

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 | | 700 | global budget |
| land-use change (LUC) emissions 2020 - 2100 | | 0 | |
| international shipping and aviation (ISA) emissions 2020 - 2100 | 3% | -21 | |
| global CO2 budget 2020 - 2100 to distribute here | | 679 | |
| weighting population key in the weighted key | | 50% | national budget |
| scenario type used for the reference values | | RM-6-abs | 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 | mulated | emissions | change |
| reference year: | 1990 | 2010 | 1990 | 2010 | in Gt | in t | emissions | share | neutrality | rate |
| China | 211% | -19% | -100% | -100% | 11.5 | 8 | 31% | 31% | 2047 | 2.2% |
| United States | -43% | -48% | -100% | -100% | 5.0 | 15 | 14% | 45% | 2044 | -2.4% |
| EU27 | -49% | -43% | -94% | -94% | 2.9 | 7 | 8% | 53% | 2052 | -4.5% |
| India | 266% | 25% | 130% | -21% | 2.6 | 2 | 7% | 60% | 2083 | 1.5% |
| Russia | -56% | -39% | -100% | -100% | 1.8 | 12 | 5% | 65% | 2045 | -0.7% |
| Japan | -38% | -41% | -100% | -100% | 1.1 | 9 | 3% | 68% | 2048 | -3.0% |

| largest national budgets 2020 - 2100 | national budget | weighted key | emissions 2019 | scope years |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|----------------|-------------|
| | Gt | | Gt | |
| China | 170.0 | 25.0% | 11.50 | 15 |
| India | 84.0 | 12.4% | 2.56 | 33 |
| United States | 61.3 | 9.0% | 5.04 | 12 |
| EU27 | 46.8 | 6.9% | 2.93 | 16 |
| Russia | 22.9 | 3.4% | 1.78 | 13 |
| Indonesia | 17.9 | 2.6% | 0.65 | 28 |
| Japan | 16.2 | 2.4% | 1.14 | 14 |
| Brazil | 13.7 | 2.0% | 0.48 | 29 |
| Pakistan | 11.6 | 1.7% | 0.22 | 53 |
| Germany | 10.2 | 1.5% | 0.70 | 15 |
| Mexico | 10.1 | 1.5% | 0.49 | 21 |
| Nigeria | 10.1 | 1.5% | 0.13 | 76 |
| Iran | 10.0 | 1.5% | 0.69 | 15 |
| South Korea | 8.4 | 1.2% | 0.66 | 13 |
| Bangladesh | 8.2 | 1.2% | 0.11 | 74 |
| Turkey | 7.5 | 1.1% | 0.41 | 18 |
| Vietnam | 7.3 | 1.1% | 0.33 | 22 |
| Canada | 7.2 | 1.1% | 0.60 | 12 |
| Egypt | 7.0 | 1.0% | 0.28 | 25 |
| Saudi Arabia | 7.0 | 1.0% | 0.59 | 12 |
| South Africa | 6.9 | 1.0% | 0.47 | 15 |
| United Kingdom | 6.3 | 0.9% | 0.36 | 18 |
| Philippines | 6.2 | 0.9% | 0.15 | 41 |
| France and Monaco | 5.8 | 0.9% | 0.32 | 18 |
| Italy, San Marino and the Holy See | 5.8 | 0.8% | 0.33 | 17 |
| Thailand | 5.6 | 0.8% | 0.27 | 21 |
| Ethiopia | 5.1 | 0.8% | 0.02 | 268 |
| Australia | 5.0 | 0.7% | 0.41 | 12 |
| Poland | 4.6 | 0.7% | 0.31 | 15 |
| Spain and Andorra | 4.4 | 0.7% | 0.26 | 17 |
| Malaysia | 3.9 | 0.6% | 0.26 | 15 |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo | 3.9 | 0.6% | 0.00 | 1,108 |
| Ukraine | 3.8 | 0.6% | 0.20 | 19 |
| Argentina | 3.7 | 0.5% | 0.19 | 20 |
| Taiwan | 3.7 | 0.5% | 0.28 | 13 |
| Iraq | 3.6 | 0.5% | 0.21 | 18 |
| Algeria | 3.5 | 0.5% | 0.18 | 20 |
| Kazakhstan | 3.4 | 0.5% | 0.27 | 12 |
| Colombia | 3.1 | 0.5% | 0.09 | 33 |
| Myanmar/Burma | 2.7 | 0.4% | 0.04 | 72 |
| Tanzania | 2.7 | 0.4% | 0.01 | 209 |
| Sudan and South Sudan | 2.6 | 0.4% | 0.02 | 110 |
| Kenya | 2.5 | 0.4% | 0.02 | 131 |
| United Arab Emirates | 2.4 | 0.4% | 0.21 | 11 |
| sum without EU | 592 | | 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-retten.info/PDF/ESPM_Background.pdf

Brief description of the RM Scenario Types:

https://www.klima-retten.info/Downloads/RM-Scenario-Types_short.pdf

Published paper for the six largest emitters:

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