudi Arabia	2.4	0.4%	0.59	4
Uzbekistan	2.3	0.4%	0.09	25
Peru	2.2	0.4%	0.06	41
sum without EU	449		32	
sum across all countries	533		37	15

### Basic idea behind the ESPM

The ESPM consists of two steps:

(1) **National budgets:** A predefined global CO2 budget is distributed to countries. The ESPM tool offers the use of a **weighted distribution key** that includes the **'population'** and the **'emissions'** in a base year (here: 2019).

(2) **National paths:** The ESPM tool offers the Regensburg Model Scenario Types to derive plausible national paths that adhere to a national budget.

### Basic idea behind the Regensburg Model Scenario Types RM 1 - 6

With the help of the RM Scenario Types, emission paths can be determined that meet a given budget. The scenario types differ in the **assumption** about the **property** of the **annual reductions**. This approach is particularly useful when it comes to making **political decisions** about emission **paths**.

Brief description of the ESPM:

[https://www.klima-rettet.info/PDF/ESPM\\_Background.pdf](https://www.klima-rettet.info/PDF/ESPM_Background.pdf)

Brief description of the RM Scenario Types:

[https://www.klima-rettet.info/Downloads/RM-Scenario-Types\\_short.pdf](https://www.klima-rettet.info/Downloads/RM-Scenario-Types_short.pdf)

Published paper for the six largest emitters:

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4764408>