

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

framework data (input values here: yellow fields)		Gt	determination
global CO2 budget 2020 - 2100		650	global budget
land-use change (LUC) emissions 2020 - 2100		0	
international shipping and aviation (ISA) emissions 2020 - 2100	3%	-20	
global CO2 budget 2020 - 2100 to distribute here		630	
weighting population key in the weighted key		85%	national budget
scenario type used for the reference values		RM-4-quadr	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	accu-	year	normalised
target year:	2030		2050		2019	2019	global	mul-	emissions	change
reference year:	1990	2010	1990	2010	in Gt	in t	emissions	ated	neutrality	rate
							2019	share		2020
China	159%	-32%	-100%	-100%	11.5	8	31%	31%	2036	2.2%
United States	-84%	-86%	-100%	-100%	5.0	15	14%	45%	2033	-2.4%
EU27	-58%	-54%	-96%	-95%	2.9	7	8%	53%	2057	-5.0%
India	388%	67%	227%	12%	2.6	2	7%	60%	2077	1.5%
Russia	-81%	-74%	-100%	-100%	1.8	12	5%	65%	2034	-0.7%
Japan	-51%	-53%	-100%	-100%	1.1	9	3%	68%	2041	-3.0%

largest national budgets 2020 - 2100	national budget	weighted key	emissions 2019	scope years
	Gt		Gt	
China	129.3	20.5%	11.50	11
India	101.5	16.1%	2.56	40
EU27	38.5	6.1%	2.93	13
United States	35.9	5.7%	5.04	7
Indonesia	20.5	3.2%	0.65	32
Brazil	15.9	2.5%	0.48	33
Pakistan	15.6	2.5%	0.22	72
Russia	14.7	2.3%	1.78	8
Nigeria	14.3	2.3%	0.13	107
Japan	11.8	1.9%	1.14	10
Bangladesh	11.6	1.8%	0.11	105
Mexico	10.1	1.6%	0.49	21
Philippines	7.9	1.3%	0.15	53
Ethiopia	7.8	1.2%	0.02	410
Egypt	7.7	1.2%	0.28	27
Germany	7.6	1.2%	0.70	11
Vietnam	7.5	1.2%	0.33	23
Iran	7.5	1.2%	0.69	11
Turkey	6.9	1.1%	0.41	17
Democratic Republic of the Congo	6.0	1.0%	0.00	1,736
United Kingdom	5.6	0.9%	0.36	16
Thailand	5.5	0.9%	0.27	21
France and Monaco	5.4	0.8%	0.32	17
South Africa	5.3	0.8%	0.47	11
South Korea	5.3	0.8%	0.66	8
Italy, San Marino and the Holy See	5.1	0.8%	0.33	15
Canada	4.1	0.7%	0.60	7
Tanzania	4.1	0.6%	0.01	318
Saudi Arabia	3.9	0.6%	0.59	7
Spain and Andorra	3.9	0.6%	0.26	15
Myanmar/Burma	3.9	0.6%	0.04	102
Sudan and South Sudan	3.8	0.6%	0.02	161
Colombia	3.7	0.6%	0.09	40
Kenya	3.7	0.6%	0.02	194
Argentina	3.6	0.6%	0.19	19
Ukraine	3.6	0.6%	0.20	18
Algeria	3.4	0.5%	0.18	20
Poland	3.4	0.5%	0.31	11
Iraq	3.3	0.5%	0.21	16
Uganda	3.1	0.5%	0.01	498
Malaysia	2.9	0.5%	0.26	11
Australia	2.8	0.4%	0.41	7
Morocco	2.7	0.4%	0.07	38
Afghanistan	2.7	0.4%	0.01	222
sum without EU	535		33	
sum across all countries	630		37	17

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

Brief description of the RM Scenario Types:

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>