

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

framework data (input values here: yellow fields)			determination
<b>global CO2 budget 2020 - 2100</b>	Gt	<b>700</b>	global budget
land-use change (LUC) emissions 2020 - 2100		<b>0</b>	
international shipping and aviation (ISA) emissions 2020 - 2100	3%	-21	
global CO2 budget 2020 - 2100 to distribute here		679	national budget
<b>weighting population</b> key in the weighted key		<b>85%</b>	
scenario type used for the reference values		<b>RM-4-quadr</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	share in	year	normalised
target year:	2030		2050		2019	2019	global	global	emissions	change
reference year:	1990	2019	1990	2019	in Gt	in t	emissions	population	neutrality	rate
China	190%	-40%	-100%	-100%	11.8	8	32%	18%	2038	2.4%
United States	-76%	-76%	-100%	-100%	5.0	15	14%	4%	2035	-3.0%
EU27	-57%	-43%	-94%	-92%	2.9	7	8%	6%	2061	-4.7%
India	347%	5%	244%	-19%	2.6	2	7%	18%	2092	0.3%
Russia	-87%	-83%	-100%	-100%	1.9	13	5%	2%	2033	3.9%
Japan	-48%	-46%	-100%	-100%	1.1	9	3%	2%	2045	-3.1%
sum							69%	50%		

largest national budgets 2020 - 2100	national	weighted	emissions	scope
	budget	key	2019	years
	Gt		Gt	
China	139.0	20.5%	11.77	12
India	109.6	16.1%	2.56	43
EU27	41.3	6.1%	2.92	14
United States	38.6	5.7%	5.01	8
Indonesia	22.0	3.2%	0.65	34
Brazil	17.2	2.5%	0.48	36
Russia	16.0	2.4%	1.88	9
Pakistan	15.9	2.3%	0.20	79
Nigeria	15.4	2.3%	0.12	128
Bangladesh	12.9	1.9%	0.10	123
Japan	12.7	1.9%	1.14	11
Mexico	11.2	1.7%	0.48	23
Philippines	8.5	1.3%	0.15	57
Egypt	8.3	1.2%	0.27	31
Ethiopia	8.3	1.2%	0.02	420
Vietnam	8.2	1.2%	0.33	25
Germany	8.1	1.2%	0.70	12
Iran	8.1	1.2%	0.67	12
Turkey	7.4	1.1%	0.42	18
Democratic Republic of the Congo	6.5	1.0%	0.00	1,932
United Kingdom	6.0	0.9%	0.37	16
Thailand	6.0	0.9%	0.28	21
France and Monaco	5.8	0.9%	0.32	18
South Africa	5.7	0.8%	0.47	12
South Korea	5.7	0.8%	0.65	9
Italy, San Marino and the Holy See	5.4	0.8%	0.33	16
Tanzania	4.6	0.7%	0.01	341
Canada	4.5	0.7%	0.61	7
Spain and Andorra	4.2	0.6%	0.26	16
Myanmar/Burma	4.2	0.6%	0.04	107
Saudi Arabia	4.2	0.6%	0.58	7
Sudan and South Sudan	4.1	0.6%	0.02	182
Kenya	4.0	0.6%	0.02	173
Colombia	4.0	0.6%	0.08	48
Argentina	3.9	0.6%	0.18	21
Ukraine	3.8	0.6%	0.20	19
Poland	3.7	0.5%	0.31	12
Algeria	3.7	0.5%	0.18	21
Iraq	3.5	0.5%	0.18	19
Uganda	3.4	0.5%	0.01	483
Malaysia	3.2	0.5%	0.27	12
Australia	3.0	0.4%	0.41	7
Morocco	2.9	0.4%	0.07	41
Afghanistan	2.8	0.4%	0.01	348
sum without EU	576		33	
sum across all countries	679		37	19

### 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>