

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

framework data (input values here: yellow fields)			determination
	Gt		
<b>global CO2 budget 2020 - 2100</b>	<b>400</b>		global budget
land-use change (LUC) emissions 2020 - 2100	<b>0</b>		
international shipping and aviation (ISA) emissions 2020 - 2100	3%	-12	
global CO2 budget 2020 - 2100 to distribute here		388	
<b>weighting population</b> key in the weighted key		<b>50%</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	share in global population 2019	year emissions neutrality	normalised change rate 2020
target year:	2030		2050							
reference year:	1990	2019	1990	2019						
China	52%	-69%	-100%	-100%	11.8	8	32%	18%	2034	-
United States	-78%	-78%	-100%	-100%	5.0	15	14%	4%	2033	-
EU27	-67%	-57%	-100%	-100%	2.9	7	8%	6%	2038	-
India	223%	-24%	-41%	-86%	2.6	2	7%	18%	2055	-
Russia	-85%	-80%	-100%	-100%	1.9	13	5%	2%	2033	-
Japan	-67%	-66%	-100%	-100%	1.1	9	3%	2%	2036	-
sum							69%	50%		

largest national budgets 2020 - 2100	national budget	weighted key	emissions 2019	scope years
	Gt		Gt	
China	98.0	25.3%	11.77	8
India	48.0	12.4%	2.56	19
United States	34.8	9.0%	5.01	7
EU27	26.6	6.9%	2.92	9
Russia	13.6	3.5%	1.88	7
Indonesia	10.2	2.6%	0.65	16
Japan	9.2	2.4%	1.14	8
Brazil	7.9	2.0%	0.48	16
Pakistan	6.2	1.6%	0.20	31
Mexico	5.9	1.5%	0.48	12
Germany	5.8	1.5%	0.70	8
Nigeria	5.7	1.5%	0.12	47
Iran	5.6	1.5%	0.67	8
Bangladesh	4.8	1.2%	0.10	46
South Korea	4.7	1.2%	0.65	7
Turkey	4.3	1.1%	0.42	10
Vietnam	4.2	1.1%	0.33	13
Canada	4.2	1.1%	0.61	7
Egypt	4.0	1.0%	0.27	15
South Africa	3.9	1.0%	0.47	8
Saudi Arabia	3.9	1.0%	0.58	7
United Kingdom	3.6	0.9%	0.37	10
Philippines	3.5	0.9%	0.15	23
France and Monaco	3.4	0.9%	0.32	10
Italy, San Marino and the Holy See	3.3	0.8%	0.33	10
Thailand	3.2	0.8%	0.28	11
Ethiopia	2.9	0.7%	0.02	145
Australia	2.8	0.7%	0.41	7
Poland	2.6	0.7%	0.31	8
Spain and Andorra	2.5	0.7%	0.26	10
Malaysia	2.2	0.6%	0.27	8
Democratic Republic of the Congo	2.2	0.6%	0.00	654
Ukraine	2.2	0.6%	0.20	11
Argentina	2.1	0.5%	0.18	11
Taiwan	2.1	0.5%	0.28	7
Algeria	2.0	0.5%	0.18	11
Iraq	2.0	0.5%	0.18	11
Colombia	1.7	0.4%	0.08	20
Kazakhstan	1.6	0.4%	0.22	7
Tanzania	1.6	0.4%	0.01	119
Myanmar/Burma	1.6	0.4%	0.04	40
Sudan and South Sudan	1.5	0.4%	0.02	65
Uzbekistan	1.5	0.4%	0.12	12
Venezuela	1.5	0.4%	0.12	12
sum without EU	338		33	
sum across all countries	388		37	11

**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>