



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

D1.5 – Report on Project and SAB Meetings – Update 2

WP1 – Project Management

28/08/2025



Funded by
the European Union

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).

Grant Agreement Number	101056306		Acronym	IAM COMPACT	
Full Title	Expanding Integrated Assessment Modelling: Comprehensive and Comprehensible Science for Sustainable, Co-Created Climate Action				
Topic	HORIZON-CL5-2021-D1-01-04				
Funding scheme	HORIZON EUROPE, RIA – Research and Innovation Action				
Start Date	September 2022	Duration	36 Months		
Project URL	https://www.iam-compact.eu				
EU Project Advisor	Andreas Palialexis				
Project Coordinator	National Technical University of Athens – NTUA				
Deliverable	D1.5 – Report on Project and SAB Meetings – Update 2				
Work Package	WP1 – Project Management				
Date of Delivery	Contractual	31/08/2025	Actual	28/08/2025	
Nature	Report	Dissemination Level	Public		
Lead Beneficiary	National Technical University of Athens (NTUA)				
Responsible Author	Anastasios Karamaneas	Email	akaramaneas@epu.ntua.gr		
	NTUA	Phone	+30 210 7723612		
Contributors	Natasha Frilingou, Alexandros Nikas (NTUA)				
Reviewer(s)	Konstantinos Koasidis (NTUA); Christiane Beuermann (WI)				
Keywords	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 document can be used as a tool for internal project progress reviewing from September 2024 until August 2025 (i.e., the end of the project's timeline) and as a guide for consortium partners on the completion of their tasks regarding the conditions set in the project's consortium agreement.

3. Short summary of results (<250 words)

According to the IAM COMPACT project's Quality Management Plan, physical (hybrid) and remote (online) meetings take place regularly so that project partners collaborate and communicate during the project's lifetime. In this context, Executive Board Meetings are organised once every month online through MS Teams, while General Board Meetings are organised twice per year, organised back-to-back with other physical project-related events or held online if no other event is taking place during this period. The Executive Board Meetings' main purpose is to brief all project partners on the development of all Work Packages and Tasks, maintain all efforts within the agreed timeline, and ensure that corrective actions (if necessary) are taken in a timely manner. Hence, these meetings help achieve the project vision and goals. The NTUA administration team is hosting these meetings and suggests the agenda, prior to finalising it with the consortium.

In the third and last year of the project (September 2024 – August 2025), two physical meetings were organised: one at KTH, Stockholm, by KTH partners and one at Imperial College, London, by Imperial partners, to thoroughly discuss the objectives and actions for the last 12 months of the project. These meetings were the 4th and 5th General Assembly Meetings of the project and took place on the 30th of September and the 1st of October, 2024, and on the 31st of March and the 1st of April, 2025, respectively, supporting online participation as well. Moreover, 5 Executive Board Meetings were organised via MS Teams. Colleagues from all consortium partners participated in most meetings, showcasing their commitment to IAM COMPACT's objectives.

4. Evidence of accomplishment

This document proves the realisation of IAM COMPACT's meetings as they are described in the project's Grant Agreement. Additionally, the materialisation of the actions presented and discussed in these meetings is showcased in other project deliverables, which, among other things, document the insightful research work realised in the project.

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.

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

Contents

1	Introduction	5
1.1	Purpose and Scope.....	5
1.2	Structure of the Document	5
2	Physical Project Meetings.....	6
2.1	4 th General Assembly Meeting: 30 September 2024 & 1 October 2024.....	6
2.1.1	Agenda	6
2.1.2	Minutes.....	8
2.2	5 th General Assembly Meeting: 31 March 2025 & 1 October 2024	22
2.2.1	Agenda	22
2.2.2	Minutes.....	24
3	Remote (Online) Meetings.....	32
3.1	Executive Board Meeting – 17 December 2024.....	32
3.1.1	Agenda	32
3.1.2	Minutes.....	33
3.2	Executive Board Meeting – 28 January 2025	36
3.2.1	Agenda	36
3.2.2	Minutes.....	36
3.3	Executive Board Meeting – 29 April 2025	40
3.3.1	Agenda	40
3.3.2	Minutes.....	40
3.4	Executive Board Meeting – 24 June 2025.....	44
3.4.1	Agenda	44
3.4.2	Minutes.....	44
3.5	Executive Board Meeting – 26 August 2025	47
3.5.1	Agenda	47
3.5.2	Minutes.....	47
4	Scientific Advisory Board meetings	50

Table of Tables

Table 1. IAM COMPACT Project Meetings (covering period September 2024 – August 2025)	5
--	---

Use of AI disclaimer

During all meetings, NTUA and/or meeting organisers were manually keeping extensive draft notes. These minutes were then edited for anonymisation and removal of any information that might be considered privileged and/or sensitive and parsed through AI to deliver summarised versions of the notes and to synthesise them in concise minutes. The final output has been checked and approved for accuracy, and further edited (e.g., adding clarifications when needed, or correcting any discrepancies) by the contributing deliverable authors.

1 Introduction

In accordance with the project's Grand Agreement, both regular and impromptu meetings were organised throughout the project's timeline. General Assembly meetings, one type of regular meetings, are organised twice a year, aiming to examine the development of all actions and tasks and assisting consortium partners to comprehend, follow and be involved in the scientific work realised within IAM COMPACT. NTUA, as the project's coordinator, is responsible for preparing the agenda, organising these meetings (in cooperation with other partners, if they are interested in hosting them), and disseminating details on the meetings' logistics. Moreover, online meetings take place through Microsoft Teams regularly to discuss targeted matters about project deliverables and tasks. Also, NTUA organises monthly Executive Board Meetings to guarantee that all consortium partners are aligned with IAM COMPACT's actions and progress. In addition, NTUA records and documents all meetings and sessions relevant to project coordination, management, and other Work Packages. Despite the consortium organising multiple ad hoc meetings relevant to specific Work Packages, tasks or even specific events, this deliverable aims to document General Assembly and Executive Board Meetings, for which the project administration team reports detailed minutes and accordingly shares them with all consortium partners, guaranteeing that all project partners are up to date with project developments, activities, and timelines.

The table below presents all the coordination meetings that were held during the third year of IAM COMPACT. Executive Board Meetings take place once per month, unless a General Assembly Meeting is organised in the same month (thus, no Executive Board Meeting took place in September 2024, October 2024, and March 2025), or due to partners' very limited availability (thus, no Executive Board Meetings were held in November 2024, May 2025, and July 2025).

Table 1. IAM COMPACT Project Meetings (covering period September 2024 – August 2025)

Type of meeting		Date
Physical	General Assembly Meeting	30st of September & 1 st of October 2024
Online	Executive Board Meeting	17 th of December 2024
Online	Executive Board Meeting	28 th of January 2025
Physical	General Assembly Meeting	31 st of March & 1 st of April 2025
Online	Executive Board Meeting	29 th of April 2025
Online	Executive Board Meeting	24 th of June 2025
Online	Executive Board Meeting	26 th of August 2025

1.1 Purpose and Scope

The deliverable's purpose is to present a periodic report of all project management meetings, including the meeting's agenda, attendees, and minutes. Moreover, it aims to demonstrate any feedback from the Scientific Advisory Board (SAB) received through online communication, especially from dedicated SAB sessions, usually held during General Assembly meetings.

1.2 Structure of the Document

The deliverable is divided into three sections. Section 2 presents the agenda and minutes of the one physical meeting that took place in London, Section 3 demonstrates the same information for online meetings, and Section 4 reports the feedback provided by IAM COMPACT's SAB.

2 Physical Project Meetings

2.1 4th General Assembly Meeting: 30 September 2024 & 1 October 2024

The 4th General Assembly Meeting of IAM COMPACT was organised in Stockholm, Sweden, with the aim to also engaging with stakeholders from the case study countries, specifically the ambassadors of Kenya, Sri Lanka, Ethiopia and Ukraine in Sweden. Consortium partners not able to attend physically were able to participate in the meeting online via MS Teams since the meeting had a hybrid format. In this meeting, there was no SAB session due to the low SAB members availability to attend, but we contacted them through written communication to keep them posted on project progress, share with them the most critical outputs in presentation format, and inform them on the results of our interim review.

2.1.1 Agenda

Participants: All partners & members of the SAB, case study country ambassadors

Day I: Progress on WPs 1-4 | **Location:** KTH, Kurslokalen, Teknikringen 1, Stockholm & MS Teams ([link](#))

Monday, September 30, 2024 (all times in CEST)			
09:00 – 09:30	Gathering, small talk, coffee		
09:30 – 09:40	I.0	Welcome	KTH
09:40 – 10:00	I.1	WP1 – Project Management - Coordination - Management - RP1 recommendations and RP2 planning	NTUA
10:00 – 10:45	I.2	WP2 – Listening - Policy Steering Group feedback & remaining workshops - 2nd PRM & Core Working Groups - Policy briefs	Bruegel
10:45 – 11:30	I.3	Case study countries – presentation to ambassadors - Project presentation (2') - Ethiopia (10') - Ukraine (10') - Sri Lanka (10') - Kenya (10') - Quick remarks (3')	KTH, AAiT, KEI, RUSL, TUM, Ambassadors of Kenya, Sri Lanka, Ethiopia
11:30 – 13:00	Lunch break & discussion on case study countries		

13:00 – 14:00	I.4	WP3 – Exchanging 1. Open data management (10') – Imperial - Model integration (10') – Aalto - Protocols for open science (10') - BC3 - Platform updates (10') - NTUA - Diagnostics (10') - CICERO - Synergies & collaboration (10') - NTUA	Imperial, Aalto, BC3, NTUA, CICERO
14:00 – 16:00	I.5	WP4 – Modelling 2. 1st PRM feedback: Studies 1,2,4 (10') – Imperial - Scenario logic & harmonisation (update & guidelines for 2nd PRM) (20') – CICERO 3. National, global, regional mitigation pathways and relevant studies & Study 8 (30') – Imperial - Sectoral dynamics and cross-sectoral aspects and relevant studies & Study 9 (30') – Wuppertal - European sub-national deep dives & Study 10 (30') – UNIGE	Imperial, CICERO, BC3, WI, UNIGE, NTUA
16:00 – 17:30	Discussion, Q&A, coffee		
18:00 - 20:00	Dinner at Albanova		

Day II: Progress on WPs 5-6 & SAB meeting | **Location:** KTH & MS Teams ([link](#))

Tuesday, October 1, 2024 (all times in CEST)			
09:30 – 10:00	Gathering, signing in, coffee		
10:00 – 10:15	II.0	Quick reflection on Day I	NTUA
10:15 – 11:30	II.1	WP6 – Explaining - Communication, dissemination, and exploitation (15') – UPRC - Visualisation of knowledge & results; publications (10') – NTUA - Drivers, barriers, and policy analysis (15') – WI - Capacity development (open-access models, next steps) – (35') KTH	URPC, KTH, Bruegel, WI, AAIT, TUM, RUSL, KEI
11:30 – 13:00	Lunch break		

13:00 – 15:00	II.2	WP5 – Expanding 4. <i>1st PRM feedback: Studies 3,6,7 (10') – E3M</i> - <i>Addressing distributional implications and gender inequality & Study 11 (15') - BC3</i> 5. <i>Out-of-ordinary extremes (15') – Imperial</i> - <i>Disruptive innovation in models & Study 12 (20') – UNIGE & NTUA</i> 6. <i>Behavioural change and social innovation & Studies 13 & 14 (30') – UVA & UPRC</i> - <i>Truly sustainable decarbonisation pathways (15') – CARTIF, UVA, Aalto & NTUA</i> - <i>Expanded multi-model assessment (15') – E3M</i>	Aalto, E3M, BC3, Imperial, NTUA, Uva, CARTIF, UNIGE
15:00 – 16:00	II.3	Scientific Advisory Board - <i>Project planning/implementation & SAB feedback</i>	SAB members, All partners
16:00 – 16:30	Discussion, Q&A, coffee		

2.1.2 Minutes

Present	Name and Surname	Organisation
1	Alexandros Nikas	NTUA
2	Natasha Frilingou	NTUA
3	Anastasios Karamaneas	NTUA
4	Christina Tigka	NTUA
5	Behzad Zamanipour	Aalto
6	Hesam Ghadaksaz	Aalto
7	Ilkka Keppo	Aalto
8	Rasmus Magni Johanssen	AAU
9	Jakob Zinck Thellufsen	AAU
10	Sebastian Bach Johannsen	AAU
11	Dirk-Jan van de Ven	BC3
12	Russell Horowitz	BC3
13	Claudia Rodés	BC3
14	Jon Sampedro	BC3
15	Xaquín García	BC3
16	Conall Heussaff	Bruegel
17	Rutger Broer	Bruegel
18	Alma Kurtovic	Bruegel
19	Ugne Keliauskaite	Bruegel
20	Adrián Mateo Martínez	CARTIF
21	Noelia Ferreras Alonso	CARTIF
22	Glen Peters	CICERO
23	Jan Ivar Korsbakken	CICERO
24	Shivika Mittal	CICERO
25	Eleftheria Zisarou	E3M
25	Panagiotis Fragkos	E3M
26	Anastasis Giannousakis	E3M
27	Camilla Lo Giudice	KTH
28	Chamindie Senaratne	KTH
29	Francesco Gardumi	KTH

30	Lorenzo Rinaldi	POLIMI
31	Matteo Rocco	POLIMI
32	Sophia Theodoropoulou	UPRC
33	Gonzalo Parrado Hernando	UVa
34	Nathalie Wregles	UVa
35	Juan Pérez	UVa
36	Georg Holtz	WI
37	Wolfgang Obergassel	WI
38	Alexander Jülich	WI
39	Lena Tholen	WI
40	Christiane Bauermann	WI
41	Dagmar Kiyar	WI
42	Jyoti Maheshwari	IIMA
43	Ryna Cui	UMD
44	Solomon Teferi	AAiT
45	Fitsum Salehu	AAiT
46	Borys Dodonov	KEI
47	Lahiru Jayasuriya	RUSL
48	John Maitha Thoya	TUM
49	Ioannis Tsipouridis	TUM
50	Salsabila Abdulhalim	TUM
51	Evelina Trutnevyte	UNIGE
52	Alison Maguire	UNIGE
53	Alaa Al Khourdajie	Imperial
54	Sonia Yeh	SAB
55	Angeline Kavindu Musili	Ambassador of Kenya in Sweden
56	Kapila Fonseka	Ambassador of Sri Lanka in Sweden

Minutes: Main issues discussed

Item	Description	Action	
		What	Who
Day I: Progress on WPs 1-4			
Welcome	Dr Francesco Gardumi (KTH) welcomed the partners attending the meeting both physically and virtually and he presented the meeting’s agenda. Next, Ms Chamindie Senaratne (KTH) informed the partners attending the meeting in Stockholm about some logistics aspects regarding that day’s dinner. Lastly, Dr Gardumi informed the consortium about the ambassadors attending the meeting.		
WP1	Then, Dr Alexandros Nikas (NTUA) took the floor and thanked all KTH partners for hosting the meeting. Following this, he presented a list of the deliverables that were prepared from May to September 2024, mentioning that there were a lot of deliverables and that there is a substantial break until early 2025. Moreover, he mentioned that the 1 st PRM has ended and that 2 nd one has begun. Next, he briefed the consortium on the final year’s deliverables that span from February 2025 to August 2025, with 5 deliverables to be delivered in August requiring input from previous deliverables as well. Additionally, he mentioned that 4 milestones should also be delivered in the same period. In a different context, Dr Nikas informed the consortium on	Upload all the work done in PRM 1 to I ² AM PARIS	NTUA, All partners

	aspects regarding visual identity, such as the need for new infographics comparing modelling results, encouraging partners to share ideas with NTUA and UPRC colleagues. He also mentioned that the EC asked about the project's exchange with stakeholders. Then, he informed the partners of the work done by Ms Natasha Frilingou (NTUA) on uploading datasets etc in Zenodo and ARGOS. In this context, he requested that partners send to the NTUA administration team relevant material. Next, he presented the comments derived from the 1st reporting period review and the improvements that the consortium promised to deliver. These improvements are related to Tasks 1.1, 1.2, 2.3, 4.1-4.4, 5.2 and 6.3. Dr Nikas also encouraged partners to work on these improvements since the project will be evaluated on that. Dr Nikas also presented an overview of the SAB's feedback from the GA held in August 2023 focusing on issues related to project management and project outcomes. Following this, Dr Nikas presented the timeline of the 2nd PRM cycle, mentioning a set of challenges and recommendations on how to overcome them. He also stated that all the work done during PRM1 should be uploaded to the I²AM PARIS platform, which will require the help of all involved partners. In a similar context, Dr Nikas and Dr Alaa Al Khourdajie (Imperial) discussed how to coordinate among modelling teams for a successful PRM implementation. Moreover, Dr Shivika Mittal (CICERO) and Dr Nikas discussed how reports can be merged to present more productive results. Lastly, Dr Nikas, Ms Frilingou and Ms Nathalie Wergles (UVa) had a discussion on how policy briefs can be updated, with Dr Nikas stressing that policy briefs from PRM2 must be produced by August 2025.		
WP2	Next, Ms Ugne Keliauskaite (Bruegel) took the floor and presented the progress made in WP2, starting with a schematic illustration of the PRM's structure. Next, she overviewed the WP's deliverables, mentioning that D2.1-D2.4 have already been delivered and D2.5 is due in August 2025. Regarding stakeholder engagement, she mentioned that 100 stakeholders, of which 39 are high-level policymakers, have participated in 10 technical workshops so far. In addition, she showcased the timeline of the 1st PRM cycle, referring to the two modelling cycles that are almost completed. She also demonstrated the timeline for the 2nd PRM cycle, mentioning that it also has 2 modelling iterations and that research questions are being transformed into modelling studies. Following this, Mr Conall Heussaff (Bruegel) presented the policy context for the 2nd PRM cycle focusing on the formulation of the EC and the Draghi report, which stresses the importance of energy prices, specifically for EU industries. Moreover, he presented the inputs from the Policy Steering Groups, mentioning the feedback received for the 1st cycle and the priorities for the second one. These inputs were focusing on 4 thematic areas: Optimal transition, Industry & innovation, Global effects and Behavioural change. Furthermore, Mr Heussaff briefed the consortium on the next steps of WP2. He started by mentioning that regarding the	Publish 1st PRM policy briefs by October 2024 Organise 4 Core Working Groups workshops by early December 2024	Bruegel Bruegel

	1st PRM cycle, Bruegel partners aim to publish the relevant policy briefs by October 2024. Regarding the 2nd cycle, he mentioned that NTUA, E3M and Imperial colleagues have worked on transforming policy-relevant questions into 7 modelling studies; a list containing them was also presented. Moreover, Mr Heussaff mentioned that Bruegel will coordinate all Core Working Groups, the meetings with which will be done the latest by the first week of December 2024. He stated that 1 workshop will be hosted for each theme and he also demonstrated the timeline of this process, suggesting that there is a 4-week window for invitations. Next, he presented a figure demonstrating the 2nd PRM timeline as well as the projected outcomes at the end of the project: D2.5, one policy brief per thematic area and possibly a journal submission regarding the PRM. After, Dr Georg Holtz (WI) and Mr Heussaff discussed the timing of the stakeholder workshops since they are taking place too early to showcase modelling results to stakeholders. Next, Dr Mittal and Mr Heussaff had a discussion on reducing what the consortium asks from stakeholders, suggesting asking for targeted and narrow input (e.g., “What results do you expect?”). Lastly, Mr Heussaff and Dr Nikas discussed short-, medium-, and long-term actions regarding WP2.		
Case study countries – presentation to ambassadors	Following this, Dr Gardumi took the floor and greeted Mr Kapila Fonseka, the ambassador of Sri Lanka in Sweden. Next, Dr Nikas briefly presented the project to the ambassadors attending the meeting, focusing on the aim of the project, its structure and the exceptional colleagues from the case study countries. Afterwards, Mr Fonseka expressed his happiness in attending the meeting and his eagerness to hear more about the project. In this context, Dr Gardumi presented Sri Lanka’s climate, energy and political context, focusing on the financial crisis the country is going through, its high susceptibility to climate change effects and its aim to become carbon neutral by 2050, presenting a table with GHG emissions reduction targets by sector. Moreover, he overviewed the enablers, barriers and policy options regarding Sri Lanka’s trajectory towards carbon neutrality based on the work conducted under WP6. Next, he showcased an illustration of Sri Lanka’s CLEWs model developed in IAM COMPACT and summarised its main features and parameters. In this context, he also presented some preliminary results of the model regarding two scenarios. These results included GHG emissions, electricity generation capacity, primary energy consumption and land-use outputs. Moreover, he summarised some final overall messages, mentioning that further work will be done. In response, Mr Fonseka stated that it is very useful to have this knowledge and recommendations for the government. He also mentioned that Sri Lanka, as an ocean country, will be facing important issues related to sea level rise. Lastly, he mentioned that there have been various changes in Sri Lanka’s policy context lately, providing an excellent opportunity to implement this knowledge. Next, Dr Nikas presented an infographic on desk research		

	knowledge (from stakeholder engagement activities), mentioning that they can share it with the ambassadors. He also stated that the consortium has the capacity to do more work and is willing to share the policy briefs when prepared. Then, Prof Fitsum Kebede (AAiT) overviewed the Ethiopian context, focusing on the rapid increase in energy demand and demonstrating an energy supply and an emissions figure. Moreover, he briefed the consortium on the key barriers following on the overreliance on biomass and presenting a set of policy options for industry, buildings, land use and other sectors. In addition, he presented the OnSSET model, demonstrating its basic parameters, its workflow and a map which shows the electrification status of Ethiopian regions. Then, he presented some preliminary results figures as well as the most important insights from the model. In the same context, he also summarised the policy recommendations from the modelling analysis. Following this, the discussion moved to Kenya and Dr Nikas thanked Ms Angeline Kavindu Musili, the ambassador of Kenya in Sweden for her attendance and briefly presented the project. Next, Ms Salsabila Abdulhalim (TUM) took the floor and summarised the Kenyan context, focusing on enablers, barriers and policy options per sector. Moreover, she presented the CLEWs model, the interlinkages between sectors and the inputs used. In this context, she demonstrated some preliminary results figures and summarised the work done in capacity development activities. In response, Prof Ioannis Tsipouridis (TUM) added that although modelling scenarios and results are very insightful, climate funding from the Global North is essential to make these modelling results a reality. Moreover, he mentioned that TUM has students contributing to modelling but TUM needs support to be part of the political discussions. Ms Kavindu Musili proposed to keep in touch with TUM and stated that the Kenyan government is committed to keeping things running towards the right direction. Next, Dr Borys Dodonov (KSE) presented the Ukrainian context, stating that Ukraine aims to speed up its decarbonisation, moving its aim from 2060 to 2050. He also demonstrated a figure regarding the GHG emissions related to the Russian invasion. Moreover, he summarised the drivers, barriers and policy options, focusing on the consequences of the Russian invasion. Then, he presented illustrative figures of the OSeMOSYS and EnergyPLAN models, mentioning that a KEI modeller joined a training programme at Aalborg University in April 2024.		
WP3	Next, Dr Alaa Al Khourdajie (Imperial) took the floor and summarised the Data Management Plan processes regarding Task 3.1, briefing the consortium on Zenodo, ARGOS and I²AM PARIS platforms. He also mentioned that the next step of this Task is preparing and delivering D3.3 in August 2025. Then, he briefed the partners on the machine-actionable DMP focusing on the functionalities of ARGOS and the data types and formats used. He also explained how the FAIR data guidelines are achieved during the project's processes.	Organise a workshop for the project's Open Science Protocol Prepare a publication on the Open Science Protocol in Open Research Europe	BC3 BC3

Moreover, he informed the participants on how resources are allocated for scientific publications and the I²AM PARIS platform. In a different context, Dr Mittal and Dr Al Khourdajie discussed the issue of the proper format of the project's modelling outputs to be compatible with IPCC AR6 guidelines. Following this, Prof Ilkka Keppo (Aalto) briefed the consortium on the aims of Task 3.2, focusing on the need for a process for linking models, determining the level of integration and finding a workflow of how models should be linked. Next, he mentioned that D3.5 will be based on D3.4 and that it will confirm the level of integration, exploit model diversity and contribute to the interpretation of modelling outputs. Afterwards, he presented a publication on model linkages, describing the publication, demonstrating its outline and presenting a set of issues for discussion regarding the paper. In this context, Dr Mittal and Prof Keppo discussed how to include the harmonisation process in deliverables and papers. Next, Ms Clàudia Rodés (BC3) took the floor to present the progress on Task 3.3. She started by summarising the Task's objectives, the progress made in the 1st PRM and the next steps for the 2nd PRM, focusing on the survey for D3.7 and the open science protocol. Regarding the latter, she presented an illustration of this protocol including elements of model documentation, tools and open management of outcomes. She also overviewed the Open Science Protocol checklist, mentioning that BC3 partners will organise a relevant workshop and that they will prepare a paper for Open Research Europe. In this context, Dr Nikas stressed that all partners should follow the same processes, focusing on the fact the project reviewer praised the consortium for these practices. Following this, Ms Rodés and Dr Al Khourdajie had a discussion on what tool to use for model documentation, mentioning Binder as a possible choice. Moreover, Dr Nikas and Ms Frilingiu discussed the idea of adopting Docker images for all models, a practice that was praised by an EC reviewer for the DIAMOND project. Next, Ms Frilingou, proceeding to Task 3.4, summarised its objectives and briefed the consortium on the recent updates (backend updates) and future work (IAM COMPACT-related work, such as harmonisation heatmaps) on the I²AM PARIS platform, expressing the administration team's aim that each modeller can upload their work. In this context, she also demonstrated a video presenting the new platform, mentioning that a training session can be hosted and that profiles for all modellers should be set up. Next, she summarised all the following steps on the platform, mentioning that the modellers should agree on the profile creation, each model should be uploaded to the platform, and each study should have its own workshop and visualisations. In a broader context, Ms Frilingou and Dr Mittal discussed how can each study be disseminated apart from the platform. Then, on Task 3.5, Ms Frilingou presented the plan and progress on synergies, mentioning the communication with the MAIA project, the 35 publications and 24 conference	Organise a training session for the new platform	NTUA, BC3
	Set up profiles for all modellers	NTUA, BC3
	Prepare a paper regarding the survey for the IAMC template	CICERO
	Prepare a paper on the vetting, classification and assessment of the IAM database	CICERO

	papers/presentations, many of them published in cooperation with other projects, the joint policy events organised so far and the future events that are planned. In this context, Dr Gardumi and Ms Frilingou discussed possible synergies with the UNDESA team. Following this, Dr Mittal briefed the consortium on the main objective of Task 3.6 and then presented the diagnostic scenarios, focusing on carbon prices, mentioning that 3 global models and 1 regional model were used. She also mentioned a list of comparison indicators and summarised the results produced, focusing on mitigation sensitivity and the dynamics between CO₂ and non-CO₂ sectors. Moreover, she informed the partners about a survey run about the IAMC template, in which 50 respondents participated. She also mentioned that a relevant paper is being prepared. Next, she presented the activities and next steps regarding the validation process, mentioning that a relevant poster was accepted at the IAMC conference and that two papers are being prepared: one on the vetting, classification and assessment of the IAM database and a second one on the IAMC template survey. Lastly, Ms Frilingou summarised the following deliverables and milestones for WP3.		
WP4	Next, Dr Al Khourdajie presented the feedback from the 1st PRM, focusing on Studies 1, 2 and 4, briefing the consortium on each study on its theme and lead. Specifically, he presented the key feedback of Study 1 (synthesised by the comments received) which focused on scenario expansion and energy efficiency. He also summarised the response, challenges and implications of the study. Similarly, he presented the key feedback for Study 2, which emphasised system configuration analysis, technological gaps, economic impacts, case studies and demand-side responses. Moreover, he also summarised the relevant implications. In a similar context, he mentioned that Study 4 received more comments than the other studies, which focused on policy modelling, technical constraints for specific technologies, geographical scope and trade dynamics. Lastly, he briefed the consortium on the response to these comments, future planning and relevant implications. Then, Prof Evelina Trutnevite (UNIGE) overviewed Task 4.5, focusing on its aims and mentioning the one deliverable pending for July 2025. In this context, she summarised D4.9, which will comprise three studies. Next, Ms Allison Maguire (UNIGE) took the floor and presented the work done regarding employment, introducing the partners to the context of the studies. She also mentioned the 3 Research Questions that these studies aim to answer, briefed the consortium on the EXPANSE model, its framework and the scenarios of the study. In the same context, she demonstrated an illustration of how the model works on fossil fuel extraction jobs. She also showcased the distribution of fossil fuel extraction jobs, focusing on the spatial distribution of jobs and lost jobs, as well as the different methods for coal, oil and biomass. Moreover, she presented the preliminary results figures for the EU coal phase-out scenario	Fill in the harmonisation report template Organise a meeting to discuss harmonisation template issues Modelling for 2nd PRM for major emitters	All modelling teams NTUA, CICERO IIMA, THU, UMD

	before and after allocating coal extraction jobs. Then, she summarised the next steps in the skill-related analysis and the policy relevance. In this context, Ms Maguire and Prof Keppo discussed peat and its importance in the analysis and next, Dr Gardumi, Ms Maguire and Prof Trutnevte had a discussion on how the number of jobs is calculated. Following this, Ms Frilingou presented Study 10 on grid infrastructure, briefing the consortium on its objective and the relevant stakeholder Research Questions, mentioning that no leader is yet decided. Moreover, she summarised the topics of interest and the timeline of the study. Lastly, Dr Nikas, Prof Trutnevte, Prof Jakob Zinck Thellufsen (AAU), Prof Keppo, Dr Mittal and Ms Frilingou had a long discussion on how Study 10 can be implemented, discussing who can lead themes such as hydrogen, offshore wind and cross-border connections. Afterwards, Dr Jan Ivar Korsbakken (CICERO), regarding Task 4.2, presented D4.4, which was delivered in July 2024 including an updated and expanded harmonisation process as well as expanded and more detailed reporting and format specifications. He also presented the harmonisation report template, which needs to be filled in by modelling teams. In this context, Ms Frilingou, Dr Mittal, Dr Nikas and Dr Korsbakken had a discussion on how to fill in the template and on how data is collected sometimes, with one of them suggesting using ideas from the PARIS REINFORCE project on how to represent some information on the template. Moreover, Dr Nikas suggested that partial harmonisation is transparent if it needs to take place for some models, with Dr Korsbakken suggesting that a relevant meeting is organised. Next, he asked for some details for the PARIS REINFORCE template. Following this, he mentioned that there is an online validation tool in GitHub designed in Python. In this context, he proceeded to present the results of the validation and vetting process, focusing on installation instructions and the demonstration of the interface, using an example. Afterwards, he presented the next steps for the relevant Task. Lastly, Dr Mittal and Dr Korsbakken discussed the validation and vetting processes and Dr Al Khourdajie suggested that the consortium should communicate with people experienced in such processes. Following this, Dr Al Khourdajie proceeded to Task 4.3, starting from the 1st PRM, presenting its objectives and the related work done. He also presented the main points of the European energy crisis case study, the global scenario protocol runs, focusing on the NDC_LTT scenario and the EU cost optimal vs. Fit-for-55, showcasing some figures as well. Lastly, regarding the 1st PRM he demonstrated some figures for the national mitigation pathways for major emitters, focusing on India, China and the USA. Afterwards, he moved to the 2nd PRM briefing the consortium on the tentative timeline for the 3 above-mentioned countries as well as the leading partner for each country and the expected month that modelling will be completed for each country. Moreover, he mentioned that the 2nd PRM also includes Study 8, which delves into global trade dynamics, examining a scenario of		
--	--	--	--

	increased trade and economic tensions. He overviewed the relevant Research Questions and described the study, mentioning the main contributors, a provisional scenario design as well as the proposed timeline. In this context, Dr Nikas, Dr Mittal, Prof Keppo, Ms Frilingou and Dr Al Khourdajie discussed the idea of including China, India and the USA in other studies as well. Lastly, Dr Gardumi added a couple of points on how case study countries can also fit into these studies. Next, Mr Georg Holtz (WI) briefed the partners on what was accomplished during the 1st PRM regarding Task 4.4. Then, he proceeded to present Study 9 regarding the EU's steel industry and its Research Questions drawn from the 2nd PRM. In this context, he presented the models that will participate in the study and the features they have. He also summarised how each model will be used, mentioning that GCAM will be used at a global level whereas the EDM-I at an EU, Member-State and sub-national level. Moreover, he briefed the consortium on issues that may or may not need to be addressed in this study. In this context, Ms Frilingou mentioned that the consortium should address all aspects included in the Grand Agreement and that insights can be taken from other studies if applicable.		
Day II: Progress on WP5-6 & SAB meeting			
WP6	The 2nd day of the GA started with WP6 and specifically with Ms Sophia Theodoropoulou (UPRC) taking the floor to present the work done in Task 6.1. She started by summarising the objectives of Task 6.1 including a Gantt chart demonstrating the Task's timeline and deliverables. Then, she briefed the consortium on the CDE activities, focusing on the KPI indices, mentioning that there is very good progress in most of them and that only 3 indicators need work (bounce rate of the I²AM PARIS platform, return of visitors to the project's website and the platform as well). Furthermore, she stressed the importance of the project's final conference. Next, returning to the previous subject, she informed the consortium about the website's and platform's visitors, mentioning also data regarding the case study countries. Afterwards, she presented the scientific outreach of the project, mentioning that the consortium has published 37 publications, of which 22 are a result of joint efforts with other projects. Similarly, she briefed the partners on the non-scientific outreach numbers of the project per type of media, mentioning that the project has a good KPI performance. Then, she proceeded to the newsletters' progress mentioning that recipients must increase but it is plausible since there are expected policy briefs to be circulated by the end of the project. Nevertheless, she also said that there is a satisfying opening rate so far. In addition, she showed data regarding the open-access self-training material, mentioning that there is good KPI progress for this as well. Next, she presented the performance of the project's social media channels, stating that they demonstrate good KPI progress, briefing the consortium on the status of the followership, posts etc. Following this, Ms Theodoropoulou summarised the Task's	Propose a framework or even soft-link an electrification model with CLEWs	KTH

	expected outcomes and impact, focusing on uptake by countries and the project's acknowledgements, demonstrating relevant indicators. She also presented the tracking framework, commenting on the contribution of UPRC and other partners. Lastly, she briefed the consortium on the next steps that must be prioritised. In this context, Dr Nikas encouraged all partners to acknowledge the project whenever possible to increase its visibility. He also mentioned that it is very important to focus on our outcomes so the project can be successful. Moreover, Dr Gardumi and Ms Theodoropoulou discussed the number of recipients from the case study countries, with the latter suggesting focusing on opening rates. Lastly, Dr Nikas stressed the issue of the open-science aspect and the importance of aiming at high-impact journals. In this context, he mentioned that the project should be acknowledged in open-access journals in order to justify funding the relevant APC or else funding should be found from other sources. Next, Mr Conall Heussaff (Bruegel) summarised the Policy Brief Publication Protocol, showcasing a schematic illustration. He also briefed the consortium on Bruegel's responsibilities and study leaders. Then, Ms Frilingou took the floor and summarised the objectives of Task 6.3 and its progress mentioning that in the last 8 months project partners have published 17 papers and 17 conference presentations/papers/posters acknowledging the project. She also mentioned that 9 training/teaching materials have been uploaded in Zenodo and that the project has hosted 3 events. Afterwards, Mr Obergassel summarised the progress made for Task 6.4, mentioning that D6.6 is finalised and overviewing future work. Next, Dr Gardumi and Ms Frilingou had a discussion on policy options and how they will be used. Moreover, they discussed whether the project will return to stakeholders for additional feedback and what are the consortium's options if there is no chance to receive extra feedback, with Dr Gardumi mentioning that some stakeholders have already expressed their policy priorities. Following this, Ms Camilla Lo Guidice (KTH) took the floor and summarised the key objectives and activities of Task 6.5. In this context, she presented the tools used per case study country and some preliminary results too. In addition, she briefed the consortium on additional activities such as the ICTP Summer School "train the trainers" event. She also mentioned ongoing activities such as the badge system that will be introduced, for which project partners have already provided their feedback. Lastly, she summarised future work related to the Task and some relevant next steps. Then, Dr Gardumi took the floor mentioning that KTH partners are considering soft-linking an electrification model with CLEWs, stating that it requires a lot of work that may require more resources than available. In the latter case, he suggested that at least a framework can be proposed. He also mentioned that they aim to enhance the documentation for each country, ensuring that the information makes the models executable for non-experienced modellers on the		
--	--	--	--

	specific model.		
SAB	In this meeting, there was no dedicated SAB session due to the SAB members' low availability at the time. Nevertheless, one member of the SAB was present on the 2nd day of the GA meeting and had a short discussion with Dr Nikas. Specifically, Dr Nikas briefed them on the 1st day's discussions and also mentioned that the NTUA administration team intends to share the review meeting presentation with the SAB, as well as the recommendations made by the reviewer so that the SAB can be properly informed. He mentioned that all recommendations were focused on future work and none of them suggested changing aspects/deliverables that have already been submitted. Then he mentioned that all PRM1 studies were included in the policy brief, and that the consortium appreciated the SAB's feedback, mentioning that most of the SAB members are impactful researchers, expressing his willingness to work with them in joint scientific publications if they want to participate in such an endeavour. In a different context, the member of the SAB wondered if the SAB has an appointed chair, with Dr Nikas replying that the NTUA administration team does not do that generally and that there is little sense doing it in the project's last year. Nevertheless, he asked the members if they had seen it happen in other projects. She replied that some projects do it and that it works well since the chair can coordinate the rest of the SAB and collect feedback. Dr Nikas replied that this is an insightful recommendation for following projects, adding that the consortium did not want to put more workload on a specific individual from the SAB. He also said that there may be an opportunity for SAB members to physically participate in person—considering willingness and availability—in the project's final event. Lastly, Prof Yeh expressed her hope that the previous day's meeting with the ambassadors was fruitful, with Dr Nikas replying that 2 out of 4 ambassadors participated, offering interesting discussions, with project partners and asking them to further support efforts. The discussion ended with Dr Nikas thanking Prof Yeh for joining.		
WP5	Regarding WP5, Ms Eleftheria Zisarou (E3M) took the floor and briefed the consortium on the comments received from stakeholders on PRM 1 for Studies 3 and 6. Focusing on study 6, the main feedback areas were: 1) phased-in derisking, 2) lower Cost of Capital with trade partner countries 3) drivers of Cost of Capital, 4) high inflation scenarios 5) focus on RES projects and 6) climate finance discussions. Similarly, regarding Study 7 she mentioned that there were 5 main feedback topics: 1) classification of policies, 2) degrees of behavioural change, 3) different behavioural change patterns per group/region, 4) linking Study 7 with empirical studies and 5) difficulties on implementing some behavioural change aspects through policies. Moreover, she overviewed the next steps for Study 6.		

	Next, Dr Xaquín García (BC3) summarised the 3 analyses done in Task 5.2 on the energy tax directive, energy poverty and just transition in Greece, as well as the MEDUSA model. He also briefed the partners on the status of each analysis. Then, he presented the MEDUSA tool, showcasing a schematic illustration, mentioning the next steps (linking with GCAM-Europe and developing an EU-level MEDUSA model) for the analysis, as well as the progress made so far. He also mentioned potential publications and conferences regarding Task 5.2. Later, he presented the main objective of Study 11 and the models that will be used (GCAM linked with MEDUSA and WILLIAM). Following this, Dr Khourdajie briefed the partners on global policy milestones regarding Task 5.3, focusing on GHG reduction goals and net-zero dates. Moreover, he presented the two main scenario building blocks, i.e., RCPs and SSPs which can be combined. He stressed the fact that SSP narratives do not include any extremes, disruption or tipping points. In this context, he demonstrated a figure showcasing all the relevant scenarios, a figure of disrupting events, as well as contributions from the IAM COMPACT project in this discussion. Moreover, he mentioned the work that must be done, focusing on the survey on disruptive events, the compatibility of IAM typology, the novel Disruptive Events-Resilient Pathways (DERPs) framework, expert insights on disruptive events and IAMs, as well as the scenario protocol. In this context, he demonstrated an illustrative figure of the DERPs framework, which has two dimensions (transformational response regarding mitigation and adaptation as well as resilience to socioeconomic impacts). He mentioned that there are 5 DERPs for which he presented their main characteristics, such as the related persistent risks, their wider context and the relevant socioeconomic resilience. Specifically, he mentioned that DERP 1 is moderate on both dimensions, representing the current trends, whereas the other four scenarios are characterised by high/low performance on each of the two dimensions. In addition, he demonstrated the DERPs Scenario Protocol, mentioning its objectives as well as the specific scenarios that will be modelled and which models will be used for each scenario. More specifically, he mentioned two positive disruption types of scenarios regarding EVs and DACCS. For each type of technology, there will be 3 scenarios: 1) current trends, 2) price shocks (DERP 3), and 3) no price shocks on minerals/improved scalability (DERP 5). There will also be heat and draught scenarios, as examples of negative disruptive events affecting the demand and supply of energy examined in DERPs 2 & 4. He also mentioned that the DERPs protocol is already included in 3 papers/presentations accepted in upcoming conferences. In addition, he briefed the partners on the two categories of questions regarding PRM 2. Lastly, he mentioned the next steps of Task 5.3, stressing the issues with perfect foresight and the need to create a matrix matching SSPs and DERPs similar to the one that matches SSPs and RCPs. In this context, Dr Mittal and Dr Khourdajie discussed how		
--	---	--	--

	disruptive events make SSPs plausible or not. In the same context, Dr Gardumi expressed his concern on the capability of running such scenarios for the case study countries, mentioning that OSeMOSYS is a perfect foresight model, although also stating that there is a myopic version of the model. Dr Nikas replied that the case study countries can go for the easiest way possible. He then added that there is an idea to broaden the SSPs to also examine political issues etc; hence they may include disruptive events in the future. In this context, Dr Nikas and Prof Keppo had a discussion on the robustness of the scenarios regarding possible events, with Dr Nikas stating that no reference to positive or negative disruptions has been made, since it is somehow subjective. Adding to this, Dr Mittal said that models cannot capture all the aspects of these shocks; hence partners may have to link models since IAMs are not the best models to examine such shocks, with Dr Nikas concluding that everyone's feedback is necessary on that issue. Next, Prof Trutnevyte described Task 5.4, presenting its aims, deliverables, etc. In this context, she briefed the consortium on the insight provided by each partner for D5.6 and the next steps. Then, Ms Frilingou, proceeding to Study 12 mentioned that it is not a modelling study, but rather a perspective on climate finance, summarising the stakeholder questions. She recommended that at least one case study country contribute to this work. Next, Prof Luis Javier Miguel González (Uva), presented the aspects of Study 7 regarding PRM 1 and Task 5.5, demonstrating its framework and its key findings. Next, he presented PRM2 insights from stakeholders regarding various issues and then moved on to Study 13, for which he presented the relevant research questions and the respective timeline. In this context, Mr Giannis Tolios (E3M) mentioned the next steps required from each partner. Next, Prof Gonzalez briefed the partners on the research questions and timeline of Study 14. Following this, Mr Gonzalo Hernando Parrado (Uva) and Ms Lo Giudice discussed how to incorporate diet changes etc. in the CLEWs model, with Ms Frilingou recommending to further discuss this aspect in the meeting planned for Study 14. Next, Mr Adrian Matteo (CARTIF), presented Section 1 of D5.8 mentioning the 6 aspects examined so far regarding SDG assessment in IAMs and presented a matrix of models and SDG representation as well as a relevant heatmap. He also briefed the partners on the future steps for PRM 2, the next steps regarding Task 5.6.1 deliverables and potential publications and conference papers. Next, he proceeded to Subtask 5.6.2, regarding biodiversity, material resources and biophysical limits, presenting the progress made so far, focusing on the contribution to Deliverables 5.8 and 4.7. In addition, he demonstrated a set of figures on the level of HANPP in the EU as well as the biosphere functional integrity. Lastly, he briefed the partners on the Subtask's next steps. Following this, Ms Frilingou took the floor to present the work done on Subtask 5.6.3 regarding uncertainty analysis on SDG		
--	--	--	--

	indicators. Specifically, she presented some figures on the methods, mentioning that this study will be revamped for the 2nd PRM cycle. Then, Prof Keppo presented the methods used and a schematic figure showing the concept of SMAA methodology, as well as a set of results figures. In addition, Ms Frilingou briefed the consortium on the next steps for Subtasks 5.6.2 and 5.6.3, mentioning an upcoming paper for the WILLIAM model. Next, Dr Anastasis Giannousakis (E3M) summarised the timeline for Task 5.7, mentioning that there is only one milestone report for April 2025. He also mentioned that the 1st meeting with NTUA partners took place in March 2024, where the possible approach, model linking, meta-indicators and questions that have to be tackled were discussed. Moreover, he briefed the partners on the next steps for this Task. Lastly, he described the Model Intercomparison Project tools based on R and Python, focusing on the validation tool of the I²AM PARIS platform, the IAMC R tool package used by the IAMC and the pyam analysis and visualisation tool for input data (i.e., assumptions/parametrisation) and results (model output) of integrated assessment models,		
Q&A, Feedback	Finally, Dr Nikas summarised items discussed during the two-day meeting, and congratulated all partners for their great work as the project received no negative comments during the EC review. Finally, he thanked online participants as well as KTH partners for hosting the meeting.		

2.2 5th General Assembly Meeting: 31 March 2025 & 1 October 2024

The 5th and final General Assembly Meeting of the project took place in London, United Kingdom with the aim of discussing the final steps of the project during the remaining 6 months. Partners who were not able to travel to London were provided the opportunity to join online via Microsoft Teams due to the meeting's hybrid format. In this meeting, there was no dedicated SAB session due to the SAB members' low availability at the time; to make up for this, we contacted the SAB members offline to keep them posted within written communications on the key messages of the first PRM cycle and the resulting policy briefs, the ongoing modelling studies stemming from our stakeholder interactions in the second PRM cycle, and a stocktake on our capacity development activities.

2.2.1 Agenda

Participants: All partners

Day I: Progress on WPs 1-4 | **Location:** Imperial & MS Teams ([link](#))

Monday, March 31, 2025 (all times in UK time)			
09:00 – 09:50	Gathering, small talk, coffee & snacks		
09:50 – 10:00	I.0	Welcome	Imperial
10:00 – 10:30	I.1	WP1 – Project Management - Coordination - Management	NTUA
10:30 – 11:30	I.2	WP2 – Listening - PRM feedback & next steps - Policy briefs	Bruegel
11:30 – 11:45	Coffee & snacks break		
11:45 – 12:50	I.3	WP3 – Exchanging - Open data management (10') – Imperial - Model integration (15') – Aalto - Platform updates (15') - NTUA - Diagnostics (15') – CICERO - Synergies & collaboration (10') - NTUA	Imperial, Aalto, NTUA, CICERO
12:50 – 14:00	Lunch break		
14:00 – 15:20	I.4	WP4 – Modelling - Harmonisation (10') - CICERO - National, global, regional mitigation pathways and relevant studies & Study 8 – Imperial (35') - Sectoral dynamics and cross-sectoral aspects and relevant studies & Study 9 (35')	Imperial, CICERO, BC3, WI, UMD, THU, IIMA
15:20 – 15:45	Coffee & snacks break		

15:45 – 16:20	I.5	WP4 – Modelling (cont.) - <i>European sub-national deep dives & Study 10 (35') – UNIGE & NTUA</i>	UNIGE, NTUA
16:20 – 17:00	Discussion, Q&A		
18:00	GA Dinner at the Hillgate . We will leave the venue at 17:30 and head there.		

Day II: Progress on WPs 5-6 | **Location:** Imperial & MS Teams ([link](#))

Tuesday, April 1, 2025 (all times in UK time)			
09:00 – 09:30	Gathering, small talk, coffee & snacks		
09:30 – 09:45	II.0	Quick reflection on Day I	NTUA
09:45 – 11:30	II.1	WP5 – Expanding - <i>Addressing distributional implications and gender inequality & Study 11 (35') - BC3</i> - <i>Out-of-ordinary extremes (30') – Imperial</i> - <i>Behavioural change and social innovation & Studies 13 & 14 (40') – UVa, UPRC</i>	E3M, BC3, Imperial, NTUA, Uva, CARTIF, UNIGE
11:30 – 11:45	Coffee & snacks break		
11:45 – 12:30		WP5 – Expanding (cont.) - <i>Disruptive innovation in models & Study 12 (10') – UNIGE & NTUA</i> - <i>Truly sustainable decarbonisation pathways (20') – CARTIF, UVa & NTUA</i> - <i>/Expanded multi-model assessment (15') – E3M</i>	E3M, BC3, Imperial, NTUA, Uva, CARTIF, UNIGE
12:30 – 13:00	II.2	WP6 – Explaining - <i>Capacity development (open-access models, next steps) – (30') KTH</i>	KTH, WI, AAiT, TUM, RUSL, KEI
13:00 – 14:00	Lunch break		
14:00 – 14:30		WP6 – Explaining (cont.) - <i>Visualisation of knowledge & results; publications (10') – NTUA</i> - <i>Communication, dissemination, and exploitation (20') – UPRC</i>	URPC, NTUA
14:30 – 15:30	II.3	Scientific Advisory Board <i>Project planning/implementation & SAB feedback</i>	SAB members, All partners
15:30 – 16:00	Coffee & snacks, discussion, Q&A		
16:00 – 17:00	CCS pilot plant visit at Imperial (same building as the venue)		

2.2.2 Minutes

Present	Name and Surname	Organisation
1	Alexandros Nikas	NTUA
2	Natasha Frilingou	NTUA
3	Anastasios Karamaneas	NTUA
4	Konstantinos Koasidis	NTUA
5	Behzad Zamanipour	Aalto
6	Ilkka Keppo	Aalto
7	Jakob Zinck Thellufsen	AAU
8	Meng Yuan	AAU
9	Dirk-Jan van de Ven	BC3
10	Russell Horowitz	BC3
11	Claudia Rodés	BC3
12	Jon Sampedro	BC3
13	Conall Heussaff	Bruegel
14	Rutger Broer	Bruegel
15	Ugne Keliauskaite	Bruegel
16	Adrián Mateo Martínez	CARTIF
17	Noelia Ferreras Alonso	CARTIF
18	Jan Ivar Korsbakken	CICERO
19	Shivika Mittal	CICERO
20	Eleftheria Zisarou	E3M
21	Panagiotis Fragkos	E3M
22	Anastasis Giannousakis	E3M
23	Camilla Lo Giudice	KTH
24	Chamindie Senaratne	KTH
25	Francesco Gardumi	KTH
25	Paramjeet Singh	KTH
26	Lorenzo Rinaldi	POLIMI
27	Matteo Vincenzo Rocco	POLIMI
28	Sophia Theodoropoulou	UPRC
29	Nikos Kleanthis	UPRC
30	Gonzalo Parrado Hernando	UVa
31	Nathalie Wregles	UVa
32	Georg Holtz	WI
33	Wolfgang Obergassel	WI
34	Jyoti Maheshwari	IIMA
35	Ryna Cui	UMD
36	Alicia Zhao	UMD
37	Solomon Teferi	AAiT
38	Fitsum Salehu	AAiT
39	Borys Dodonov	KEI
40	Salsabila Abdulhalim	TUM
41	Xin Wen	UNIGE
42	Alexandre Torné	UNIGE
43	Alaa Al Khourdajie	Imperial
44	Adam Hawkes	Imperial

Minutes: Main issues discussed

Item	Description	Action	
		What	Who
Day I: Progress on WPs 1-4			

Welcome	Dr Alaa Al Khourdajie (Imperial) greeted the consortium and thanked all participants for attending the meeting. He also made some notes on the meeting's agenda. In this context, Dr Alexandros Nikas (NTUA) thanked Dr Al Khourdajie for hosting the meeting and all the partners attending virtually.		
WP1	Next, regarding WP1 Dr Nikas overviewed the project's timeline and deliverables already submitted. He also summarised the upcoming deliverables as well as the MSs of the project, focusing on the ones that must be prepared by the end of May. Moreover, he briefed the consortium on the project's visual identity, focusing on infographics, and Zenodo uploads. Then, he presented a summary of the 1st Reporting Period comments, stating how the consortium approached them and matters that need to be addressed. He focused on Task 2.3, regarding the PRM and Task 4.4, regarding possible updates that may be needed. In this context, various partners discussed how studies can be included to respond to the relevant comment. Moreover, there were some discussions for Task 5.2 regarding the MEDUSA and FlexTool models. Lastly, there were also some comments regarding Task 6.3 regarding the case studies. Mr Wolfgang Obergassel (WI), Dr Francesco Gardumi (KTH), Dr Nikas as well as other consortium members discussed the content and structure of case study papers. Next, Dr Nikas presented the PRM timeline, mentioning that the 1st cycle's briefs are being finalised and that the 2nd cycle's briefs must be finalised by June. He also described the challenges related to this timeline. Moreover, he mentioned that the project horizon was asked to be extended for 2 months in order to organise the final event in October. In this context, he mentioned that only WP1 and WP6 will be extended, if approved, as well as that no deliverable deadlines and costs will be extended. He also suggested that the Museum of Acropolis could be booked for the project's final event and commented that partners are not required to attend the final event, but they are more than welcome to do so if they want to. He also stated that the Technical Report can be prepared during this 2-month extension, if granted. Afterwards, Dr Nikas and Dr Shivika Mittal (CICERO) discussed the impacts of the extension on WP2 and WP6 briefs as well as the issues of transferring the budget between WPs. Lastly, regarding organisational matters, Dr Nikas and Dr Alaa Al Khourdajie had a discussion on how Imperial and UNIGE partners will be affected by the extension.		
WP2	Then, Ms Ugne Keliauskaite (Bruegel) took the floor and summarised the structure of the PRM process, demonstrating an illustrative figure. Next, she presented an overview of WP2, focusing on the processes of the 1 st and 2 nd cycles of the PRM, showcasing what has been done so far. Moreover, she summarised the Core Working Group workshops that have taken place within the 2 nd cycle, focusing on their outcomes and mentioning that they were characterised by	Finalise 1st cycle policy briefs Prepare the 2nd cycle policy briefs	Bruegel Bruegel, study leaders

	high attendance. Following this, Mr Conall Heussaff (Bruegel) presented the EU policy context, focusing on the Clean Industry Deal, the Action Plan for Affordable Energy and the strategy for phasing out Russian gas, with Ms Keliauskaite commenting on specific aspects. Next, Mr Rutger Broer (Bruegel) provided an overview of the policy briefs, focusing on the next steps of the PRM and its detailed timeline. He also mentioned that Bruegel needs to communicate with policy brief leads for the each step of the process, with Dr Nikas suggesting a discussion with the study leads and Ms Natasha Frilingou (NTUA) mentioning the leaders of each study. In this context, various partners had a discussion on the detailed policy brief timeline and structure. Then, Mr Broer overviewed the remaining work, focusing on D2.5. He also summarised the project outcomes so far. Lastly, Dr Nikas and Mr Broer discussed sharing the policy briefs with the SAB as well as the number of policy briefs and policy briefs focusing on case-study countries.		
WP3	Regarding WP3, Dr Al Khourdajie took the floor and summarised the Open Data Management Plan processes and platforms, focusing on the integration of Scenario Metadata Filtering for the IAM PARIS platform. He briefed the consortium on its background and data sources, its indicators and functionalities, its results display features as well as its user interface elements. In this context, Ms Frilingou, Dr Mittal and Dr Al Khourdajie discussed filtering metadata according to IPCC protocols. Moreover, Dr Konstantinos Koasidis (NTUA), Ms Frilingou and Dr Al Khourdajie had a discussion on examining the usage of the tools used in the DIAMOND project in IAM COMPACT as well. Next, regarding Task 3.2 and Task 3.3 Prof Ilkka Keppo (Aalto) summarised the relevant activities of WP3, focusing on the paper about model linkages. He presented a checklist for model linking regarding various aspects, such as harmonisation. Then, he presented the relevant deliverable structure. Following this, Ms Frilingou briefed the partners on the objectives and the completed work of Task 3.4, focusing on the IAM PARIS platform updates, such as the new domain and the new name, the backend updates as well as the remaining work. She also demonstrated the policy catalogue feature of the platform. In this context, Ms Eleftheria Zisarou (E3M) and Ms Frilingou had a discussion on the changes regarding the new domain. In a different context, Ms Frilingou summarised the work done on synergies, focusing on journal and conference papers/presentations jointly published with other projects and briefing the consortium on the recent joint policy events. Next, Dr Gardumi and Ms Frilingou had a discussion regarding project partners participating in the ICTP Summer School. Afterwards, Dr Mittal presented the main objective of the diagnostics processes and summarised the relevant scenarios. She presented the results from various models on diagnostics such as GCAM, PROMETHEUS, WILIAM and	Prepare the model linkage paper and the relevant deliverable Upload the diagnostics MS report	Aalto NTUA

	MUSE and informed the consortium on the survey about the IAMC template, mentioning the themes captured, the number of respondents and that a relevant paper is being prepared. Moreover, Dr Nikas and Ms Frilingou discussed uploading the diagnostics milestone report. Then, Dr Jan Ivar Korsbakken (CICERO) summarised the validation tool and the variables naming harmonisation process, mentioning that some partners have already sent relevant data. In this context, Ms Frilingou mentioned that there is no need for new variables for the GCAM model. In addition, Dr Mittal and Dr Korsbakken discussed possible definition changes on the IIASA platform and the IPCC AR7 reports. Next, Dr Mittal presented the next steps in the validation processes. Additionally, Ms Camilla Lo Giudice (KTH), Ms Frilingou and Dr Mittal had a discussion if CLEWs should be included in the harmonisation processes. Next, Ms Frilingou briefed the consortium on the upcoming deliverables for WP3, mentioning that this WP is almost completed.		
WP4	Regarding WP4, Dr Korsbakken took the floor to present the updates of D4.4, focusing on the data harmonisation report. In this context, he mentioned that harmonisation information will be used in the platform and that some models miss their harmonisation files. He also presented relevant future work. Next, Dr Mittal and Ms Frilingou had a discussion on harmonisation and how models differ in this aspect. Then, Dr Al Khourdajie presented Study 8, mentioning its subject, its lead partners, its contributors as well as the main research questions that it aims to answer, which are two broadened questions based on modelling capabilities. He also presented the scenario protocol, stating that there are 3 main scenarios: the Reference scenario, the Restricted Trade scenario and the Alternative Partnerships scenario, having three variants. Next, he summarised the role of IAMs, presenting the results for each model (GCAM, TIAM and PROMETHEUS) and each scenario. These results focused on final energy demand, emissions and investments in energy supply. In this context, Dr Dirk-Jan van de Ven (BC3), Dr Mittal and Dr Nikas had a discussion on hydrogen demand and emissions. Next, Dr Al Khourdajie overviewed the questions that can be covered in the "Discussions" section of the deliverable. Afterwards, he presented the national mitigation analyses, focusing on the tentative timelines for China, India and the USA. Next, Dr Georg Holtz (WI) presented Study 4, focusing on its outline, the models used, and the scenarios examined. Then, he proceeded to Study 9, summarising the final stakeholder questions after processing all the questions received. Moreover, he presented an outline of the study's sub-studies, mentioning how they are connected and what models they use. Regarding sub-study 9.0, he presented its assumptions in detail, as well as the 1st PRM cycle updates on GCAM scenarios. He also demonstrated GCAM results on CO₂, steel consumption/trade and steel production by technology. Then, he briefed the consortium on the Global DRI Trade ran	Prepare D4.4 Complete USA modelling	CICERO, All modelling partners UMD

	on GCAM regarding Study 9.1 and the impact of steel transport in the EU and GHG emissions regarding Study 9.2. Next, he described the inputs and output for the MARIO model as well as its results on GHG footprint per technology as well as the steel production mix and GHG emissions deriving from Study 9.3. Lastly, regarding Study 9.4, he presented EU-level policies, DRI trade aspects and Member-State level analyses, focusing on the work that has been conducted and the next steps. Lastly, he presented the timeline for Study 9 and had a discussion with Mr Heussaff and Ms Frilingou on relevant workshops. Then, he presented other work related to Task 4.4 focusing on hydrogen and e-fuel trade, mentioning that a relevant paper prepared by Dr Mittal is included in D4.8. Afterwards, Ms Alicia Zhao (UMD) briefed the partners on the work done by UMD for USA modelling, focusing on the scenarios examined. She also overviewed future work until June, when a relevant report will be published. In addition, Prof Ryna Cui (UMD) mentioned that UMD partners aim to reflect federal policy changes in their scenarios. She also summarised UMD's cooperation with numerous non-federal stakeholders such as state governors. Next, Mr Alexandre Torné (UNIGE) took the floor to present aspects of Task 4.5, starting by mentioning its aims and deliverables as well as a background overview of coal phase-out and employment. Then, he summarised the 3 research questions that the EXPANSE model is meant to answer in this Task as well as the methods it uses. Specifically, he mentioned the regional allocation of extraction jobs, the fact that biomass jobs are considered steady and the skill analysis for workers, aiming to match the skills needed and the skills of people who lost their employment during the phase-out. Following this, he presented results on regional job changes, job changes by technology, most gained and lost skills, country-level reskilling requirements and NUTS-2 level reskilling needs. Additionally, he summarised the conclusions of the work done, focusing on the skill analysis. In this context, Mr Torné and Dr Jon Sampedro (BC3) discussed scenario limitations, focusing on skills and types of jobs examined for Spain. Mr Torné also presented a database used for skill groups and job groups. Moreover, Prof Keppo and Mr Torné had a short discussion on niche fossil fuels (e.g., oil shale) focusing on how they can be modelled. In a different context, Ms Frilingou took the floor and presented Study 10, summarising the relevant stakeholder-posed research questions, the study's contributors and its framework, focusing on GCAM-Europe usage. Then, she presented the scenarios ran, the scenario design logic (EU, National and sub-regional levels) and the Core Working Group research questions. Moreover, she presented the next steps for the study, focusing on the work done on enhancing the model. Lastly, Dr Mittal and Ms Frilingou discussed the differences between GCAM-Europe and TIAM results, with Prof Jakob Zinck Thellufsen (AAU) suggesting doing a similar comparison with EnergyPLAN results as well.		
--	---	--	--

Discussion and Q&A	As everything was discussed thoroughly in each WP session, the 1 st Day ended with Dr Al Khourdajie thanking all participants for their attendance in the meeting.		
Day II: Progress on WP5-6			
Quick reflection on Day I	The 2 nd Day of the meeting commenced with Dr Nikas thanking everyone for participating. He also mentioned that the timeline for the briefs may be quite tight but there is some flexibility if needed. In this context, he asked if there were any comments on the respected timeline, but no comments were made.		
WP5	Next, Dr van de Ven took the floor to present the work done on Task 5.2 and specifically on Study 11. In this context, he summarised the first analysis and the developments done so far. He also showed the structure of MEDUSA and its capabilities, focusing on household categories. Moreover, he briefed the consortium on the current development of the model. He also mentioned potential journal publications and conferences as well as the usage of the model in the 2nd cycle of the PRM. Additionally, he summarised the process for the distributional impacts work, how GCAM and MEDUSA interact and what output they provide, as well as how WILIAM is linked with GCAM. Then, he briefed the consortium on stakeholder feedback, focusing on scenarios to explore, distributional impacts and redistribution options. Next, he moved to D5.3, summarising its structure and contents. In this context, Dr Mittal and Dr van de Ven discussed the GINI coefficient effect on the modelling framework and its results. Then, Dr Nikas and Dr van den Ven had a discussion on the progress of soft-linking GCAM and MEDUSA, with Dr van den Ven stating that most of the work has already been done. They also discussed whether the soft-linking of these two models can follow the checklist of the soft-linking protocol, with Dr van de Ven stating that this is not that relevant since MEDUSA has a modelling horizon of one year. Afterwards, Dr Al Khourdajie took the floor, moving to Task 5.3 and specifically D5.5. He described its objective and mentioned that it is based on a paper that is being prepared. Then he introduced the term “disruptive event”, focusing on abrupt changes and climate change impacts. In this context, Dr Mittal, Prof Keppo, Dr Nikas and Dr Al Khourdajie discussed the difference between a disruptive event and a disruptive action, with Dr Mittal stressing the importance of clarification and Dr Nikas stressing also the importance of clarifying what is considered as disruptiveness. Next, Dr Al Khourdajie summarised the DERPs framework using quantitative illustrations as well. In addition, Dr Nikas, Dr Mittal and Dr Al Khourdajie had a discussion on resilience aspects in modelling scenarios. Then, Dr Al Khourdajie presented the 5 DERPs narratives based on climate action effectiveness and resilience on socioeconomic impacts. In this context, he compared SSPs with DERPs, showcasing various differences. Additionally, Dr Nikas and Dr Mittal discussed the differences among disruptive events and how they can be modelled in different models. Moreover, Dr Nikas and Dr Al Khourdajie	Task 5.7 MS report	E3M

	had a discussion on the added value of DERPs in comparison with SSPs. Following these discussions, Dr Al Khourdajie thoroughly presented each DERP's narrative showcasing some structural elements of each one (e.g., level of climate action resource allocation) as well as driving forces and underlying dynamics. Next, Dr Xin Wen (UNIGE) presented the work done under Task 5.4. First, she focused on a study which uses retrospective analysis of 31 European countries with the D-EXPANSE model to provide empirical guidance on selecting slack values in MGA applications, grounding them in historical cost deviations rather than subjective assumptions. Then, she presented a study investigating how integrating geopolitical risk factors into energy system models can improve the realism of energy transition projections. Both studies will be reported under D5.7. Then, Dr Anastasis Giannousakis (E3M) took the floor to present the work done on Task 5.7 starting with an overview of the task, mentioning that this concerns a meta-study from all the studies of the 1st PRM which will be published as a milestone report. He stated that the milestone reported is already under preparation, in which Studies 3,4,6 and 7 are evaluated under 4 dimensions, as presented in Wilson et al., 2021, and briefed the consortium on each dimension. Additionally, he presented the relevance hierarchy of models for Study 4 and commented on the limited availability of data on energy statistical facts. He also presented a figure on appropriateness and summarised the work in progress regarding interpretability. In this context, Dr Mittal, Prof Keppo, Dr Giannousakis and Ms Frilingou had a discussion on the figures that will be used in the milestone report and calibration aspects as well as historical data. Next, Mr Gonzalo Parrado Hernando (Uva) took the floor to present Task 5.6, commencing by summarising the progress done on subtasks 5.6.1 and 5.6.2 regarding the 2nd PRM cycle as well as biodiversity and material resources respectively. Next, Ms Noelia Ferreras Alonso (CARTIF) presented the key takeaways from the workshop on land use and renewables as well as stakeholder feedback received, which will share Study 15 focusing on environmental impacts, policy considerations, socioeconomic impacts and barriers and indicators to measure effects. In this context, many partners had discussions on carbon accounting and biomass. Next, Ms Alonso summarised the capabilities of WILIAM relevant to the study, focusing on solar energy and bioenergy. Following this, Ms Lo Giudice briefed the partners on the work done on CLEWs for Ethiopia as well as the following steps and the used indicators. She also suggested that CARTIF and KTH partners as well as Ms Frilingou have a discussion on how to combine different models under Study 15. Next, Dr Koasidis summarised the objectives of subtask 5.6.3, focusing on updates for the 2nd PRM cycle. He mentioned that all work is done and will be used in D5.9 and that a relevant paper is prepared, led by BC3 colleagues. He also presented a schematic illustration of the used framework. Moreover, he presented some results on 2 °C, 1.7		
--	--	--	--

	°C and 1.5°C portfolios, mentioning that these results will be soon finalised, along with SDG implications from selected pathways.		
WP6	Regarding WP6, Ms Lo Giudice briefed the consortium on the Work Package's tasks. Then Ms Sophia Theodoropoulou (UPRC) took the floor and summarised Task 6.1 and its 3 pillars regarding CDE activities and presented the relevant timeline. She also mentioned that D6.3 should contain information on the final event. Next, she overviewed the progress of the project's progress regarding its KPIs, mentioning that there is good progress in almost every area and that focus should be given to 1) website visitor numbers, 2) the return rate of the platform and the website and 3) the number of newsletter recipients. She also commented on the great performance of the project's academic outreach. In this context, Ms Theodoropoulou and Dr Nikas discussed KPI performance evaluation. Following this, Ms Keliauskaite summarised Task's 6.2 timeline and presented an overview of the policy brief publication protocol. Regarding, Task 6.3 Ms Frilingou summarised new publications and conference papers/presentations that were published in the last 6 months. She also briefed the consortium on the task's targets, mentioning that there is good performance on all targets, although a couple of them require some work. Additionally, she informed the partners on new infographics and policy briefs as well as on upcoming conferences, in which project partners are encouraged to participate.		
Discussion and Q&A	Lastly, Dr Al Khourdajie thanked everybody for attending this 2-day meeting.		

3 Remote (Online) Meetings

3.1 Executive Board Meeting – 17 December 2024

3.1.1 Agenda

Executive Board Meeting
Tuesday, 17 December 2024
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
 - ECEMP submissions (July 2024)
 - WP2: Listening
 - 2nd PRM Core Working Groups: feedback (Bruegel)
 - Policy briefs: progress
 - WP3: Exchanging
 - Task 3.2 – Model linking (Aalto)
 - Task 3.6 – Open science protocols (BC3)
 - WP4: Modelling
 - Task 4.1 – From policy needs to scenario frameworks – Update (CARTIF)
 - Task 4.2 – Broad scenario logic update (CICERO)
 - Task 4.3 – Study 8 (Imperial)
 - Task 4.4 – Study 9 (WI)
 - Task 4.5 – Study 10 (NTUA)
 - WP5: Expanding
 - Task 5.2 - Study 11 (BC3)
 - Task 5.3 – DERP (update – Imperial)
 - Task 5.4 – Study 12 (NTUA)
 - Task 5.5 – Study 13 (UPRC) and Study 14 (UVa)
 - Task 5.6 – SDGs (CARTIF, UVa, NTUA)
 - WP6: Explaining
 - Task 6.1 – Brief progress (UPRC)
 - Task 6.4 – Drivers, barriers, and policy analysis progress (WI)
 - Task 6.5 – Progress on case study country workshops & models (KTH, KEI, TUM, RUSL, AAIT)
2. Any other business

3.1.2 Minutes

Present on Call	Name and Surname	Organisation
1	Natasha Frilingou	NTUA
2	Anastasios Karamaneas	NTUA
3	Alexandros Nikas	NTUA
4	Christina Tigka	NTUA
5	Thomas Nikolakakis	NTUA
6	Konstantinos Koasidis	NTUA
7	Ilkka Keppo	Aalto
8	Jakob Zinck Thellufsen	AAU
9	Dirk-Jan van de Ven	BC3
10	Claudia Rodés	BC3
11	Ugne Keliauskaite	Bruegel
12	Rutger Broer	Bruegel
13	Adrián Mateo Martínez	CARTIF
14	Jan Ivar Korsbakken	CICERO
15	Shivika Mittal	CICERO
16	Panagiotis Fragkos	E3M
17	Eleftheria Zisarou	E3M
18	Camilla Lo Giudice	KTH
19	Lorenzo Rinaldi	POLIMI
20	Nikolaos Kleanthis	UPRC
21	Sophia Theodoropoulou	UPRC
22	Gonzalo Parrado	UVa
23	Nathalie Wergles	UVa
24	Wolfgang Obergassel	WI
25	Jyoti Maheshwari	IIMA
26	Solomon Teferi	AAiT
27	Ioannis Tsipouridis	TUM
28	Alaa Al Khourdajie	Imperial

Minutes: Main issues discussed

Item	Description	Action	
		What	Who
WP6	Dr Alexandros Nikas (NTUA) greeted the consortium and gave the floor to Ms Sophia Theodoropoulou (UPRC) to present the progress on Task 6.1. She mentioned that almost all of the project's KPIs are characterised by good performance. Nevertheless, she stressed that focus must be given to the I ² AM PARIS platform, which has a low bounce rate and a low rate of returning visitors. She added that the latter issue is also prevalent for the project's website. Moreover, she mentioned that the number of newsletters could be increased and that there should be a discussion about the project's final event. Then, she informed the partners that the following newsletter would be published by the 23rd of December. Following this, she briefed the consortium on the Task's next	Discuss the organisation of the final event	NTUA, UPRC, Bruegel
		Create a time plan for policy briefs	UPRC, Bruegel
		Stakeholder engagement survey	UPRC, Bruegel
		Prepare one or	KTH, WI, case

	steps, starting by suggesting that a time plan for action on policy briefs be created. She also mentioned that a survey must be rolled out on stakeholder engagement, stating that this issue is less pressing. Next, she mentioned that the final event could be an EU conference in Athens on M36 back-to-back with an ECMP or H2020 ECEMF event, with Dr Nikas replying that doing it back-to-back with ECMP would not work since the ECMP event is in November. In this context, Ms Natasha Frilingou (NTUA) recommended that this be discussed in a separate meeting. Then, Ms Theodoropoulou continued mentioning that the project must participate in 10 joint events with other projects and that it has participated in 5 so far. Next, she presented the project's current synergies. Lastly, she reminded the consortium to support the project's Social Media profiles. Next, Mr Wolfgang Obergassel (WI) took the floor to present a short summary and the next steps for Tasks 6.4 and 6.5, mentioning that WI and KTH are discussing with case study partners how to disseminate modelling results. Afterwards, Ms Camilla Lo Giudice (KTH) presented the progress regarding the 2nd PRM and the feedback received from the Working Core Groups regarding case study countries. She also summarised the completed tasks as well as the mapping of questions and feedback, showcasing the main outcomes. She then briefed the partners on the ongoing work on data harmonisation workflow for the IAMC format. Lastly, she mentioned that the project should aim to publish one or more publications from Tasks 6.4 and 6.5: one joint paper and papers on case study countries. Lastly, on WP6, Dr Nikas stressed that the consortium should start considering options and ideas for the final event.	more publications from Tasks 6.4 and 6.5	study partners
WP5	Ms Frilingou took the floor and mentioned that it is not required to discuss everything related to WP5 in this meeting since a WP5-dedicated meeting was organised previously; hence only the latest updates can be discussed. In this context, Ms Eleftheria Zisarou (E3M) mentioned that there are no significant updates and that all studies are progressing. Next, Mr Gonzalo Parrado (UVa) quickly updated the partners on Studies 13 and 14. Following this, Dr Alaa Al Khourdajie (Imperial) mentioned that the Imperial team is still investigating how to capture the impacts of various disruptive events on modelling scenarios, and he also provided some examples of disruptive events. Afterwards, Ms Frilingou briefed the consortium on the progress of Study 12, presenting the stakeholder feedback on the study's research questions. She presented the questions and the received feedback per question focusing on issues such as CBAM and global taxation. In this context, Dr Dirk-Jan van de Ven (BC3) and Ms Frilingou discussed how the project can act on feedback not related to modelling results. In this context, Ms Frilingou stated that a policy brief is needed per study. Following this, Mr Nikos Kleanthis (UPRC) briefly summarised the work done for Study 13 so far, focusing on the stakeholders' research questions, and summarising the Working Core Group feedback at a global, EU and national level. In this context, Ms Zisarou and Mr Kleanthis discussed the need to compare EU and global measures. Lastly, Ms Frilingou mentioned that Task 5.6 was thoroughly discussed at the WP5 meeting and suggested that a bilateral	Prepare a paper on biodiversity	NTUA, BC3

	meeting between NTUA and BC3 partners should take place to discuss the biodiversity paper.		
WP4	Dr Mittal mentioned that there are no significant updates on scenarios and harmonisation relating to NDCs and LTTs. Similarly, Dr Jan-Ivar Korsbakken (CICERO) stated that there are no important updates on diagnostics as well as no feedback on harmonisation and vetting aspects. In this context, he encouraged the consortium to provide related feedback. Next, Ms Frilingou and Dr Mittal had a discussion on how to present the results of the two PRM cycles. Following this, Dr Al Khouardajie summarised the objectives of Study 8 and presented the relevant research questions and the stakeholders' feedback. He also briefed the consortium on the Scenario Protocol mentioning that there will be a baseline scenario, 2 Restricted Trade Scenarios and 3 Alternative Partnership Scenarios. Lastly, he summarised the next steps for this study. Afterwards, Ms Frilingou summarised the objectives of Study 10 as well as the stakeholders' feedback on research questions, mentioning that there is no model for distribution.	Prepare the harmonisation template	All modelling teams
WP3	Next, Prof Ilkka Keppo (Aalto) informed the consortium that there is no significant progress in Task 3.2, stating that a paper will be ready for submission by early January.	Submit a paper related to WP3	Aalto
WP2	Ms Ugne Kelaiuskaite (Bruegel) informed the partners that the 2 nd cycle workshops are done. She mentioned that there were 3 workshops and for each one of them, she briefed the consortium on the number of studies presented and the number of stakeholders attending. She also mentioned that Bruegel aims to publish 3 policy briefs in the following January. In this context, Ms Frilingou suggested that these policy briefs be shared with NTUA by early January and then the NTUA administration team will share them with the consortium by early February at the latest.	Publish 3 policy briefs in January	Bruegel, NTUA
WP1	Lastly, Dr Nikas said that everything was progressing smoothly from a project management perspective and wished everyone a pleasant holiday and thanked everybody for attending.		
Any other business	N/A		

3.2 Executive Board Meeting – 28 January 2025

3.2.1 Agenda

Executive Board Meeting
Tuesday, 28 January 2025
14:00-15:00 CET

Microsoft Teams ([Link](#))

Participants: All Partners

Agenda

1. Update on project progress (completed, ongoing, upcoming tasks & deliverables)
 - WP1: Project Management
 - Next GA meeting in London
 - Project duration
 - WP2: Listening
 - LULUCF workshop update
 - Policy briefs: progress (Bruegel, 1st PRM leads)
 - WP3: Exchanging
 - Task 3.2 – Model linking (Aalto)
 - Task 3.4 – I²AM PARIS updates (NTUA)
 - WP4: Modelling
 - Task 4.1 – From policy needs to scenario frameworks – Update (CARTIF)
 - Task 4.2 – Broad scenario logic update (CICERO)
 - Task 4.3 – High emitters contribution & progress (THU, IIMA, UMD)
 - WP4 studies **quick** progress – Studies 8, 9, 10 (Study leads)
 - WP5: Expanding
 - WP5 studies **quick** progress – Studies 11, 12, 13, 14 (Study leads)
 - Task 5.3 – DERP framework progress (Imperial)
 - Task 5.7 – MS10 progress (E3M)
 - WP6: Explaining
 - Task 6.1 – Brief progress (UPRC)
 - Task 6.5 – Progress on case study country workshops & models (KTH, KEI, TUM, RUSL, AAiT)
2. Any other business

3.2.2 Minutes

Present on Call	Name and Surname	Organisation
1	Natasha Frilingou	NTUA
2	Anastasios Karamaneas	NTUA
3	Alexandros Nikas	NTUA
4	Rasmus Magni Johanssen	AAU
5	Jakob Zinck Thellufsen	AAU
6	Dirk-Jan van de Ven	BC3
7	Russell Horowitz	BC3
8	Claudia Rodés	BC3
9	Jon Sampedro	BC3



10	Adrián Mateo Martínez	CARTIF
11	Noelia Ferreras Alonso	CARTIF
12	Jan Ivar Korsbakken	CICERO
13	Shivika Mittal	CICERO
14	Panagiotis Fragkos	E3M
15	Eleftheria Zisarou	E3M
16	Francesco Gardumi	KTH
17	Lorenzo Rinaldi	POLIMI
18	Nikolaos Kleanthis	UPRC
19	Sophia Theodoropoulou	UPRC
20	Gonzalo Parrado Hernando	UVa
21	Nathalie Wergles	UVa
22	Wolfgang Obergassel	WI
23	Jyoti Maheshwari	IIMA
24	Alicia Zhao	UMD
25	Solomon Teferi	AAiT
26	Alaa Al Khourdajie	Imperial

Minutes: Main issues discussed

Item	Description	Action	
		What	Who
WP1	The meeting commenced with Ms Natasha Frilingou (NTUA) and Dr Alaa Al Khourdajie (Imperial) discussing the next General Assembly meeting, taking place in London at the end of March. Dr Francesco Gardumi (KTH) informed the consortium that KTH may not be able to attend physically due to their demanding schedule during that period. Next, Ms Frilingou mentioned the probability of seeking an extension to the project's timeline, mainly related to the project's final event, an issue further discussed later in the meeting. Moreover, Ms Frilingou stated that the Project Officer encouraged the consortium to participate in the EAERE conference in Bergen, Norway in June. After discussing aspects of WP2 and WP3 (as presented below), Dr Alexandros Nikas (NTUA) mentioned that the consortium should organise a final conference, commenting that this is not very convenient since the project ends in August. Therefore, he encouraged partners to provide ideas. He also mentioned that Athens is very hot in summer and that he will have to communicate with the Project Officer to examine possible solutions. In this context, Dr Dirk-Jan van de Ven (BC3) mentioned that BC3 had organised a final conference (in a hybrid manner) two months earlier than the end of the project. Moreover, Ms Frilingou and Dr Shivika Mittal (CICERO) had a discussion on the travels remaining during the project's lifetime. Next, Ms Sophia Theodoropoulou (UPRC) suggested that the project could organise a small event in Athens and if the project is extended a bigger event can also be hosted. Next, Dr Gardumi mentioned that there is a big event organised in Brussels in June; hence the project could consider organising an event during this week in Brussels. Lastly, Mr Wolfgang Obergassel (WI) stated that conference travel has significantly reduced since the emergence of the COVID-19 pandemic, hence he proposed that the consortium should choose its target audience and then host the final event in order to best	Organise the next GA meeting	Imperial

	accommodate its target audience location-wise.		
WP2	Next, Ms Frilingou briefed the consortium on WP2 aspects focusing on the land-use workshop. In this context, Dr Mittal asked that Dr Glen Peters (CICERO) is also invited to this workshop, with Ms Frilingou responding that this can be discussed with Bruegel partners and inform him of the discussed topics if he is not available to join. Similarly, Dr Gardumi proposed that KTH partners are also invited, with Ms Frilingou replying that case study partners were not invited since the workshop is focusing on European aspects. Next, Ms Frilingou informed the consortium that a batch of policy briefs is almost ready, mentioning that Bruegel suggested that policy briefs be published for Studies 1,2,3 and 6. These policy briefs will be ready by February with help from NTUA partners. On the other hand, insights from Studies 4,5 and 7 will also be included in the next studies; hence Bruegel partners proposed to keep them for the second round of policy briefs.	Prepare policy briefs for studies 1,2,3 & 6	Bruegel, NTUA
WP3	Following this, Ms Frilingou informed the consortium that a paper on model linking (related to Task 3.2) is being prepared and that the modelling sections will be ready by the end of January. Then, she added, that Aalto partners will finish the rest of the paper which will be submitted by March. Moreover, Ms Frilingou mentioned that a dedicated workspace for each study must be created in the I²AM PARIS platform. In this context, Dr Mittal and Ms Frilingou discussed what is needed per study, with Ms Frilingou stressing the need to have the studies finished by the end of February.	Prepare model linking paper Finish modelling studies	Aalto, all modelling teams All modelling teams
WP4	After the brainstorming session on the project's final event, the discussion moved to WP4 with Mr Adrian Mateo (CARTIF) taking the floor, informing the consortium that CARTIF and NTUA partners had a meeting for the policy catalogue, for which progress was made. He also mentioned that a final template will be shared for the relevant MS. Ms Frilingou added that this catalogue will be available in the I²AM PARIS platform, showing which scenarios are modelled per model. Next, Dr Jan-Ivar Korsbakken (CICERO) requested that modellers run their models with the tool developed by CICERO to examine if new variables need to be added and he also encouraged for feedback on variable names. In a slightly different context, he continued by stating that the harmonisation process does not intend to examine study-specific inputs but focuses on 4 aspects (population, GDP, emissions and energy) without considering parameters such as technology costs. He mentioned that such parameters can be added but it would require discussing that with all modelling teams. In this context, Dr Mittal and Dr Korsbakken discussed what would be checked and then, Dr Korsbakken and Ms Frilingou had a discussion on preparing a brief e-mail reminding all partners about the vetting/harmonisation feedback required by CICERO. Then, regarding Task 4.3, Ms Alicia Zhao (UMD) mentioned that UMD is investigating federal policies as well as what can be impacted by non-federal aspects, proposing that UMD can submit some of these scenarios later this year. Ms Frilingou offered to send a template for some guidance. Next, Dr Jyoti Maheshwari (IIMA), Mr Nikos Kleanthis (UPRC) and Ms Frilingou discussed the	Run models to check variable names Remind all modelling teams about the necessary feedback to CICERO Arrange a meeting between UPRC and IIMA Organise 2 study-related stocktake meetings Run some GCAM scenarios	All modelling teams NTUA, CICERO IIMA, UPRC Imperial BC3, NTUA

	contribution of IIMA in Study 13, with Mr Kleanthis suggesting arranging a meeting with IIMA to discuss details, with Ms Frilingou adding that Study 13 for India will be part of Task 4.3. Following this Dr Al Khourdajie mentioned that Imperial partners have two stocktake meetings until April regarding the relevant studies and briefed the consortium on the progress of Study 8. Then, Dr Mittal updated the partners on Study 9 and Ms Frilingou informed the partners that a Doodle poll will be shortly shared focusing on Studies 10 and 12. In this context, Dr van de Ven and Ms Frilingou informed the partners that some tests are taking place and GCAM runs will start by mid-February.		
WP5	Next, Dr van de Ven briefed the consortium on Study 11 and how GCAM and MEDUSA will be linked. Afterwards, Ms Frilingou mentioned that NTUA will send an e-mail regarding Study 12 the following week and Mr Kleanthis mentioned that there is no significant update on Study 13. Regarding Study 14, Mr Gonzalo Parrado Hernandez (UVA) stated that there is good progress and that UVA received stakeholder feedback in December. He also added that 3 models will be used that focus on the household sector. Then, Dr Al Khourdajie summarised the progress made on DERP aspects. Lastly, regarding MS10, focusing on applying an appropriateness index to Studies 1-7, Ms Frilingou mentioned that this Milestone will include model intercomparison and that it will provide useful insights that can be the content of a scientific publication.	Send an e-mail regarding Study 12	NTUA
WP6	Regarding WP6, Dr Gardumi informed the consortium that biweekly calls with case-study partners take place to discuss modelling progress. He added that KTH and case-study partners aim to publish at least one paper per country. He also mentioned that KTH and Bruegel should discuss the links with policy steering groups. In this context, Ms Frilingou mentioned that there is a Milestone for all case-study models, and it would be great if KTH and case-study countries provide input, with Dr Gardumi expressing his intent to help. Regarding Task 6.1, Ms Theodoropoulou mentioned that there was no significant update since the previous month's meeting. She then added that most KPIs are characterised by good performance but the consortium still has to pay attention to metrics related to the project's website, platform and newsletters. Finally, Ms Frilingou thanked everyone for participating in the meeting.	Publish at least on paper per case study country	KTH, case study partners
Any other business	N/A		

3.3 Executive Board Meeting – 29 April 2025

3.3.1 Agenda

Executive Board Meeting
Tuesday, 29 April 2025
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
 - Amendment request
 - IAMC / ECEMP submissions
 - WP2: Listening
 - Policy briefs: progress (Bruegel, 1st PRM leads)
 - WP3: Exchanging
 - Task 3.2 – Model linking (D3.5, Aalto)
 - Task 3.4 - IAM PARIS updates (also on Task 3.1, NTUA)
 - WP4: Modelling
 - Task 4.1 – Policy catalogue (MS9, CARTIF)
 - Task 4.3 – Global/national/regional mitigation analysis; progress for D4.6 (Imperial)
 - WP4 studies **quick** progress – Studies 8, 9, 10 (Study leads)
 - WP5: Expanding
 - WP5 studies **quick** progress – Studies 11, 12, 13, 14 (Study leads)
 - Task 5.3 – Extremes; progress for D5.5 (Imperial)
 - Task 5.7 – Improving multi-model science; progress for MS10 (E3M)
 - WP6: Explaining
 - Task 6.1 – Brief progress (UPRC)
 - Task 6.5 – Progress on case study country workshops & models (KTH, KEI, TUM, RUSL, AAiT)
2. Any other business

3.3.2 Minutes

Present on Call	Name and Surname	Organisation
1	Natasha Frilingou	NTUA
2	Anastasios Karamaneas	NTUA
3	Ilkka Keppo	Aalto
4	Rasmus Magni Johanssen	AAU
5	Dirk-Jan van de Ven	BC3
6	Claudia Rodés	BC3
7	Rutger Broer	Bruegel
8	Adrián Mateo Martínez	CARTIF
9	Noelia Ferreras Alonso	CARTIF
10	Eleftheria Zisarou	E3M
11	Camilla Lo Giudice	KTH



12	Paramjeet Singh	KTH
13	Chamindie Senaratne	KTH
14	Nikolaos Kleanthis	UPRC
15	Sophia Theodoropoulou	UPRC
16	Gonzalo Parrado Hernando	UVa
17	Wolfgang Obergassel	WI
18	Jyoti Maheshwari	IIMA
19	Solomon Teferi	AAiT
20	Borys Dodonov	KEI
21	John Maitha Thoya	TUM
22	Ioannis Tsipouridis	TUM
23	Alaa Al Khourdajie	Imperial

Minutes: Main issues discussed

Item	Description	Action	
		What	Who
WP1	The meeting started with Ms Natasha Frilingou (NTUA) greeting the consortium. Then, she briefed the meeting participants on the progress of the grant agreement amendment request as well as on some ideas for the organisation of the project's final event. Moreover, she mentioned the upcoming IAMC conference in November, for which she encouraged partners to submit their relevant work and also expressed NTUA's will to assist any partners that may need help with this procedure. In this context, Dr Alaa Al Khourdajie (Imperial) mentioned that he with some other project partners will be hosting a session on the said conference.		
WP2	Next, Mr Rutger Broer (Bruegel) took the floor and briefed the consortium on the progress of WP2, focusing on the policy briefs. He mentioned that there is a lot of ongoing work and that Bruegel partners are having bilateral meetings with other project teams towards this direction. In this context, Ms Frilingou mentioned that the policy briefs will be shared with the SAB members to receive their feedback prior to publishing them. In response, Mr Broer said that most policy briefs from the 2 nd RPM should be published to meet the project's relevant KPI and Ms Frilingou mentioned that NTUA colleagues in cooperation with other partners have also prepared a study on SGDs that can be also used to form a policy brief if required.	Prepare the study policy briefs	Bruegel, study teams
WP3	Then, Prof Ilkka Keppo (Aalto) informed the partners of the progress of the model linking deliverable and the relevant paper. Afterwards, Ms Frilingou summarised the progress done on the IAM PARIS platform, focusing on the workspaces that will be created for the various studies, mentioning that the workspaces for the 1 st RPM studies will be ready by the end of May. In this context, Dr Al Khourdajie summarised how these workspaces will work and how users will be able to interact, highlighting the sustainability of this process since the platform will be continuously updated after the end of the project as well, due to its usage from other research projects. Lastly, Ms Frilingou mentioned that partners will be asked to look at the platform in June to provide their feedback on possible improvements regarding its ease of use etc.	Prepare the workspaces for the 1 st RPM studies	NTUA, BC3

WP4	The discussion on WP4 commenced with Mr Adrián Mateo Martínez (CARTIF) who mentioned that there are no significant updates on Task 4.2. Then, Dr Al Khourdajie took the floor summarising the progress made on Task 4.3 and Study 8, focusing on some modelling insights. He also presented some takeaways from the USA and India, mentioning that THU partners are still expected to send their feedback. In this context, Dr Al Khourdajie and Ms Frilingou discussed the interaction so far with the THU partners. Next, Ms Frilingou briefed the consortium on Study 10, mentioning that related work was presented at the EGU conference. She also commented that partners from UNIGE and CICERO will also deliver their results soon, stating that the model runs on GCAM must be extended. Lastly, she mentioned that the relevant deliverable will be prepared by early July.	Continue the work on Study 10	UNIGE, CICERO, NTUA, BC3
WP5	Following this, Dr Dirk-Jan van de Ven (BC3) summarised the progress on Study 11, focusing on the work done on the GCAM and MEDUSA models. He also mentioned that his team had a meeting with Bruegel partners. Next, Ms Frilingou summarised the progress made on Study 12, focusing on the paper prepared. Then, Mr Nikos Kleanthis (UPRC), regarding Study 13, mentioned that the UPRC team has started simulations, that they already have results from the PROMETHEUS model and that they expect results from three other models by May. He stated that the work is on good track and he also informed the participants of the meeting that UPRC had with BC3 and Bruegel partners regarding the joint policy brief. Afterwards, Ms Frilingou and Prof Rasmus Magni Johanssen (AAU) discussed the extension of Study 2 and two relevant papers that AAU partners are preparing, with Ms Frilingou mentioning that part of this research work should acknowledge the project. Regarding Study 14, Mr Gonzalo Parrado Hernando (UVa) mentioned that the modelling teams aim to provide preliminary modelling results by the following week and that UVa will send inputs to Bruegel by the 15th of May. Then, Dr Al Khourdajie summarised the progress made on the D5.5 and the relevant paper and in this context, he and Ms Frilingou had a discussion on additional elements that the deliverable can include compared to the paper. Lastly, Ms Eleftheria Zisarou (E3M) mentioned that there are no significant updates on the model intercomparison milestone report. In this context, she and Ms Frilingou had a short discussion on historical data during this intercomparison.	Send modelling data to Bruegel	UVa
WP6	Regarding WP6, Ms Camilla Lo Giudice (KTH) mentioned that KTH and the case study partners aim to finalise modelling work for Tasks 6.4 and 6.5 by the end of May and that their aim is to complete the relevant deliverable by June. She also mentioned that all case study partners are working on their papers. In this context, Mr Paramjeet Singh (KTH) took the floor and brief the consortium on the work done on transforming CLEWs results on IAMC format in order to run vetting checks. He stated that this process will be completed by mid-June. In this context, Ms Frilingou and Mr Singh discussed the vetting variables that should be introduced for CLEWs. Next, case study partners briefed the consortium on their	Finalise case study modelling work and prepare the relevant deliverable and papers Transform CLEWs results to IAMC format	KTH, case study partners KTH

	progress, with Prof Ioannis Tsipouridis (TUM) stating that there are no significant updates on the Kenyan model. In this context, Prof Solomon Teferi (AAiT) briefed the partners on the progress of his team, mentioning that a draft will be ready by mid-May. He also stated that the paper they are preparing will focus on energy and that his team has prepared a table of contents for the relevant policy brief. Similarly, Dr Borys Dodonov (KEI) updated the consortium on the modelling work done by KEI focusing on scenario aspects. Next, Ms Lo Giudice briefed the consortium on the progress of the Sri Lankan team, mentioning that they are preparing two papers and a policy brief. Next, Ms Frilingou and Ms Lo Giudice had a discussion on the models that should be uploaded on GitHub. In this context, Prof Rasmus Johanssen mentioned that EnergyPLAN is a free model. On the other hand, Dr Dodonov mentioned that for Ukraine uploading some data is not feasible due to their classified nature, due to the country's martial law. Lastly, Ms Frilingou thanked everybody for attending the meeting.		
Any other business			

3.4 Executive Board Meeting – 24 June 2025

3.4.1 Agenda

Executive Board Meeting
Tuesday, 24 June 2025
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**
 - Final event (*NTUA*)
 - IAMC / ECEMP submissions (*NTUA*)
 - **WP2: Listening**
 - Policy briefs: progress (*Bruegel, 1st PRM leads*)
 - **WP3: Exchanging**
 - Task 3.4 - IAM PARIS updates (*D3.9; NTUA*)
 - **WP4: Modelling**
 - WP4 studies **quick** progress – Studies 9 (*D4.8*), 10 (*D4.9*) (*Study leads*)
 - **WP5: Expanding**
 - WP5 studies **quick** progress – Studies 11 (*D5.3*), 12, 13, 14 (*D5.7*) (*Study leads*)
 - Task 5.3 – Extremes (*Imperial*)
 - Task 5.6 – SDGs (*NTUA*)
 - **WP6: Explaining**
 - Task 6.1 – Brief progress (*UPRC*)
 - Task 6.5 – Progress on case study country workshops & models (*KTH, KEI, TUM, RUSL, AAIT*)
2. Any other business

3.4.2 Minutes

Present on Call	Name and Surname	Organisation
1	Natasha Frilingou	NTUA
2	Anastasios Karamaneas	NTUA
3	Alexandros Nikas	NTUA
4	Ilkka Keppo	Aalto
5	Rasmus Magni Johanssen	AAU
6	Jakob Zinck Thellufsen	AAU
7	Dirk-Jan van de Ven	BC3
8	Jon Sampedro	BC3
9	Rutger Broer	Bruegel
10	Noelia Ferreras Alonso	CARTIF
11	Shivika Mittal	CICERO
12	Jan Ivar Korsbakken	CICERO
13	Eleftheria Zisarou	E3M

14	Francesco Gardumi	KTH
15	Chamindie Senaratne	KTH
16	Lorenzo Rinaldi	POLIMI
17	Matteo Vincenzo Rocco	POLIMI
18	Nikolaos Kleanthis	UPRC
19	Sophia Theodoropoulou	UPRC
20	Gonzalo Parrado Hernando	UVa
21	Dagmar Kiyar	WI
22	Georg Holtz	WI
23	Jyoti Maheshwari	IIMA
24	Ioannis Tsipouridis	TUM
25	Alaa Al Khourdajie	Imperial

Minutes: Main issues discussed

Item	Description	Action	
		What	Who
WP1	The meeting started with Dr Alexandros Nikas (NTUA) greeting the consortium and informing all partners on the EC's negative decision on the extension. He also briefed the consortium on the reasoning behind this decision, which is a general approach from the EC and not something related to the project itself. Next, he updated the participants on the project's final event, mentioning that it will most probably be on the 29th of August in the Acropolis Museum in Athens, Greece. He also stated that the event will last 7 hours, from 10:00 to 17:00 local time, and the NTUA administration team aims to have more than 100 attendees. In this context, Dr Alaa Al Khourdajie (Imperial) and Dr Nikas had a discussion on the partners that will attend, with Dr Nikas mentioning that there is a Doodle poll on people who have responded positively. He also requested that all consortium members who aim to attend the meeting inform the NTUA administration team. Next, Dr Nikas and Dr Shivika Mittal (CICERO) had a discussion on what kind of speakers will be invited, with Dr Nikas mentioning that focus will be given to consortium members but that there will also be some Greek stakeholders speaking as well. Moreover, Dr Nikas and various other partners, inter alia Dr Mittal, Dr Jon Sampedro (BC3), Prof Jakob Zinck Thellufsen (AAU), Dr Georg Holtz (WI) and Dr Lorenzo Rinaldi (POLIMI), had a conversation on who will present each study, who will attend from each institution and what can be done if no one can represent any institution. Next, Dr Nikas presented some ideas for each session, as well as an idea to host a meeting at NTUA the day before. He also mentioned that people will be able to join online, but there is no plan for online presentations. Then, Dr Nikas stated that the meeting will be co-hosted with a Greek NGO (ELLINIKI ETAIREIA Society for the Environment and Cultural Heritage – ELLET) that has the capacity to involve several local stakeholders. Lastly, Dr Nikas, Dr Mittal and Ms Natasha Frilingou (NTUA) discussed how studies will be presented, with Dr Nikas mentioning that the draft agenda presented previously is only a tentative version until the attendance of all partners is clarified.	Organise the final event	NTUA
		Inform the NTUA administration if participating	All partners
		Finalise the draft agenda	NTUA

WP2	Regarding WP2, Mr Rutger Broer (Bruegel) briefly updated the consortium on the progress of the policy briefs. He mentioned that 3 policy briefs are sent to stakeholders and that feedback is expected by the end of the week. In this context, he requested that all partners inform Bruegel of policy brief-related updates.	Inform Bruegel on policy brief-related matters	All partners
WP3	There is no discussion on WP3 aspects since there was nothing crucial to discuss.		
WP4	Dr Holtz updated the consortium on the progress of the ongoing WP4 deliverable. Moreover, Ms Frilingou and Prof Zinck Thellufsen discussed the finalisation of the relevant study with UNIGE.	Finalise the electricity sector study	AAU, UNIGE
WP5	Then, Dr Sampedro informed the consortium on the progress of the ongoing D5.3. Afterwards, Ms Frilingou and Mr Gonzalo Parrado Hernando (UVa) had a discussion on how the deliverable will include two Tasks and the required coordination with UNIGE. Following this, Ms Noelia Ferreras Alonso briefed the partners on the work done for SubTask 5.6.1. Next, Dr Nikas and Ms Frilingou had a discussion on the embargo status of deliverables and on relevant dates and timelines. Moreover, Dr Mittal and Dr Nikas discussed how budget allocation can take place after the 31 st of August. Lastly, Dr Al Khourdajie updated the consortium on DERPs' progress.		
WP6	Next, Ms Sophia Theodoropoulou (UPRC) took the floor and mentioned that the project's KPIs are progressing well. Nevertheless, there are also some issues, such as the return rate on the I ² AM PARIS platform and the number of newsletter recipients. In this context, she and Ms Frilingou discussed how to increase newsletter recipients. She also mentioned that the users of the website need some improvement, but the publication of the first batch of policy briefs has significantly helped. Next, Ms Chamindie Seranatne (KTH) briefed the consortium on pilot countries, mentioning that they are progressing as planned and that they are expected to produce their results by the following week. In this context, Prof Ioannis Tsiouridis (TUM) stated that his team will also be ready by the following week. Next, Dr Francesco Gardumi (KTH), Dr Nikas and Ms Seranatne had a brief discussion on the WP6 deliverable. Lastly, Dr Nikas summarised what was discussed on administrative issues during the meeting and mentioned that a draft agenda for the final event will be sent for all partners to make their recommendations and thanked all participants for joining the meeting.		
Any other business			

3.5 Executive Board Meeting – 26 August 2025

3.5.1 Agenda

Executive Board Meeting
Tuesday, 26 August 2025
14:00-15:00 CEST

Microsoft Teams ([Link](#))

Participants: All Partners

Agenda

1. Update on project progress (completed, ongoing, upcoming tasks & deliverables)
 - **WP6: Explaining**
 - Final assessment of remaining tasks (*KTH*)
 - **WP5: Expanding**
 - Final assessment of remaining tasks (*E3M*)
 - **WP4: Modelling**
 - Final assessment of remaining tasks (*Imperial*)
 - **WP3: Exchanging**
 - Final assessment of remaining tasks (*NTUA*)
 - **WP2: Listening**
 - Final assessment of remaining tasks (*Bruegel*)
 - **WP1: Project Management**
 - Final event (*NTUA*)
 - Project final review process (*NTUA*)
2. Any other business

3.5.2 Minutes

Present on Call	Name and Surname	Organisation
1	Natasha Frilingou	NTUA
2	Anastasios Karamaneas	NTUA
3	Alexandros Nikas	NTUA
4	Konstantinos Koasidis	NTUA
5	Rasmus Magni Johanssen	AAU
6	Jakob Zinck Thellufsen	AAU
7	Jon Sampedro	BC3
8	Ugne Keliauskaite	Bruegel
9	Rutger Broer	Bruegel

10	Noelia Ferreras Alonso	CARTIF
11	Shivika Mittal	CICERO
12	Jan Ivar Korsbakken	CICERO
13	Eleftheria Zisarou	E3M
14	Francesco Gardumi	KTH
15	Chamindie Senaratne	KTH
16	Debora Ghezzi	POLIMI
17	Nikolaos Kleantis	UPRC
18	Sophia Theodoropoulou	UPRC
19	Gonzalo Parrado Hernando	UVa
20	Wolfgang Obergassel	WI
21	Jyoti Maheshwari	IIMA
22	Solomon Teferi	AAiT
23	Salsabila Abdulhalim	TUM
24	Ioannis Tsipouridis	TUM
25	Alaa Al Khourdajie	Imperial

Minutes: Main issues discussed

Item	Description	Action	
		What	Who
WP1	The meeting commenced with Dr Alexandros Nikas (NTUA) greeting the participants and briefing them on some details regarding the project's final event, mentioning the organisers' intention not to have online participants interfere, although the event will be hosted online as well for specific audiences, with an online link being available and shared with the dedicated online participants. He also thanked all the project partners for their great collaboration over the past 3 years. Then, he requested that speakers at the final event respect the scheduled timeslots of the event's agenda, providing instructions for the event's presentation. He stressed the importance of focusing on results and not processes, since the event's audience will not be very familiar with modelling tools, as it will comprise multiple types of stakeholders. Moreover, he stated that the NTUA organisation team aims for at least 70 participants, hoping to have more, although the event takes place at the end of August. Dr Nikas also mentioned that badges will be distributed to the event's speakers and contributors and that Prof Haris Doukas will participate in the event, sharing his experiences as the mayor of Athens. In addition, Dr Nikas provided some instructions on how people will access the event's venue, located in the Acropolis Museum. In this context, Dr Nikas and Dr Shivika Mittal (CICERO) discussed the Q&A section of each session, focusing on the moderator's ability to prioritise questions according to their relevance and direct them to the most appropriate speaker. Moreover, Dr Mittal, Dr Nikas, and Ms Natasha Frilingou (NTUA) had a discussion on the presentations' content and format, with Ms Frilingou mentioning that the NTUA team will send its feedback today and Dr Nikas describing what must be included in the presentation. Following this, Dr Nikas and Ms Sophia Theodoropoulou (UPRC) debated how the event will be covered for CDE purposes. In a different subject, Dr Nikas mentioned that the technical and financial reporting of the project will take place during September	Prepare the financial and technical reports	NTUA, All partners

	and October, following a process similar to the one followed for the Interim Reporting. He informed the consortium that the NTUA team will soon contact all partners and all WP leaders requesting the necessary information. Lastly, Dr Nikas and Dr Mittal discussed how/whether preprints or planned publications will be reported in the technical report.		
WP6	Regarding WP6, Dr Francesco Gardumi (KTH) took the floor and informed the consortium that D6.8 was submitted, thanking all contributors. He also mentioned that WP6 teams are working on the case study countries policy briefs and that these reports will be available soon. In this context, he also stated that the relevant papers will be ready after the end of the project. Then, Prof Ioannis Tsipouridis (TUM) informed the consortium that everything is going according to plan for the TUM team. Similarly, Prof Solomon Teferi (AAiT) briefed the partners on the progress of the policy brief and the relevant paper for Ethiopia. Moreover, Dr Gardumi mentioned that the final event presentations are being finalised, asking that the NTUA administration team provide its feedback. Next, Ms Theodoropoulou informed the consortium that D6.3 has been reviewed and is expected to be submitted by the following day. Moreover, she made a brief presentation on KPI's progress, stating that the project has achieved all its targets except the IAM PARIS platform's and website's bounce rates, for which D6.3 provides the necessary explanation. In this context, Mr. Rutger Broer (Bruegel) mentioned that the stakeholder database figures have not changed since the preparation of the Deliverable. Following this, Dr Nikas, Ms. Frilingou and Mr. Broer had a discussion on the stakeholder survey regarding the PRM and how the consortium should report its results and processes.	Prepare the case study countries' policy briefs and relevant papers	AAiT, RUSL, TUM, KEI, KTH, WI
WP5	Next, Ms Eleftheria Zisarou (E3M) informed the consortium that all WP5 deliverables are published, except D5.7, which is under review. She also mentioned that Study 13 is in progress, as well as the relevant policy brief. Then, regarding the final event, she mentioned that E3M's presentation will be ready today. Moreover, adding to Ms Zisarou's comments, Mr Nikos Kleanthis (UPRC) added that the policy brief is revised after stakeholders provided feedback and is under review by Bruegel. In this context, Ms Ugne Keliauskaite (Bruegel) stated that Bruegel partners have already sent some relevant content.		
WP4	Regarding WP4, Dr Alaa Al Khouardajie (Imperial) informed the consortium that all relevant deliverables have been submitted. Moreover, Dr Mittal and Ms Frilingou had a discussion on Studies 10 & 11, with Ms Frilingou adding that IAM PARIS workspaces for each study are being prepared.		
WP3	Similarly, Ms. Frilingou mentioned that all WP3 deliverables are ready and that relevant workspaces are being developed.		
WP2	Then, Mr. Broer and Ms. Keliauskaite briefed the meeting's participants on the preparation of policy briefs and thanked everybody for their help. Next, Ms Frilingou and Mr Broer discussed how to report the PRM process and a future paper on that matter.		
	Lastly, Ms Frilingou thanked everybody for attending the meeting.		
Any other business	N/A		

4 Scientific Advisory Board meetings

The SAB serves as an advisory body to the IAM COMPACT Consortium. The General Assembly (GA), which includes the Project Coordinator and one representative from each beneficiary, is responsible for selecting and appointing SAB members. The initial formulation, tentative composition, and Terms of Reference for the SAB were documented in the first milestone of IAM COMPACT. NTUA, in collaboration with all partners, had reached out to various stakeholders, including academics and climate change mitigation experts, to invite them to join the project's SAB. The SAB originally consisted of ten members, but its composition changed in response to new opportunities and challenges, with 1 member being replaced and another having limited availability and opting out. During the two General Assembly meetings held (September 2024 and March 2025) there were no dedicated SAB sessions due to the SAB members' low availability at the time. However, NTUA shared with the SAB a very detailed slide deck outlining the project's progress, as well as a series of emails updating them on several key developments, achievements, and challenges—to which the feedback was positive.

Critically, in earlier interactions, SAB members had suggested that the consortium shares the series of policy briefs based on the results of our first PRM cycle—which at the time were under development—with selected members of the SAB based on their interests and expertise, to scope their reaction and/or feedback, before officially releasing. This suggestion was followed upon, during this period. Notably, based on the topic of each policy brief, different SAB members were contacted and asked to read the draft and share any reactions. Based on their feedback, each policy brief was polished and uploaded to our website¹.

Finally, all members of the SAB were invited to join our final public event “Responsive Science in Support of Climate Policy Making”, which took place on Friday, August 29, 2025, at the Acropolis Museum in Athens, Greece. The event aimed to capitalise on a series of national conferences on Climate Change, Energy, and the Environment previously organised (i.e., building upon and acting as a continuation of the 2020 and 2022 editions).

¹ <https://iam-compact.eu/publications/policy-briefs>