

more different framework data and corresponding results at: <http://results-esp.m.save-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	national budget
<b>weighting population</b> key in the weighted key		<b>70%</b>	
scenario type used for the reference values		<b>RM-3-lin</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	per capita	share in global emissions	share in global population	year emissions neutrality	normalised change rate
target year:	2030		2050		2019	2019	2019	2019		2020
reference year:	1990	2019	1990	2019	in Gt	in t				
China	103%	-58%	-100%	-100%	11.8	8	32%	18%	2040	2.4%
United States	-75%	-75%	-100%	-100%	5.0	15	14%	4%	2040	-3.0%
EU27	-62%	-51%	-98%	-97%	2.9	7	8%	6%	2056	-4.7%
India	307%	-5%	90%	-55%	2.6	2	7%	18%	2087	0.3%
Russia	-82%	-78%	-100%	-100%	1.9	13	5%	2%	2037	3.9%
Japan	-60%	-59%	-100%	-100%	1.1	9	3%	2%	2046	-3.1%
sum							69%	50%		

largest national budgets 2020 - 2100	national budget	weighted key	emissions 2019	scope years
	Gt		Gt	
China	120.0	22.5%	11.77	10
India	77.4	14.5%	2.56	30
United States	37.8	7.1%	5.01	8
EU27	34.2	6.4%	2.92	12
Indonesia	15.9	3.0%	0.65	25
Russia	15.2	2.8%	1.88	8
Brazil	12.4	2.3%	0.48	26
Japan	11.1	2.1%	1.14	10
Pakistan	10.8	2.0%	0.20	54
Nigeria	10.3	1.9%	0.12	85
Bangladesh	8.6	1.6%	0.10	82
Mexico	8.5	1.6%	0.48	18
Germany	7.0	1.3%	0.70	10
Iran	6.9	1.3%	0.67	10
Vietnam	6.2	1.2%	0.33	19
Egypt	6.1	1.1%	0.27	23
Philippines	5.9	1.1%	0.15	39
Turkey	5.8	1.1%	0.42	14
Ethiopia	5.4	1.0%	0.02	274
South Korea	5.3	1.0%	0.65	8
South Africa	4.9	0.9%	0.47	10
United Kingdom	4.8	0.9%	0.37	13
Thailand	4.6	0.9%	0.28	16
France and Monaco	4.6	0.9%	0.32	14
Canada	4.5	0.8%	0.61	7
Italy, San Marino and the Holy See	4.3	0.8%	0.33	13
Democratic Republic of the Congo	4.2	0.8%	0.00	1,251
Saudi Arabia	4.2	0.8%	0.58	7
Spain and Andorra	3.4	0.6%	0.26	13
Poland	3.2	0.6%	0.31	10
Tanzania	3.0	0.6%	0.01	223
Ukraine	3.0	0.6%	0.20	15
Australia	3.0	0.6%	0.41	7
Argentina	3.0	0.6%	0.18	16
Algeria	2.8	0.5%	0.18	16
Myanmar/Burma	2.8	0.5%	0.04	72
Colombia	2.8	0.5%	0.08	33
Iraq	2.7	0.5%	0.18	15
Malaysia	2.7	0.5%	0.27	10
Sudan and South Sudan	2.7	0.5%	0.02	120
Kenya	2.6	0.5%	0.02	114
Taiwan	2.4	0.4%	0.28	8
Uganda	2.2	0.4%	0.01	315
Uzbekistan	2.1	0.4%	0.12	17
sum without EU	457		33	
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>