



Expanding Integrated Assessment Modelling:  
Comprehensive and Comprehensible Science  
for Sustainable, Co-Created Climate Action

## **D1.3 – Report on Project and SAB Meetings**

WP1 – Project Management



30/08/2023



Funded by  
the European Union

[www.iam-compact.eu](http://www.iam-compact.eu)

## Disclaimer

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Climate, Infrastructure and Environment Executive Agency (CINEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

## Copyright Message

This report, if not confidential, is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0); a copy is available here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>. You are free to share (copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format) and adapt (remix, transform, and build upon the material for any purpose, even commercially) under the following terms: (i) attribution (you must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made; you may do so in any reasonable manner, but not in any way that suggests the licensor endorses you or your use); (ii) no additional restrictions (you may not apply legal terms or technological measures that legally restrict others from doing anything the license permits).

<b>Grant Agreement Number</b>	101056306		<b>Acronym</b>	IAM COMPACT	
<b>Full Title</b>	Expanding Integrated Assessment Modelling: Comprehensive and Comprehensible Science for Sustainable, Co-Created Climate Action				
<b>Topic</b>	HORIZON-CL5-2021-D1-01-04				
<b>Funding scheme</b>	HORIZON EUROPE, RIA – Research and Innovation Action				
<b>Start Date</b>	September 2022	<b>Duration</b>	36 Months		
<b>Project URL</b>	<a href="https://www.iam-compact.eu">https://www.iam-compact.eu</a>				
<b>EU Project Advisor</b>	Andreas Palialexis				
<b>Project Coordinator</b>	National Technical University of Athens – NTUA				
<b>Deliverable</b>	D1.3 – Report on Project and SAB Meetings				
<b>Work Package</b>	WP1 – Project Management				
<b>Date of Delivery</b>	<b>Contractual</b>	31/08/2023	<b>Actual</b>	30/08/2023	
<b>Nature</b>	Report	<b>Dissemination Level</b>	Public		
<b>Lead Beneficiary</b>	National Technical University of Athens (NTUA)				
<b>Responsible Author</b>	Anastasios Karamaneas	<b>Email</b>	akaramaneas@epu.ntua.gr		
	NTUA	<b>Phone</b>	+30 210 7723612		
<b>Contributors</b>	Natasha Frilingou, Alexandros Nikas (NTUA)				
<b>Reviewer(s)</b>	Konstantinos Koasidis (NTUA)				
<b>Keywords</b>	project meetings; communication; project management				

## EC Summary Requirements

### 1. Changes with respect to the DoA

No changes with respect to the work described in the DoA.

### 2. Dissemination and uptake

This report can be used for internally reviewing the project's progress and as a reference point for project partners on their tasks' completion regarding the agreed conditions by the consortium.

### 3. Short summary of results (<250 words)

In accordance with the project's Quality Management Plan, remote (online) and physical meetings (in hybrid format) are taking place so that consortium partners communicate and cooperate during the IAM COMPACT project's lifetime. In this context, monthly Executive Board Meetings are arranged online through Microsoft Teams as well as biannual General Assembly Meetings, which are hosted either back-to-back with other physical events organised by the project or held online due to sustainability concerns. The monthly meetings aim to update all consortium members on the progress of all Work Packages, maintain all actions within the agreed timelines, and ensure that corrective actions (if needed) are taken in due time. Thus, these monthly meetings contribute to achieving the project's goals and vision. NTUA's administration team is organising these meetings and proposes the agenda in advance, before finalising it with all partners.


In the first year of the project, two physical meetings have been organised: the Kick-Off Meeting in Athens, Greece on the 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> of September 2022, and the 2<sup>nd</sup> General Assembly Meeting, in Mombasa, Kenya on the 28<sup>th</sup> of August 2023. Additionally, 7 Executive Board Meetings and the 1<sup>st</sup> General Assembly Meeting have also taken place through Microsoft Teams. All meetings, both physical and remote, are characterised by high levels of participation from all partners (European and international as well), with all partners demonstrating significant commitment to the project's goals.

### 4. Evidence of accomplishment

This report is evidence for the realisation of the project's meetings as they are presented in the Grant Agreement. Moreover, the implementation of the actions discussed in these meetings is and/or will be demonstrated in the rest of the project's deliverables, which inter alia report the significant research work carried out in IAM COMPACT.

## Preface

IAM COMPACT supports the assessment of global climate goals, progress, and feasibility space, and the design of the next round of Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) and policy planning beyond 2030 for major emitters and non-high-income countries. It uses a diverse ensemble of models, tools, and insights from social and political sciences and operations research, integrating bodies of knowledge to co-create the research process and enhance transparency, robustness, and policy relevance. It explores the role of structural changes in major emitting sectors and of political, behaviour, and social aspects in mitigation, quantifies factors promoting or hindering climate neutrality, and accounts for extreme scenarios, to deliver a range of global and national pathways that are environmentally effective, viable, feasible, and desirable. In doing so, it fully accounts for COVID-19 impacts and recovery strategies and aligns climate action with broader sustainability goals, while developing technical capacity and promoting ownership in non-high-income countries.

<b>NTUA</b> – National Technical University of Athens	EL	
<b>Aalto</b> – Aalto Korkeakoulusaatio SR	FI	
<b>AAU</b> – Aalborg Universitet	DK	
<b>BC3</b> – Asociacion BC3 Basque Centre for Climate Change – Klima Aldaketa Ikergai	ES	
<b>Bruegel</b> – Bruegel AISBL	BE	
<b>CARTIF</b> – Fundacion CARTIF	ES	
<b>CICERO</b> – Cicero Senter for Klimaforskning Stiftelse	NO	
<b>E3M</b> – E3-Modelling AE	EL	
<b>KTH</b> – Kungliga Tekniska Hoegskolan	SE	
<b>POLIMI</b> – Politecnico di Milano	IT	
<b>UPRC</b> – University of Piraeus Research Center	EL	
<b>UVa</b> – Universidad De Valladolid	ES	
<b>WI</b> – Wuppertal Institut fur Klima, Umwelt, Energie GGMBH	DE	
<b>IIMA</b> – Indian Institute of Management	IN	
<b>THU</b> – Tsinghua University	CN	
<b>USMF</b> – University System of Maryland	US	
<b>AAiT</b> – Addis Ababa University	ET	
<b>KEI</b> – International Civic Organisation Kyiv Economics Institute	UA	
<b>RUSL</b> – Raja Rata University of Sri Lanka	LK	
<b>TUM</b> – Technical University of Mombasa	KE	
<b>UNIGE</b> – Université de Genève	CH	
<b>Imperial</b> – Imperial College of Science, Technology and Medicine	UK	

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>6</b>
1.1	Purpose and Scope	6
1.2	Structure of the Document	6
<b>2</b>	<b>Physical meetings</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1	Kick-Off Meeting, 8-9 September 2022	7
2.1.1	Agenda	7
2.1.2	Minutes	9
2.2	2 <sup>nd</sup> General Assembly Meeting: 28 August 2023	17
2.2.1	Agenda	17
2.2.2	Minutes	17
<b>3</b>	<b>Remote (Online) Meetings</b>	<b>25</b>
3.1	Executive Board Meeting – 18 October 2022	25
3.1.1	Agenda	25
3.1.2	Minutes	26
3.2	Executive Board Meeting – 22 November 2022	29
3.2.1	Agenda	29
3.2.2	Minutes	30
3.3	Executive Board Meeting – 17 January 2023	32
3.3.1	Agenda	32
3.3.2	Minutes	33
3.4	1 <sup>st</sup> General Assembly Meeting: 23-24 February 2023	36
3.4.1	Agenda	36
3.4.2	Minutes	36
3.5	Executive Board Meeting – 28 March 2023	47
3.5.1	Agenda	47
3.5.2	Minutes	48
3.6	Executive Board Meeting – 23 May 2023	52
3.6.1	Agenda	52
3.6.2	Minutes	53
3.7	Executive Board Meeting – 27 June 2023	56
3.7.1	Agenda	56
3.7.2	Minutes	56
3.8	Executive Board Meeting – 25 July 2023	60
3.8.1	Agenda	60
3.8.2	Minutes	60
<b>4</b>	<b>Scientific Advisory Board meetings</b>	<b>64</b>
4.1	1 <sup>st</sup> SAB Session: 24 February 2023	64
4.1.1	Minutes	64
4.2	2 <sup>nd</sup> SAB Session: 28 August 2023	66
4.2.1	Minutes	66

## Table of Tables

Table 1. IAM COMPACT Project Meetings (covering period September 2022 – August 2023).....	6
Table 2. Kick-off Meeting Day I - Full Project Overview - <i>Microsoft Teams (link)</i> .....	7
Table 3. Kick-off Meeting Day II - Challenges, opportunities, and near-term objectives - <i>Microsoft Teams (link)</i>	8
Table 4. 2 <sup>nd</sup> General Assembly ( <i>MS Teams link</i> ) .....	17
Table 5. 1 <sup>st</sup> General Assembly Day I: Progress on WPs 1-4 ( <i>MS Teams link</i> ).....	36
Table 6. 1 <sup>st</sup> General Assembly Day II: Progress on WP5-6 & SAB meeting ( <i>MS Teams link</i> ).....	36

# 1 Introduction

In accordance with the Grant Agreement, regular and provisional meetings take place during the project’s lifetime. Regular meetings (General Assembly Meetings) are planned to take place biannually to monitor the progress of all actions implemented as well as to help partners understand the whole scientific work realised in the context of the project. The Project Coordinator (NTUA) is responsible for setting the meetings’ agenda, organising the meetings (in cooperation with other partners) as well as communicating the meeting’s time and place. Moreover, online meetings (via Microsoft Teams) take place regularly for partners to communicate on specific issues regarding project deliverables and tasks. In this context, the Project Coordinator also organises monthly meetings (Executive Board Meetings) so that all partners are in line with the project’s progress and actions. NTUA records all sessions and meetings, in the context of both project management and coordination and other work packages and activities. This deliverable concerns the former, i.e., General Assembly and Executive Board Meetings, for which the NTUA administration team records meeting minutes and immediately distributes them to all partners ensuring that the entire consortium is aware of the project’s progress, actions, agreed plans, and timelines.

Table 1 below outlines the meetings that took place during the first year of the project. Executive Board meetings take place on a monthly basis, meaning once every month—unless a General Assembly is scheduled for the same month (hence, no Executive Board meeting was held in September 2022, February 2023, and August 2023). Moreover, there was no Executive Board meeting in December 2022 and April 2023 due to limited availability during the two holiday seasons.

**Table 1.** IAM COMPACT Project Meetings (covering period September 2022 – August 2023)

Type of meeting		Date
Physical	Kick-Off Meeting	8 <sup>th</sup> and 9 <sup>th</sup> of September 2022
Online	Executive Board Meeting	18 <sup>th</sup> of October 2022
Online	Executive Board Meeting	22 <sup>nd</sup> of November 2022
Online	Executive Board Meeting	17 <sup>th</sup> of January 2023
Online	1 <sup>st</sup> General Assembly Meeting	23 <sup>rd</sup> and 24 <sup>th</sup> of February 2023
Online	Executive Board Meeting	28 <sup>th</sup> of March 2023
Online	Executive Board Meeting	23 <sup>rd</sup> of May 2023
Online	Executive Board Meeting	27 <sup>th</sup> of June 2023
Online	Executive Board Meeting	25 <sup>th</sup> of July 2023
Physical	2 <sup>nd</sup> General Assembly Meeting	28 <sup>th</sup> of August 2023

## 1.1 Purpose and Scope

This deliverable’s objective is to present a periodic report of all project meetings (online and physical), which includes the meetings’ agenda, attendance, and minutes. Another purpose of this deliverable is to present any feedback from the Scientific Advisory Board from any physical and online communication, especially in the context of dedicated SAB meetings, typically taking place during General Assembly meetings.

## 1.2 Structure of the Document

The deliverable is separated into three sections. Section 2 presents the agenda and minutes of the physical meetings held, Section 3 includes all the details from online meetings and Section 4 covers the feedback provided by the project’s SAB members.

## 2 Physical meetings

### 2.1 Kick-Off Meeting, 8-9 September 2022

The Kick-off meeting took place on the 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> of September 2022 in Athens, Greece, where NTUA, the coordinator of IAM COMPACT, is based. The main purpose of this two-day event was for the consortium partners to inform each other about their expertise areas, their responsibilities in the project's context and propose a roadmap for the project's first 12 months. All EU, UK, Swiss, Ethiopian, Kenyan, Indian and Ukrainian partners participated with at least one of their team members joining physically. Moreover, partners from Sri Lanka, China and the USA participated remotely and made online presentations and interventions.

#### 2.1.1 Agenda

**Kick-off Meeting**  
**Thursday - Friday, September 8-9, 2022**  
**09:30-16:00 CEST**

**Table 2.** Kick-off Meeting Day I - Full Project Overview - *Microsoft Teams* ([link](#))

<b>Thursday, September 8, 2022, Oasis Hotel Apartments</b> (all times in EEST/local)			
09:30 – 10:00	<i>Arrival, coffee, get together</i>		
10:00 – 10:15	I.1	<b>Welcome, agenda, introductory notes</b>	NTUA
10:15 – 11:45	I.2	<b>Roundtable: Partners' Introduction</b> Expertise, role, and expectations in IAM COMPACT (4' per partner)	All Partners
11:45 – 12:00	<i>Coffee Break</i>		
12:00 – 12:15	I.3.1	<b>Project Overview, Vision &amp; Objectives</b>	NTUA
12:15 – 12:40	I.3.2	<b>WP1 – Project Management</b> Including coordination, management, quality processes	NTUA
12:40 – 13:05	I.3.3	<b>WP2 – Listening</b> Ensuring policy relevance and ownership	Bruegel
13:05 – 13:30	I.3.4	<b>WP3 – Exchanging</b> Open & FAIR Science, mutual learning (and I <sup>2</sup> AM PARIS)	NTUA
13:30 – 14:30	<i>Lunch Break</i>		
14:30 – 14:55	I.4.1	<b>WP4 – Modelling</b> Quantitative evidence for post-2030 Paris-compliant action	Imperial
14:55 – 15:20	I.4.2	<b>WP5 – Expanding</b> Resilient, inclusive, and sustainable recovery & development	E3M
15:20 – 15:45	I.4.3	<b>WP6 – Explaining</b> Policy analysis, capacity development, communication, dissemination, exploitation	KTH, WI, UPRC
15:45 – 16:00	I.5	<b>Wrap-up, Q&amp;A, Discussions</b>	NTUA



**Table 3.** Kick-off Meeting Day II - Challenges, opportunities, and near-term objectives - *Microsoft Teams* ([link](#))

<b>Friday, September 9, 2022, Oasis Hotel Apartments</b> (all times in EEST/local)			
09:30 – 10:00	<i>Arrival, coffee, get together</i>		
10:00 – 10:15	II.1	<b>Synopsis of Day 1</b>	NTUA
10.15 – 11.00	II.2.1	<b>Challenges &amp; Opportunities</b> Each WP representative (5') presents two slides to address: - What are you most excited about in your WP & the project? - What are you most concerned about in your WP?	All partners
11.00 – 11.20	II.2.2	<b>A quick summary of Year 1 deliverables &amp; milestones</b>	NTUA
11.20 – 11.45	II.2.3	<b>Early project management requirements</b> Scientific Advisory Board (MS1), Internal data management (MS2), Quality management plan (D1.2), Meetings (D1.3)	NTUA
11:45 – 12:00	<i>Coffee Break</i>		
12:00 – 12:25	II.3.1	<b>Open models for all</b> Building and/or developing new modelling capacities	KTH
12:25 – 12:50	II.3.2	<b>Preparing a co-creation space</b> Stakeholder engagement plan (D2.1) & database (MS3), mechanism for early scoping of research questions (D2.2)	Bruegel
12:50 – 13:05	II.3.3	<b>Laying the groundwork for data exchange &amp; synergies</b> I <sup>2</sup> AM PARIS & upgrade plan (D3.1), Planning collaborations and synergies with sister/other research projects (MS4), model integration (D3.4) & open science protocols (D3.6)	NTUA, Aalto, BC3
13:05 – 13:30	II.3.4	<b>Setting up the modelling machine</b> Translating policy needs to scenario frameworks (D4.1) and scenario logics (D4.3). Crunching out the details for the first modelling round	CARTIF, CICERO, Imperial
13:30 – 14:30	<i>Lunch Break</i>		
14:30 – 15:00	II.4.1	<b>While the iron is hot</b> Extremes, uncertainties, COVID-19, and the energy crisis	E3M, BC3, Imperial
15:00 – 15:15	II.4.2	<b>Maximising the project's impact</b> Visual identity and website (D1.1), CDE strategy (D6.1)	UPRC
15:15 – 15:45	II.5	<b>Project implementation for Horizon Europe</b> Presentation and Q&A with Project Advisor	CINEA
15:45 – 16:00	II.6	<b>Wrap-up, Q&amp;A, Discussions</b>	NTUA

## 2.1.2 Minutes

<b>Present physically</b>	<b>Name and Surname</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
1	Haris Doukas	NTUA
2	Alexandros Nikas	NTUA
3	Konstantinos Koasidis	NTUA
4	Natasha Frilingou	NTUA
5	Anastasios Karamaneas	NTUA
6	Maro Bafoulakou	NTUA
7	Charikleia Karakosta	NTUA
8	Aikaterini Forouli	NTUA
9	Themistoklis Koutsellis	NTUA
10	Ilkka Keppo	Aalto
11	Jakob Zinck Thellufsen	AAU
12	Rasmus Magni Johannsen	AAU
13	Dirk-Jan van de Ven	BC3
14	Jon Sampedro	BC3
15	Georg Zachmann	Bruegel
16	Daniel Mayer	Bruegel
17	Conall Heussaff	Bruegel
18	Noelia Ferreras Alonso	CARTIF
19	Panagiotis Fragkos	E3M
20	Dimitris Fragkiadakis	E3M
21	Eleftheria Zisarou	E3M
22	Francesco Gardumi	KTH
23	Matteo Vincenzo Rocco	POLIMI
24	Lorenzo Rinaldi	POLIMI
25	Wolfgang Obergassek	WI
26	Alexandros Flamos	UPRC
27	Vassilis Stavrakas	UPRC
28	Dimitra Aglamisi	UPRC
29	Ignacio de Blas	UVa
30	Mohamed Lifi	UVa
31	Jaime Nieto	UVa
32	Omkar Patange	IIMA
33	Solomon T. Teferi	AAiT
34	Fitsum S. Kebede	AAiT
35	Borys Dodonov	KEI
36	Ioannis Tsipouridis	TUM
37	Jan-Philippe Sasse	UNIGE
38	Zongfei Wang	UNIGE
39	Ajay Gambhir	Imperial
<b>Present in MS Teams</b>	<b>Name and Surname</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
40	Ida Sognnaes	CICERO
41	Glen Peters	CICERO
42	Georg Holtz	WI

43	Christiane Beuermann	WI
44	Saritha Sudharma Vishwanathan	IIMA
45	Jyoti R. Maheshwari	IIMA
46	Amit Garg	IIMA
47	Sheng Zhou	THU
48	Yu Wang	THU
49	Alexandre C. Koberle	Imperial
50	Sara Giarola	Imperial
51	Shivika Mittal	Imperial
52	George Xexakis	NTUA
53	Maxim Fedoseenko	KEI
54	Ryna Cui	UMD
55	Alicia Zhao	UMD
56	Silvia Vaghi	CINEA
57	Irena Gabrielaitiene	CINEA

### Minutes: Main issues discussed

Item	Description	Action	
		What	Who
<b>Day I - Full Project Overview</b>			
Introduction of Project Partners	<p>The meeting started with Prof. Haris Doukas (NTUA) presenting the meeting's agenda. Afterwards, Dr Alexandros Nikas (NTUA) presented NTUA's faculty and research activities as well as the WPs of the project. Prof. Ilkka Keppo (Alto) greeted the partners and briefly presented Alto's faculty and focus areas as well as its contribution to IAM COMPACT. Prof. Jakob Thellufsen (AAU) presented the faculty and scientific field of AAU as well as its role in the project. Dr Dirk-Jan van de Ven (BC3) also greeted the partners and presented BC3's capabilities and role in the project. Mr Conall Heussaff (Bruegel), presented the organisation's scientific expertise as well as its future contribution to the project. Ms Noelia Ferreras-Alonso (CARTIF) introduced CARTIF's faculty to the consortium and then presented the organisation's role in the project. Dr Glen Peters (CICERO) through Microsoft Teams, presented CICERO's role in the project as well as its faculty and scientific fields of expertise. Dr Panagiotis Fragkos (E3M) took the floor and presented E3M's faculty, scientific fields, models and similar projects as well as its role in IAM COMPACT. Dr Francesco Gardumi (KTH) made a similar presentation for KTH, focusing on the university's role in the project and its models. Dr Vassilis Stavrakas (UPRC) briefly presented UPRC's faculty and models as well as its role in the project. Dr Jaime Nieto (UVa) proceeded to a similar presentation representing the University of Valladolid. Next, Mr Wolfgang Obergasel (WI) took the floor and presented WI's role in the project as well as its scientific expertise. Dr Omkar Patange (IIMA) proceeded to a similar introduction for IIMA. Prof. Cheng Zhou (THU), via Microsoft Teams, took the floor and introduced THU's faculty and role in the upcoming project. In this context, Prof. Solomon Teferi (AAiT) introduced the university's work and faculty to the consortium and briefed its role in this project. Similarly, Dr Borys Dodonov (KEI) presented KEI's recent research work as well as its contribution to IAM COMPACT,</p>		

	<p>stressing the changes caused on research priorities by the Russian invasion of Ukraine. Prof. Ioannis Tsipouridis (TUM) presented the University's faculty, role in the project and research centre (RECCReC) as well as the importance of SDG 7 for people's lives in Africa. He also suggested that a project meeting is organised in Mombasa, Kenya. Finally, Dr Ajay Gambhir (Imperial), Mr Jan-Philippe Sasse (UNIGE) and Dr Matteo Rocco (POLIMI) presented the universities' faculty, research fields and roles in the project.</p> <p>During this introductory section of the KoM, various other partners took the floor (physically or via Microsoft Teams) to introduce themselves.</p>		
WP1	<p>After the coffee break on Day 1, Dr Alexandros Nikas briefly overviewed the project's timeframe, funding, and objectives as well as the interconnections between the WPs. He also presented the four counties (Ethiopia, Kenya, Sri Lanka and Ukraine) where a capacity development and technical assistance program will run throughout the project.</p> <p>Afterwards, he delved into the details of WP1, starting by introducing the contact persons of NTUA.</p> <p>In the same context, Dr Vassilis Stavrakas made a brief presentation of the visual identity of the project and its website.</p> <p>Furthermore, Dr Nikas introduced the internal data management platform (Microsoft 365 SharePoint) that will be used for exchanging files and documents. Afterwards, he continued by presenting the organisational structure of the consortium (e.g. general assembly and executive board).</p> <p>Lastly, regarding Task 1.4, Dr Nikas presented the quality control and quality management plan, mentioning the role of milestones in securing timely progress as well as the deliverable review process and requirements for acknowledging the project in scientific publications.</p>	<p>Semestral cost statements to be drawn.</p> <p>Creation of website and logo by the end of 2022</p> <p>General assembly organisation twice per year and monthly executive board meetings</p> <p>Quarterly reports on meetings.</p>	<p>All partners</p> <p>NTUA, UPRC</p> <p>NTUA, All partners</p> <p>NTUA</p>
WP2	<p>The presentation of WP2 was made by Mr Daniel Mayer (Bruegel), which included the WP's objectives and the introduction of the Policy Response Mechanism (PRM). This mechanism will match policy questions from stakeholders with models resulting in policy briefs. The stakeholder database will be based on the PARIS REINFORCE database but will be expanded. Afterwards, Dr Georg Holtz (WI), Dr Francesco Gardumi, Mr Wolfgang Obergassel, Dr Vassilis Stavrakas and Dr Alexandros Nikas engaged in questions regarding the PRM which were answered by Mr Mayer.</p>		
WP3	<p>The presentation of WP3 was conducted by Mr Konstantinos Koasidis (NTUA) and included an overview of the Data Management Plan (DMP), which is the main aspect of Task 3.1.</p> <p>Regarding Task 3.2. Mr Koasidis presented the project's aims on model compatibility and integration and mentioned that it will rely on the PARIS REINFORCE harmonisation protocol.</p> <p>Another important issue commented on was the protocols for open science (Task 3.3).</p> <p>Furthermore, Mr Koasidis' presentation displayed the objectives of Task 3.4, mainly related to the upgrade of the I<sup>2</sup>AM PARIS platform, so that it can host new models and functionalities with improved visualisations.</p> <p>Task 3.5 will focus on synergies with other projects, hence WP3's presentation included some indicative projects where collaboration</p>		

	<p>and common activities with IAM COMPACT could be pursued.</p> <p>Finally, WP3's presentation concluded with the aims of Task 3.6 which focuses on the scenario validation process. In this Task, the project should follow the IPCC vetting process to be in line with IPCC guidelines.</p> <p>Afterwards, a discussion regarding open data between Dr Jon Sampedro (BC3) and Dr Nikas concluded that GitHub can be a useful platform for sharing data.</p>		
WP4	<p>Afterwards, Dr Gambhir took the floor, commencing the presentation of WP4 by overviewing its goals, the modelling ensemble as well as its tasks.</p> <p>More specifically, Task 4.1 aims to understand how policies fit into the project's models.</p> <p>Task 4.2 aims to develop a broad scenario logic that should be followed across all models, setting a common protocol which will define parameters, such as timeframe and harmonisation requirements, as well as the best available sources for the required data. The SSPs scenario framework was also mentioned as an example.</p> <p>Furthermore, WP4 includes three Tasks that aim to fully exploit the modelling capacity of the consortium examining post-2030 mitigation scenarios with global and regional/national models (Task 4.3), delving into sectoral aspects of mitigation (Task 4.4) and exploring subnational scenarios within Europe (Task 4.5).</p> <p>Lastly, Dr Gambhir's presentation concluded with a brief overview of the WP's planning schedule.</p>		
WP5	<p>The meeting continued with Dr Fragkos presenting an overview of WP5, considering its objectives and tasks. This WP aims to examine real net-zero pathways and extremes.</p> <p>Task 5.1 focuses on a green recovery after the pandemic, investigating recovery packages and their optimal distribution, taking also into consideration the current energy crisis. This work can be combined with the work already done in the context of the PARIS REINFORCE project.</p> <p>Moreover, in the context of Task 5.2, IAM COMPACT aims to tackle issues such as gender inequality which have not been examined in the literature so far. The presentation of this Task included a summary of the methods that will be used as well as preliminary results of already published work from partners of the consortium.</p> <p>Another crucial issue is modelling extremes (e.g. Russian gas imports reduction) which is the core objective of Task 5.3.</p> <p>Other matters that will be examined in WP5 relate to disruptive innovation (Task 5.4) and behavioural change (Task 5.5) which will be investigated in a sociotechnical and modelling context.</p> <p>Lastly, WP5 consists of two more tasks regarding sustainable decarbonisation (Task 5.6) and the expansion of multi-model assessment (Task 5.7), proposing a new harmonisation method.</p> <p>In this context, Dr Nikas stressed the importance of technical alignment and inter-comparisons for this diverse range of models and dimensions.</p>		
WP6	<p>Dr Gardumi's presentation of WP6 commenced with an overview of the WP's objectives and tasks.</p> <p>Task 6.1 aims to develop a CDE plan providing guidelines on how to reach the project's target groups and disseminate the project's output.</p>		

	<p>In this context, the consortium aims to timely publish policy briefs for non-academic audiences (Task 6.2).</p> <p>Complementing Task 6.2, the consortium will also aim to disseminate key scientific outputs to academic audience, with multiple publications, special issues, international events, and open-access teaching material (Task 6.3).</p> <p>The last two tasks of this WP, respectively Tasks 6.4 and 6.5, will focus on the 4 pilot countries (Kenya, India, Sri Lanka and Ukraine). The first one aims to examine the sociotechnical context of mitigation drivers, barriers, and policies according to the latest available scientific knowledge, whereas the second one aims to develop the modelling capacity in the pilot countries and formulate local modelling teams.</p>		
<b>Day II - Challenges, opportunities, and near-term objectives</b>			
Challenges and opportunities	<p>The 2<sup>nd</sup> day of the KoM commenced with Prof. Doukas' greeting, in which he stated that the day's agenda will focus on possible issues of the first year of the project.</p> <p>Dr Nikas presented the challenges/opportunities regarding WP1, such as the swift from the pandemic to the energy crisis. He also stressed that IAM COMPACT poses many managerial challenges such as the number of partners, the finetuning between scientific excellence and stakeholder engagement and a very tight schedule. Regarding WP3, there exist various opportunities such as the expansion of the I<sup>2</sup>AM PARIS platform, the inclusion of more models and an improved diagnostics process. Yet, these opportunities are accompanied by various challenges such as the coordination of the vast modelling ensemble, the openness of the scientific work and the difficulties that could arise during synergies with other projects. In this context, Prof. Keppo stressed the importance of keeping up with the schedule since many deliverables are strongly linked.</p> <p>Afterwards, Dr Gambhir commenced his presentation on WP4, stating that this project provides the opportunity to model policy issues that are under-modelled so far, produce real-world pathways for sectoral, national and regional decarbonisation and delve into specific sectors (e.g. the electricity sector and its reliance on the penetration of RES and hydrogen). This endeavour also hinders various challenges such as managing stakeholder expectations, maintaining consistency among different models and being ready for unpredictable events (as we have experienced in the last 3 years). In this context, Dr Gambhir stressed that the consortium must be very clear regarding model capabilities since models cannot investigate weekly, monthly, or even year-by-year events. Therefore, the consortium should consider the best and clearest way to present its models to the stakeholders, according to Dr Nikas's intervention. In this context, Dr Peters, Dr Fragkos and Dr Nieto pinpointed important issues (modelling carbon removals, soft-linking models and examining endogenous and exogenous parameters) that must be tackled before heading to stakeholders. In response, Dr Stavrakas suggested that the modelling teams could prepare a series of modelling seminars, and Dr Nikas proposed that modelling teams should update or include their modelling documentation in the I<sup>2</sup>AM PARIS platform. Lastly, after Ms Ferreras-Alonso's question on climate extremes, Dr Gambhir and Dr Nikas replied that climate extremes are already proposed in a couple of tasks and that it is important to keep up with the scientific discussions regarding 1.5°C</p>	<p>Organise internal seminars on modelling capabilities</p> <p>Preparing data on model capabilities for the I<sup>2</sup>AM PARIS platform and uploading them to the platform.</p>	<p>All modelling partners</p> <p>All modelling partners, NTUA</p>

	<p>scenarios feasibility.</p> <p>This session of the KoM continued with Dr Georg Zachmann's (Bruegel) presentation on WP2. Discussions were focused on the formation of the PRM groups. Dr Stavrakas proposed the creation of 5 groups and Dr Zachmann replied that this is a manageable number that the consortium should not overpass. In this context, Dr Gambhir suggested that some models may examine the impact of energy prices whereas others the impact of climate change on energy demand. He also noted that some modelling results highlight important issues (e.g. IPCC results for oil usage in India).</p> <p>Dr Zachmann's presentation was followed by Dr Fragkos who presented the opportunities (e.g. improving modelling capacity) and challenges (such as managing stakeholder expectations and modelling extremes) of WP5. In this context, Dr Nikas suggested that some scenarios previously thought of as extremes have now become a reality and can thus be part of WP4. Moreover, Prof. Doukas suggested that examining the closure of a "Lehman Brothers" case in the energy sector is also crucial and Dr Fragkos replied that it should be considered. Lastly, Dr Stavrakas, Dr Fragkos and Prof. Doukas engaged in a short discussion regarding the timing of some deliverables and the 1<sup>st</sup> iteration of modelling runs.</p> <p>This session ended with Dr Gardumi's presentation regarding WP6, which is characterised by opportunities such as providing support to pilot countries in developing their modelling capacity but also challenges such as surprising developments in those countries out of our control (e.g. war in Ukraine). In this context, Dr Gardumi mentioned that models may not be able to capture some pressing concerns (referring to SDGs). Lastly, Dr Nikas and Dr Gardumi discussed the different modelling capacities of the 4 case study countries and concluded that before progressing there should be fruitful discussions with relevant partners and stakeholders.</p>		
Overview of the first year	<p>Dr Nikas took the floor and presented the tasks and deliverables of the first 12 months of the project. He stressed the tight deadline for Milestone 3 (Stakeholder Engagement Database) but also suggested that the already existing database from Bruegel can form the basis of MS3. Specifically, the deliverables that must be ready until M12 are D2.1, D1.1, D3.1, D2.2, D1.2, D4.1, D3.4, D4.3, D3.6 and D1.3. In the same context, Ms Natasha Frilingou (NTUA) presented the project's early project management requirements, including the procedures that have already taken place for the formulation of the SAB and the internal data management platform (i.e Microsoft 365). She also presented the project's quality management plan as well as an overview of the planning summary for WP1.</p>	<p>Provide contact information to NTUA for mailing lists</p> <p>Create deliverables templates</p>	<p>All partners</p> <p>NTUA</p>
Open models for all	<p>Dr Gardumi took the floor and presented KTH's capacity development projects with different countries. These projects consist of examining the needs of the countries and investigating the balance of model complexity and accessibility. The process from scoping to model creation requires ~ 24 months. Nevertheless, according to each country's context, some steps can be avoided (with an example for Kenya). These tools will be developed by the Optimus community aiming to be understood by local stakeholders and if these tools are not useful for all 4 countries, already existing tools (e.g. CLEWS) can be used for some of the countries.</p> <p>After the presentation, Dr Rocco pointed out that it is very difficult to train the local teams to use the model independently and replicate its results, and Dr Gardumi replied that indeed this is the case but our ambition is that capacity development leads to independent local modelling teams. In this context, the AAiT partners pinpointed some important issues regarding the Ethiopian context. On the one hand,</p>		

	<p>the industry is not yet convinced to use modelling results. On the other hand, modelling exercises should take into consideration important local issues such as the ongoing civil war and the fragile transportation sector. Similar concerns were also expressed by our Ukrainian partner, claiming that KEI initially examined net zero scenarios for 2050 but due to the immense infrastructure destruction caused by the war, new scenarios propose net-zero emissions by 2060. These issues demonstrate from the beginning that each case study country is characterised by a very different sociotechnical context.</p>		
Preparing a co-creation space	<p>Mr Zachmann presented the deliverables and milestones that must be delivered in the first twelve months within WP2 of the project from Bruegel's side. Furthermore, he mentioned that model descriptions must be available by the end of October (M2). After his presentation, a discussion regarding the model descriptions and the policy question that these could answer took place between Dr Nikas, Prof. Keppo, Dr Gambhir and Dr Zachmann.</p>	<p>Guidelines for model description</p> <p>Short description of models</p>	<p>Bruegel</p> <p>All modelling partners</p>
Laying the groundwork	<p>Dr Nikas took the floor and presented the consortium's plan for collaboration and synergies as well as the protocols that can be followed for open science (e.g. GitHub and Zenodo). Prof. Keppo continued the presentation and pinpointed several scientific issues around model comparability and interdisciplinarity that will concern the consortium from a technical and epistemological perspective (e.g., variables definition, interpretation of results). Lastly, Dr Gambhir closed the presentation with an initial description of model linking, and a brief summary of the modelling cycles of D3.4.</p>		
Setting up the modelling machine	<p>The next presentation started by Ms Ferreras-Alonso and focused on the objectives of D4.1, with its main goal to clearly understand policy representation in models and how to cluster them in scenario frameworks. She also briefed the consortium partners on the activities and outputs of this deliverable. Afterwards, Dr Ida Sognaes (CICERO) presented Task 4.2 and its main objective of meaningful comparisons across different models. She also presented its main challenges (namely, preserving model diversity in tandem with consistency) as well as its main links with other Tasks, focusing on Task 3.6.</p>		
Project implementation for Horizon Europe	<p>The presentation of Dr Irena Gabrielaitiene (CINEA), who is the project's advisor, commenced with a brief overview of CINEA's role and objectives. Afterwards, she delved into details regarding the Grand Agreement preparation, the role of the partners and their interaction with the European Commission. Her presentation included details on deliverables and periodic reports deadlines. Afterwards, Prof. Doukas and Dr Gabrielaitiene discussed urgent policy requests from CINEA (e.g., regarding the current energy crisis). This discussion was expanded on aspects such as continuous reporting and delays in delivering output. Lastly, Dr Nikas had collected various questions for the Project Advisor regarding the progress of the project, the review meeting for the final report and how team changes must be tackled regarding the EC's platform.</p>		
Where the iron is hot: Modelling extremes	<p>As already discussed on the 1<sup>st</sup> day of the KoM modelling extremes are a crucial aspect of IAM COMPACT. In this context, Dr Gambhir presented the three types of extremes considered (transient events, disruptive drivers and unexpected outcomes) as well as possible tailwinds and headwinds that must be considered for more realistic modelling. Dr Gambhir, after Prof. Keppo's intervention, suggested that the consortium should focus on under-studies extremes. Afterwards, Dr Fragkos commenced his presentation, focusing on the extreme of Russia turning off Europe's gas supply and how it can affect the EU domestically as well as how it can influence global mitigation efforts. The presentation continued with a discussion on which models can be used to capture these questions.</p>	<p>Website development</p> <p>Leaflets preparation in all partners' languages</p>	<p>UPRC</p> <p>UPRC, All partners</p>



	<p>Lastly, a discussion regarding the speed of progress required to be scientifically relevant and the interconnections with the PRM took place between Dr Fragkos, Dr Nikas, Dr Sampedro, Dr Zachmann and Dr Shivika Mittal (Imperial).</p>		
Maximising the project's impact	<p>The last presentation of the meeting was conducted by Dr Stavrakas. He presented an overview of the CDE strategy, focusing on aspects such as the message communicated, the audiences as well as the suitable communication tool.</p> <p>Afterwards, he stated that the project's website must be fully functional until December 2022. The same deadline is effective for the project's logo as well, but it is already ready and well-established.</p> <p>The presentation continued with matters such as the project's leaflets, newsletters and social media accounts as well as publications and conferences aimed at academic audiences.</p> <p>Lastly, he stressed that the CDE activities should align with the current post-covid and energy crisis context which will be published timely.</p>	Project's SoMe	UPRC, All partners
Wrap-up, Q&A, Discussions	<p>During the whole 2-day KoM, partners were encouraged to make questions after each presentation, a process which was greatly embraced by the partners, thus there was no need for a Q&amp;A session afterwards.</p> <p>The meeting concluded with a goodbye statement from Prof. Doukas</p>		

## 2.2 2<sup>nd</sup> General Assembly Meeting: 28 August 2023

The 2<sup>nd</sup> General Assembly Meeting took place in Mombasa, Kenya, where the project also hosted a set of capacity development events in Mombasa on the days following the consortium’s internal meeting. Participants unable to travel to Kenya were able to join the meeting through MS Teams, as it was held as a hybrid meeting. It is noteworthy, however, that during the General Assembly Meeting a dedicated SAB session also took place, in which attending SAB members provided their insightful feedback on the project’s progress and objectives.

### 2.2.1 Agenda

**Table 4.** 2<sup>nd</sup> General Assembly (*MS Teams link*)

Monday, August 28, 2023			
10:45 – 11:00	<i>Gathering, signing in, etc</i>		
11:00 – 11:20	I.1	<b>WP1 – Project Management</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Coordination</li> <li>- Management</li> <li>- Quality processes (including review, review times, etc.)</li> </ul>	NTUA
11:20 – 11:50	I.2	<b>WP2 – Listening</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Evaluating progress in July core working group meetings</li> </ul>	Bruegel
11:50 – 12:20	I.3	<b>WP3 – Exchanging</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Platform updates</li> <li>- Protocols for open science</li> </ul>	NTUA, BC3
12:20 – 13:30	<i>Lunch/break</i>		
13:30 – 14:15	I.4	<b>WP4 – Modelling</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Broad scenario logic</li> <li>- First modelling cycle (overview of RQs and progress):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Study 1: NECPs vs. EU’s optimal transition</li> <li>o Study 2: Energy security &amp; resilience</li> <li>o Study 3: Geopolitics</li> <li>o Study 4: Industry decarbonisation</li> <li>o Study 5: Rapid cost reductions of low-TRL cleantech</li> <li>o Study 6: Interest rates</li> <li>o Study 7: Behavioural change &amp; economic impacts</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	CICERO, Imperial & Study Leads
14:15 – 14:35	I.5	<b>WP5 – Expanding</b> COVID recovery analysis progress	E3M
14:35 – 15:15	I.6	<b>WP6 – Explaining</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Communication, dissemination, and exploitation</li> <li>- Outreach and publications</li> <li>- Drivers, barriers, and policy analysis progress</li> <li>- Capacity development progress and timeline</li> </ul>	UPRC, NTUA, KTH, WI
15:15 – 16:15	I.7	<b>Scientific Advisory Board</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project planning/implementation &amp; SAB feedback</li> </ul>	SAB members, All partners
16:15 – 17:00	I.8	<b>Workshop dry runs</b>	All partners

### 2.2.2 Minutes

Present physically	Name and Surname	Organisation
1	Natasha Frilingou	NTUA
2	Anastasios Karamaneas	NTUA
3	Meng Yuan	AAU
4	Diana Romero	AAU



5	Dirk-Jan van de Ven	BC3
6	Noelia Ferreras Alonso	CARTIF
7	Francesco Gardumi	KTH
8	Eftychia Ntostoglou	KTH
9	Francesco Tonini	POLIMI
10	Lorenzo Rinaldi	POLIMI
11	David Álvarez-Antelo	UVa
12	Mohamed Lifi	UVa
13	Ioannis Tsipouridis	TUM

<b>Present in MS Teams</b>	<b>Name and Surname</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
14	Alexandros Nikas	NTUA
15	Konstantinos Koasidis	NTUA
16	Themistoklis Koutselis	NTUA
17	Ilkka Keppo	Aalto
18	Ghadkasaz Hesam	Aalto
19	Diamantis Koutsandreas	Aalto
20	Jakob Zinck Thellufsen	AAU
21	Rasmus Magni Johannsen	AAU
22	Jon Sampedro	BC3
23	Russel Horowitz	BC3
24	Clàudia Rodés	BC3
25	Conall Heussaff	Bruegel
26	Adrián Lauer	Bruegel
27	Adrian Mateo	CARTIF
28	Yáiza Villar	CARTIF
29	Jan Ivar Korsbakken	CICERO
30	Glen Peters	CICERO
31	Anastasis Giannousakis	E3M
32	Panagiotis Fragkos	E3M
33	Eleutheria Zisarou	E3M
34	Matteo Vincenzo Rocco	POLIMI
35	Vasilis Stavrakas	UPRC
36	Nikos Kleanthis	UPRC
37	Sophia Theodoropoulou	UPRC
38	Georg Holtz	WI
39	Carsten Elsner	WI
40	Alexander Jülich	WI
41	Wofigang Obergassel	WI
42	Saritha Sudharma Vishwanathan	IIMA
43	Fitsum Kebede	AAIT
44	Solomon Teferi	AAIT
45	Salsabila Abdulhalim	TUM
46	Evelina Trutnevyte	UNIGE
47	Sara Giarola	Imperial
48	Shivika Mittal	Imperial

49	Diana Reckien	SAB
50	Sonia Yeoh	SAB
51	Suranga Karavita	SAB

<b>Minutes: Main issues discussed</b>			
Item	Description	Action	
		What	Who
WP1	<p>Dr. Alexandros Nikas (NTUA) started the meeting by greeting all participants and stressing the pleasure over this event taking place in Mombasa, Kenya, vis-à-vis a series of other events, altogether allowing to better understand the national context. Next, Prof. Ioannis Tspouridis (TUM) from the host partner institute welcomed all partners.</p> <p>Dr. Nikas mentioned that the consortium tries hard to follow the project's timeline and this is evident from the fact the Deliverables of the first year are not only delivered to the EC services in time but also overall well aligned with the quality control process timeline—slight delays with regard only to the latter were observed but expected, in the case of deliverables requiring input from ongoing work or during holiday months (e.g., May 2023). Moreover, the 4 milestones of the first year had all been met in time. Next, Alexandros summarised the content scope and expectations associated with the eight deliverables to be prepared by January 2024, as part of a near-term outlook, as well as the ten deliverables to be submitted by the end of the project's 2<sup>nd</sup> year, as a longer-term outlook. In this context, he requested that consortium partners express their willingness to review the latter, as the reviewers' list for the upcoming eight deliverables had been compiled early. He also informed the consortium that the SyGMA platform has been revamped considerable in Horizon Europe, requiring extensive new information, for which NTUA administration will soon request feedback from all partners. After discussing progress in terms of visual identity, Dr Nikas then requested that all partners sign up for the project's newsletter. He then stressed the project administration's effort to record all project meetings (General Assemblies, Executive Board Meetings, and SAB sessions) and to put together detailed minutes. In this context, he also briefed the consortium on the final SAB synthesis as well as on the highlights of the previous SAB session in February 2023. Finally, Dr Nikas demonstrated a visual overview of the project's first Policy Response Mechanism (PRM) timeline, which was followed by a vivid consortium-wide discussion on the two cycles, with a focus on timelines and their interaction with other deliverables.</p>	<p>Express willingness to review deliverables</p> <p>Sing up to the newsletter</p>	<p>All partners</p> <p>All partners</p>
WP2	<p>Next, proceeding to WP2, Mr Conall Heussaff (Bruegel) took the floor and presented an overview of the PRM, quickly briefing the consortium on how it works. He then presented the cradle-to-grave process of the mechanism, stressing that we are currently at the end of the 1<sup>st</sup> modelling iteration, before presenting the interactions with the 2<sup>nd</sup> iteration of this first cycle.</p> <p>Next, he briefed the consortium on the discussions with the Policy Steering Groups, mentioning that all Groups had met</p>		

	<p>except the ones for the USA and India. Moreover, two of the Core Working Groups (CWGs) had already met with two more scheduled by the end of September 2023.</p> <p>Next, he briefed the partners on the workshop that took place in July focusing on its format and aims. In this context, he summarised the discussions held in the two CWGs on Optimal Transition and Industry &amp; Innovation. Then he summarised the WP's next steps, mentioning how the 2<sup>nd</sup> iteration of this cycle will begin by the end of 2023 by reviewing research questions and finish in the summer of 2024. In this context, Dr Mittal and Mr Heussaff discussed the PRM timeline for non-EU countries, which is different than the one for EU countries. Dr Nikas mentioned that non-EU modelling teams can take advantage of the fact that multi-team coordination is not necessary, meaning that non-EU results may not be ready by November 2023 but should definitely be submitted in possibly updated deliverables by February 2024, which is the end of the first reporting period. Finally, Dr Nikas mentioned that there can be flexibility in the PRM process for updates and additions, without significantly diverging from the timeline.</p>		
WP3	<p>Next, Ms Natasha Frilingou (NTUA) took the floor and presented WP3 in the context of the project. She kicked off a task-by-task description by taking aim at Task 3.1 regarding the project's Data Management Plan, a task running through the entire project's lifecycle, summarising scope/objectives, progress, and next steps. She then moved onto Task 3.2, briefly presenting Deliverable D3.4 focusing on model typologies, and onto Task 3.3 and D3.6 on FAIR &amp; TRUST principles, which was submitted in June 2023. Moreover, she summarised the work on Task 3.4 regarding the updates on the I<sup>2</sup>AM PARIS platform, largely focusing on the validation tool (which is already available), before briefing partners on next steps (e.g., the introduction of new workspaces and the integration of validation and vetting checks). Task 3.5 was summarised with a focus on the synergies plan and the joint events, publications, and other activities of the project with its sister/other initiatives. Lastly, Ms Frilingou presented Task 3.6 that aims to develop diagnostics to assess IAM outputs (e.g., their consistency), and which will lead to automated validation across variables and a diagnostics tool. In this context, Dr Jan Ivar Korsbakken (CICERO) stressed that this process will not lead to rejecting scenarios but to suggesting improving actions.</p> <p>Next, a consortium-wide discussion on the timeline and the availability of the vetting tool based on scenarios concluded that, if the tool is not ready for the 1<sup>st</sup> cycle of the PRM cycle, manual checks should be done instead. In this context, Dr Francesco Gardumi (KTH) and Ms Frilingou discussed about the responsible partner for following protocols for the case study countries, agreeing that task leaders should be on top of these issues.</p> <p>Then, Prof Ilkka Keppo (Aalto) asked whether the project would advance to other practices further than just using the tool (e.g., improving scenarios), with Ms Frilingou replying that the tool is still under development but warmly open to suggestions and improvements. Dr Korsbakken stated that</p>	<p>Update the I<sup>2</sup>AM PARIS platform</p> <p>Develop diagnostics tool</p> <p>Expand vetting criteria for specific scenarios / studies</p>	<p>NTUA, BC3</p> <p>CICERO</p> <p>PRM study leads &amp; CICERO</p>

	the task's goal is to develop the tool and find outliers but not necessarily to dig into improving scenarios. In this context, Dr Mittal proposed that the project can use indicators for diagnostics that were used in the PARIS REINFORCE project.		
WP4	<p>Then, Dr Mittal proceeded to the presentation of WP4, beginning by summarising the progress in the past semester and overviewing the upcoming tasks. Next, Dr Korsbakken took the floor and briefed the partners on the starting point and components of Task 4.2 regarding the broad scenario logic. Afterwards, he presented D4.3 focusing on the harmonised data specifications as well as the specifications for format and data availability. In this context, he mentioned the data sources for harmonising default population and GDP data. He also demonstrated some differences between the old and new SSP2 data as well as the database of the project. This data can be accessed by every partner in the relevant GitHub repository; after some discussion with/among IPCC authors in the consortium, it was made clear that the new SSP data will only become available after they are published, probably in 2024—they are currently under review.</p> <p>Next, Dr Mittal took the floor and presented a schematic mapping of the Policy Steering Groups with the 7 studies that will take place and the CWG themes. In this context, Dr Dirk-Jan van de Ven (BC3) presented the three-step process of Study 1 regarding the EU NECP Implementation, focusing on a Greek case study. He mentioned that there is insightful feedback from stakeholders drawn during the CWG workshop in July 2023. Then, Dr Rasmus Magni Johannsen (AAU) summarised the aims of Study 2 and presented the primary methods and models to be used as well as the progress so far. Dr Panagiotis Fragkos (E3M) took the floor to brief the consortium on Study 3 regarding geopolitics, presenting an overview of the study's research questions and scenario philosophy, with respect to the relevance of the transition to the availability of specific technologies (e.g., biomass, etc.). Moreover, he presented the scenario design and the models that will be used. Next, Dr Georg Holtz (WI) took the floor and presented the current status of Study 4, before then demonstrating the research questions and scenario logic by mentioning the three scenarios that will be examined as well as the models to be employed. Study 5 (regarding the rapid reduction of tech costs) was presented by Dr Mittal in a similar fashion, while Ms Frilingou proceeded to Study 6 (interest rates) presenting current research gaps, research questions, and three-step research design, before briefing the partners on the timeline of Studies 5 and 6. Finally, Dr Mohammed Lifi (UVa) took the floor and briefed the consortium on the research questions as well as the next steps for Study 7. In this context, Dr Mittal, Dr van de Ven, Dr Fragkos, Dr Korsbakken and Dr Glen Peters (CICERO) had a broad discussion on scenarios and SSPs regarding the 7 studies.</p>	Proceed with the 7 studies	All task leaders relevant to these studies, Study leaders
WP5	Next, Dr Fragkos took the floor to present the progress of WP5. He briefed the partners on how the WP fits into the project, its tasks, and the mapping of studies onto the tasks. He then presented the timeline of the WP, which comprises	Submit Tas 5.1 deliverable	E3M

	<p>three phases. Then, Ms Eleftheria Zisarou (E3M) presented Task 5.1 focusing on the challenges related to data and how they were tackled. She also presented some research results as well as the next steps on this Task, focusing on the Deliverable that must be submitted by December 2023. Then, Dr Fragkos took the floor once again presenting a schematic summary of Task 5.2 as well as its expected outcomes. Afterwards, Dr Mittal briefed the consortium on Tasks 5.3 according to the description of work in the Grant and proceeded to early actions that have been taken so far. She ended her intervention by presenting some task-relevant papers that have been submitted and/or accepted. Next, Prof Evelina Trutnevyte (UNIGE) and Dr Nikas briefed the partners on Tasks 5.4 and 5.6 respectively, focusing on their timeline, planning, and objectives. Dr Fragkos concluded by presenting a planning summary of WP5 deliverables and the next steps planned with Dr Gardumi engaging in a discussion on data collection.</p>		
SAB	<p>Since the schedule took a few twists, with the discussions left behind schedule by a WP and the lunch having moved to 14.00 instead, WP6 was shifted towards the end of the event and the SAB session begin exactly as scheduled in the agenda, not to disrupt the SAB members' agendas.</p> <p>Dr Nikas welcomed the SAB members that eventually joined. Some early interventions from SAB members were made, for example by Prof Diana Reckien, who highlighted the benefits in the GA taking place in Africa and the need to keep the SAB updated on the the bigger picture of project progress, as well as by Prof Sonia Yeh, who after thanking the consortium for the invitation expressed her interest in hearing more about the project's African partners as well as about the aspects of technological innovation in the project.</p> <p>Dr Nikas took the floor once again and proceeded to a brief presentation of the project's progress, focusing on selected highlights. These included the Policy Steering Group discussions at the EU level, and the overall progress of the 1<sup>st</sup> RPM cycle iteration, by presenting the 4 Policy Steering Groups and the 3 CWG themes. He also mentioned that two workshops regarding the first two themes have already taken place, while the other two are expected by end of September 2023. He delved into the scope and takeaways of these workshops, focusing on policy and stakeholders' feedback, and demonstrated a timeline schematic of the RPM cycles. Dr Nikas then provided an overview of the second policy brief, which was fed into the EU 2040 target planning, on the energy crisis analysis (in which SAB member showed great interest). He finally provided a visual overview of the work done so far, focusing on scientific publications and outreach, including among others the flagship publication led by Dr. van de Ven in Nature Climate Change, which made the news (e.g., in the Conversation, Bloomberg, Nature Climate Change News &amp; Views, etc.).</p> <p>One SAB member congratulated the consortium on the work done so far and expressed their interest in hearing more on project management challenges, behavioural change aspects in research, and ethical aspects with regard to involvement</p>		

	<p>of African partners and their ownership of outputs. On the first point, Dr Nikas replied that the consortium had known from the start that there might be challenges especially considering the non-EU partners from countries with difficult contexts (e.g., Ukraine) but were overall very satisfied with the level of commitment from these partners—with this Kenya meeting and entire series of capacity development events later in the week as a fine example. Among the most notable such challenges, according to Dr Nikas, was the divergence of this 1<sup>st</sup> PRM cycle timeline among the EU and non-EU countries, noting however that we can afford some flexibility as the analyses carried out outside the EU mainly require guidance but not multi-partner collaborations, which can save considerable time and ensure that all deliverables are submitted within the reporting period, as scheduled. On the second point, there was little to add at this stage, as the consortium was able to delve into detail on the more economic side of behavioural changes (as also emerged in the policy needs and stakeholder discussions) and less on the qualitative aspects of human behaviour—something due to be examined as part of dedicated WP5 tasks nonetheless. On the third point, Dr Nikas explained that—although there exist no specific protocols for inclusion of all consortium partners—it is top priority for NTUA as coordinators to ensure that all outputs, scientific or otherwise, are owned by and credited to all involved, and that this has always been the case (e.g., much like Bruegel colleagues are also invited to join scientific publication efforts, or TUM colleagues to participate or lead similar efforts, so far). A member of the SAB appreciated the fact that IAM COMPACT processes are inclusive, before then providing suggestions on how to make project research processes even more inclusive, mentioning an example of a recent research project she is involved in, in which they have a policy to include a non-EU ‘counterpart’ as a second author in every papers produced involving them.</p> <p>Next, Dr Nikas informed the SAB of the progress regarding capacity development activities in the case study countries. Finally, the SAB session concluded with the consortium and the SAB having a short discussion on the project’s modelling validation procedures, as well as with Dr Nikas assuring the SAB that the consortium aim to provide the SAB with more feedback on the project’s outcomes onwards, when more content-related progress is expected.</p>		
WP6	<p>After the SAB session ended, Ms Sophia Theodoropoulou (UPRC) took the floor and briefed the consortium on the current status of WP6, focusing on the project’s CDE plan, social media accounts, and monitoring tools. On the latter, she mentioned that there are two MS Excel tools comprising the CDE KPIs framework and tracking progress, shared in the project’s SharePoint, in which all partners are involved. Next, she mentioned that CDE activities as well as the project’s scientific outreach have marked good progress so far. Then, she provided an overview of the project’s social media activity and strategy and also presented future planning for Task 6.1, focusing on D6.2. Next, Dr Gardumi presented the current status of Task 6.2 providing a visual representation</p>	Constantly filling in the CDE KPIs Excel files	UPRC, partners All



of the protocol regarding policy brief processes. He did not emphasise Task 6.3, since much of it was already presented during the SAB session, although Dr Nikas intervened to nonetheless briefly raise the open science strategy of the project; Dr Gardumi then moved onto Task 6.4 and its description by the Grant Agreement, focusing on the relevant deliverables and milestones as well as the current status and division of work between partners. Then, Ms Eftychia Ntostoglou (KTH) took the floor and presented the work on Task 6.5 focusing on the ICTP Summer School's CLEWs track that many partners attended during July. She proceeded to an overview of the case study countries regarding D6.7 and mentioned that the material prepared for the workshops in Mombasa constitutes the first part of Milestone MS6.

Dr Gardumi stimulated a discussion on how case study models can be used in deliverables and mentioned that there is a set of training kits to be published in cooperation with WP3 to ensure that all openness protocols are followed. In this context, Prof Tsipouridis mentioned that the ideal aim of the workshops in Mombasa, to be held in the upcoming days, is to create a small group of students to form a national modelling team for Kenya.

Finally, a discussion focused on the readiness of the project with regard to these upcoming workshops (e.g., materials, timeline, dry runs, etc.).

## 3 Remote (Online) Meetings

### 3.1 Executive Board Meeting – 18 October 2022

#### 3.1.1 Agenda

**Tuesday, 18 October, 2022**  
**Executive Board Meeting**  
**14:00-15:00 CET**

*Microsoft Teams ([link](#))*

**Participants:** All partners

#### **Agenda**

1. Update on the project progress (completed, ongoing, and upcoming tasks and Deliverables)
  - WP1: Project Management
    - Consortium Agreement (NTUA)
    - Mailing lists (NTUA)
    - MS1: Formulation of the SAB (NTUA) – October 2022
    - MS2: Internal data management (NTUA) – December 2022
    - D1.1: Visual Identity & website (UPRC) – December 2022
    - Quality management (NTUA & CICERO)
  - WP2: Listening
    - D2.1: Stakeholder engagement plan (Bruegel) – November 2022
    - Policy brief attached to D2.1 (Bruegel)
    - MS3: Stakeholder engagement DB (Bruegel) – December 2022
  - WP3: Exchanging
    - D3.1: I2AM PARIS upgrade plan (NTUA) – December 2022
  - WP4: Modelling
    - Modelling seminars (Imperial)
  - WP5: Expanding
    - Energy crisis (E3M & NTUA)
  - WP6: Explaining
    - Project social media (UPRC)
2. M1-M6 deliverables and review planning – NTUA/All Partners
3. Agree on Executive Board meeting slots – NTUA/All Partners
4. Any other business

### 3.1.2 Minutes

Present on Call	Name and Surname	Organisation
1	Alexandros Nikas	NTUA
2	Konstantinos Koasidis	NTUA
3	Anastasios Karamaneas	NTUA
4	Natasha Frilingou	NTUA
5	Themistoklis Koutsellis	NTUA
6	Ilkka Keppo	Aalto
7	Jakob Zinck Thellufsen	AAU
8	Dirk-Jan van de Ven	BC3
9	Jon Sampedro	BC3
10	Conall Heussaff	Bruegel
11	Daniel Mayer	Bruegel
12	Panagiotis Fragkos	E3M
13	Eleftheria Zisarou	E3M
14	Francesco Gardumi	KTH
15	Matteo Vincenzo Rocco	POLIMI
16	Lorenzo Rinaldi	POLIMI
17	Vassilis Stavrakas	UPRC
18	Ilias Tsopelas	UPRC
19	Jaime Nieto	UVa
20	Wolfgang Obergassel	WI
21	Ryna Cui	USMF
22	Solomon T. Teferi	AAiT
23	Fitsum S. Kebede	AAiT
24	Lahiru Jayasuriya	RUSL
25	Ioannis Tsipouridis	TUM
26	Jan-Philippe Sasse	UNIGE
27	Evelina Trutnevyte	UNIGE
28	Zongfei Wang	UNIGE
29	Ajay Gambhir	Imperial
30	Alexandre C. Köberle	Imperial

Minutes: Main issues discussed			
Item	Description	Action	
		What	Who
WP1	<p>The meeting started by Dr Alexandros Nikas (NTUA), by commenting on the status of the Consortium Agreement (CA). Two partners have sent some considerable comments and the CA is being processed by NTUA's legal department.</p> <p>The next issue discussed was the mailing lists which are still in progress. So far, the process is quite manual since the project's website is not yet ready.</p> <p>Afterwards, a considerable discussion took place regarding the formulation of the SAB. At first, Dr Nikas mentioned that the report will be ready to be submitted to the EC's platform as soon as the synthesis of the SAB is finalised. In this context, Prof. Ilkka Keppo (Aalto) suggested that the SAB should be smaller and more academic but Dr Nikas replied that it is not suggested to remove people at this stage and that only 3 stakeholders are not academics. Another matter proposed by Dr Pangatiotis Fragkos (E3M) was the insertion</p>	<p>Edit the Consortium agreement to match the partners' comments</p> <p>Send to NTUA administration the names of partners that should be included in the mailing lists</p> <p>Reconsider the addition of the BP stakeholder and communicate with them if needed to</p>	<p>NTUA</p> <p>All partners</p> <p>All partners, E3M</p>

	<p>of a BP stakeholder into the SAB. In this context, some partners (e.g. Prof. Ioannis Tsipouridis (TUM)) objected to this idea, others were more open to it (e.g. Dr Ajay Gambhir (Imperial)) whereas Prof. Evelina Trutnevyte proposed that if a stakeholder from BP is inserted, this addition should be counterbalanced with the addition of an NGO stakeholder, e.g. someone from DG Clima. Lastly, colleagues from Bruegel suggested that they could communicate with someone from the EC.</p> <p>Regarding the Internal data management system, Dr Nikas informed the partners that it is ready and that no issues have been reported.</p> <p>Next, Dr Vassilis Stavrakas (UPRC) took the floor and informed the project's partners on issues regarding the visual identity of the project. The logo is already ready and the website is still in progress, since it is to be delivered in December. Feedback from the partners will be asked later on.</p> <p>Lastly, there are no updates regarding the Quality Management Plan of the project, as it was thoroughly discussed in the KoM. The relevant deliverable should be ready in 2023.</p>	Preparation of the website	UPRC
WP2	Mr Conall Heussaff (Bruegel) made a brief overview of the Policy Response Mechanism (PRM) deliverable, a draft of which will be available in two weeks. Furthermore, he mentioned that a smaller version of the deliverable will be disseminated as a policy brief.	Prepare the RPM deliverable and the relevant policy brief	Bruegel
WP3	Afterwards, the discussion moved to the I <sup>2</sup> AM PARIS platform (D3.1), which should be expanded for non-PARIS REINFORCE models. For this process, feedback from modelling partners is necessary. The template for this feedback is already prepared.	Modelling documentation feedback	All modelling partners
WP4	Regarding WP4, the discussion revolved around the organisation of seminars, aiming to familiarise modelling teams with the entire modelling ensemble. In this context, Dr Gambhir suggested that these seminars will commence with the global models preferably in the first week of November or after COP27, with 6 models per session. Dr Gambhir will send the partners an exemplary presentation. Afterwards, Dr Nikas and Dr Gambhir proposed sending a <i>Doodle</i> poll to the consortium partners to find the most suitable dates. Lastly, Dr Nikas suggested that the seminars are recorded and uploaded to the I <sup>2</sup> AM PARIS platform.	Prepare exemplary presentation  Arrange the modelling seminars	Imperial  Imperial, NTUA
WP5	The next issue discussed was the energy crisis analysis that will take place in the context of WP5. Dr Nikas presented the modelling teams that will contribute to this process and the models they will use. The presentation also included the availabilities and comments of each modelling team. Lastly, Dr Fragkos and Dr Nikas proposed that, since most modelling teams have low availability until November, the consortium should at least discuss by then the common questions and parameters.	Organise a <i>Doodle</i> poll for modelling teams to discuss this issue	E3M, NTUA
WP6	Dr Stavrakas took the floor and presented the progress on the project's social media. He mentioned that they are still in progress, similarly to the website.	Set up the project's social media accounts	UPRC

M1-M6 deliverables and review planning	These deliverables were already discussed in the relevant sessions for each WP. The only addition made by Dr Nikas is that the NTUA administration will communicate with all partners to ask them what deliverables they would like to review. He mentioned that the partners can demonstrate their interest in as many deliverables as possible but that the administration will share the burden according to the partners' workload in the project.	Demonstrate interest deliverables reviewing	All partners, NTUA
Agree on Executive Board meeting slots	Closing the meeting, Dr Nikas proposed that a slot for executive board meetings or ad hoc meetings is considered on every Tuesday from 14:00 to 15:00 CET. He clarified that meetings will not take place every Tuesday but whenever a meeting has to take place, this time slot will be used.		

## 3.2 Executive Board Meeting – 22 November 2022

### 3.2.1 Agenda

**Executive Board Meeting**  
**Tuesday, November 22, 2022**  
**14:00-15:00 CEST**

*Microsoft Teams ([Link](#))*

**Participants:** All Partners

#### **Agenda**

1. Update on project progress (completed, ongoing, upcoming tasks & deliverables)
  - WP1: Project Management
    - Consortium Agreement (NTUA)
    - Mailing lists (NTUA)
    - MS2: Internal data management (NTUA) – December 2022
    - D1.1: Visual Identity & website (UPRC) – December 2022
    - Quality management (NTUA & CICERO)
  - WP2: Listening
    - D2.1: Stakeholder engagement plan (Bruegel) – November 2022
    - Policy brief attached to D2.1 (Bruegel)
    - MS3: Stakeholder engagement DB (Bruegel) – December 2022
  - WP3: Exchanging
    - D3.1: I<sup>2</sup>AM PARIS upgrade plan (NTUA) – December 2022
  - WP4: Modelling
    - Modelling seminars (Imperial) – notes from seminar #1
  - WP5: Expanding
    - Energy crisis (E3M, BC3, Bruegel, & NTUA) – timeline, which WP?
  - WP6: Explaining
    - Project social media (UPRC)
    - Meetings with case study partners (KTH)
2. Pending requests (model documentation, capacity, seminars, etc.) – All Partners
3. Project social media & partner introduction posts – UPRC & all partners
4. Any other business

### 3.2.2 Minutes

Present on Call	Name and Surname	Organisation
1	Alexandros Nikas	NTUA
2	Konstantinos Koasidis	NTUA
3	Anastasios Karamaneas	NTUA
4	Natasha Frilingou	NTUA
5	Themistoklis Koutsellis	NTUA
6	Ilkka Keppo	Aalto
7	Jakob Zinck Thellufsen	AAU
8	Dirk-Jan van de Ven	BC3
9	Jon Sampedro	BC3
10	Conall Heussaff	Bruegel
11	Noelia Ferreras-Alonso	CARTIF
12	Ida Sognaes	CICERO
13	Panagiotis Fragkos	E3M
14	Eleftheria Zisarou	E3M
15	Matteo Vincenzo Rocco	POLIMI
16	Lorenzo Rinaldi	POLIMI
17	Vassilis Stavrakas	UPRC
18	Luis Javier Miguel Gonzalez	UVa
19	Wolfgang Obergassel	WI
20	Yu Wang	Tsinghua
21	Ioannis Tsipouridis	TUM
22	Zongfei Wang	UNIGE
23	Ajay Gambhir	Imperial
24	Shivika Mittal	Imperial

#### Minutes: Main issues discussed

Item	Description	Action	
		What	Who
WP1	<p>The meeting started with Dr Alexandros Nikas (NTUA), greeting the partners and briefing them on the agenda. The first issue discussed was the pending comments on the Consortium Agreement from the project's associated partners.</p> <p>Regarding the Internal data management system, Dr Nikas requested that partners inform the NTUA administration if any issues regarding access have occurred.</p> <p>Dr Nikas also mentioned that in WP1 only executive board meetings' minutes will be included while the rest of the meetings will be included in the relevant WPs' reporting. Each task or WP leader requesting an ad-hoc meeting will also be responsible for keeping the respective MoM.</p> <p>Next, Dr Vassilis Stavrakas (UPRC) took the floor and informed the project's partners on issues regarding the visual identity of the project. The logo is ready (available in the project's SharePoint database) and the website is in progress and on-track for delivery in December. Mock-ups will be provided next week.</p> <p>Lastly, there are no updates regarding the Quality Management Plan of the project yet as there is adequate time for the deliverable deadline (M6).</p>	<p>Edit the Consortium agreement to match the partners' comments</p> <p>Inform NTUA administration if there is any problem regarding Microsoft SharePoint access</p> <p>Preparation of the website. Mock-ups presentation</p>	<p>NTUA</p> <p>All partners</p> <p>UPRC</p>

WP2	<p>Mr Conall Heussaff (Bruegel) informed the partners that D2.1 is almost ready and that it will be distributed to by next week, including the relevant policy brief for non-consortium stakeholders. In this context, Dr Nikas asked if there is any modelling inputs missing and Mr Heussaff replied that most modelling teams have already delivered the required information.</p> <p>Lastly, Dr Nikas and Mr Heussaff discussed some details regarding the relevant milestone that should be delivered (MS3).</p>	Prepare D2.1 and the relevant policy brief	Bruegel
WP3	<p>Afterwards, the discussion moved to the I<sup>2</sup>AM PARIS platform (D3.1). The relevant deliverable is slightly delayed due to some preparations on the platform. Nevertheless, partners were requested to check if the models' documentation is accurate by the 9<sup>th</sup> of December 2022.</p> <p>Dr Nikas also mentioned that is important to start a discussion on sectoral modelling aspects that may not be covered by the documentation template used so far.</p>	Modelling documentation feedback	All modelling partners
WP4	<p>Next, Dr Ajay Gambhir (Imperial) took the floor and briefed the partners on the 1<sup>st</sup> modelling seminar which took place. Moreover, he presented the agenda of the 2<sup>nd</sup> modelling seminar, taking place on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of December. In this context, Dr Nikas added that the 3<sup>rd</sup> and last seminar will take place on the 5<sup>th</sup> of December. Dr Gambhir informed the partners that most presentations are still missing and that each presentation should last 10 minutes, as this format worked fine in the 1<sup>st</sup> seminar.</p>	Send modelling presentations	Modelling partners
WP5	<p>The next issue discussed was the energy crisis analysis that will take place in the context of WP5. The discussion started with Dr Panagiotis Fragkos (E3M) mentioning that this analysis is a cross-WP issue. In this context, Dr Nikas added that the energy crisis can be a part of Task 5.1 and WP4 (since stakeholders are involved) but also part of WP3. Moreover, Dr Fragkos mentioned that this analysis should focus on natural gas and the electrification of end-use demand. Accordingly, Bruegel has already prepared a first scenario set-up. Lastly, Dr Fragkos shared with the partners a Google file presenting the input that will be provided by each modelling team.</p>	Check the Google file regarding modelling input	Modelling partners
WP6	<p>Regarding WP6, and especially Task 6.1, Dr Vassilis Stavrakas (UPRC) informed the partners that the project's accounts on Twitter and LinkedIn are ready and requested from partners to follow them. He also mentioned that the project's Instagram account will be ready next week. Moreover, he informed the consortium that D6.1 is in progress and that a newsletter will be delivered soon.</p>	<p>Prepare the project's first newsletter</p> <p>Prepare the project's Instagram account</p>	<p>UPRC</p> <p>UPRC</p>
Any other business	<p>The last issue discussed during this meeting was the kick-off of all WPs. In this context, Mr Wolfgang Obergassel (WI) mentioned that Task 4.4 will soon kick-off, also requiring the involvement of NTUA. Moreover, Prof. Ilkka Keppo (Aalto) started a discussion regarding e-mails focusing on WP-related partners. Lastly, Dr Nikas mentioned that most WPs kick-off in December and requested that all partners keep up with timelines. All the other issues on the agenda were covered during the relevant WP discussions.</p>		



## 3.3 Executive Board Meeting – 17 January 2023

### 3.3.1 Agenda

**Executive Board Meeting**  
**Tuesday, January 17, 2022**  
**14:00-15:00 CEST**

*Microsoft Teams ([Link](#))*

**Participants:** All Partners

#### Agenda

1. Update on project progress (completed, ongoing, upcoming tasks & deliverables)
  - WP1: Project Management
    - D1.2: Quality management (NTUA & CICERO)
    - Next (hybrid) project meeting?
  - WP2: Listening
    - D2.2: Scoping policy relevant Research Questions (Bruegel) – January 2023
  - WP3: Exchanging
    - Model documentations, videos, presentations: next steps (NTUA)
    - D3.4: Model interlinkages and integration (Aalto) – April 2023
  - WP4: Modelling
    - D4.1: From policy needs to scenario frameworks (CARTIF) – March 2023
    - EC's request on EU climate target for 2040 – April 2023
    - D4.3: Broad scenario logic (CICERO) – May 2023
  - WP5: Expanding
    - Energy crisis (E3M, BC3, Bruegel, & NTUA) – progress, which WP?
  - WP6: Explaining
    - D6.1: CDE plan (UPRC) – February 2023
    - Kenya workshop in March? (NTUA, TUM, KTH)
    - Open access publication strategy (NTUA)
    - Kicking off work in Tasks 6.4 & 6.5 (KTH, WI)
2. Pending requests (model documentation, capacity, seminars, etc.) – All Partners
3. Project social media & partner introduction posts – UPRC & all partners
4. Any other business

### 3.3.2 Minutes

Present on Call	Name and Surname	Organisation
1	Alexandros Nikas	NTUA
2	Konstantinos Koasidis	NTUA
3	Anastasios Karamaneas	NTUA
4	Natasha Frilingou	NTUA
5	Themistoklis Koutsellis	NTUA
6	Haris Doukas	NTUA
7	Ilkka Keppo	Aalto
8	Hesam Ghadaksaz	Aalto
9	Rasmus Magni Johannsen	AAU
10	Jon Sampedro	BC3
11	Dirk-Jan van de Ven	BC3
12	Conall Heussaff	Bruegel
13	Noelia Ferreras-Alonso	CARTIF
14	Jan Ivar Korsbakken	CICERO
15	Glen Peters	CICERO
16	Panagiotis Fragkos	E3M
17	Eleftheria Zisarou	E3M
18	Matteo Vincenzo Rocco	POLIMI
19	Lorenzo Rinaldi	POLIMI
20	Vassilis Stavrakas	UPRC
21	Ilias Tsopelas	UPRC
22	Jaime Nieto	UVa
23	Wolfgang Obergassel	WI
24	Ajay Gambhir	Imperial
25	Viktoria Martin	KTH
26	Saritha Vishwanathan	IIMA

#### Minutes: Main issues discussed

Item	Description	Action	
		What	Who
WP1	<p>The meeting started with Prof. Haris Doukas (NTUA) greeting the partners and wishing everyone a happy and productive new year with enhanced collaboration.</p> <p>Then, Dr Nikas (NTUA) briefed everyone on the agenda. The first issue discussed was the financing of IAM COMPACT. Not many partners have sent the CA signed and Financial ID forms—only E3M, KEI, CICERO, IIMA, POLIMI.</p> <p>The second issue is the finalisation of the SAB in February. NTUA will formalise the preliminary synthesis through NDAs signed by each member.</p> <p>Moving on to our first project meeting, Dr Nikas reminded to all partners to express their capacity to join the Kenya workshop. This workshop will provide IAM COMPACT with the chance for a pilot capacity-building exercise in Kenya and could coincide with the first project/GA meeting. In case most partners cannot attend either physically or virtually, the consortium should decide on a new project/GA meeting in March.</p> <p>Finally, Dr Gambhir (imperial) asked the project manager about his preference for online or in-person meetings. Dr</p>	<p>Communicate to the partners whose documents missing &amp; follow-up</p> <p>Send the NDAs to SAB members.</p> <p>Reply to the respective doodle poll</p>	<p>All partners</p> <p>NTUA</p> <p>All partners</p>

	Nikas responded of his preference for online for sustainability reasons; however, at least 1 meeting per year should be in-person, to build connections with the entire consortium.		
WP2	Mr Conall Heussaff (Bruegel) mentioned the progress on D2.2, where themes and regions were used for the aggregation of the stakeholders. He then asked the consortium to provide suggestions on the initial policymakers for the policy steering groups in each theme/region as well as related research questions. Finally, he mentioned the next steps in the operation of the Policy Response Mechanism. First, the appropriate models to address research questions should be mapped. Then, the research questions will be refined with the core working groups (March onwards) and finally, the scenario-building co-creation process can begin.	Prepare D2.2  Provide interest to join discussions and in which themes/regions to Bruegel  Share key policy stakeholders	Bruegel  All partners  Non-EU partners (USA, China, Kenya, Ethiopia, Sri Lanka)
WP3	Afterwards, the discussion moved to Prof. Ilkka Keppo (Aalto) for the D3.4 on model interlinkages and integration, collaborating with stakeholder questions / clustered themes and scenario logic. Next, Dr Nikas mentioned that the revamping of the I <sup>2</sup> AM PARIS platform is ongoing with the integration of new models, enhanced documentation, and tools.	Share the initial version of D3.4	Aalto
WP4	Dr Ajay Gambhir took the floor and briefed the partners on the D4.1 draft deliverable. Ms Noelia Ferreras Alonso (CARTIF) highlighted the needed exchange with D2.2. Dr Ajay Gambhir then moved to D4.3 for the development of a broad scenario model, highlighting that it should define general principles on model set-up and common assumptions but should be leaving flexibility to answer the policy questions. Finally, the possible contribution to the legislative proposal for an intermediate EU climate target for 2040 (European Climate Law) was discussed. Dr Nikas mentioned that the timeline for input (May 1 <sup>st</sup> 2023) does not align well with the PRM timeline. However, the early modelling exercise of energy crisis scenarios could contribute to a policy brief.	Review D4.1 draft structure  Contribute to the EU-2040 target.	WP4 partners and deliverable reviewers  Modelling partners, NTUA, Bruegel
WP5	The next issue discussed was the energy crisis analysis. The first round of results is on the way from the core modelling group (TIAM, PROMETHEUS, GCAM, MUSE). Next, Dr Nikas mentioned that sectoral models will soon join the analysis to contribute with finer granularity (EXIOBASE, DREEM, EXPANSE) and soft-linking with the core models. Next, Dr Panagiotis Fragkos (E3M) that WP5 work will soon start with recovery packages analysis (Task 5.1), disruptive innovation (Task 5.4), and behavioural change and societal innovation (Task 5.5).	Follow up on results.  Sectoral models to join the modelling exercise  WP5 kick-off meeting in February	Core modelling partners (E3M, Imperial, BC3), NTUA, Bruegel.  POLIMI, UPRC, UNIGE  WP5 partners
WP6	Regarding WP6, Prof. Viktoria Martin (KTH) mentioned a board meeting with all involved partners, with Mr Wolfgang Obergassel (WI) agreeing that this should be the next step. Also, Prof. Martin highlighted the need to work closely with capacity-building counties. Dr Nikas then underlined that a pilot meeting in Kenya would help in this regard. Dr Vasilis Stavrakas then elaborated on D6.1's progress. A draft is ready, while Ms Sophia Theodoropoulou has prepared a 2023 strategy with SoMe activities and a list of different events, initiatives, and projects.	Upload D6.1 on SP after greenlighting from NTUA & KTH  Review final CDE materials.	UPRC  All partners

	Finally, all partners were reminded to go through the final CDE materials for any inconsistencies/issues.		
--	---	--	--

### 3.4 1<sup>st</sup> General Assembly Meeting: 23-24 February 2023

The 1<sup>st</sup> General Assembly Meeting took place online since according to the Grant Agreement, for sustainability reasons, the consortium aims to reduce its carbon footprint, hence since there was no other project event (e.g., workshops) the project's administration decided to have this meeting online, via Microsoft Teams. It is noteworthy though, that in the General Assembly Meeting, an SAB session also took place in which some of the SAB members provided their insightful feedback on the project's progress and objectives.

#### 3.4.1 Agenda

**Table 5.** 1<sup>st</sup> General Assembly Day I: Progress on WPs 1-4 (*MS Teams link*)

Thursday, February 23, 2023			
10:45 – 11:00	Gathering, signing in, etc		
11:00 – 11:30	I.1	<b>WP1 – Project Management</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Coordination</li> <li>- Management</li> <li>- Quality processes (including review, review times, etc.)</li> </ul>	NTUA
11:30 – 12:15	I.2	<b>WP2 – Listening</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meetings with policy steering groups (progress, impressions)</li> <li>- Timeline for meetings with core working groups</li> </ul>	Bruegel
12:15 – 13:00	I.3	<b>WP3 – Exchanging</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Platform updates</li> <li>- Modelling seminars, presentations, and videos</li> <li>- Protocols for modelling interlinkages, outputs, etc.</li> <li>- Ideas on synergies with other projects</li> </ul>	NTUA, Aalto
13:00 – 13:20	Short break		
13:20 – 14:50	I.4	<b>WP4 – Modelling</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Energy crisis (first and second level) analysis, next steps</li> <li>- Policy categorisation</li> <li>- Scenario logic</li> </ul>	Imperial, CARTIF, CICERO
14:50 – 15:00	Discussion, Q&A		

**Table 6.** 1<sup>st</sup> General Assembly Day II: Progress on WP5-6 & SAB meeting (*MS Teams link*)

Friday, February 24, 2023			
10:45 – 11:00	Gathering, signing in, etc		
11:00 – 11:10	II.1	<b>Wrap-up Day 1</b>	NTUA
11:10 – 11:50	II.2	<b>WP5 – Expanding</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- COVID recovery analysis planning</li> <li>- How do WP5 dimensions align with overarching RQs?</li> </ul>	E3M
11:50 – 12:50	II.3	<b>WP6 – Explaining</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Communication, dissemination, and exploitation</li> <li>- Drivers, barriers, and policy analysis kick-off</li> <li>- Capacity development (timeline, Kenya, etc.)</li> </ul>	KTH, WI, UPRC
12:50 – 13:10	Short break		
13:10 – 14:10	II.4	<b>Scientific Advisory Board</b> <i>Introduction, project planning/implementation &amp; SAB feedback</i>	SAB members, All partners
14:10 – 15:00	II.5	<b>Discussion, Q&amp;A</b>	All partners

#### 3.4.2 Minutes

Present on Call	Name and Surname	Organisation
<b>Day I: Progress on WPs 1-4</b>		
1	Alexandros Nikas	NTUA
2	Konstantinos Koasidis	NTUA

3	Anastasios Karamaneas	NTUA
4	Natasha Frilingou	NTUA
5	Themistoklis Koutsellis	NTUA
6	Haris Doukas	NTUA
7	Behzad Zamanipour	Aalto
8	Hesam Ghadaksaz	Aalto
9	Dirk-Jan van de Ven	BC3
10	Conall Heussaff	Bruegel
11	Georg Zachmann	Bruegel
12	Noelia Ferreras-Alonso	CARTIF
13	Yaiza Villar	CARTIF
14	Adrián Matero	CARTIF
15	Jan Ivar Korsbakken	CICERO
16	Panagiotis Fragkos	E3M
17	Eleftheria Zisarou	E3M
18	Anastaisios Giannousakis	E3M
19	Viktoria Martin	KTH
20	Matteo Vincenzo Rocco	POLIMI
21	Lorenzo Rinaldi	POLIMI
22	Vassilis Stavrakas	UPRC
23	Sophia Theodoropoulou	UPRC
24	Nikolaos Kleanthis	UPRC
25	Alexandros Flammos	UPRC
26	Jaime Nieto	UVa
27	Wolfgang Obergassel	WI
28	Georg Holtz	WI
29	Chun Xia	WI
30	Zongfei Wang	WI
31	Alexander Jülich	WI
32	Saritha Vishwanathan	IIMA
33	Yu Wang	THU
34	Wang Tianpeng	THU
35	Fitsum S. Kebede	AAiT
36	Borys Dodonov	KEI
37	Lahiru Jayasuriya	RUSL
38	Ioannis Tsipouridis	TUM
39	Jan-Philipp Sasse	UNIGE
40	Ajay Gambhir	Imperial
41	Shivika Mittal	Imperial
42	Sonia Yeh	SAB

**Day II: Progress on WP5-6 & SAB meeting**

1	Alexandros Nikas	NTUA
2	Konstantinos Koasidis	NTUA
3	Anastasios Karamaneas	NTUA
4	Natasha Frilingou	NTUA
5	Themistoklis Koutsellis	NTUA
6	Haris Doukas	NTUA
7	Hesam Ghadaksaz	Aalto
8	Dirk-Jan van de Ven	BC3
9	Jon Sampedro	BC3
10	Xaquín García	BC3
11	Georg Zachmann	Bruegel
12	Noelia Ferreras-Alonso	CARTIF

13	Yaiza Villar	CARTIF
14	Adrián Matero	CARTIF
15	Jan Ivar Korsbakken	CICERO
16	Panagiotis Fragkos	E3M
17	Eleftheria Zisarou	E3M
18	Anastaisios Giannousakis	E3M
19	Viktoria Martin	KTH
20	Matteo Vincenzo Rocco	POLIMI
21	Lorenzo Rinaldi	POLIMI
22	Vassilis Stavrakas	UPRC
23	Sophia Theodoropoulou	UPRC
24	Nikolaos Kleanthis	UPRC
25	Alexandros Flammos	UPRC
26	Wolfgang Obergassel	WI
27	Georg Holtz	WI
28	Chun Xia	WI
29	Zongfei Wang	WI
30	Alexander Jülich	WI
31	Saritha Vishwanathan	IIMA
32	Yu Wang	THU
33	Wang Tianpeng	THU
34	Fitsum S. Kebede	AAiT
35	Borys Dodonov	KEI
36	Lahiru Jayasuriya	RUSL
37	Ioannis Tsipouridis	TUM
38	Ajay Gambhir	Imperial
39	Shivika Mittal	Imperial
40	Anthony Patt	SAB
41	Sureka Perera	SAB
42	Diana Reckien	SAB
43	Boaventura Cuamba	SAB

### Minutes: Main issues discussed

Item	Description	Action	
		What	Who
<b>Day I: Progress on WPs 1-4</b>			
WP1	<p>The meeting started with Prof. Haris Doukas (NTUA) greeting the consortium partners. Afterwards, Dr Alexandros Nikas (NTUA) took the floor and after greeting the partners as well, he briefed them on the agenda of the General Assembly (GA). Before proceeding to the presentation of WP1, he also requested that all partners update the project's contact lists if new members are added to their teams.</p> <p>The presentation of WP1 started with a summary of the relation of WP1 with the rest of the project since it is a cross-cutting WP. In his presentation, Dr Nikas briefed the partners on the progress of the milestones and deliverables related to WP1. In this context, a discussion on the number of reviewers and deadlines of the deliverables and milestones delivered so far took place. The only deliverable that is not on track is the updated version of D2.2; the Project Officer is already informed about this. Moreover, Dr Nikas informed the consortium about the new Project Officer who will be supervising the whole process. The project's administration</p>	<p>Update contact lists</p> <p>Sign in to the project's newsletter</p>	<p>All partners</p> <p>All partners</p>

	<p>already had a meeting with him and he seemed happy about the scientific publications as well as the monthly updates sent to the EC.</p> <p>The next section of Dr Nikas' presentation delved into Task 1.2 and the project's visual identity. There are many template options for presentations. Furthermore, the project's website is ready but it is constantly improved and updated. Its main features of it were also presented to the consortium. In this context, Dr Nikas requested that all partners sign in to the project's newsletter and that they also circulate this request to other stakeholders.</p> <p>Another issue summarised was the progress in Task 1.3. Regarding this, all partners are now familiar with the MS SharePoint data exchange platform. Apart from that, Dr Nikas briefed the partners on the planning of the following meetings. Lastly, he requested that every e-mail communication regarding the project should also carbon-copy (CC) him, Ms Natasha Frilingou (NTUA) and/or the project's e-mail account.</p> <p>The last matter discussed about WP1 was Task 1.4 focusing on the SAB synthesis, of which the 5 members have already signed the non-disclosure agreement and 4 others have confirmed their will to do so.</p>		
WP2	<p>The meeting continued with Mr Conall Heussaff (Bruegel) taking the floor and presenting an overview of WP2 focusing on the PRM's progress and structure as well as the deliverables that have already been delivered and the ones that will be composed in the future. Afterwards, he focused on Deliverable 2.2 presenting a sample of policy-relevant research questions provided by project stakeholders. Afterwards, Mr Heussaff informed the consortium of the next steps and future actions of WP2 focusing on the interaction between the models and the PRM.</p> <p>Afterwards, Mr Heussaff, Dr Nikas and Dr Ajay Gambhir (Imperial) discussed the energy crisis analysis, the involvement of stakeholders and the role of the RPM. They also discussed the best way to use the analysis results in the project's WPs. This conversation was continued by Dr Nikas, Dr Gambhir and Dr Shivika Mittal (Imperial) discussing the allocation of work between WPs 2, 3 &amp; 4.</p> <p>Another issue raised by Dr Georg Zachmann is the publication of new NECPs from EU member-states by summer which will set up more ambitious and consistent goals. In this discussion, Dr Nikas, Dr Gambhir and Mr Heussaff also participated and there was a suggestion to use models to examine the consistency of the new NECPs. In this context, Dr Vasilis Stavrakas (UPRC) mentioned that UPRC has already done some relevant work.</p> <p>Moreover, Mr Heussaff informed the partners about the planning of stakeholder meetings and the participation of modelling teams in them. He also mentioned that the participants from the modelling teams will be determined in the following weeks.</p> <p>The last issue discussed regarding WP2 was its interaction with WP6 regarding the increase in stakeholder participation and possible feedback on the CDE plan. This matter was</p>	<p>Modelling exercises on the new NECPs</p> <p>Plan the following stakeholder meetings</p>	<p>All modelling partners</p> <p>Bruegel</p>



	<p>raised by Ms Sophia Theodoropoulou (UPRC) and Mr Heussaff proposed a bilateral call between UPRC and Bruegel partners before organising any workshops.</p> <p>Before moving to WP3, Prof. Sonia Yeh (SAB) took the floor to introduce herself and greet the partners as a member of the SAB. Dr Nikas thanked her for her presence at the GA meeting.</p>		
WP3	<p>Dr Nikas took the floor once again and proceeded with the presentation of WP3 on the timeline of the project. Afterwards, Dr Gambhir summarised Task 3.1 and the ARGOS Data Management Plan (DMP), demonstrating the consortium’s next steps towards this issue focusing on the draft protocol that will be prepared. In this discussion, Dr Nikas added that the NTUA administration team is already familiar with the ARGOS system and that two DMP deliverables will be prepared, one for each modelling cycle. He also mentioned that there is already a prepared template for Zenodo uploads.</p> <p>Dr Hesam Ghadaksaz (Aalto) continued the presentation of WP3, overviewing Task 3.2, summarising its objectives, deliverables and the structure of D3.4. He, then, briefed the consortium on the databases used for model categorisation (e.g. I<sup>2</sup>AM PARIS and IAMC). Lastly, he presented some types of categorisation such as the analytical approach used in each model. The presentation of Task 3.2 was concluded by Mr Behzad Zamanipour (Aalto) who summarised the review of the state-of-the-art regarding model linking, focusing on technical aspects such as system boundaries and the scope of harmonisation.</p> <p>The discussion then moved to Task 3.3 about Open Science and Dr Dirk-Jan van de Ven (BC3) took the floor in order to present an overview of the FAIR principles, focusing on the preliminary planning of Task 3.3, aiming to use the proper infrastructure (e.g. GitHub and Zenodo) and go beyond FAIR. Next, Dr Nikas proceeded to Task 3.4, briefing the consortium on the modelling seminars that took place. These seminars are available on the project’s YouTube channel as well as in the I2AM PARIS platform as part of the model documentation (accompanied by pdf slides), which has been updated and broadened with new models. He, then, presented the next steps on the platform as well as the timeline and the new workspaces that are planned. Another matter presented by Dr Nikas was the synergies with other projects, which can be distinguished into three categories. He also mentioned that a milestone report is planned to be delivered in M8, providing an extensive report on this issue. In this context, Dr Stavrakas suggested that the H2020 ENCLUDE project is included in the synergies planning but Dr Nikas replied that the European Commission prefers to focus on Horizon Europe project synergies and then they had a brief discussion on updating the current documentation and Dr Stavrakas suggested to consider synergies with ECEMF. Finally, Dr Mittal and Dr Nikas had a short discussion regarding vetting processes.</p>	Prepare a draft protocol for data management	NTUA, Imperial

WP4	<p>After a short break, Dr Gambhir took the floor to present the progress on WP4 so far, beginning with the position of WP4 on the project’s timeline. He then summarised the preparatory tasks and deliverables required for the 1<sup>st</sup> modelling cycle. Afterwards, Ms Frilingou presented the progress of the energy crisis analysis, which is split into 3 scenarios on cutting-off Russian natural gas. The scenarios were modelled with the GCAM, MUSE, TIAM and PROMETHEUS models and will be soft-linked with the EXPANSE, EXIOBASE, DREEM and ATOM models in M7 and M8. She also presented some graphs of the results of the analysis so far. These results demonstrated a significant reduction in Russian imports and a lower natural gas price (compared to default scenarios). In this context, Dr Gambhir commented on the variations presented in the results of GCAM and PROMETHEUS, with Ms Frilingou replying that these issues will be solved in the following days. Afterwards, Dr Zachmann, Dr Nikas and Ms Frilingou had a discussion regarding the macroeconomic details of these models and how can these results can provide feedback for stakeholder questions. Specifically, Dr Nikas and Ms Frilingou informed the consortium that macroeconomic data will be examined later on with macroeconomic models and that a full presentation of the results will be provided to Bruegel shortly. In this context, Dr Mittal and Dr Gambhir suggested that comments from Bruegel can be considered and to arrange a meeting next week to further discuss results, after re-running the models. Moreover, Dr Panagiotis Fragkos (E3M) proposed to include some more indicators before the re-runs and Dr Nikas suggested a timeline for the re-runs and the following meeting regarding the energy crisis analysis.</p> <p>Afterwards, Ms Noelia Ferreras Alonso (CARTIF) took the floor and briefed the consortium on the progress of Task 4.1, focusing on the task’s objectives and milestones as well as D4.1 which is scheduled to be delivered in March 2023. Then, she presented the progress so far as well as the next steps that must be taken, concluding that a draft version of the deliverable must be ready by the 10<sup>th</sup> of March. In this context, Ms Noelia, Dr Gambhir, Dr Zachman and Dr Mittal discussed ideas on how to proceed with the 1<sup>st</sup> policy cycle. Specifically, Dr Zachmann suggested that the process must be more inclusive and Dr Mittal suggested that the process used for the energy crisis analysis can be used for this process as well.</p> <p>Then, the discussion proceeded to Task 4.2 and Dr Jan Ivar Korsbakken (CICERO) started his presentation with the principles of the broad scenario logic (e.g. common starting point for all models). Next, he presented some factors regarding the harmonisation of models and then he summarised the elements of the broad scenario logic. Such elements are the technology assumptions, the climate emulation, the historical data used, etc. The last issue discussed regarding Task 4.2 was the survey on mapping consortium needs focusing on model calibration and the modellers’ previous experience.</p> <p>The next issue discussed was D4.3 which will have two</p>	<p>Further modelling runs on the energy crisis analysis and soft-linking with other models</p> <p>Prepare a presentation on the energy crisis analysis</p> <p>Re-run the models</p> <p>Arrange a meeting for discussion</p> <p>Prepare a draft for D4.1</p> <p>Preparation of the modellers’ survey</p> <p>Prepare the first version of D4.3</p> <p>Participation in the EMP-A modelling seminars</p> <p>Participation in the Joint Summer School on Modelling Tools seminars</p>	<p>All modelling teams</p> <p>Imperial, NTUA</p> <p>Imperial, BC3, E3M</p> <p>NTUA, Bruegel, Imperial, BC3, E3M</p> <p>CARTIF</p> <p>CICERO</p> <p>Imperial</p> <p>AAiT, TUM</p> <p>RUSL, KEI, AAiT, TUM</p>
-----	--	---	--

	<p>versions, one delivered in May 2023 and one on M23. In this context, Dr Gambhir suggested that the survey can be in excel form and then he proceeded by summarising the next steps and the longer-term planning for this deliverable.</p> <p>Lastly, Dr Nikas and Prof. Viktoria Martin (KTH) discussed the modelling seminars that will take place in the upcoming months. They focused on the Energy Modelling Platform for Africa (EMP-A) seminars that will take place in April, for which Prof. Martin provided more details and Dr Nikas suggested that African partners participate in these seminars. Afterwards, they also discussed the Joint Summer School on Modelling Tools that will take place in Trieste, Italy. Once again, Dr Nikas suggested that all case study partners participate in these seminars. He also mentioned that both events are built on OpenLearn courses which are totally online.</p>		
Wrap-up Day 1	In conclusion, Dr Nikas thanked all the partners for their participation on the Day 1 of the GA meeting and he briefed them on the agenda for Day 2.		
<b>Day II: Progress on WP5-6 &amp; SAB meeting</b>			
WP5	<p>Day 2 started with Dr Nikas greeting the consortium partners and the SAB members that joined the meeting from the beginning. Before proceeding to WP5, Ms Sureka Perera (SAB) introduced herself and presented her experience. Afterwards, Dr Nikas briefed her on the project's structure and objectives.</p> <p>Next, Dr Fragkos took the floor and commenced the presentation of WP5, informing the partners on how it fits in the overall project and about its goals. Afterwards, he briefed the consortium on the WP's tasks and informed them that it starts in March, hence the discussion will focus on planning actions. Then, he presented the linkages of WP5 with other WPs as well as the timeline of WP5, which is separated into 3 phases, with each phase focusing on different Tasks as the project progresses.</p> <p>After this brief presentation of the whole WP, Dr Fragkos proceeded to present Task 5.1. His presentation demonstrated which steps of the Task will be completed each month.</p> <p>Afterwards, Dr Xaquin Garcia (BC3) took the floor and briefly presented the linkages between models and the expected results of Task 5.2, focusing on the distributive analysis and gender impacts. In this context, Dr Fragkos presented the book chapter published in Elsevier from NTUA and E3M on energy poverty and just transition.</p> <p>Then, the discussion moved to Task 5.3, focusing on out-of-ordinary extremes. Dr Fragkos briefed the consortium on its structure and then Dr Gambhir stressed the project's aim to link its efforts with the 7<sup>th</sup> Assessment of IPCC.</p> <p>Afterwards, Dr Fragkos continued by presenting the objectives of Tasks 5.4 and 5.5 and then he focused on Task 5.5, analysing how it fits to the project's pipeline as well as the work that must be done each month. He specifically mentioned that there will be two modelling cycles, the first one spanning from M7 to M18 and the second one running</p>		

	<p>on the rest of the project timeline.</p> <p>Then, Dr Nikas took the floor and presented the subtasks of Task 5.6, which will kick off mainly after M12.</p> <p>The last issue discussed regarding WP5 was Task 5.7 which will start after M19 and its planning was presented by Dr Fragkos analysing the steps taken each month. Afterwards, he summarised the planning for deliverables and milestones and he also briefed the consortium on the next steps. In this context, Dr Mittal and Dr Fragkos discussed the synchronisation of WPs, with the former stressing the need not to overlap WPs 4 &amp; 5.</p>		
WP6	<p>Next, Prof. Martin took the floor and summarised WP6, focusing on its objectives and tasks. She also presented the deliverables pipeline and their interactions, stating the D6.1 is already under review from project partners. She also informed the consortium about the WP's milestone to include introductory modelling courses in the project's website by M18.</p> <p>In this context, Dr Stavrakas continued the meeting by presenting the key points of discussion regarding Task 6.1. He briefed the consortium on the monthly steps of the task and its progress, mentioning that the KPIs are demonstrating good progress so far, stressing the impact of the project's LinkedIn account. Afterwards, he briefed the partners on the project's logo, banners, poster etc as well as the project's social media accounts, mentioning also the frequency of posts on each social media platform. Then, he started a discussion on the social media followers and the activity KPIs and he also requested that all partners follow the project's account and they promote the social media channels. Another topic discussed was the project's newsletters, and focus was given on the first newsletter that is being prepared, the distribution strategy as well as GDPR concerns. Afterwards, Ms Theodoropoulou informed the partners about the CDE monitoring table, available in the project's SharePoint. Partners should update the table with their social media activity regarding the project. She also presented the partner's monitoring system which will track accountability and improvement in two reporting periods. Then, she overviewed the KPIs monitoring process. In this context, Dr Stavrakas summarised the CDE points of discussion such as the social media strategy, the KPIs fine-tuning etc, as already previously discussed. Dr Nikas intervened stressing that the KPIs cannot be changed since they are a part of the grant agreement so the project's CDE planning should stick to them. He also mentioned that the project should deliver each month a newsletter or a press release. Finally, he stressed that there is no Green open-access option for publication in the Horizon Europe projects. Afterwards, Mr Wolfgang Obergassel (WI) proposed that the CDE strategy focuses more on social media than newsletters but he also mentioned that if the newsletters are part of the Grant Agreement the consortium must comply with what is agreed upon. Then, he and Ms Theodoropoulou discussed the monitoring process. In this context, Prof. Alexandros Flamos (UPRC) stressed that ticking the boxes of the CDE plan is not the main concern of</p>	<p>Review of D6.1 and deliver its final version</p> <p>Prepare the 1<sup>st</sup> newsletter</p> <p>Frequently update monitoring table</p> <p>Accelerate Instagram and Twitter activity</p> <p>Report to NTUA administration on the options for fully open-access publications</p> <p>Pilot countries submit to modelling seminars</p> <p>Organise the joint workshop for pilot countries</p> <p>Organise the Kenyan workshop</p>	<p>UPRC</p> <p>UPRC</p> <p>All partners</p> <p>UPRC</p> <p>All partners</p> <p>AAiT, RUSL, KEI, TUM, KTH</p> <p>AAiT, RUSL, KEI, TUM, KTH, WI</p> <p>TUM</p>

the scientific community and that in other projects they had reduced some outdated CDE requirements after discussions with project officers and proposed to discuss the CDE strategy in next meetings. Then, Dr Nikas replied that 2-3 posts per week is a good target and there can be no trade-offs to what is agreed upon. Next, Prof. Doukas informed the consortium that project officers are waiting for the newsletters to get informed about the project's progress but NTUA sends them separate updates to keep them on track. He also mentioned that newsletters are highly appreciated by the Commission and the consortium partners. Then, he stressed the need to accelerate the frequency of posts on Twitter and Instagram and he proposed a set of ideas such as infographics and Twitter campaigns for specific events. Lastly, Prof. Flamos proposed to focus on the CDE strategy and strive for balanced activity.

Afterwards, Dr Nikas proceeded to Task 6.2 presenting two infographics that are already available on the project's website. Next, he moved to Task 6.3 briefing the consortium on the new EC guidelines regarding scientific publication, requiring papers to be submitted only as fully open-access. Hence, the consortium should develop a strategy to determine which journals can the research work derived from the project be published in. In this context, he also summarised the papers that have been published so far acknowledging the project. Then, Dr Nikas and Dr Gambhir discussed the Nature Portfolio journals regarding the new publication policy.

Mr Obergassel took the floor and briefed the consortium on the objectives and deliverables of Task 6.4. He also mentioned MS5 regarding semi-formal country sheets and D6.6. Lastly, he stressed that the typology of enablers and barriers should build on IPCC Working Group 3.

The last issue discussed regarding WP6 was Task 6.5 and the discussion started with Prof. Martin briefing the partners on the initial dialogue with TUM regarding Kenya becoming the first case for national development programmes. Then, she presented the task's next actions, focusing on the EMP-A and the Joint Summer School for Modelling Tools seminars, as discussed on Day 1 as well, adding that KTH will support case study countries to submit to these seminars. Next, she proposed that the consortium should think about the training sessions, the milestone on introductory modellings courses and the links with other WPs. In the context of Task 6.5, she also mentioned that the partners should discuss the joint workshop with the pilot countries and especially the linkages between Tasks 6.4 and 6.5 as well as the division of work among partners. Then, Prof. Ioannis Tsipouridis (TUM) informed the consortium about the Kenyan workshop that will take place in August as well as the Africa Climate Summit, which will be hosted in Nairobi, Kenya in September 2023. He specifically proposed that he could participate and talk about IAM COMPACT. Prof. Doukas and Prof. Martin replied that this is a great opportunity and that an offline discussion should take place to decide how to promote the project through this activity Dr Nikas mentioned that this summit has

	<p>great timing with the project's Kenyan workshop in August. Afterwards, Dr Nikas and Dr Zachmann discussed the communication with the Ukrainian partners due to the current situation. In this context, Dr Borys Dodonov (KEI) informed the consortium that although security in Ukraine may be improved stakeholders focus on energy security, hence they do not seem interested in modelling at the moment. Then he started a discussion on the sustainable recovery of the country's energy sector mentioning that an energy strategy draft will be published soon. Lastly, Dr Nikas proposed that all pilot partners participate in the modelling seminars and Prof. Tsipouridis requested help on the letter of application for the EMP-A seminar.</p>		
SAB	<p>After the discussion on WP6, the meeting proceeded to the SAB session which start with Prof. Diana Reckien (SAB) and Prof. Anthony Patt (SAB) introducing themselves and briefly presenting their experience and the projects they have participated in lately. Afterwards, Prof. Patt started a discussion on the role of models in policymaking. He also mentioned that he does not prefer IAMs but more narrow models. Then, Dr Nikas replied that this strictness is one of the reasons that Prof. Patt was invited to be part of the SAB. Next, Ms. Perera re-introduced herself and summarised the current situation in Sri Lanka regarding the energy sector and the economy in general.</p> <p>Afterwards, Prof. Doukas thanked the SAB members for their participation in the project and mentioned that the consortium will focus on exploiting their feedback. In this context, Dr Nikas said that the project is still in its preparatory phase with no significant scientific impacts, hence there was no significant need to communicate with the SAB until now. He also proposed that the consortium will provide them with policy briefs and other material for their feedback.</p> <p>Then, Dr Nikas commenced the presentation of the project, starting by mentioning the project's duration and partners and summarising the project's objectives. Next, he briefed the SAB on the modelling ensemble used in the project as well as its 5 components and the 4 pilot countries. Furthermore, he summarised the projects in which each partner has participated and the Horizon Europe ecosystem of relevant projects. Afterwards, he presented an overview of the project's progress regarding issues such as the policy-relevant research questions, the modelling seminars and the CDE activities. He concluded his presentation by demonstrating the final synthesis of the SAB.</p> <p>After Dr Nikas' presentation ended, Prof. Riecken advised the consortium to focus on internal communication due to the multitude of partners to delve into content-related aspects apart from progress discussions. She also advised the partners to arrange physical meetings. Lastly, she stated that the project can produce very interesting outcomes and that she is happy to engage further. Then Dr Nikas informed the SAB that the consortium updates the Commission monthly and that the same will take place with the SAB members.</p> <p>Then, Prof. Patt took the floor stressing the fact that the project has many ambitious goals, which can be an issue</p>		

	<p>since many EU projects fail to achieve all their goals, mainly the most ambitious ones. He also advised the consortium to think critically about the information coming out of the models and how it can be used. Dr Nikas replied that the consortium is aware that IAM COMPACT is a big and ambitious project with many models and that all partners aim to produce meaningful results for policy briefs and not only for peer-reviewed papers. In this context, the partners from Bruegel, through stakeholder engagement, try to use the project's outcomes to go beyond "science for science". Dr Nikas also mentioned that the consortium is aware that it is not easy to use the variety of available models.</p> <p>Next, Ms Theodoropoulou suggested that the consortium includes SAB members in its dissemination efforts. Dr Nikas replied that the SAB members are welcome to help but they have no obligation to do so.</p> <p>Afterwards, Dr Nikas, Dr Gambhir and Prof. Patt had a short discussion on their experience with models in other projects. Then, Dr Nikas mentioned that during the lifetime of the PARIS REINFORCE project, there was an issue with SAB interaction due to the COVID-19 restrictions and he stressed that the IAM COMPACT consortium should focus to achieve higher interaction.</p> <p>Lastly, he summarised what was discussed during the SAB session and thanked all the SAB members for participating in this GA meeting.</p>		
Q&A, Feedback	<p>As soon as the SAB session ended, Prof. Martin stressed that it is important to keep the SAB updated so there is no need to update them during the GA meetings, without exhausting them though with extensive reports. In this context, Prof. Flamos, Dr Nikas and Dr Zachmann intervened highlighting the importance of the policy briefs, which can be used for SAB updates as well. Dr Nikas also suggested that each SAB member can be updated more closely to their field of expertise and be mapped to specific activities in order not to overwhelm them with information. Then, Prof. Martin proposed that the consortium can ask the SAB members about what they want to be involved in. Lastly, on this topic, Prof. Doukas agreed that they should be engaged with specific areas in accordance with the Grant Agreement.</p> <p>Next, Dr Nikas informed the consortium that the payments are on track and that if there are any delays partners should inform the NTUA administration. In this context, Ms Frilingou added that there are no other administrative issues.</p> <p>The last matter discussed was the energy crisis analysis which will be ready by early March, as Dr Nikas informed the consortium. He also added that it would be a great opportunity to submit it in the 2040 climate target discussion that the EC will organise. The deadline is in April. In this context, there is also the capability to use outputs from PARIS REINFORCE to enhance the existing analysis. Lastly, Dr Nikas thanked all the consortium members participating in this GA.</p>	Prepare a deliverable for the 2040 climate goal target that the EC is organising	All modelling partners

## 3.5 Executive Board Meeting – 28 March 2023

### 3.5.1 Agenda

**Executive Board Meeting**  
**Tuesday, 28 March, 2022**  
**14:00-15:00 CEST**

*Microsoft Teams ([Link](#))*

**Participants:** All Partners

#### Agenda

1. Update on project progress (completed, ongoing, upcoming tasks & deliverables)
  - WP1: Project Management
    - Partners not yet paid (actions pending!)
    - Next (hybrid) project GA meeting in September?
  - WP2: Listening
    - D2.2: Scoping policy relevant Research Questions (Bruegel) – UP
  - WP3: Exchanging
    - Model interlinkages meeting (March 20-23, 2023, TBC)
    - D3.4: Model interlinkages and integration (Aalto) – April 2023
    - MS4: Plan on collaboration and synergies (NTUA) – April 2023
  - WP4: Modelling
    - D4.1: From policy needs to scenario frameworks (CARTIF) – March 2023
    - Energy crisis (NTUA, several partners) – progress
    - EC's request on EU climate target for 2040 – end of April 2023
    - D4.3: Broad scenario logic (CICERO) – May 2023
  - WP5: Expanding
    - WP5 kick-off meeting aftermath, next steps (March 23, 2023)
  - WP6: Explaining
    - Task 6.4 & 6.5 coordination (KTH, WI)
    - Kenya workshop back-to-back with African Summit (Aug-Sep)?
2. Pending requests (outstanding pre-financing transfers) – NTUA
3. Next meetings (GA/consortium meeting, Kenya workshop, etc.) – All partners
4. Any other business



### 3.5.2 Minutes

Present on Call	Name and Surname	Organisation
1	Alexandros Nikas	NTUA
2	Anastasios Karamaneas	NTUA
3	Ilkka Keppo	Aalto
4	Jakoc Zinck Thellufsen	AAU
5	Rasmus Magni Johannsen	AAU
6	Dirk-Jan van de Ven	BC3
7	Conall Heussaff	Bruegel
8	Jan Ivar Korsbakken	CICERO
9	Glen Peters	CICERO
10	Panagiotis Fragkos	E3M
11	Eleftheria Zisarou	E3M
12	Francesco Gardumi	KTH
13	Lorenzo Rinaldi	POLIMI
14	Vassilis Stavrakas	UPRC
15	Nikolaos Kleanthis	UPRC
16	Jaime Nieto	UVa
17	Georg Holtz	WI
18	Zongfei Wang	WI
19	Saritha Vishwanathan	IIMA
20	Jyoti Maheswari	IIMA
21	Yu Wang	THU
22	Ioannis Tsipouridis	TUM
23	Jan-Philipp Sasse	UNIGE
24	Ajay Gambhir	Imperial
25	Shivika Mittal	Imperial

#### Minutes: Main issues discussed

Item	Description	Action	
		What	Who
WP1	<p>Dr Alexandros Nikas (NTUA) commenced the meeting by greeting the consortium. The first issue he posed was the fact that some partners have still not signed the Consortium Agreement, hence some payments may be missing.</p> <p>The next issue discussed was the date and location of the next General Assembly (GA) meeting. The main idea is that it takes place in a hybrid form in Kenya at the end of August or the beginning of September. In this context, Prof. Ioannis Tsipouridis (TUM) mentioned that they have already done some planning since a capacity-building workshop will take place in TUM at the end of August in the scope of WP6. He also stated that they intend to make the workshop as inclusive as possible. Next, Dr Francesco Gardumi (KTH) took the floor informing the partners that TUM and KTH are working on the workshop's agenda. It will take place in the last week of August in Mombasa, Kenya and it will be a few days workshop. Partners from POLIMI as well as the case study countries will participate. Moreover, Prof. Tsipouridis stressed that the consortium should strive for stakeholder engagement even before the workshop. In this context, Dr Nikas proposed that if the GA is somehow linked to the</p>	<p>CA signing</p> <p>Finalise the agenda of the capacity-building workshop</p> <p>Discussion on the organisation of the GA in Mombasa</p>	<p>Remaining partners</p> <p>TUM, KTH</p> <p>NTUA, TUM</p>

	<p>workshop it would be more realistic to organise the GA parallelly to the climate summit (taking place in Nairobi at the beginning of September) to maximise participation in the GA. Then, he suggested that a meeting takes place in the next few weeks to discuss this issue. Prof. Tsipouridis mentioned that the workshop will begin on Monday the 28<sup>th</sup> of August (Dr Gardumi mentioned that this date is locked) and Dr Nikas suggested that it would be convenient if the GA took place on Thursday/Friday depending on the workshop's agenda. Moreover, Dr Nikas and Prof. Ilkka Keppo (Aalto) had a short discussion on how the GA and the workshop can be intertwined, with Dr Nikas suggesting that if few partners participate in the workshop Kenya may not be the best idea for the GA. Nevertheless, Prof. Tsipouridis stressed that TUM is capable of hosting the GA back-to-back with the workshop. The discussion closed with Prof. Jakob Zinck Thellufsen (AAU) proposing that if the GA does not take place in Kenya it should not take place back-to-back with the workshop since many partners would want to participate in the climate summit in Nairobi.</p>		
WP2	<p>Next, Mr Conall Heussaff (Bruegel) took the floor and briefed the consortium on the progress of WP2. First, he mentioned that stakeholder meetings led to a slight delay regarding the results of the Policy Steering processes. Then, he mentioned that non-EU partners have been very responsive so far with partners from TUM and KEI already communicating with stakeholders. He also proposed that a meeting is organised in a couple of weeks to further organises this process. In this context, Dr Nikas proposed that the consortium should not wait for all meetings to further proceed since this may jeopardise the whole mechanism. Next, Dr Gardumi and Mr Heussaff had a brief discussion on the feedback from RUSL and AAiT partners, who have also contacted stakeholders but have not received any feedback yet. They also discussed Bruegel's participation in the Kenyan workshop. Lastly, Dr Nikas briefed the partners on the deliverables' timeline.</p>	<p>Set up a meeting for WP2 stakeholder engagement</p>	<p>NTUA, Bruegel</p>
WP3	<p>Prof. Keppo took the floor and informed the partners that a meeting for WP3 will take place on the 3<sup>rd</sup> of April. He also pinpointed the overlap between Task 4.1 and Task 3.2 since both Tasks focus on models, but with different scopes, mentioning that there is a deadline for input by Friday the 31<sup>st</sup> of March. Prof. Keppo also stated that research questions affect models and how they will be used in the project's context. Next, Dr Nikas mentioned that in the second iteration, the consortium may have the opportunity to better time all processes. He also stressed that typologies should be set and that models should be mapped according to these typologies in order to examine which models are more relevant and how scenarios can be set, a process which can also help the Policy Response Mechanism. In this context, Prof. Keppo stressed that the consortium should focus on the typologies and spend more time on them to further enhance the second modelling cycle. Nevertheless, the timing problem is also evident in the second cycle since the deliverable for the research questions is close to the discussed deliverable of the second cycle. Lastly, Dr Shivika Mittal (Imperial) and</p>	<p>Set model typologies  Prepare MS4</p>	<p>All modelling partners, Aalto  NTUA</p>

	<p>Dr Nikas briefly discussed the creation of a relevant workspace in the I<sup>2</sup>AM PARIS platform.</p> <p>The previous thorough discussion also covered all the relevant matters regarding D3.4.</p> <p>Dr Nikas closed the discussion on WP3 by mentioning that Milestone 4 (scheduled for April) is a simple task which should focus on sister projects and that will resemble a strategy.</p>		
WP4	<p>Afterwards, Dr Ajay Gambhir (Imperial) took the floor and informed the consortium that WP4 deliverables are under progress with the two first being delivered by the end of March and May respectively. Dr Nikas mentioned that D4.1 has received good reviews, and is already submitted meeting most of the expected outcomes. He also stressed the importance of tracking changes and not deleting comments during the internal review process to simplify the reviewer's work.</p> <p>Moreover, Dr Gambhir stressed that the consortium has to complete an analysis of the EU's 2040 target by the end of April. Next, Dr Nikas, Dr Mittal and Dr Gambhir had a brief discussion regarding the energy crisis study. They mentioned that a brief will be available in April and that the study will be accompanied by an analysis of the PARIS REINFORCE project that is still active. In this context, Dr Nikas informed the partners that he and Dr Mittal will participate in an event on diagnostics organised by the EC to represent PARIS REINFORCE and IAM COMPACT projects.</p> <p>Next, Dr Nikas, Dr Mittal and Dr Gambhir had a brief discussion regarding the energy crisis study. They mentioned that a brief will be available in April and that the study will be accompanied by an analysis of the PARIS REINFORCE project that is still active. In this context, Dr Nikas informed the partners that he and Dr Mittal will participate in an event on diagnostics organised by the EC to represent PARIS REINFORCE and IAM COMPACT projects.</p> <p>Next, Dr Nikas, Dr Mittal and Dr Gambhir had a brief discussion regarding the energy crisis study. They mentioned that a brief will be available in April and that the study will be accompanied by an analysis of the PARIS REINFORCE project that is still active. In this context, Dr Nikas informed the partners that he and Dr Mittal will participate in an event on diagnostics organised by the EC to represent PARIS REINFORCE and IAM COMPACT projects.</p> <p>The last issue discussed regarding WP4 was D4.3 on the broad scenario logic. Dr Jan Ivar Korsbakken (CICERO) informed the consortium that the deliverable is progressing as planned, as partners have already provided their input. He mentioned that this deliverable aims to set the scenario logic, focusing on assumptions and data that will be used without diving into specific narrow scenarios. Dr Mittal proposed that the consortium should work on calibration and harmonisation for a week before delivering D4.3 and Dr Korsbakken proposed that a first draft will be available by the start of May and in this stage, reviewers can make recommendations on calibration and harmonisation and if everything is OK the draft can be finalised.</p>	<p>Prepare the EU 2040 target analysis</p> <p>Finalise the energy crisis study and prepare a relevant brief</p> <p>Prepare a first draft of D4.3</p>	<p>All modelling partners</p> <p>NTUA, all modelling partners</p> <p>CICERO</p>

WP5	Next, Dr Panagiotis Fragkos (E3M) took the floor and informed the partners that the WP's kick-off meeting took place this month and that tasks are already in progress. Specifically, regarding Task 5.1, he mentioned that the collection of data from the Green Recovery Packages of EU countries has already started and that the Consortium intends to proceed to the data collection for non-EU countries as well. Lastly, he stressed that mapping policy questions with WP5 tasks is important to examine if they can reply to these questions.	Green Recovery Packages data collection	E3M, all partners
WP6	Dr Gardumi immediately proceeded to the joint meeting for Tasks 6.4 and 6.5 since the workshop and possible GA hosting were already thoroughly discussed during the session on WP1. He proposed that a joint meeting is organised every two months. He also stated that the research framework from WP4 works properly for WP6. Lastly, he suggested that a timeline for deliverables of Tasks 6.4 and 6.5 must be set with an ending date on M24. The meeting concluded with Dr Vasilis Stavrakas (UPRC) informing the consortium that CDE activities are in progress and that the second newsletter is already being prepared.	Organise the next joint meeting for Tasks 6.4 and 6.5  Finalise the second newsletter	KTH  UPRC, NTUA

## 3.6 Executive Board Meeting – 23 May 2023

### 3.6.1 Agenda

**Executive Board Meeting**  
**Tuesday, 23 May, 2023**  
**14:00-15:00 CEST**

*Microsoft Teams ([Link](#))*

**Participants:** All Partners

#### Agenda

1. Update on project progress (completed, ongoing, upcoming tasks & deliverables)
  - WP1: Project Management
    - Next (hybrid) project GA meeting in August– Kenya?
    - EC target planning 2040 update
    - List of reviewers for upcoming deliverables
  - WP2: Listening
    - Core working groups & stakeholder workshops (Bruegel) – May, June 2023
    - First PRM cycle entire timeline (Bruegel, NTUA) – (M6 – M21)
  - WP3: Exchanging
    - D3.6: Open science protocols (BC3) – June 2023
  - WP4: Modelling
    - First modelling cycle: RQGs (Imperial)
    - D4.3: Broad scenario logic (CICERO) – May 2023
    - Tasks 4.3, 4.4, 4.5 coordination (Imperial, WI, UNIGE)
  - WP5: Expanding,
    - Progress (E3M)
  - WP6: Explaining
    - Task 6.4 & 6.5 coordination (KTH, WI)
    - Kenya workshop back-to-back with African Summit (28 Aug – 01 Sep)
2. Next meetings (GA/consortium meeting, Kenya workshop, etc.) – All partners
3. Any other business

### 3.6.2 Minutes

Present on Call	Name and Surname	Organisation
1	Alexandros Nikas	NTUA
2	Anastasios Karamaneas	NTUA
3	Anastasia Frilingou	NTUA
4	Ilkka Keppo	Aalto
5	Claudia Rodes	BC3
6	Russel Horowitz	BC3
7	Jon Sampedro	BC3
8	Conall Heussaff	Bruegel
9	Noelia Ferreras-Alonso	CARTIF
10	Jan Ivar Korsbakken	CICERO
11	Eftychia Ntostoglou	KTH
12	Francesco Gardumi	KTH
13	Lorenzo Rinaldi	POLIMI
14	Zongfei Wang	UNIGE
15	Vassilis Stavrakas	UPRC
16	Nikolaos Kleanthis	UPRC
17	Jaime Nieto	UVa
18	Wolfgang Obergassel	WI
19	Zongfei Wang	WI
20	Saritha Vishwanathan	IIMA
21	Jyoti Maheswari	IIMA
22	Solomon Teferi	AAIT
23	Tianpeng Wang	THU
24	Ioannis Tsiouridis	TUM
25	Ajay Gambhir	Imperial
26	Shivika Mittal	Imperial

#### Minutes: Main issues discussed

Item	Description	Action	
		What	Who
WP1	Dr Alexandros Nikas (NTUA) started the meeting by mentioning IAM COMPACT's contribution to the EC 2040 target planning process, with one policy brief and one pre-print, the latter focusing more explicitly on 2030/2050 targets while the former analysing the impact of completely shutting-off Russian pipeline gas in Europe. Ms Natasha Frilingou (NTUA) reminded partners that in case of unavailability to review the next round of deliverables as prescribed in the weekly update, they should let NTUA asap. Finally, Dr Nikas briefly mentioned the upcoming GA meeting and workshops planned in August in Mombassa, Kenya, as NTUA will soon circulate a participant list to be filled by all.	Participant list for GA / workshops	NTUA, TUM
WP2	Mr Heussaff (Bruegel) took the floor and quickly mentioned that PRM questions (22) were finally summed into 7 distinct studies and allocated to 4 different themes, which will be used to coordinate CWG discussion. The next urgent step is to assign EU-study leads to start organising the CWG planned in June. For the Non-EU meetings with stakeholders: There is progress on meeting with local stakeholders, and discussions	Organise CWG	Bruegel



	<p>are ongoing.</p> <p>Dr Francesco Gardumi (KTH) mentioned that the people involved in the capacity building workshops (policymakers) should also be involved in the CWG – not explicitly but should probably be the first to be part of the discussions in WP2 to which Mr Heussaff agreed.</p>		
WP3	<p>Dr Jon Sampedro (BC3) took the floor to mention that D3.6 is in the internal review process and will be delivered in time as planned.</p>	D3.6 for review (02/Jun/2023)	BC3
WP4	<p>Dr Ajay Gambhir (Imperial) took the floor, and explained that assigning leads to each of the proposed studies is currently the bottleneck in the 1<sup>st</sup> Modelling Cycle. He presented all 7 modelling studies to the consortium (here) and explained which leads are not yet finalised. For study 6, there is a paper under review led by CMCC with Imperial and BC3 as contributors. The question is therefore whether we have more things to add to the study already submitted to qualify for a whole new analysis.</p> <p>Challenge: 22 questions into 7 studies and fair allocation across partners</p> <p>Dr Nikas explained which modelling work can be actually claimed as part of IAM COMPACT. For example, the WACC paper can be reported in IAM COMPACT if not reported in any other project as part of deliverables (it can though if other relevant project was only acknowledged in the paper, as this is a form of synergy among different consortia)</p> <p>Dr Ilkka Keppo (Aalto) cautioned against disaggregating questions into studies that have already been dealt with, and not picking instead themes/questions that were not addressed anywhere.</p> <p>Dr Gambhir then said that it's almost impossible to address 22 questions (which we anyway didn't know ex-ante), but it was fortunate that we received questions already planned and in line with ongoing studies, to which Mr Nikas also agreed.</p>	<p>Reach out to Evelina (UNIGE) to confirm study lead for Studies 3</p> <p>Early next week: finalise study leads</p> <p>Finalise the scenario design</p>	<p>Imperial</p> <p>Proposed study leads / Imperial / NTUA</p> <p>Study leads (BC3, UVa, NTUA, Imperial, E3M, UNIGE)</p>
WP5	<p>E3M colleagues who lead this task were not present on the call.</p>	-	-
WP6	<p>Dr Vassilis Stavrakas (UPRC), Mr Heussaff and Dr Nikas quickly briefed the partners on the progress in Tasks 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3, with no foreseen issues regarding upcoming work and project KPIs.</p> <p>Dr Gardumi then spoke about Task 6.5, and the consideration of having teaching material (for models, concepts, the project methodology itself) into a standard format, proposing to use the Climate Compatible Project platform which is very user-friendly. Ms Frilingou asked whether already existing material can be easily transferred to the CCG website, with Dr Gardumi replying that a partner from KTH is working on the platform to see how integratable it is. He also mentioned that KTH is responsible for maintaining the training CCG platform, and thus can add IAM COMPACT and Horizon Europe acknowledgements as necessary. On Task 6.4, a detailed allocation of work has been prepared by WI for the creation of country sheets, which are expected as a first draft on December 2023. After gathering insights from country-</p>		

	<p>models (T6.5), the final sheets will be ready by April 2024. Finally, regarding capacity building, there is ongoing work on country-specific analysis for the pilot countries as well as hands-on training already held (EMP for Africa) and planned (ICTP Summer School, TUM Workshop). Regarding the GA in Mombassa: surveys have been sent out and the participation is positive so far.</p>		
--	--	--	--



## 3.7 Executive Board Meeting – 27 June 2023

### 3.7.1 Agenda

**Executive Board Meeting**  
**Tuesday, 27 June, 2023**  
**14:00-15:00 CEST**

*Microsoft Teams ([Link](#))*

**Participants:** All Partners

#### Agenda

1. Update on project progress (completed, ongoing, upcoming tasks & deliverables)
  - WP1: Project Management
    - Next (hybrid) project GA meeting in August– Kenya
    - D1.3: Report on Project and SAB Meetings (NTUA) – Aug 2023
  - WP2: Listening
    - Core working groups – progress and timeline (Bruegel)
  - WP3: Exchanging
    - D3.6: Open science protocols (BC3) – Jun 2023
    - I<sup>2</sup>AM PARIS updates (NTUA)
  - WP4: Modelling
    - First modelling cycle: PRM1 Studies (Imperial & Study leads)
    - Implementing the broad scenario logic (CICERO)
  - WP5: Expanding
    - Progress (E3M)
    - COVID-19 analysis (Task 5.1): setting up a plan (E3M)
    - Distributional impacts (Task 5.2): kick-off in July (BC3)
  - WP6: Explaining
    - Task 6.1 – progress so far (UPRC)
    - Task 6.4 & 6.5 coordination (KTH, WI)
    - Kenya workshop (28 Aug – 01 Sep)
2. Next meetings (GA/consortium meeting, Kenya workshop, etc.) – All partners
3. Any other business

### 3.7.2 Minutes

Present on Call	Name and Surname	Organisation
-----		



1	Alexandros Nikas	NTUA
2	Anastasios Karamaneas	NTUA
3	Natasha Frilingou	NTUA
4	Konstantinos Koasidis	NTUA
5	Themistoklis Koutsellis	NTUA
6	Ilkka Keppo	Aalto
7	Jakob Zinck Thellufsen	AAU
8	Claudia Rodes	BC3
9	Russel Horowitz	BC3
10	Jon Sampedro	BC3
11	Dirk-Jan van de Ven	BC3
12	Adrian Lauer	Bruegel
13	Noelia Ferreras-Alonso	CARTIF
14	Jan Ivar Korsbakken	CICERO
15	Eleftheria Zisarou	E3M
16	Anastasios Giannousakis	E3M
17	Francesco Gardumi	KTH
18	Vassilis Stavrakas	UPRC
19	Nikolaos Kleanthis	UPRC
20	Sophia Theodoropoulou	UPRC
21	Jaime Nieto	UVa
22	Wolfgang Obergassel	WI
23	Solomon Teferi	AAIT
24	John Maitha Toya	TUM
25	Ioannis Tsipouridis	TUM
26	Ajay Gambhir	Imperial
27	Shivika Mittal	Imperial

### Minutes: Main issues discussed

Item	Description	Action	
		What	Who
WP1	The meeting started with Dr Alexandros Nikas (NTUA) greeting the partners. Then he introduced Mr Adrian Lauer (Bruegel), the newest partner of the project. Afterwards, Mr Lauer took the floor to present himself and what he will work on during the project. Next, Dr Ajay Gambhir (Imperial) mentioned that this was the last meeting that he participates in. He also informed the consortium of the way that he will participate in the future. He mentioned that he aims for a soft handle to Dr Shivika Mittal (Imperial) and the rest of the Imperial team and to keep in touch with the consortium. Dr Nikas took the floor once again to mention that setting the ground for the RPM studies is also done and that these studies are the most pressing issue for the project in the period. Focusing on WP1, he informed the consortium about the next project meeting in Mombasa, Kenya mentioning that the dates, the venue etc are decided and the partners are informed. In this context, Mr John Maitha Toya (TUM) introduced himself. Next, Dr Nikas mentioned that Deliverable 1.2 focuses on General Assemblies and Executive Board Meetings since the rest of the meetings are focused on a specific matter and not the project's progress in general.	Prepare D1.2	NTUA

WP2	Regarding WP2, Dr Nikas mentioned that the NTUA team should provide Bruegel with the final invitation text. Then, Mr Lauer informed the partners about the workshop taking place on the 31 <sup>st</sup> of July, for which invitations have already been sent. He also mentioned that two more workshops will take place on the 18 <sup>th</sup> and the 19 <sup>th</sup> of July, with the exact timeslots being determined through a Doodle poll. In this context, he encouraged the partners to suggest specific stakeholders if they want. Moreover, he mentioned that 41 and 15 stakeholders have already confirmed their attendance at each workshop respectively and he suggested that more stakeholders are invited to the second one, with Dr Nikas mentioning the study leaders should consider that. He specifically, asked that invitations are sent by tomorrow and he also proposed that SAB members can also be invited if they are interested.	Prepare the final invitation text  Organise the oncoming workshops  Invite stakeholders to the second workshop	NTUA  Bruegel  Bruegel, RPM study leading partners
WP3	The next issue discussed by Dr Nikas was Deliverable 3.6, the final version of which had already been given by BC3 with some final touches to be done by the next day. Next, Ms Natasha Frilingou (NTUA) took the floor and informed the partners of the updates (e.g., automatic vetting) that are being developed. Dr Nikas added that these updates are ahead of the proposed timeline and will be presented in the next meeting. Lastly, he mentioned that the consortium will try to have an EBM in July if a suitable date can be determined.	Final touches to D3.6  I <sup>2</sup> AM PARIS updates	NTUA  NTUA, BC3
WP4	The discussion on WP4 started with Dr Gambhir mentioning that the meeting last Friday regarding the RPM studies was very useful since all studies have a selected leader now. He continued by briefing the consortium on the 7 RPM studies, mentioning their leaders, their subjects, their timelines as well as their progress so far. They will include a contributors list and scenario protocols. He also started a discussion on how models can display all the latest policies by mentioning four tracks (NDCs, current policies, long-term strategies and 1.5° C scenario). Dr Nikas mentioned that this is a very detailed presentation but stressed the caveats of Study 6 which is still in the formulation process. The next issue discussed was Deliverable 4.3 for which Dr Jan Ivar Korsbakken (CICERO) took the floor. He informed the consortium that the relevant data are shared on the project's SharePoint, including emissions data from IEA and EDGAR. In this context, Dr Mittal, Dr Nikas and Dr Korsbakken discussed how IEA and EDGAR data were accessed. Specifically, Dr Nikas mentioned that IEA data will be the first source and the EDGAR database will mainly be used if further disaggregation is needed, with Dr Korsbakken replying that EDGAR may not include everything. Next, Dr Nikas mentioned that modelling teams may have their own alternatives as well. Dr Anastasios Giannousakis (E3M) mentioned that technology costs can be taken from the EU Reference Scenario and that there are routines for processing this data.	Kick-off RPM studies	RPM studies leading partners
WP5	Dr Nikas took the floor mentioning that there is an Excel file covering the relations of Tasks with the RPM cycle, which is	Check the relations Excel file	All partners

	<p>an issue regarding WP4 and WP5, and he suggested that partners give it a check. But he also mentioned that there are also some tasks independent from the RPM cycle. Next, he proposed that NTUA and E3M teams should coordinate their actions regarding Task 5.1, which starts in January 2024, suggesting that a kick-off meeting is organised. Next, regarding Task 5.2, he informed the partners that a kick-off meeting will take place in July, with Dr Jon Sampedro (BC3) mentioning that a Doodle poll will be sent and that the BC3 team is working on modelling. Afterwards, Dr Gambhir mentioned that a soft kick-off meeting for Task 5.3 has already taken place, with its recording being available in the project's SharePoint. Moreover, he encouraged the partners to make their suggestions and mentioned that a kick-off meeting will take place in September.</p>	<p>Organise a kick-off meeting for Task 5.1</p> <p>Organise a kick-off meeting for Task 5.2</p> <p>Organise a kick-off meeting for Task 5.2</p>	<p>NTUA, E3M</p> <p>BC3</p> <p>Imperial</p>
WP6	<p>Then, Dr Vassilis Stavrakas (UPRC) took the floor and mentioned that everything regarding Task 6.1 will be discussed during the General Assembly meeting. Next, Ms Sophia Theodoropoulou (UPRC) mentioned that a presentation is available in the project's SharePoint and proceeded with presenting the project's KPIs. Specifically, the I<sup>2</sup>AM PARIS platform is demonstrating a high performance so far. The scientific outreach of the project is also progressing quite well regarding its first target as well as the project's social media accounts. Afterwards, Mr Wolfgang Obergassel (WI) mentioned that the analysis in the 4 capacity building countries is in progress with Dr Nikas replying that a relevant meeting is arranged for the following Thursday. Next, Dr Francesco Gardumi (KTH) suggested that the presentation of Task 6.1 in the General Assembly meeting should last slightly longer than initially scheduled. He also mentioned that 100 students will participate in the students' workshop in Mombasa (29 &amp; 30 August) and that help in coordinating it will be required. He also mentioned that interventions from colleagues would be very helpful for the stakeholder workshop (1 September). Lastly, he informed the partners that more details on the sessions will be provided by mid-July to partners joining physically in Mombasa. Regarding Task 6.5, he mentioned that an output regarding the model used will be available soon and that partners from NTUA and AAIT are participating in the ICTP Summer School, attending the CLEWs lessons. Next, Dr Nikas took the floor to inform the partners regarding the ECMP and IAMC conferences taking place online and in Venice, Italy respectively. He suggested that partners submit their abstracts by the 30<sup>th</sup> of June deadline since the consortium aims to support relevant proceedings. He mentioned that work from the energy crisis work will be submitted and he asked that partners submitting abstracts acknowledging the project should inform the NTUA team. Lastly, Dr Nikas mentioned that an e-mail will be sent to the SAB members inviting them to the General Assembly meeting.</p>	<p>Meeting for capacity-building countries</p> <p>Organise the workshops in Mombasa</p> <p>Send abstracts to IAMC and ECMP</p> <p>Invite SAB members to the GA</p>	<p>NTUA, WI</p> <p>KTH, TUM</p> <p>All partners</p> <p>NTUA</p>

## 3.8 Executive Board Meeting – 25 July 2023

### 3.8.1 Agenda

**Executive Board Meeting**  
**Tuesday, 25 July, 2023**  
**14:00-15:00 CEST**

*Microsoft Teams ([Link](#))*

**Participants:** All Partners

#### Agenda

1. Update on project progress (completed, ongoing, upcoming tasks & deliverables)
  - WP1: Project Management
    - Policy contributions at the SME level – July 2023
    - Next (hybrid) project GA meeting in Kenya – August 2023
    - D1.3: Report on Project and SAB Meetings (NTUA) – August 2023
  - WP2: Listening
    - Core working groups – invitations update and coordinating meetings (Bruegel)
  - WP3: Exchanging
    - I<sup>2</sup>AM PARIS updates: vetting demo (NTUA)
  - WP4: Modelling
    - First modelling cycle: PRM1 Studies (Imperial & Study leads)
  - WP5: Expanding
    - COVID-19 analysis (Task 5.1): recovery packages database (E3M)
    - Distributional impacts (Task 5.2): kick-off in July (BC3)
  - WP6: Explaining
    - Task 6.1 – progress so far (UPRC)
    - Task 6.3 – participation in ECEMP, IAMC (NTUA)
    - Task 6.4 & 6.5 coordination (KTH, WI)
    - Kenya workshop: partners' contribution (28 Aug – 01 Sep)
2. Any other business

### 3.8.2 Minutes

Present on Call	Name and Surname	Organisation
-----		



1	Alexandros Nikas	NTUA
2	Anastasios Karamaneas	NTUA
3	Natasha Frilingou	NTUA
4	Konstantinos Koasidis	NTUA
5	Themistoklis Koutsellis	NTUA
6	Jakob Zinck Thellufsen	AAU
7	Russel Horowitz	BC3
8	Eleftheria Zisarou	E3M
9	Panagiotis Fragkos	E3M
10	Eftychia Ntostoglou	KTH
11	Fumi Maeda Harapap	KTH
12	Lorenzo Rinaldi	POLIMI
13	Vassilis Stavrakas	UPRC
14	Nikolaos Kleantis	UPRC
15	Sophia Theodoropoulou	UPRC
16	Jaime Nieto	UVa
17	Wolfgang Obergassel	WI
18	Jyoti Maheswari	IIMA
19	Fitsum Kebede	AAiT
20	John Maitha Toya	TUM
21	Zongfei Wang	UNIGE
22	Shivika Mittal	Imperial
23	Sara Giarola	Imperial

### Minutes: Main issues discussed

Item	Description	Action	
		What	Who
WP1	<p>Dr Alexandros Nikas (NTUA) started the meeting by greeting all the participants and then he informed the consortium that the EC has thanked IAM COMPACT for its contribution to the 2040 target plan. In this context, he also mentioned that other projects have also made their own submissions, which will be available shortly. Moreover, Dr Nikas and Dr Shivika Mittal (Imperial) had a short discussion on the scope of the 2040 target plan, which focuses on the EU level and does not examine national targets as well as on the EU's collaboration mechanism between different projects.</p> <p>Next, Dr Nikas briefed the partners on the current societal turmoil in Kenya which brings some considerations regarding the organisation of the project's General Assembly Meeting in Mombasa, Kenya the following month. Nevertheless, he mentioned that the project's local partners reassured the project's management team that the situation is under control so far. Lastly, he stated that the management team will take a final decision the following week.</p> <p>Another issue regarding the General Assembly Meeting discussed between Dr Nikas and Dr Mittal was the presence of SAB members via Microsoft Teams. SAB members are already invited and two of them have already accepted the invitation. Next, Dr Nikas mentioned that the administration team of the project is closely cooperating with Prof. Ioannis Tsiouridis (TUM) and Dr Francesco Gardumi (KTH) to organise everything regarding the General Assembly Meeting</p>	Prepare teaching material for the Kenya workshops	All modelling teams

	<p>as well as the capacity-building workshops. In this context, Dr Vassilis Stavrakas (UPRC) informed the partners that the UPRC team had a call with Dr Gardumi and he provided them with guidance on the teaching material needed for the workshops. Ms Eftychia Ntostoglou (KTH) intervened mentioning that there is a relevant folder in the project's SharePoint repository.</p> <p>Lastly, Mr John Maitha Toya (TUM) took the floor and informed the partners that the organisation of the meetings is progressing and on the situation in Kenya. Specifically, he stated that demonstrations have calmed down the past few days and that by the end of August, everything will be peaceful once again.</p>		
WP2	<p>Regarding WP2 Dr Nikas briefed the consortium (after communicating with Bruegel partners) since Bruegel partners were not able to participate in this meeting. Specifically, Bruegel partners wanted to thank all the people that participated in the 2 workshops for the 4 upcoming studies. In this context, Dr Nikas presented some initial insights from the workshops and Dr Mittal added that the participants of the workshops should be checked regarding their expertise on the issues discussed. Moreover, Dr Nikas suggested that a more thorough discussion on the aftermath of the workshops is organised.</p>	Organise a discussion on the aftermath of the WP2 workshops	NTUA, Bruegel
WP3	<p>Next, Ms Natasha Frilingou (NTUA) took the floor and presented a demonstration for the validation and vetting tool supported by the I<sup>2</sup>AM PARIS platform, which is created in collaboration with the DIAMOND project. Moreover, she stated that improvements will be made and encouraged the consortium to check the tool and provide their feedback. In this context, Ms Frilingou and Dr Mittal discussed the creation of a scenario explorer tool, as a next step of the project.</p>	<p>Provide feedback on the vetting tool</p> <p>Create a scenario explorer tool</p>	<p>All partners</p> <p>NTUA, BC3</p>
WP4	<p>Then, Dr Mittal took the floor mentioning that the outlines for the 7 studies are available and that a working group meeting is already organised. In this context, she stated that the 1<sup>st</sup> step of the studies is the harmonisation of input data and the 2<sup>nd</sup> one is the development of the modelling scenarios. For this step, info is already collected and it will be shortly available. Lastly, she encouraged the consortium to provide its comments on this info.</p>	Provide feedback on scenario development info	All partners
WP5	<p>Dr Panagiotis Fragkos (E3M) mentioned that WP5 is closely interlinked with WP4 and he also mentioned that work on the 7 studies is already scheduled. Specifically, he informed the partners that the work on Task 5.1 is almost finalised and will be available by the following week, accompanied by a scenario outline protocol. Next, he mentioned that the kick-off meeting for Task 5.2 will take place shortly and it will be led by BC3. Discussions for its organisation will take place by the end of August.</p>	<p>Finalise Task 5.1</p> <p>Organise the kick-off meeting of Task 5.2</p>	<p>E3M</p> <p>E3M, BC3</p>
WP6	<p>Next, Dr Nikas took the floor reminding the partners to inform the NTUA administration team whether they have submitted in the ECEMP and IAMC conferences acknowledging the project.</p> <p>Then, Dr Stavrakas mentioned that UPRC, NTUA and KTH had a meeting on CDE ideas, in which they also discussed</p>	<p>Inform NTUA administration of conference submissions</p> <p>Finalise the</p>	<p>All partners</p> <p>UPRC</p>

	<p>the progress of the project's KPIs. Ms Sophia Theodoropoulou (UPRC) added that the UPRC team is currently working on social media posts as well as the newsletter for July. She also mentioned that the project has already achieved its KPI regarding LinkedIn followership, already reaching 500 followers.</p> <p>The last issue discussed was Deliverable 6.4 for which Mr Wolfgang Obergassel (WI) took the floor and mentioned that studies regarding the mitigation policies on the 4 capacity-building countries are under development. In this context, Dr Mittal and Mr Obergassel discussed how the outcomes of the workshops can be used for these 4 countries and Ms Ntostoglou made some comments regarding the progress of each national study so far.</p> <p>The meeting ended with Dr Nikas informing the partners that there will probably be no weekly updates in August until the General Assembly Meeting in Kenya and he thanked everybody for their presence at this meeting.</p>	newsletter for July	
--	---	---------------------	--



## 4 Scientific Advisory Board meetings

The SAB is an advisory body to the IAM COMPACT Consortium. The responsibility for selecting and appointing SAB members falls upon the General Assembly (GA), which consists of one representative from each beneficiary and the Project Coordinator. The formulation, tentative synthesis and Terms of References of the SAB have been documented in the the first milestone of IAM COMPACT (due in Month 2), as well as attached to the Appendix herein. In collaboration with all partners, the Project Coordinator has communicated with various stakeholders including academics and climate change mitigation experts and invited them to join the project's SAB. The SAB currently consists of nine members, although its synthesis will remain open to modifications, based on new opportunities and/or challenges.

### 4.1 1<sup>st</sup> SAB Session: 24 February 2023

#### 4.1.1 Minutes

This SAB meeting took place during the 1<sup>st</sup> General Assembly meeting of the project, which was hosted virtually through the MS Teams platform on the 23<sup>rd</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup> of February 2023. In particular, it took place on the second day of the meeting, after the discussion on all WPs had concluded, allowing the SAB members to be thoroughly updated on the project progress at the time, as well as important planned actions. Most SAB members attended the meeting and managed to get in touch with the consortium; due to their strict schedules, some SAB members participated throughout the General Assembly meeting and not necessarily in the dedicated SAB session (e.g., Prof. Sonia Yeh and Prof. Boaventura Cuamba). This means that, although most members interacted with the consortium and discussed feedback and ways to steer and collaborate with the project, not everyone had the opportunity to properly introduce themselves to the consortium—in which case, we made sure that all partners were given a detailed memo on the background of, and acquainted with, the SAB members offline.

The dedicated session started with Prof. Reckien introducing herself. She is an Associate Professor at the University of Twente, Netherlands and she works primarily on climate change impacts/adaptation and less so on climate change mitigation, bringing expertise to the table that bridges the two fields. She has been the lead author of Chapter 17 of the Working Group 2 of the 6<sup>th</sup> Assessment Report of the IPCC. She is experienced in Horizon research projects, having participated in many such projects such as H2020 LOCALISE, aiming to achieve carbon neutrality and examine climate change adaptation options; other projects that she has participated in are related to greening schoolyards, examining how climate risk can match first responders and planners, and climate change mitigation in Africa. In this context, she stated that, from the consortium's presentations, she can already see many links to and opportunities within IAM COMPACT, with consortium partners agreeing on the potential of synergies among the project and Prof. Reckien's work.

Tony Patt, a Professor of Climate Policy at ETH Zurich, then introduced himself, arguing that, although modelling is not his main area of expertise, he participates in many projects closely related to modelling. The H2020 SENTINEL project is such an example, which he and his team coordinated, and which aimed to develop next-generation energy system planning models for the EU at the community and national levels, creating a new modular framework, the Sustainable Energy Transitions Laboratory (SENTINEL), with some models included in that framework having a very narrow focus, investigating specific technologies such as electric mobility. Prof. Patt also mentioned that he has worked in the field of climate change adaptation in the past but his research work now focuses mostly on mitigation. Apart from SENTINEL, he has also participated in other EU projects such as the TRANSRISK project, in which he led a work package dedicated to risks and uncertainties and in which he had the opportunity to work with several members of IAM COMPACT (e.g., from NTUA and BC3). Having contributed to the two latest Assessment Reports of the IPCC on both adaptation and mitigation, as review editor in AR5 WGII and coordinating lead author for Chapter 14 on International Cooperation in AR6 WGIII, the potential on bridging the two, just line in the case of Diana Reckien, was then discussed with the consortium. After introducing himself, Prof. Patt commented on the capabilities of IAMs, since IAM COMPACT is a project heavily relying on them, expressing reservations to models always being helpful, as they sometimes cannot answer fundamental

scientific questions. The discussion then oriented towards the fact that, although IAMs can inform choices based on their results, these choices are also sensitive to political or philosophical ideas that cannot change due to model results, meaning that modellers should focus on listening to what stakeholders have to say—and this is why he saw great value in IAM COMPACT and its Policy Response Mechanism. He also discussed the difficulties in the interpretation of IAM results due to complexity, mentioning that his modelling work focuses on more specific and narrow models (e.g., models for energy storage) since their results are more understandable. Then, Dr. Nikas explained that Prof. Patt could thus serve as a strict reviewer of the project’s model implications and highlighted that Prof. Patt’s feedback can be very useful towards improving model usage.

Other members of the SAB had already introduced themselves briefly, having joined previous sessions of the meeting. As a last minute change to the synthesis, though, Ms Sureka Perera was invited to re-introduce herself (after having briefly done so earlier during the General Assembly meeting). She is a quality and design analyst from the climate and environment team of UNDP Sri Lanka. Sri Lanka is facing an economic crisis and is also a country very vulnerable to climate change and COVID-19. These issues have made climate change mitigation quite challenging with policy initiatives such as for electric mobility requiring considerable regulatory efforts, capacity development, as well as institutional reinforcements. Nevertheless, the country’s government appears committed to combatting climate change (in addition to pressing matters of relevance such as energy poverty and inequalities), often proposing rather optimistic targets (e.g., 70% of electricity from renewables by 2030).

Prof. Haris Doukas (NTUA) thanked the SAB members for devoting their precious time to this discussion. He also stated that the consortium will try to better exploit their preferences and expertise and understand their perspective. Dr. Nikas explained that the consortium’s communication with the SAB will be targeted, and SAB meetings will be hosted during each General Assembly meeting, with the SAB’s participation being desirable but not a mandatory requirement. Moreover, he informed them that the consortium plans to offer them policy briefs and presentations on the project’s progress, on which they will be more than welcome to provide their feedback. He also suggested that synergies between IAM COMPACT and the SAB members’ projects can take place and prove very useful. He then proceeded to a thorough presentation of the project scope and progress, the modelling tools, the five intertwined components/blocks of the project, as well as the four pilot countries, before presenting the Horizon Europe ecosystem of relevant projects. Afterwards, he summarised the project’s progress regarding matters related to policy-relevant research questions, modelling seminars, and CDE activities, and concluded by presenting the entire synthesis of the SAB.

After the presentation, all SAB members had the chance to provide comments, with one member suggesting that the call for this project was very complex as the project itself, and that internal communication among consortium partners is key to success, especially for a project with as many partners. The SAB members also advised us to begin internal updates from the start of the project and that these updates should go deeper than usual project updates, which focus on the progress of deliverables and milestones, proposing that the consortium should organise seminars focussing on content-related aspects for partners to exchange content. In this context, it was mentioned that in-person meetings are more beneficial and that the consortium should aim to strengthen communication and meet physically in the near future. We were also advised that modelling should not be the end goal but only a means to concrete outcomes and impacts. Dr. Nikas informed the SAB members that the EC asks for regular updates, which are highly appreciated, and that the consortium will thus seek to update the SAB in a similar way and frequency, by distributing a half-page summary of recent and upcoming activities. Apart from that, he stated that the consortium always aims to have more detailed communication, not targeting only the progress of the project and that partners endeavour to keep everybody fully engaged, going above and beyond the contractual obligations in terms of communication.

Another SAB member commented on the abundance of ambitious goals that EU projects typically have, mentioning that these projects rarely achieve all of their ambitious objectives, mainly failing to accomplish the most ambitious and out-of-the-box aims. Nevertheless, the consortium must do its best to achieve as many objectives as possible and always evaluate critically modelling outcomes and the target group of end users that can really use them and for which purpose. The consortium replied that the project does not aim to produce

“noise” but something useful for policymakers, meaning that results should be transposed to policy briefs and not only to papers addressed at the scientific community. In this context, the consortium does not want countless scenarios but prefers things that can drive change, admitting that the project should offer results for different audiences and that efforts should focus on explaining both the model results and the ranges across models.

From the consortium’s side, it was proposed that SAB members could also help disseminate project results and that the consortium can set up a strategy in this direction. It was of course explicitly discussed that SAB members are highly encouraged to share any results of the project, stressing however that they should feel no obligation to do so, and that a good starting point would be for members of the SAB to share information on the project with related projects and audiences. After a relevant question to the SAB, one member admitted that a previous project of theirs had not lived up to all expectations when it had come to the development of an online platform for model use, as their developed platform offered the appropriate documentation but did not offer the expected functionality and usefulness for external, non-expert users.

Issues relating to previous project challenges, such as COVID-19 and stakeholder engagement were then raised, in which case the PARIS REINFORCE example was mentioned, whereby considerably more research was carried out and published than originally anticipated/promised to balance the limitations to stakeholder engagement due to COVID-19 constraints.

Finally, the SAB members stated that they are looking forward to future interactions with the IAM COMPACT project, and the consortium thanked them for attending and in advance for their steering efforts.

## 4.2 2<sup>nd</sup> SAB Session: 28 August 2023

### 4.2.1 Minutes

This SAB meeting took place during the 2<sup>nd</sup> General Assembly meeting of the project, which was hosted physically at the Technical University of Mombasa, Kenya—while allowing hybrid participation, through the MS Teams platform—on the 28th of August 2023. It took place after the discussion of WP1 - WP5, providing the SAB members with an overview on the project progress at the time, as well as important planned actions.

In particular, Dr Nikas first welcomed the SAB members that eventually joined. Some early interventions from SAB members were made, for example by Prof Diana Reckien, who highlighted the benefits in the GA taking place in Africa and the need to keep the SAB updated on the the bigger picture of project progress, as well as by Prof Sonia Yeh, who after thanking the consortium for the invitation expressed her interest in hearing more about the project’s African partners as well as about the aspects of technological innovation in the project.

Dr Nikas took the floor once again and proceeded to a brief presentation of the project’s progress, focusing on selected highlights. These included the Policy Steering Group discussions at the EU level, and the overall progress of the 1st RPM cycle iteration, by presenting the 4 Policy Steering Groups and the 3 CWG themes. He also mentioned that two workshops regarding the first two themes have already taken place, while the other two are expected by end of September 2023. He delved into the scope and takeaways of these workshops, focusing on policy and stakeholders’ feedback, and demonstrated a timeline schematic of the RPM cycles. Dr Nikas then provided an overview of the second policy brief, which was fed into the EU 2040 target planning, on the energy crisis analysis (in which SAB member showed great interest). He finally provided a visual overview of the work done so far, focusing on scientific publications and outreach, including among others the flagship publication led by Dr. van de Ven in Nature Climate Change, which made the news (e.g., in the Conversation, Bloomberg, Nature Climate Change News & Views, etc.).

One SAB member congratulated the consortium on the work done so far and expressed their interest in hearing more on project management challenges, behavioural change aspects in research, and ethical aspects with regard to involvement of African partners and their ownership of outputs. On the first point, Dr Nikas replied that the consortium had known from the start that there might be challenges especially considering the non-EU partners

from countries with difficult contexts (e.g., Ukraine) but were overall very satisfied with the level of commitment from these partners—with this Kenya meeting and entire series of capacity development events later in the week as a fine example. Among the most notable such challenges, according to Dr Nikas, was the divergence of this 1st PRM cycle timeline among the EU and non-EU countries, noting however that we can afford some flexibility as the analyses carried out outside the EU mainly require guidance but not multi-partner collaborations, which can save considerable time and ensure that all deliverables are submitted within the reporting period, as scheduled. On the second point, there was little to add at this stage, as the consortium was able to delve into detail on the more economic side of behavioural changes (as also emerged in the policy needs and stakeholder discussions) and less on the qualitative aspects of human behaviour—something due to be examined as part of dedicated WP5 tasks nonetheless. On the third point, Dr Nikas explained that—although there exist no specific protocols for inclusion of all consortium partners—it is top priority for NTUA as coordinators to ensure that all outputs, scientific or otherwise, are owned by and credited to all involved, and that this has always been the case (e.g., much like Bruegel colleagues are also invited to join scientific publication efforts, or TUM colleagues to participate or lead similar efforts, so far). A member of the SAB appreciated the fact that IAM COMPACT processes are inclusive, before then providing suggestions on how to make project research processes even more inclusive, mentioning an example of a recent research project she is involved in, in which they have a policy to include a non-EU ‘counterpart’ as a second author in every papers produced involving them.

Next, Dr Nikas informed the SAB of the progress regarding capacity development activities in the case study countries. Finally, the SAB session concluded with the consortium and the SAB having a short discussion on the project’s modelling validation procedures, as we llas with Dr Nikas assuring the SAB that the consortium aim to provide the SAB with more feedback on the project’s outcomes onwards, when more content-related progress is expected.