

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

| framework data (input values here: yellow fields)               |    | Gt              | determination   |
|---|----|-----------------|-----------------|
| <b>global CO2 budget 2020 - 2100</b>                            |    | <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             |                 |
| <b>weighting population</b> key in the weighted key             |    | <b>70%</b>      | national budget |
| 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  | 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   | 206% | -20% | -100% | -100% | 11.5      | 8          | 31%       | 31%     | 2046       | 2.2%       |
| United States   | -59% | -63% | -100% | -100% | 5.0       | 15         | 14%       | 45%     | 2044       | -2.4%      |
| EU27  | -57% | -52% | -91%  | -90%  | 2.9       | 7          | 8%        | 53%     | 2071       | -4.5%      |
| India   | 353% | 55%  | 179%  | -5%   | 2.6       | 2          | 7%        | 60%     | 2095       | 1.5%       |
| Russia  | -65% | -51% | -100% | -100% | 1.8       | 12         | 5%        | 65%     | 2044       | -0.7%      |
| Japan   | -47% | -50% | -97%  | -97%  | 1.1       | 9          | 3%        | 68%     | 2054       | -3.0%      |

| largest national budgets 2020 - 2100 | national budget | weighted key | emissions 2019 | scope years |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|----------------|-------------|
|                                      | Gt              |              | Gt             |             |
| China                                | 152.5           | 22.5%        | 11.50          | 13          |
| India                                | 98.5            | 14.5%        | 2.56           | 38          |
| United States                        | 48.4            | 7.1%         | 5.04           | 10          |
| EU27                                 | 43.8            | 6.4%         | 2.93           | 15          |
| Indonesia                            | 20.3            | 3.0%         | 0.65           | 31          |
| Russia                               | 18.9            | 2.8%         | 1.78           | 11          |
| Brazil                               | 15.7            | 2.3%         | 0.48           | 33          |
| Pakistan                             | 14.6            | 2.1%         | 0.22           | 67          |
| Japan                                | 14.2            | 2.1%         | 1.14           | 12          |
| Nigeria                              | 13.1            | 1.9%         | 0.13           | 98          |
| Bangladesh                           | 10.7            | 1.6%         | 0.11           | 97          |
| Mexico                               | 10.6            | 1.6%         | 0.49           | 22          |
| Germany                              | 9.1             | 1.3%         | 0.70           | 13          |
| Iran                                 | 8.9             | 1.3%         | 0.69           | 13          |
| Vietnam                              | 7.8             | 1.1%         | 0.33           | 24          |
| Egypt                                | 7.8             | 1.1%         | 0.28           | 27          |
| Philippines                          | 7.5             | 1.1%         | 0.15           | 50          |
| Turkey                               | 7.4             | 1.1%         | 0.41           | 18          |
| Ethiopia                             | 7.0             | 1.0%         | 0.02           | 367         |
| South Korea                          | 6.9             | 1.0%         | 0.66           | 10          |
| South Africa                         | 6.2             | 0.9%         | 0.47           | 13          |
| United Kingdom                       | 6.2             | 0.9%         | 0.36           | 17          |
| France and Monaco                    | 5.8             | 0.9%         | 0.32           | 18          |
| Thailand                             | 5.8             | 0.9%         | 0.27           | 22          |
| Canada                               | 5.6             | 0.8%         | 0.60           | 9           |
| Italy, San Marino and the Holy See   | 5.6             | 0.8%         | 0.33           | 17          |
| Saudi Arabia                         | 5.4             | 0.8%         | 0.59           | 9           |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo     | 5.4             | 0.8%         | 0.00           | 1,544       |
| Spain and Andorra                    | 4.3             | 0.6%         | 0.26           | 17          |
| Poland                               | 4.1             | 0.6%         | 0.31           | 13          |
| Australia                            | 3.9             | 0.6%         | 0.41           | 9           |
| Argentina                            | 3.8             | 0.6%         | 0.19           | 20          |
| Ukraine                              | 3.8             | 0.6%         | 0.20           | 19          |
| Tanzania                             | 3.6             | 0.5%         | 0.01           | 286         |
| Algeria                              | 3.6             | 0.5%         | 0.18           | 21          |
| Colombia                             | 3.6             | 0.5%         | 0.09           | 39          |
| Iraq                                 | 3.6             | 0.5%         | 0.21           | 17          |
| Myanmar/Burma                        | 3.5             | 0.5%         | 0.04           | 93          |
| Sudan and South Sudan                | 3.5             | 0.5%         | 0.02           | 146         |
| Malaysia                             | 3.4             | 0.5%         | 0.26           | 13          |
| Kenya                                | 3.3             | 0.5%         | 0.02           | 176         |
| Taiwan                               | 3.0             | 0.4%         | 0.28           | 11          |
| Uganda                               | 2.8             | 0.4%         | 0.01           | 445         |
| Kazakhstan                           | 2.7             | 0.4%         | 0.27           | 10          |
| sum without EU                       | 582             |              | 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>