



ENhancing our understanding of Trade Impacts
on Climate, industries, and the Environment



Funded by
the European Union

Project funded by



Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft
Confédération suisse
Confederazione Svizzera
Confederaziun svizra

Swiss Confederation

Federal Department of Economic Affairs,
Education and Research EAER
**State Secretariat for Education,
Research and Innovation SERI**

D7.1 – Quality management and risk management plan

WP7 – Project management and coordination

27/06/2025





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	101184775		Acronym	ENTICE	
Full Title	ENhanced understanding of Trade Impacts on Climate, industries, and the Environment				
Topic	HORIZON-CL5-2024-D1-01-04				
Funding scheme	HORIZON Research and Innovation Actions				
Start Date	January 2025	Duration		48 Months	
Project URL	http://www.enticeproject.eu/				
EU Project Advisor	Michela Tagliaferri				
Project Coordinator	E3 Modelling S.A. (E3M)				
Deliverable	D7.1 – Quality management and risk management plan				
Work Package	WP7 – Project management and coordination				
Date of Delivery	Contractual	30/06/2025	Actual	27/06/2025	
Deliverable type	Report	Dissemination Level		Public	
Lead Beneficiary	E3 Modelling S.A. (E3M)				
Responsible Author	Maro Baka	Email		maro.baka@ricardo.com	
	E3M	Phone		+30 210 6775696	
Contributors	Panagiotis Fragkos (E3M)				
Reviewer(s)	Dimitra Spatharidou (HOL); Konstantinos Koasidis (ICCS)				
Keywords	Quality management, Project management, Risk 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 deliverable serves as a reference document for all consortium partners, ensuring awareness of and compliance with the ENTICE project's quality management procedures, roles, and requirements. It is also intended to inform external stakeholders, such as policymakers, researchers, and funding authorities, by documenting the quality assurance framework and the robust processes that support the scientific integrity of the project's methodologies, results, and policy recommendations.

3. Short summary of results (<250 words)

The ENTICE project is managed through a well-defined governance structure comprising the Project Coordinator (PC), Project Manager/Quality Manager (PM/QM), Work Package Leaders (WPLs), and the General Assembly (GA). The PC leads coordination with the European Commission, while the PM/QM ensures efficient operations and quality assurance across all project activities and outputs. WPLs oversee the scientific delivery of their work packages ensuring that all deliverables and milestones are delivered on time and with high quality, and the GA serves as the main decision-making body.

Robust management procedures have been developed for internal communication, decision-making, conflict resolution, and document sharing. The project adheres to official reporting requirements defined in the Grant Agreement, submitting periodic technical and financial reports via the Funding & Tenders Portal. Deliverables undergo a structured quality assurance process involving at least 2-3 internal reviewers, the PM/QM, and the E3M management team, with clear criteria and timelines.

In addition to formal deliverables, other materials like policy briefs and communication outputs are subject to streamlined review procedures to ensure clarity and consistency. Project performance is tracked through a self-evaluation framework that includes outcome and impact indicators, dissemination metrics, and operational indicators, updated every six months. Risk management is embedded in the project through continuous identification, assessment, and mitigation of technical and managerial risks, led by E3M with input from all partners.

4. Evidence of accomplishment

This report.





Preface

In today's interconnected global economy, understanding the trade-climate nexus is more critical than ever. Trade policies significantly influence environmental outcomes, while climate change affects trade flows. However, the complex relationship between these areas remains insufficiently explored, often due to data limitations, gaps in economic modelling and the evolving nature of global supply chains. The ENTICE project aims to bridge these knowledge gaps by advancing our understanding of the trade-climate-industry (TCI) nexus. It examines how trade policies impact environmental sustainability and how climate policies shape global trade dynamics. By developing fact-based insights and innovative modelling tools, ENTICE supports informed decision-making at this crucial intersection of trade, climate, and sustainability.

E3M – E3-MODELLING AE	EL	
CMCC – FONDAZIONE CENTRO EURO-MEDITERRANEO SUI CAMBIAMENTI CLIMATICI	IT	
WI – WUPPERTAL INSTITUT FÜR KLIMA, UMWELT, ENERGIE GGMH	DE	
REFORM – FUNDACJA INSTYTUT REFORM	PL	
VUA – STICHTING VU	NL	
HOL – HOLISTIC IKE	EL	
ENEXTGEN – ENEXTGEN S.R.L.	IT	
UoS – UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON	UK	
UNIVR – UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI VERONA	IT	
SEURECO – SEURECO SOCIÉTÉ EUROPÉENNE D'ECONOMIE SARL	FR	
ICCS – ΕΡΕΥΝΗΤΙΚΟ ΠΑΝΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΙΑΚΟ ΙΝΣΤΙΤΟΥΤΟ ΣΥΣΤΗΜΑΤΩΝ ΕΠΙΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΥΠΟΛΟΓΙΣΤΩΝ	EL	
POLIMI – POLITECNICO DI MILANO	IT	
Purdue – TRUSTEES OF PURDUE UNIVERSITY	US	
ZEW – LEIBNIZ-ZENTRUM FÜR EUROPÄISCHE WIRTSCHAFTSFORSCHUNG GMBH MANNHEIMRL	DE	
UU – UNIVERSITEIT UTRECHT	NL	
ORDESCYS – ORDECSYS SARL	CH	



Executive Summary

The ENTICE project is governed by a comprehensive and clearly structured management framework designed to ensure smooth implementation, scientific excellence, and transparent accountability. At its core, the project is coordinated by the Project Coordinator (PC), who is responsible for the overall leadership of the project and for acting as the primary liaison with the European Commission. Supporting this central role is the Project Manager/Quality Manager (PM/QM), who combines operational coordination with responsibility for the quality assurance of project outputs. Together, the PC and PM/QM form the operational backbone of the project's governance. Work Package Leaders (WPLs) manage the delivery of scientific and technical outputs within their respective work streams. They ensure timely execution, monitor progress, and coordinate inputs from contributors. The project's overarching strategic decisions and key operational changes are made by the General Assembly (GA), which is composed of one representative per beneficiary. This body ensures democratic and transparent governance across the consortium.

ENTICE implements well-defined management procedures covering communication, decision-making, conflict resolution, and document sharing across project partners. These procedures enable effective coordination and support collaborative working practices across a diverse set of partners. For example, day-to-day communication is streamlined via dedicated channels, while significant decisions are escalated through structured voting mechanisms or resolved via consensus within the GA. Document sharing is managed through a secure and version-controlled repository (SharePoint – ENTICE-EXT). The project is organized into reporting periods in accordance with the Grant Agreement, during which periodic reports, both technical and financial, are submitted through the European Commission's Funding & Tenders Portal. Technical reporting includes Part A (structured online data) and Part B (a narrative PDF detailing scientific progress, partner contributions, and deviations). A clear internal timeline is in place for drafting, reviewing, and submitting these reports, giving the PC sufficient time to address any issues before final submission.

A structured quality assurance framework governs all formal deliverables of the ENTICE project, supported by a clear timeline. The review process begins one month prior to the submission deadline to ensure timely delivery. Each deliverable is initially drafted by a designated deliverable leader, supported by contributors. It is then reviewed by 2–5 internal reviewers, the PM/QM, and, when required, a member of the E3M management team for final formatting and consistency checks. Deliverables are evaluated against specific quality criteria, including clarity, scientific robustness, policy relevance, and adherence to templates and timelines. This multi-stage process ensures all outputs meet the high standards expected by the European Commission. Beyond formal deliverables, the project generates various scientific and policy-relevant outputs, such as milestones, policy briefs, commentaries, and communication materials (e.g. newsletters, press releases). These undergo a simplified quality review, with a focus on consistency, scientific accuracy, and visual presentation. While not subject to formal submission or fixed deadlines, these materials play a critical role in stakeholder engagement and are held to rigorous internal standards.

Performance monitoring is implemented through a two-tier self-evaluation scheme. The first tier, impact evaluation, tracks progress against expected outcomes and impacts as defined in the Grant Agreement. This includes scientific achievements, societal relevance, and policy influence. The second tier, process





evaluation, focuses on internal project functioning, assessing workflows, collaboration effectiveness, and compliance with deadlines. Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) are grouped into three categories: (1) scientific and impact-related KPIs, (2) communication and dissemination metrics, and (3) operational and procedural indicators. These are updated every six months and used to guide internal reviews and corrective measures where necessary.

Finally, a proactive Risk Management Plan is embedded in project operations. Risks are categorized into technical (research-related) and managerial (implementation-related), with each risk evaluated for its likelihood and potential impact. Risk monitoring is led by the coordinating partner E3M, with WP Leaders responsible for identifying and managing risks within their work packages/domains. Mitigation strategies and contingency plans are regularly reviewed and updated to reflect the evolving context of the project. This approach ensures early identification of potential issues and supports adaptive project management.

In summary, ENTICE is supported by a comprehensive and structured governance system that integrates project coordination, quality assurance, performance tracking, and risk management. This framework not only supports the project's scientific objectives but also ensures transparency, accountability, and resilience throughout its lifecycle.





Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Purpose and Scope	1
1.2	Structure of the document.....	1
2	Project Management and Quality	2
2.1	Project Governance.....	2
2.2	Project management roles and responsibilities	2
2.3	Ethics and Data Protection.....	3
2.4	Project management system and procedures	3
2.4.1	Project SharePoint – ENTICE-EXT	3
2.4.2	Document management	4
2.5	Internal communication framework.....	6
2.5.1	General Assembly Meetings (Hybrid or Online).....	6
2.5.2	Coordination and WP meetings (Online)	7
2.5.3	Conflict resolution in project execution	7
2.5.4	Regular updates.....	7
2.6	Internal Financial Monitoring and Reporting	8
2.7	Official Reporting	8
2.8	Quality Assurance of Deliverables.....	9
2.8.1	Roles and Responsibilities.....	9
2.8.2	Review Process	10
2.8.3	Quality Criteria	11
2.9	Quality Assurance of Other Materials	11
3	Quality Assessment.....	13
3.1	Evaluation Framework	13
3.2	Performance Indicators.....	13
4	Risk Management Plan.....	14
4.1	Risk analysis and mitigation measures	14
	ANNEX I: Allocation of reviewers to deliverables (Reporting Period 1)	19
	ANNEX II: Outcome- and impact-related KPIs	21
	ANNEX III: Communication and dissemination metrics	23
	ANNEX IV: Operational and process indicators.....	25

Table of Figures

Figure 1.	Folder structure of the ENTICE-EXT SharePoint Documents library	4
-----------	---	---





Table of Tables

Table 1. Work Package Leaders in ENTICE.....	3
Table 2. Naming convention of ENTICE documents	6
Table 3. Tentative schedule of ENTICE GA Meetings	7
Table 4. Reporting Periods of ENTICE	8
Table 5. Process timeline for the preparation and submission of official periodic reports	9
Table 6. Deliverable review timeline	10
Table 7. Quality criteria for ENTICE deliverables	11
Table 8. Identified risks and mitigation measures	15



1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose and Scope

This document outlines the Quality Management Plan (QMP) and Risk Management Plan (RMP) for the ENTICE project. It defines the roles, procedures, indicators, and tools required to ensure the project is effectively managed, and that outputs are delivered on time, and in line with the expected scientific and quality standards and EC requirements.

Specifically, this document aims to:

- Define the roles and responsibilities of all consortium partners.
- Establish procedures for monitoring the quality and timely delivery of project outputs.
- Set out communication and coordination mechanisms to ensure smooth collaboration.
- Identify and assess key technical and managerial risks.
- Specify mitigation strategies to reduce the likelihood and impact of risks and disruptions.

To ensure continued relevance and effectiveness, the plan will be regularly reviewed and updated. All ENTICE partners are expected to adhere to the principles and commitments outlined in this document.

1.2 Structure of the document

The structure of the document is as follows:

- Section 1 outlines the purpose, scope, and structure of the document.
- Section 2 defines the governance framework, including roles, responsibilities, and communication procedures to ensure effective coordination, quality assurance, and risk management. It also covers ethical guidelines, document and data management, internal reporting, and deliverable review processes.
- Section 3 presents the evaluation framework, covering both impact and process assessments.
- Section 4 describes the Risk Management Plan, including risk identification, assessment, and mitigation strategies.

The document also includes some annexes as below:

- Annex I: Reviewer allocation for project deliverables (Reporting Period 1)
- Annex II: Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) related to project outcomes and impacts
- Annex III: Communications and dissemination metrics
- Annex IV: Operational and process indicators



2 Project Management and Quality

The ENTICE project is governed by a clear and effective management structure designed to ensure smooth decision-making, timely risk mitigation, and active participation by all partners. Project coordination, technical oversight, and quality assurance are embedded in clearly defined roles and responsibilities to ensure coherence and accountability.

2.1 Project Governance

The **General Assembly (GA)** is the ultimate decision-making body of the consortium, comprising one representative from each partner. It is chaired by the Project Coordinator (PC) from E3M unless otherwise decided. The GA is responsible for high-level decisions related to project content, finances, intellectual property, consortium evolution, and member appointments.

The **Executive Board (EB)** is the supervisory body responsible for overseeing the execution of the project and reports to the GA. It includes the PC and representatives appointed by the GA. The EB ensures the smooth implementation of the work plan, prepares GA meetings and decisions, facilitates consensus-building, monitors progress, supports interactions with the European Commission, and oversees dissemination activities.

Operational procedures for the EB and GA are detailed in Section 6.3 of the Consortium Agreement.

2.2 Project management roles and responsibilities

The **Project Coordinator (PC)**, Dr. Panagiotis Fragkos (E3M), is responsible for the scientific and technical direction of ENTICE, the coordination and timely submission of deliverables, financial oversight, and acting as the primary contact with the European Commission and the Project Advisor (PA). Key responsibilities of the PC include:

- Ensuring compliance with the Grant and Consortium Agreements
- Submitting reports, financial statements, and deliverables to the EC
- Chairing the GA and EB meetings, preparing agendas and minutes
- Monitoring the implementation of GA and EB decisions
- Managing the distribution and administration of project funding
- Overseeing the alignment of scientific work with project objectives

An exhaustive list of all responsibilities of the PC are presented in detail in the ENTICE Consortium Agreement, to which all partners have agreed and will adhere.

The **Project Manager & Quality Manager (PM/QM)**, Dr. Maro Baka (E3M), leads the day-to-day management and quality assurance of the project. The PM/QM works closely with the PC and the consortium to ensure the effective implementation of project activities. Responsibilities include:

- Coordinating administrative processes and communication among partners
- Supporting financial and contractual management
- Ensuring timely (and with high quality) delivery of milestones and deliverables
- Monitoring progress against the work plan
- Leading the implementation of quality assurance procedures
- Identifying deviations and risks, and supporting corrective actions
- Facilitating internal communication tools and regular progress updates





Work Package Leaders (WPLs) are responsible for the coordination and successful delivery of their WPs. They supervise task activities, review intermediate and final outputs, coordinate with other WPs, and ensure the technical quality of deliverables. WPLs participate in monthly calls with the PC and PM/QM and provide quarterly progress reports.

Table 1. Work Package Leaders in ENTICE

WP No	Leaders	Co-leaders
WP 1	Lukas Hermwille (WI)	Alexandros Nikas (ICCS)
WP 2	Georgios Trachanas (ICCS)	Maksym Chepeliev, Dominique van der Mensbrugghe (Purdue)
WP 3	Baptiste Boitier, Pierre Le Mouël (SEURECO)	
WP 4	Lorenza Campagnolo, Paola Rocchi (CMCC)	
WP 5	Panagiotis Fragkos, Maro Baka (E3M)	
WP 6	Dimitra Spatharidou, George Xexakis (HOL)	
WP 7	Panagiotis Fragkos, Maro Baka (E3M)	

Task Leaders (TLs) manage the implementation of specific tasks, guiding involved partners, planning and tracking activities, compiling contributions, and finalizing deliverables. They maintain regular communication with WPLs and raise issues when needed.

Consortium Partners contribute to tasks as assigned, comply with deadlines, ensure quality, and promptly report risks or challenges to the TLs, WPLs, or PC/PM as necessary.

2.3 Ethics and Data Protection

ENTICE partners will comply with all applicable EU, national, and institutional ethical guidelines. Research activities will not involve the collection of personal data, and all stakeholder input will be anonymised. The stakeholder database will remain confidential (and compliant with GDPR and other related regulations) and will only be used for project-related communication. Ethical standards will be ensured through internal review procedures. Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) and AI-assisted technologies will be used solely for language refinement and editing purposes, under human oversight and with appropriate disclosure, ensuring transparency and alignment with ethical research practices.

2.4 Project management system and procedures

To ensure effective collaboration, traceability, and consistency across all work packages and partners, ENTICE will use a single, centralized platform for internal document management. This avoids fragmentation and ensures that all project participants have access to the latest materials in a secure and structured environment.

2.4.1 Project SharePoint – ENTICE-EXT

SharePoint is a secure, web-based collaboration platform that integrates with Microsoft Office. The ENTICE SharePoint site, hosted under ENTICE-EXT, serves as the project’s central document repository. It includes a well-structured “Documents” library that hosts all materials related to the project, including deliverables, milestones, scientific outputs, meeting records, administrative documents, and supporting files.



Key advantages of using SharePoint include:

- Central access: All project documents are stored in one place, accessible to authorised partners via the ENTICE-EXT platform.
- Version control: Automatic tracking of document revisions, with the ability to restore previous versions and view change history
- Secure sharing: Access-controlled sharing of files and folders within the consortium, ensuring confidentiality.
- Collaborative editing: Real-time co-authoring and commenting through Microsoft Office integration.
- Document locking: Files can be checked out during editing to avoid concurrent modifications.
- Accessibility: The web-based platform is accessible from desktops, laptops, tablets, and smartphones.
- Metadata and lists: Support for tagging, sorting, and creating custom lists for tracking actions, issues, and tasks.

These functionalities and features ensure high standards of document integrity and workflow efficiency throughout the project lifecycle.

The Documents library of the ENTICE-EXT SharePoint follows a simple yet comprehensive folder structure, enabling users to easily identify and locate all documents related to the project. The classification is intuitive and aligned with the project's work packages and activities, ensuring efficient navigation and collaboration across the consortium, as illustrated in Figure 1.

Name	Modified	Modified By
1.Administrative	December 20, 2024	Baka, Maro
2.Deliverables and Milestones	December 20, 2024	Baka, Maro
3.Meetings	December 20, 2024	Baka, Maro
4.Other Material	December 20, 2024	Baka, Maro
5.Events	December 20, 2024	Baka, Maro
6. Periodic Reports	January 8	Fragkos, Panagiotis
ENTICE - Research Papers	April 4	Baka, Maro
ENTICE_PartnersContactList-2025.06.02.xlsx	5 minutes ago	Baka, Maro

Figure 1. Folder structure of the ENTICE-EXT SharePoint Documents library

The ENTICE-EXT SharePoint repository will be maintained for at least three years after the project's completion, in line with Horizon Europe requirements for data availability and auditability. During this period:

- The E3M management team will ensure continued access for consortium members.
- No structural changes or deletions will occur.
- The repository will serve as an archival record of all project outputs.

This approach supports sustainable knowledge management and aligns with FAIR data principles.

2.4.2 Document management

Document management in ENTICE includes the preparation and use of consistent templates for project deliverables, presentations, policy briefs, and management reports, the operation of a shared document repository, and adherence to naming and versioning conventions. These tasks fall under the responsibility



of the Project Coordinator (PC).

ENTICE will produce 46 official deliverables, along with a variety of other documents over the course of the project. These will include periodic reports to the European Commission, internal coordination materials (e.g., meeting agendas and minutes), policy briefs, scientific publications, datasets, and supporting documentation. Where applicable, standardised templates will be used to ensure consistency and support effective collaboration across the consortium.

Documents will primarily be created using the following software:

- **Word Processor:** Microsoft Word 2013 or later
- **Spreadsheets:** Microsoft Excel 2013 or later
- **Presentations:** Microsoft PowerPoint 2013 or later

If any partners face limitations in using these tools, E3M will provide assistance to ensure documents are formatted as required.

2.4.2.1 Naming conventions and versioning

To ensure consistent version control and traceability, all ENTICE project documents will follow structured naming conventions. Document history is managed via SharePoint, and the naming structure varies slightly depending on the document type and stage.

General Rules

Each document name begins with ENTICE, followed by specific identifiers such as deliverable numbers, document titles, versioning, and when relevant, author/reviewer initials or dates. Versioning uses the format vA.BB, where A indicates a major version and BB a minor update (e.g., v0.01, v1.00). Final versions submitted to the European Commission should avoid spaces, using underscores instead, and may drop the version number, unless archived (e.g., ENTICE_D1.1_Stakeholder_engagement_strategy or ENTICE_D1.1_Stakeholder_engagement_strategy-v1.00).

Deliverables

Deliverables are named using their work package and deliverable number and follow the format:

ENTICE DX.Y [Deliverable Title]-vA.BB, where:

- **X** = Work Package number
- **Y** = Deliverable number
- **A** = Major version (e.g., 1 for submission version)
- **BB** = Minor version (e.g., 01, 02 for draft versions)

Reviewed versions add reviewer initials, ENTICE DX.Y [Deliverable Title]-vA.BB_IN

- **IN** = Initials of reviewer

The final submission format replaces any spaces with underscores to comply with the FAIR principles (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable) and the European Commission's requirements for structured, machine-actionable digital outputs. This ensures better compatibility with automated systems, repositories, and metadata extraction tools.

Reports to the EC

The draft reports to the EC will use the format: ENTICE [Report Title]-vA.BB. The final submission format replaces any spaces with underscores to comply with FAIR principles.



Internal Project Documents

For regularly updated files like contact lists, internal effort reports, dissemination trackers, the format includes the date (yyyy.mm.dd) and optionally the partner's name.

Publications and Outreach Materials

These include among other newsletters, policy briefs and presentations. They will follow the naming ENTICE [Title or Issue]-vA.BB.

Table 2. Naming convention of ENTICE documents

Document Type	Format	Description	Example
Deliverables (Drafts)	ENTICE DX.Y [Deliverable Title]-vA.BB	X = WP number Y = Deliverable number A = Major version BB = Minor version	ENTICE_D1.1_Stakeholder_engagement_strategy-v1.00
Deliverables (With Reviewer)	ENTICE DX.Y [Deliverable Title]-vA.BB_IN	IN = Reviewer initials	ENTICE D2.1 Data management plan-v0.80_MB
Deliverables (Final)	ENTICE_DX.Y [Deliverable Title] or ENTICE_DX.Y [Deliverable Title]-v1.00	- Final version for EC submission (<i>machine-readable with underscores</i>)	ENTICE_D1.3_Project_CDE_plan or ENTICE_D1.3_Project_CDE_plan-v1.00
EC Reports (Drafts)	ENTICE [Report Title]-vA.BB	For official technical or financial reports to the EC	ENTICE 1st Periodic Technical Report-v0.70
EC Reports (Final)	ENTICE_[Report Title] or ENTICE_[Report Title]-v1.00	- Final version for EC submission (<i>machine-readable with underscores</i>)	ENTICE_1st_Periodic_Technical_Report or ENTICE_1st_Periodic_Technical_Report-v1.00
Internal Documents	ENTICE_[Description]-yyyy.mm.dd or ENTICE_[Description]_Partner- yyyy.mm.dd	Partner = partner abbreviation yyyy.mm.dd = date For evolving files like effort reporting, contact lists	ENTICE_PartnersContactList-2025.06.02 or ENTICE_PartnersContactList_E3M-2025.06.02
Outreach Materials	ENTICE [Title or Issue]-vA.BB	Newsletters, briefs, presentations, etc.	ENTICE Newsletter No1-v0.90

2.5 Internal communication framework

Clear and structured communication is essential for effective project coordination and implementation. Established dedicated channels and routines have been established in ENTICE since Month 1 to support information flow, alignment, and collaboration across the consortium.

2.5.1 General Assembly Meetings (Hybrid or Online)

Key project milestones are marked by biannual General Assembly (GA) meetings. These aim to review progress, align strategies, and ensure smooth implementation of the ENTICE project. The kick-off meeting (M1) was held as a hybrid event in Athens. The second GA meeting (M9 or M10) is planned to be held online. Subsequent meetings (Table 3) will be held either online or hybrid and will often be held alongside other project events to reduce travel and enhance participation. Dates will be proposed early via Doodle



polls managed by E3M, ideally at least 3-4 months before physical/hybrid meetings.

Table 3. Tentative schedule of ENTICE GA Meetings

Meeting identifier	Time	Place
Kick-off Meeting	January 2025 (M1)	Athens
2 nd GA Meeting	M9 or M10	Online
3 rd – 8 th GA Meeting	Every 6 months	TBD
Final Event	M48	Brussels

Proposed dates for each meeting will be discussed in online meetings and decided over doodle polls organised by the management team from E3M, at an early stage, i.e., at least four (4) months before a physical/hybrid meeting.

2.5.2 Coordination and WP meetings (Online)

Remote meetings, mainly via Microsoft Teams, will ensure continuous communication and decision making throughout the project. These include:

- Monthly Executive Board (EB) meetings, coordinated by E3M, to track progress in all project activities, adjust timelines, and identify corrective actions. Agendas and invites are circulated at least one week in advance by E3M.
- Work Package (WP) meetings will be coordinated by the respective WP Leaders, in coordination with the E3M management team, to align WP-specific activities and address any WP-level issues or conflicts. Task-specific meetings may also be organised, when necessary, under the coordination of the relevant Task Leader.

Minutes are documented by the meeting coordinator, using a standard template, for all physical, hybrid, and remote meetings. Hybrid and remote meetings are recorded, subject to the consent of all participants. Meeting minutes contribute to deliverable “D7.2-1st report on project and SAB meetings” (M12), and its subsequent updates “D7.3-2nd report” (M30) and “D7.4-3rd report” (M48).

2.5.3 Conflict resolution in project execution

Technical issues or disagreements that fall within the contractual framework, excluding those related to contracts, budgets, resource allocation, or major shifts in project scope, are first addressed at the WP-level. If a consensus cannot be reached, the following conflict resolution process is followed:

1. The concerned consortium members notify the WP Leader of the issue.
2. The WPL assesses whether the matter requires a bilateral call or a dedicated WP meeting and informs the PC accordingly.
3. Outcomes of the call or meeting are communicated to the PC.
4. If no agreement is reached, the PC engages directly with the relevant partners to seek resolution.
5. If the conflict remains unresolved, it is escalated to the EB, whose decision is final.

2.5.4 Regular updates

Starting from M6, the PC will send weekly or biweekly email updates to all ENTICE partners. These updates will provide timely information on project implementation, including reminders about upcoming deliverables and meetings, relevant international events and consortium involvement, useful documentation, newly produced materials, and any required partner actions. The objective is to ensure that all partners have a clear and up-to-date overview of the project’s progress.



2.6 Internal Financial Monitoring and Reporting

For internal project management and monitoring, all partners will report their actual use of human resources every 18 months to the PC, to support the preparation of the interim, midterm, and final periodic reports (in the end of each Reporting Period), unless otherwise required by the European Commission. This reporting will cover personnel costs as well as sub-contracting, travel, and other direct costs incurred during each reporting period (Table 4).

A standardised internal reporting template has been developed and will be used by all beneficiaries for consistency.

In accordance with Article 20.1 of the Grant Agreement, all partners are required to maintain time records documenting the hours worked on the project for their personnel. These records must be written, approved monthly by the individuals concerned and their supervisors, and retained by each partner. While there is no obligation to submit these records to the PC, each partner is responsible for ensuring their availability in case of audit or request by the European Commission.

2.7 Official Reporting

According to Data Sheet Point 4.2 of the Grant Agreement, the project is divided into the following 'reporting periods' (RPs):

Table 4. Reporting Periods of ENTICE

Reporting Period	Project Months	Calendar Duration
1	Month 1 to Month 18	January 2025 - June 2026
2	Month 19 to Month 36	July 2026 - December 2027
3	Month 37 to Month 48	January 2028 - December 2028

Article 21.2 of the Grant Agreement (GA) outlines the requirements for periodic reporting, covering both the technical report and the financial statements.

Periodic technical reports include two main components:

- Part A consists of structured online forms in the Funding & Tenders Portal that capture key quantitative and summary information about the project's implementation, including work package progress, deliverables, milestones, use of resources, and deviations from the plan.
- Part B, a narrative PDF document with detailed description of the work carried out during the reporting period, results and progress towards project objectives, contributions from each beneficiary, detailed explanation of any deviations or changes.

The information will be regularly inserted into the reporting template to allow timely submission of the periodic report, ensuring that all necessary data is provided to the European Commission. Part A will also be updated on a regular basis via the Funding & Tenders Portal.

The process to ensure high-quality delivery of the official reports is outlined in the following steps (Table 5):

**Table 5. Process timeline for the preparation and submission of official periodic reports**

When	Who	What	Recipient
1 month before end of reporting period	PC	Provides consortium partners with detailed guidelines on the periodic report template and the timeline towards submission	All consortium partners
1 week before end of reporting period	PC	Provides template for the technical part of the periodic report (progress, resource use)	All consortium partners
3 weeks after end of reporting period	All consortium partners	Provide progress and resources use information for the technical part of the report	PM/QM
4 weeks after end of reporting period	PM/QM	Provides feedback on the draft periodic report	PC
4 weeks after end of reporting period	All beneficiaries	Provide financial statements with details on resource use (submitted via Participants Portal)	EC
5 weeks after end of reporting period	PC, PM/QM	Synthesise and share draft technical report, incorporating feedback	All consortium partners
6 weeks after end of reporting period	All consortium partners	Provide final inputs/modifications based on comments	PC, PM/QM
7 weeks after end of reporting period	PC	Compiles final report and submits to the EC	EC

The above time schedule foresees a complete draft of the report five weeks after the end of the reporting period, thereby allowing the PC three weeks to address any remaining issues before submitting the report to the EC, as per Article 21 of the Grant Agreement.

For associated partners (ORDECSYS), this process will be adapted according to their internal procedures and funding body requirements.

2.8 Quality Assurance of Deliverables

This section outlines the process to ensure the quality of all project deliverables.

2.8.1 Roles and Responsibilities

Project Manager / Quality Manager (PM/QM): Oversees the review process, ensuring scientific and technical quality. Reviews both drafts and final versions of deliverables, with authority to resolve review disagreements and conduct extra checks for key deliverables. The PM/QM is responsible for the submission of the final deliverable to the EC via the portal.

Internal reviewers: Evaluate draft deliverables against set criteria (Table 7), providing detailed comments. If quality remains insufficient after revision, they may be re-engaged.

Deliverable leaders: Draft the structure, coordinate contributions, consolidate content, and address reviewer comments.

Deliverable contributors: Draft assigned sections and deliver inputs on time.





Project Coordinator (PC): Participates in the review process and coordinates closely with PM/QM and reviewers.

E3M Management team (If required): One member of the E3M management team conducts final edits before submission, checking format, language, and presentation.

2.8.2 Review Process

Each deliverable is reviewed by 2–5 internal reviewers, the PM, and one E3M management team member (if required).

2.8.2.1 Assignment of reviewers

The PM/QM gathers reviewer interest and assigns them based on expertise, availability, and project effort share. The assignment of reviewers for the deliverable of the Reporting Period 1 is shown in Annex I.

2.8.2.2 Review steps

For each deliverable of the Reporting Period the following steps take place to secure timely submission of the deliverable (Table 6).

Table 6. Deliverable review timeline

Timing	Actor	Action	Recipient
5-6 weeks before submission deadline	PM/QM	Confirm reviewer availability and share deadlines and timeline towards submission to the EC portal	Reviewers
4 weeks before submission deadline	Deliverable leader	Upload draft to SharePoint Inform PM/QM	PM/QM
4 weeks before submission deadline	PM/QM	Notify reviewers of draft availability	Reviewers
3-2 weeks before submission deadline	Reviewers, PM/QM	Submit comments in tracked Word doc on SharePoint	PM/QM
3-2 weeks before submission deadline	PM/QM	Notify Deliverable Leader to address comments	Deliverable Leader
10 days before submission deadline	Deliverable Leader	Submit revised draft to SharePoint Inform PM/QM	PM/QM
5 days submission deadline	PM/QM	Final quality review Forward for editing	E3M management member
2 days before the official submission deadline	E3M management member	Copysedit deliverable (language, formatting, template)	PM/QM



Timing	Actor	Action	Recipient
2 days before the official submission deadline	PM/QM	Submits final deliverable to the EC online Portal	EC (SyGMA)
2 days before the official submission deadline	PM/QM	Informs consortium about submission of the deliverable	All partners

2.8.3 Quality Criteria

Reviewers will assess deliverables against the criteria listed in Table 7 to ensure consistent quality throughout the project.

Table 7. Quality criteria for ENTICE deliverables

Quality criteria	Description
Clarity	- Clear and unambiguous language - The text is in English (UK) - Explained terminology, including acronyms - Free from errors and sensitive content
Completeness	- Full coverage of GA Annex I (Part A) requirements
Accuracy	- Reliable with properly referenced information
Added value	- Analytical depth - Scientific and/or policy relevance - Useful to the targeted audience (e.g. scientists, policymakers, etc.)
Relevance	- Aligned with deliverable scope and target audience
Compliance	- Conforms to deliverable template
Originality	- No plagiarism & accurate citations - Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) and AI-assisted technologies used only for language improvement with human oversight and proper disclosure
Conciseness	- Clear, focused text which avoids redundancy

2.9 Quality Assurance of Other Materials

In addition to formal deliverables, the project will produce various scientific and policy-related outputs, such as commentaries, milestones, and policy briefs. These materials will undergo a light review process focused primarily on adherence to the respective templates. Since these outputs are not subject to formal submission or fixed deadlines, the review will consist of a single step: the dissemination leader will compile the draft based on authors' inputs, and a member of the E3M management team will perform a technical check to ensure basic quality standards are met. If deemed necessary, an additional reviewer can be appointed to review content, especially for policy briefs.

Similarly, communication-related materials (e.g., newsletters, press releases) will be prepared using dedicated templates. Each piece will be reviewed by the E3M management team to ensure:



- completeness and scientific relevance
- alignment with the project's objectives and obligations under the Description of the Action (DoA)
- consistency with formatting requirements

This process ensures that all published materials, while not formal deliverables, maintain a high standard of clarity, relevance, quality, and visual coherence.



3 Quality Assessment

3.1 Evaluation Framework

The ENTICE consortium applies a two-tier self-evaluation scheme of the project.

The first one, **impact evaluation**, measures progress regarding the project's expected outcomes and impacts as set out in Annex I (Part B) of the GA. The second one, **process evaluation**, monitors the efficiency and consistency of the project's internal procedures and day-to-day operations.

Data collection, analysis and reporting are managed by the E3M project-management team, supervised by the PC and coordinated by the PM/QM. Indicator values are updated every six months, enabling the consortium to detect deviations early and implement corrective actions where necessary.

3.2 Performance Indicators

The project monitors three categories of indicators:

- Outcome- and impact-related KPIs (Annex II): These track progress toward achieving the scientific, societal, and policy objectives described in Annex I (Part B) of the GA.
- Communication and dissemination metrics (Annex III): These fall under impact evaluation, assessing the visibility, accessibility, and influence of the project outputs among target audiences.
- Operational and process indicators (Annex IV): These fall under process evaluation, monitoring the quality, timeliness, and compliance of internal project workflows.



4 Risk Management Plan

The Risk Management Plan involves the identification of both technical (research-oriented) and managerial (project implementation-related) risks, the assessment of their likelihood and potential impact, and the design of measures to minimize the probability of their occurrence. For each identified risk, the plan includes appropriate mitigation strategies to be applied during the project's implementation phase.

Within this framework, risk management forms an integral part of Task 7.3 “Quality control, risk management and the transdisciplinary Scientific Advisory Board”, which is led by E3M with contributions from all project partners. E3M will be responsible for the continuous monitoring of project risks, supported by the Work Package Leaders. WPLs are tasked with identifying possible risks specific to their work packages, assessing their probability and potential impact, and proposing contingency plans. These measures will be reviewed and validated in coordination with the Project Coordinator to ensure the project remains aligned with its objectives.

4.1 Risk analysis and mitigation measures

Table 8 outlines the critical implementation-related risks identified at the start of the project. This table is considered a living document and will be continuously updated to reflect the evolving context and progress of the project.



**Table 8. Identified risks and mitigation measures**

Risk ID	Description of risk	WPs	Risk likelihood	Risk severity	Proposed risk mitigation measures
1	Partner(s) unable to contribute	WP1, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6, WP7	Low	High	Rigorous management. Failure of partners will lead to immediate capacity assessment, task reassignment. Partners with adequate skills to take over
2	Partners' contribution to outputs not delivered on time	WP1, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6, WP7	Medium	Low	Quality management, early directions for timely outputs (WP7). Monthly calls on WPs (reviews/appropriate revisions) for corrective actions. 16 of 46 deliverables in first RP to reveal risks; 14 milestones to track progress.
3	Low scientific and/or technical quality of deliverables	WP1, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6, WP7	Low	High	Rigorous quality management (WP7); first deliverable drafts one month to deadline, for thorough internal review and detailed feedback by 2-5 reviewers. Partners have excellent track record for scientific quality.
4	Low engagement of the four target groups of stakeholders in the TCI Nexus	WP1, WP6	Medium	Medium	Partners to mobilise existing networks and experience in co-creation and maintenance of CDE nodes. SAB to be asked to support if needed. Some partners well linked to industrial clusters (e.g., WI); others well rooted in policy (e.g., UU, E3M); many partners experienced in citizen engagement.
5	Lack of coordination with other critical actors, expectations in the wrong	WP1, WP7	Low	Medium	Acknowledging the requirement of inclusiveness in both trade policy and the climate dialogue, ENTICE is



Risk ID	Description of risk	WPs	Risk likelihood	Risk severity	Proposed risk mitigation measures
	direction				oriented to co-creation (WP1). Key stakeholders have already been identified, and consortium partners are actively engaging with them. Partners have expertise in transdisciplinary methods. Scoping work (Task 1.1.2) and first workshops (Task 1.3) devoted to fostering the right expectations.
6	Limited policy and/or industrial impact and delays to major policy or scientific processes	WP1, WP6	Low	Medium	Project planning fits well in the industrial policy renaissance & climate policy debate. Project envisioned to run within the IPCC AR7 cycle and to end in time for the Global Stocktake. Partners are actively monitoring relevant policies. Even if policy processes are affected, the project is designed to integrate quickly related policies and deliver significant impacts that will extend beyond its duration.
7	Limited participation of external experts	WP1, WP6, WP7	Medium	Low	Robust CDE plan established and dynamically updated twice, promoting the project and results with all possible means (Task 6.1). Diverse SAB of experts to be set up early (Task 7.3). If needed, we will use existing knowhow in establishing an effective dialogue platform.
8	Difficulty in organising and attending stakeholder exchanges	WP1	Medium	Medium	Organisation responsibility for interactions in the listening mechanism (Task 1.3) is spread in the consortium. Some interactions will take place online for





Risk ID	Description of risk	WPs	Risk likelihood	Risk severity	Proposed risk mitigation measures
					sustainability reasons and/or due to potential barriers to travel.
9	Limited transparency of the modelling processes	WP1, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5	Low	High	Openness for transparency (across data & model developments in WP2, WP3). Open protocols for open and FAIR data early and regularly updated (Task 2.1). Stakeholders to drive data and model co-development (WP2, WP3), use (WP4, WP5), validation (WP6). Any new modelling capacity to be released in open access, and all datasets in an open repository.
10	Vulnerability of modelling to different types of uncertainty	WP4, WP5	Low	Medium	Robustness of model results is a core aim of ENTICE, notably in a model inter-comparison setup securing robustness against structural uncertainty. Model ensemble comprises diversity of macroeconomic models & IAMs.
11	Limited legitimacy of models, databases, and other methods, and tools	WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5	Low	High	Technical notes & policy briefs on capacity of ENTICE model ensemble effectively disseminated in workshops and via I2AM PARIS. Data/model development (WP2, WP3) and use (WP4, WP5) driven by stakeholders based on their needs. Dedication to open software development practices.
12	Limited contribution to scientific (e.g. IPCC) / policy assessments	WP1, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6,	Low	Medium	Participation in networks underpinning such assessments (e.g., IAMC, ECEMP). Many members were



Risk ID	Description of risk	WPs	Risk likelihood	Risk severity	Proposed risk mitigation measures
		WP7			IPCC AR6 authors. Models well rooted in policy support (GEM-E3) or IPCC reports (WITCH, GCAM, IMAGE).
13	Data not being forthcoming from various sources:	WP2	Medium	Low	Existing open datasets to be used. Although our database starting point (GTAP) is not fully open, any advancements to GTAP envisaged in the project (in Tasks 2.2-2.5) will be made openly available for all.
14	High complexity of the policy instruments under analysis	WP3, WP4, WP5	Medium	Medium	Mitigation measures: i. most of project partners are very experienced in modelling and analysing complex policy instruments, ii. all ENTICE models have (or will develop during the project) the required granularity and sophistication to address analysis of complex policy instruments in the TCI nexus.



ANNEX I: Allocation of reviewers to deliverables (Reporting Period 1)

Deliverable	Name	Due Date	Deliverable Leader	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Reviewer 6
D1.1	Stakeholder engagement strategy	30 Jun 2025	ICCS	E3M	WI	REFORM	HOL		
D2.1	Data management plan	30 Jun 2025	ICCS	E3M	HOL	ENEXTGEN			
D6.1	Project CDE plan	30 Jun 2025	HOL	E3M	ICCS				
D7.1	Quality management and risk management plan	30 Jun 2025	E3M	HOL	ICCS				
D1.7	Policy brief: research capacities in TCI	30 Sep 2025	WI	E3M	CMCC	VUA	SEURECO		
D1.2	TCI framework and synthesis of cocreation results	31 Oct 2025	WI	E3M	CMCC	SEURECO	ZEW		
D1.3	State of the art of TCI economic theory, political science, economic modelling	31 Oct 2025	WI	E3M	SEURECO	ORDECSYS			
D3.1	Mapping of model improvements: what, why, how	31 Dec 2025	SEURECO	E3M	CMCC	WI	UoS	POLIMI	Purdue
D7.2	1st report on project and SAB Meetings	31 Dec 2025	E3M	HOL	UNIVR				
D1.4	Modelling research needs	27 Feb 2026	ICCS	E3M	CMCC	WI	POLIMI	Purdue	
D4.1	Reference scenario & metrics	27 Feb 2026	CMCC	E3M	UoS	ICCS	UU	ORDECSYS	



Deliverable	Name	Due Date	Deliverable Leader	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Reviewer 6
D2.3	Needs for improved data on climate-trade links	31 Mar 2026	Purdue	E3M	VUA	ENEXTGEN	SEURECO		
D3.2	Progress in model improvements	29 May 2026	SEURECO	E3M	CMCC	ICCS	Purdue	UU	
D1.5	Public perception of trade and its environmental and economic impacts	30 Jun 2026	WI	E3M	REFORM	ICCS	ORDECSYS		
D2.4	Enhanced GTAP database	30 Jun 2026	Purdue	E3M	CMCC	UNIVR	SEURECO		
D6.2	Project CDE plan - First update	30 Jun 2026	HOL	E3M	ICCS				





ANNEX II: Outcome- and impact-related KPIs

Expected Outcomes (EO)/ Expected Impacts (EI)		Planned Outputs	Performance Indicator/ Targets
EO1	Quantify trade impacts on climate & environment and inform policy makers	- 8 technical reports (TCI quantification & policy analysis) - 10 I2AM-PARIS workspaces - ≥ 5 policy briefs, ≥ 1 industry guide - ≥ 10 open-access journal articles - ≥ 10 press releases & non-academic articles - ≥ 10 conference presentations - Public perception report - Capacity-building tool + report (live ≥ 4 years)	- Each report/paper > 200 views - Tool: > 200 users, ≥ 80% satisfaction - Each paper > 30 citations - > 10 policy citations (EU & partner countries) - > 5 NGO/industry report citations - > 5 IPCC AR7 chapters reference ENTICE - > 20 scenario submissions - > 20 total citations in IPCC/WTO/IPBES/etc.
EO2	Improve and enlarge the modelling & data toolbox for the TCI nexus	- Open data on Zenodo, GitHub, I2AM-PARIS - ≥ 3 data-method papers; > 3 events (GTAP/IAMC) - 4 model-improvement reports - ≥ 2 modelling-method papers; > 2 events - 3 literature reviews + 1 synthesis report - 2 synergy reports	- Data: > 200 views per item, > 200 visitors for data tool - > 7 models improved and documented - > 10 teams adopt datasets; > 20 citations per data-related paper - Models: GitHub starred/watched > 50 times - Improved models adopted by > 15 teams (>10 external) - > 20 follow-up publications using improved models - Reviews: > 30 citations each - > 5 joint outputs & > 5 co-organised events
EI1	Advance knowledge & solutions in climate science	Research outputs from EO1 & EO2 underpin new knowledge	Each ENTICE paper viewed > 200 times & cited > 30 times
EI2	Contribute to key international assessments (IPCC, EEA)	Scenario submissions, methodological & review papers	- ENTICE cited in ≥ 1 major cycle; > 20 citations total across assessments - Project researchers contribute to ≥ 2 IPCC chapters
EI3	Strengthen the European Research Area (ERA) on climate change	Joint papers/events; open data & models shared	- > 5 joint papers - > 5 co-organised events - > 10 external groups adopt ENTICE tools/data



Expected Outcomes (EO)/ Expected Impacts (EI)		Planned Outputs	Performance Indicator/ Targets
EI4	Increase transparency, robustness & usability of the climate knowledge base	Open-source tool, datasets, models, manuals, industry guide	- Tool/data/code accessible ≥ 4 years - Tool/papers > 200 views - Development paper > 20 citations - ≥ 10 policy document citations



ANNEX III: Communication and dissemination metrics

Task	Objectives	Main channel/activity	Month
T1.3	Establish a transdisciplinary 'listening' mechanism to enable stakeholder co-creation	Create a stakeholder engagement strategy and a database of relevant individuals and organisations	1-6
T1.1, T1.3	Co-define research and policy questions for model development & scenario modelling	Workshops (including the one for developing countries), webinars, bilateral interviews	6-18
T1.3	Use stakeholder input and relevant political developments to develop scenarios	Workshops and webinars with all stakeholder groups, monitoring political developments	8-42
T6.2, T6.3	Maximise project outreach in science, policy, industry, and society, at all geographic levels	Participate in relevant high-impact events, publish policy briefs and scientific papers, establish synergies	1-48
T6.3	Inform policymakers and industrial associations about the main project results	Policy briefs (>5), industry guide (>1), participation in >6 policy events and trade events on green technology (e.g., booths in ENLIT, Ecomondo)	1-48
T6.3	Showcase the capabilities of the full toolbox to stakeholders, especially EU policymakers, industries, academics.	Simplified, web-based toolbox and 3 capacity-building workshops/webinars; integration of tool in academic teaching.	1-48
T1.2, T6.3	Evaluate the public perception of trade impacts on environment and climate	Public discourse analysis in 5 EU countries, targeted survey & interventions on awareness of trade impacts	1-46

Activity	Objective	Expected audience	Monitoring tool
Project visual identity (Task 6.1)	Establish a distinct branding for the project, appealing to stakeholders.	<u>All stakeholder groups</u> : policy, industry, research, civil society	Summary of all monitoring means
Project website (Task 6.1)	Establish a central information outlet about ENTICE with links to project results & relevant research and initiatives about trade impacts.	<u>All stakeholder groups</u> 2000 unique visitors/year 30% of return visitors <50% bounce rate	Google Analytics





Activity	Objective	Expected audience	Monitoring tool
International synergies with other research clusters (Task 6.2)	Collaborate with relevant research projects and clusters such as the GTAP, IAMC, IIOA, IAEE	<u>Academia</u> Project reference in 10 projects/ groups, joint papers, meetings	Digital monitoring, # of joint papers & acknowledgements
Social media channels (Task 6.1)	Create awareness of project scope, objectives, results among policy, industry, scientists, citizens & others	<u>All stakeholder groups</u> 1,000 #enticeproject uses, 500 followers in LinkedIn & X	Analytics from X, LinkedIn, BlueSky, etc.
Quarterly newsletter (Task 6.1)	Provide a concise periodic update on project activities and outputs, share commentaries of policy interest	<u>All stakeholder groups</u> 2,000 recipients/downloads 30% opening rate	Email monitoring system; Website download analytics; LinkedIn newsletter subscribers
Infographics & videos (Task 6.1)	Share significant project messages in a visual and user-friendly format	<u>Policymakers, industry, society</u> >1,500 views/downloads	YouTube/Instagram stats; # downloads
Blog posts, media articles, commentaries (Tasks 6.1)	Adapt project outcomes in articles in leading news/media websites and blogs such the Conversation.	<u>Industry and civil society</u> At least 10 articles and press releases in the project's lifetime	Media monitoring; Copies of articles shared on website
Final EU event (Task 6.3)	Share main messages coming out of the project at a high-level event.	<u>All stakeholder groups</u> Audience of 70-100	# of attendees; minutes; photos
Scientific outreach (Task 6.2)	Academic dissemination of project results (open access)	<u>Academia</u> > 20 papers; > 20 conferences	Digital monitoring; OpenAIRE entries; Zenodo/GitHub unique users



ANNEX IV: Operational and process indicators

Performance Indicator	Targets
% of comments of reviewers addressed by the Deliverable Leaders/authors	>90%
Average Delay (in days) in the submission of draft deliverables for internal review	<7
Average Delay (in days) in the submission of the final deliverables to the Participants Portal	<1
Average number of inconsistencies according to the deliverable template (format, layout, spelling, etc.) in the versions ready for the final editing before submission	<3
% of internal effort reports delivered on time	>80%
Delay (in days) in the submission of the periodic report	0
Delay (in days) in the submission of the final report	0

