

1 This is FRIDA (v2.1): An Introduction to the FRIDA GMD Collection

2 V3: Submitted May 8, 2026

3 Cecilie Mauritzen

4 Climate Division, Norwegian Meteorological Institute, 0131 Oslo, Norway

5 Correspondence to: Cecilie Mauritzen (ceciliem@met.no)

6 **Abstract.**

7 FRIDA is a new contribution to the portfolio of integrated assessment models (IAMs) that address the climate - energy -
8 economy – and society nexus. The FRIDA acronym stands for *Feedback-based knowledge Repository for Integrated*
9 *Assessments*. Naming it a “knowledge repository” signals that the FRIDA model is never finished; it represents the current
10 state of knowledge of the development team at any given time.

11 FRIDA was developed through the European Horizon project *WorldTrans – Transparent Assessments for Real People*
12 (2022-2026). The journal *Geoscientific Model Development* has given us space to document FRIDA, including its
13 submodules and spin-offs, in a special *GMD Collection*¹. This brief paper is the introduction to the GMD FRIDA collection
14 of papers. The purpose of the introductory paper, written by the project lead on behalf of the consortium, is to provide the
15 conceptual and institutional context for the original model and to make explicit the initial design requirements that guide
16 FRIDA’s ongoing development as a living knowledge repository.

17 FRIDA is implemented as a computationally efficient system-dynamics model and is accompanied by an Interactive
18 Learning Environment. This combination makes it suitable not only for research, but also for education and broader
19 outreach. In particular, FRIDA can be used in interdisciplinary climate science courses to show how individual disciplines
20 (e.g. climatology, economics, demography) are tightly interwoven within the coupled climate–human system, thereby
21 lowering the barrier to entry for users beyond the IAM community.

22 What sets FRIDA apart from traditional IAMs is its shift from exogenous, narrative-based scenarios to a fully feedback-
23 driven framework, in which human activities and climate change co-evolve within a single system of equations. By
24 explicitly representing these two-way feedbacks, FRIDA accounts for the impacts that climate change has already begun to
25 exert on human systems; without them, projections of the human activities that drive climate change will become

¹ <https://gmd.copernicus.org/articles/collection12.html>

26 increasingly unreliable. Preliminary results suggest that including these feedbacks lead to systematically less optimistic
27 projections than conventional IAM baselines.

28 **1 Introduction (knowledge gaps that FRIDA aims to cover, incl. Shortcomings with scenarios)**

29 Earth's surface temperature depends on the amount of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere - in the absence of any
30 greenhouse gases the average temperature on earth would be a freezing -19 °C, instead of the approximately + 15 °C we
31 observe today (Ramanathan and Coakley, 1978). Any radiative change in this system results in a change in atmospheric
32 temperature, an experiment humans have been running for the past 250 years. Access to cheap energy—facilitated by the
33 invention of the steam engine and subsequent methods of extracting energy from fossil fuels—which co-evolved during the
34 Industrial Revolution with accelerating population growth, has greatly disturbed the climate equilibrium. Changes in how we
35 use land areas have also contributed greatly to pushing the climate system out of equilibrium.

36 For long, climate change was hard to notice. But by now, the world has entered the realm of *dangerous climate change*. In
37 2024, global average temperature exceeded 1.5 °C above pre-industrial levels for the first time (Bevacqua et al. 2025). While
38 an isolated year above this threshold does not yet mean the high ambition goal of the Paris Agreement — to hold global
39 temperature increase well below 2 °C and to pursue efforts to limit it to 1.5 °C on a sustained basis — human-caused climate
40 change is already causing widespread adverse impacts and losses and damages (O'Neill et al. 2022 (IPCC AR6 WGII
41 Chapter 16)), including observed increases in extreme heat, heavy precipitation and drought (Seneviratne et al. 2021 (IPCC
42 AR6 WGI Chapter 11)), indicating that dangerous climate change is already being experienced.

43 Many questions arise, such as: Is it even possible to combat climate change while still pursuing better lives? What strategies
44 can ensure that mitigation efforts are inclusive and just? Is it perhaps better to focus our efforts on adaptation to the new type
45 of climate rather than trying to prevent climate change?

46 For as long as the UN has engaged in climate change negotiations, these questions have been on the table, and answers have
47 been sought using a myriad of models and expert negotiation processes. But climate has continued to change. These
48 recognitions — that negotiations still fail and that climate now affects our lives — were strong motivations for introducing a
49 new IAM that explicitly includes diverse climate change impacts on humans. We call this new model FRIDA, with the
50 subtitle *Feedback-based knowledge Repository for IntegrateD Assessments*.

51 What sets FRIDA apart from traditional IAMs is the shift from exogenous, narrative-based scenarios to a feedback-driven
52 approach, where human activities (that drive climate change), and climate change (that drives impacts, such as reduced labor
53 productivity or financial instability) co-evolve as equal partners within a single system of equations. In other words, FRIDA

54 explicitly accounts for the impacts that climate change has already begun to exert on human systems. Without incorporating
55 these feedbacks, projections of the human activities that drive climate change will become increasingly unreliable.

56 The collection of FRIDA papers in Geoscientific Model Development documents the development of FRIDA from its
57 origins in 2023–2026 within the European Horizon project “WorldTrans – Transparent Assessments for Real People”
58 (covering FRIDA version 2.1 and FRIDA v3), as well as the envisaged evolution in future versions. At the time of writing,
59 FRIDA 2.1 is the official version.

60 **2 Requirement for FRIDA**

61 During the framing phase of the WorldTrans project in 2022 the team discussed at length how to design a model that would
62 produce credible and relevant results for all three working groups of the IPCC, that would be able to advice on the European
63 Green deal (to obtain climate neutrality by 2050, leaving no one behind) and which would be useable and useful for non-
64 expert users. We came up with the following list of requirements:


- 65 ● **Take advantage of conservation laws to constrain the model.** This involves including the carbon, heat and water
66 cycles.
- 67 ● **Begin with a non-regional model.** By building a global, rather than a regionally segregated, model, the model
68 output remains simpler to analyze, due to the reduced number of degrees of freedom (which is large already on the
69 global scale). The result is increased transparency and a better chance at building intuition and insights.
- 70 ● **Balanced representation of climate and humans.** This means focusing on the minimum detail necessary to
71 capture the important interconnections between subsystems.
- 72 ● **Complete treatment of climate change forcing.** This means to include the main greenhouse gases (CO₂, CH₄,
73 N₂O and HFCs) and the main cooling aerosol agent (SO₂), and to account for the effect of other climate forcings,
74 such as those associated with land use change. It also means to model the sectors that create the greenhouse gas
75 emissions (transport sector, energy production, land use and agriculture, chemical industries, cement production and
76 waste). And it means considering the underlying economic system and demography that creates changes in those
77 sectors.
- 78 ● **Complete treatment of climate-driven feedback.** This implies taking into account, quantitatively, how climate
79 affects (mostly damages) these sectors and the underlying economy and demography.
- 80 ● **Complete treatment of uncertainty.** This implies keeping the computing speed low, to allow for large ensemble
81 runs.
- 82 ● **Include human needs, desires and behavior.** This means that (modelled) people can have an impact on the
83 system, by changing behavior with respect to, for instance, dietary and mobility choices. This implies a departure
84 from describing humans as purely theoretical economic beings maximizing profit or utility.

- 85 ● **A dynamic representation of the economy.** This means to model the economy as a system that moves forward in
86 time and acts and reacts to its surroundings, just like we model the rest of the system.
- 87 ● **Modular organization of the model.** This is a requirement that improves the transparency of the model.
- 88 ● **Familiar external levers.** To generate change in the system we include the possibility of acting as a decision maker
89 within the various modules of the model (for instance within government, or within the financial or energy sector)
- 90 ● **An accompanying toolbox for users of the model.** Since every model, even the simplest, is hard to interpret, we
91 have developed a set of tools to aid the use of the model, aimed at our three user groups: 1) the *decision-maker* who
92 would normally use IAM-based analysis to inform decisions about climate action. An important use context for the
93 decision maker is the European Green Deal; 2) a *scientist*, say, a typical IPCC author who needs improved
94 information flows and shared understanding of the system links and feedbacks between physical climate, the social
95 and environmental impacts of climate change, adaptation responses, and mitigation efforts; and 3) the *engaged*
96 *citizen* who is concerned about the climate challenge, but lacks the knowledge needed to engage in and catalyze a
97 deeper societal discussion on the topic.

98

99 **3. Design of FRIDA**

100 FRIDA is built using the tools of System Dynamics (see e.g., Forrester 1961, Sterman 2000). This approach facilitates, at
101 relative ease, the inclusion of very different disciplines and their methods, ranging from the laws of nature to empirical
102 relationships, direct observations and co-created knowledge. Central to the approach are feedback and delay perspectives,
103 which highlight the complex and oftentimes circular interactions between system components that endogenously generate
104 behavior, making it a suitable approach to coupling the natural climate system with the many aspects of human life that can
105 affect — and are affected by — climate. FRIDA is divided into seven modules: Climate, Human behavior, Land use and
106 Agriculture, Energy, Economy, Resources and Demography (Fig. 1). All these interlinkages within and between the modules
107 collectively create the complex dynamics of the system. This is what make it is easy to state that “everything is connected to
108 everything”, but comparably difficult to explain how.




109

110 **Figure 1:** The modules and interlinkages in FRIDA V2.1. All modules except the climate module are collectively referred to
 111 as the “anthropogenic” modules of FRIDA. Note, however, that the “Land Use and Agriculture” module contains
 112 information about both nature and agriculture.

113

114 In FRIDA, climate impacts are modelled as recognizable processes, such as the assessment of climate risk made by financial
 115 institutions, changes in demand for animal food products because of personal norms driven by climate risk perception,
 116 changes in demand for energy as a consequence of changing temperature; changes in labor productivity, changes in water
 117 use for irrigation, and so forth. To determine which impacts to include, the starting point was IPCC WGII AR6’s assessment
 118 of literature on climate impacts and risks (Pörtner et al. 2022). Decisions were based on three criteria: 1) applicability to the
 119 [global] scope of FRIDA; 2) the expected global magnitude of the effect as agreed upon in the extant literature; 3) when the
 120 scope and magnitude of the impact was not agreed upon in the literature, was there enough data present in the literature to
 121 reproduce at least one pre-existing global study with wide uncertainty parameters? In addition, we added some climate
 122 impacts that are of relevance to the scope of FRIDA yet not included in the IPCC assessment. Details on the implementation
 123 of climate drivers and impacts in FRIDA are documented in Wells et al. 2026a and Ramme et al. 2025. A graphical
 124 representation of the implementation of climate effects and impacts in FRIDA v2.1 is given in Fig. 2.



125

126 **Figure 2:** A schematic overview of the climate drivers and impacts in FRIDA V2.1, from climate change to the anthropogenic modules.

127

128 To build each module of FRIDA, the team entered an iterative cycle of mapping essential feedback loops, selecting
 129 equations and theoretical frameworks from scientific literature and developing novel "expert-supplied functional forms"
 130 when literature is insufficient, as documented in Schoenberg et al. 2025. Examples include:

- 131 • **Laws of Nature:** The model embodies the laws of nature within its Climate module, representing the Earth's
 132 radiation balance, carbon cycle, and water cycle. Specific examples include the three-layer energy balance
 133 model (simulating heat exchange between ocean layers) and the carbonate chemistry system in the ocean
 134 (Wells et al. 2026b, Schoenberg et al. 2025)
- 135 • **Leading Theoretical Frameworks:**

- 136 ○ The Economy module uses a monetary model of production, consumption, and finance based on
137 Schumpeterian dynamics of innovation and creative destruction (Schumpeter, 1942; Aghion &
138 Howitt, 1992, 2009) to simulate the dynamic circular flow of income (Grimeland et al, 2026,
139 Schoenberg et al. 2025).
- 140 ○ The Behavioral Change module is conceptualized using the Motivation–Agency–Past Behaviour
141 (MAP) meta-theoretical framework (van Valkengoed, Perlaviciute and Steg, 2025), which integrates
142 motivational drivers, enabling conditions, and behavioural path dependence (Rajah et al. 2025,
143 Schoenberg et al. 2025).
- 144 ○ Population changes in the demography module are modeled as a continuous cohorting system
145 (Eberlein, Thompson and Matchar, 2012), using "conveyors" to represent the physical dynamics of
146 aging and age-specific mortality rates (Schoenberg et al. 2025)
- 147 ● **Expert-Supplied functional Forms:** When established literature is insufficient for certain feedback loops, the
148 team uses "expert-supplied functional forms" that are dimensionally consistent and behaviorally logical under
149 extreme conditions. For example, energy infrastructure damage by climate is modeled as a power law function
150 of the global temperature anomaly, representing how extreme warming increases the decay rate of capital.
151 Climate impact on crop yields is modelled as a complex functional form that is linear in CO2 concentration
152 and quadratic in absolute temperature, capturing the antagonistic relationship between CO2 fertilization and
153 heat stress (Wells et al. 2026a, Schoenberg et al. 2025).

154 The calibration process of FRIDA happens in two steps: First, a partial calibration is made within each module, and
155 then the full model is calibrated. During the latter process, the parameter estimates and uncertainty ranges that cannot
156 with confidence be found in the literature - more than 800 parameters - are determined through calibration against
157 historical data (1980-2023), using climate and socio-economic variables such as global GDP and its growth rate,
158 inflation, investment, population, working age population, radiative forcing, energy use and so forth (158 time series in
159 total). These serve as targets that the model should reproduce. Each uncertain parameter is given an initial uncertainty
160 range by the team. Using those ranges, a 100,000-member Sobol sequence (Sobol, 1967; Saltelli et al. 2008) global
161 sensitivity ensemble is run with the full model. The purpose of this analysis is twofold: 1) As a vehicle for calibration,
162 by exploring the joint parameter space and selecting subsets that match historical time series, and 2) as a tool to
163 quantify uncertainty and importance, showing how different parameters drive variability in model outcomes. Each
164 variable from each model run is reported as the ensemble median - and 67% and 95% confidence intervals - over the
165 horizon ~2020–2150. Details are laid out in Schoenberg et al. 2025.

166 **4. FRIDA's Endogenous Model Behaviour**

167 A useful feature of a nearly all-inclusive model like FRIDA is that it does not require external forcing for future projections.
168 The processes that are deemed important for the problem, i.e. within the scope of the model, exist inside the model. This is
169 contrary to a typical Earth System Model and many process-based Integrated Assessment Models, which require external
170 forcing to run (the former: for example, greenhouse gas emissions; the latter: for example, population growth). We call
171 FRIDA's "free", or "unforced", or "endogenous" run the "*Endogenous Model Behavior*" (EMB) run. In the EMB run, all the
172 change comes entirely from its internal feedback structure. The run is 'free' because, after starting, all changes are driven
173 solely by the model's internal mechanisms. It is "endogenous" because every variable that changes does so because of the
174 model's own dynamics. And the results are tied to reality in the sense that where possible, the governing equations are based
175 on science, and the parameterizations are arrived at through calibration with observations.

176 The significance of the EMB run is twofold: 1) it gives insights into how the system would evolve into the future without
177 further policy changes or other external forcing, and 2) it gives us a base run to compare all forced runs to. By "forced runs"
178 we mean experiments during which external levers are pulled, or forcings or parameters are altered.

179 **5. Using FRIDA**

180 FRIDA is designed as an intuition builder, not as a source of precise future projections with fine regional granularity and
181 sectoral detail. It is possible to run experiments on one's desktop in minutes. To do so one can adjust a lever or parameter at
182 any time during the model run and see what happens. To set up experiments with FRIDA the team developed a few guiding
183 principles (see the appendix) and a wide range of external levers that can be pulled to run experiments (the original set is
184 documented in Schoenberg et al. 2025).

185 To facilitate the learning process, the FRIDA model is accompanied by an Interactive Learning Environment (ILE) (Mustafa,
186 2025). The ILE combines guided demonstrations with an interactive dashboard which can be used to investigate how the
187 model responds to interventions. Dynamic visualizations illustrate the consequences of decisions across time scales. The user
188 manipulates parameters through interactive levers, observe responses across more than 225 variables, and compare results
189 with the EMB run as well as with predetermined "goals" for each experiment). The visualization framework highlights trade-
190 offs, sensitivities, and unintended consequences, illustrating how even simple interventions can produce complex outcomes.
191 The hypothesis is that by lowering technical and conceptual barriers, the platform extends beyond research applications to
192 engage students, educators, and lay users. This makes the ILE well suited for interdisciplinary teaching, where students can
193 see how their own discipline, whether economics, environmental science, or engineering, is interwoven with other domains
194 in shaping climate futures.

195 **6. Comparisons with other projections**

196 FRIDA projections have been compared to the five Shared Socioeconomic Pathways: SSP1 (Sustainability), SSP2 (Middle
197 of the Road), SSP3 (Regional Rivalry), SSP4 (Inequality), and SSP5 (Fossil-fueled Development) (O’Neill et al. 2017). In
198 this comparison, Schoenberg et al. (2025) find that SSP1-, SSP2-, and SSP5-Baseline are overly optimistic regarding future
199 economic growth, while SSP3- and SSP4-Baseline align more closely with FRIDA’s ensemble behavior. The reason is the
200 structural difference: FRIDA represents the climate–human system as a fully coupled, feedback-rich system, rather than
201 treating many climate-to-human effects as exogenous, omitted, or highly aggregated. In conventional IAMs, much of the
202 climate–damage literature has focused on aggregate GDP losses in top-down assessments (Howard and Sterner, 2017), often
203 through highly aggregated damage functions that have been criticized as empirically weak and “black box” in nature
204 (Pindyck, 2017). FRIDA instead replaces this with a more disaggregated, process-based representation of impacts
205 (Grimeland et al. 2026; Wells et al. 2026a).

206 What this means in practice is that FRIDA allows climate damages to feed back onto the drivers of future growth. In the
207 economy module, expected climate impacts reduce economic production primarily through reduced investment growth and
208 financial fragility, while government budgets come under increasing stress from unemployment and demographic change; in
209 some simulations, these combined pressures can even halt growth altogether (Grimeland et al. 2026). Unlike standard IAM
210 baselines, FRIDA therefore does not assume that high GDP growth can continue largely unaffected in a warming world.
211 Rajah et al. (2025) further show that, when behaviour is endogenized, future food and animal-product demand is lower than
212 in the standard GDP-driven approach, producing slightly lower emissions and a somewhat cooler baseline climate. Ramme
213 et al. (2025) likewise show that adding coastal feedbacks can generate non-linear damage patterns, including peak-and-
214 decline storm-surge damages driven by endogenous retreat and reduced coastal investment. Wells et al. (2026b) add that
215 even the climate module differs from standard simple-climate emulators because FRIDA-Clim uses a process-based carbon
216 cycle within the coupled framework. Overall, the FRIDA papers therefore suggest not just a different set of numbers, but a
217 systematically less optimistic future outlook, because once feedbacks from climate damages, finance, behaviour, and
218 adaptation constraints are internalized, future growth paths become lower, more fragile, and less consistent with the high-
219 growth baselines commonly used in conventional IAM exercises (Schoenberg et al. 2025; Grimeland et al. 2026; Rajah et al.
220 2025; Ramme et al. 2025; Wells et al. 2026a, 2026b).

221 **7. Outlook**

222 FRIDA was conceived as a transparent, modular, and flexible integrated assessment framework designed to connect climate
223 dynamics with the multiple facets of human activity that both drive and are affected by climate change. By framing FRIDA
224 as a “knowledge repository” rather than a static model, we emphasize its role as a platform that can be continually updated
225 with new scientific insights, policy needs, and empirical data.

226 IPCC AR6 WGII Summary for Policymakers (Pörtner et al. 2022) identifies one of the central challenges of climate change
227 as the growing complexity of impacts and risks: multiple hazards interact with non-climatic stressors, producing
228 compounding and cascading risks that are increasingly difficult to manage across sectors and regions. The present version of
229 FRIDA (which at the time of writing is v2.1) demonstrates that it is possible to integrate climate forcing, human behavior,
230 land use, energy, resources, demography, and the economy into a single, fully coupled system, making it possible to capture
231 cascading socioeconomic risks and systemic feedbacks. Because changes in one sector propagate through the entire system
232 with realistic lags and feedbacks, FRIDA is particularly well positioned to explore risks of systemic destabilization, identify
233 leverage points, and illuminate co-benefits and trade-offs of mitigation and adaptation strategies.

234 A central advantage of FRIDA is its suitability for running a wide range of experiments. Its low computational cost enables
235 users to explore thousands of alternative futures, whether testing hypothetical “what if” scenarios, assessing the effectiveness
236 of different policy levers, or comparing model behavior across versions and against other frameworks. The EMB provides a
237 powerful baseline for these explorations: it isolates the dynamics generated purely by the model’s internal feedback
238 structure, allowing users to distinguish between outcomes that emerge from past actions already “baked into the system” and
239 those that result from external interventions.

240 Importantly, not all of our original requirements have yet been met: equity dimensions, certain social and health impacts, and
241 systematic treatment of biodiversity remain outside the current scope of the model. Nevertheless, the framework is designed
242 to facilitate such extensions.

243 In sum, FRIDA provides a novel contribution to the family of integrated assessment approaches: it is computationally light,
244 transparent in design, open to interdisciplinary collaboration, and accessible to both expert and non-expert users. We see
245 FRIDA as a living platform that will grow with the scientific community, and as an instrument to help society confront the
246 complex and cascading challenges of climate change in the decades ahead.

247

248 **Author Contribution**

249 The author is the coordinator and scientific lead of the EU project “*WorldTrans - Transparent Assessments for Real People*”.

250 **Competing Interests**

251 The author declares that she has no conflict of interest.

252 **Acknowledgements**

253 The author would like to thank the entire WorldTrans team², and in particular the FRIDA model development team:
254 Benjamin Blanz, Axel Eriksson, Martin Grimeland, Andreas Nicolaidis Lindqvist, Jefferson Rajah, Lennart Ramme, Chris
255 Wells and the coordinator of the model development process: Billy Schoenberg. This research was supported by the
256 Horizon Europe research and innovation programs under grant agreement no. 101081661 (WorldTrans). This work used
257 resources of the Deutsches Klimarechenzentrum (DKRZ) granted by its Scientific Steering Committee (WLA) under project
258 IDs 0033 and 1275.

260 **Code/Data availability**

261 This paper is an overview of the FRIDA collection and does not introduce new simulations or datasets. Code and data
262 availability for FRIDA v2.1 and specific experiments are documented in the companion model-description and application
263 papers in the collection.

264 **References**

- 265 Aghion, P. and Howitt, P.: A model of growth through creative destruction, *Econometrica*, 60, 323–351, 1992.
- 266 Aghion, P. and Howitt, P.: *The economics of growth*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA, 2009.
- 267 Bevacqua, E., Schlessner, C.-F., and Zscheischler, J.: A year above 1.5 °C signals that Earth is most probably within the 20-
268 year period that will reach the Paris Agreement limit, *Nat. Clim. Change*, 15, 262–265, [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-025-02246-9)
269 [025-02246-9](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-025-02246-9), 2025.
- 270 Eberlein, R. L., Thompson, J. P., and Matchar, D. B.: Chronological aging in continuous time, in: *Proceedings of the 30th*
271 *International Conference of the System Dynamics Society*, St. Gallen, Switzerland, 22–26 July 2012, 2012.
- 272 Forrester, J. W.: *Industrial dynamics*, M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, MA, USA, 464 pp., 1961.
- 273 Grimeland, M. B., Blanz, B., Schoenberg, W., and Callegari, B.: Schumpeterian disaggregation and integrated assessment:
274 An endogenous, stock-flow consistent economy in disequilibrium for FRIDA v2.1, *EGUsphere* [preprint],
275 <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2025-6342>, 2026.
- 276 Howard, P. H. and Sterner, T.: Few and not so far between: A meta-analysis of climate damage estimates, *Environ. Resour.*
277 *Econ.*, 68, 197–225, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-017-0166-z>, 2017.
- 278 Mustafa, M.: *From complexity to clarity: Designing and evaluating an interactive learning environment for human–climate*
279 *system exploration using FRIDA*, Master's thesis, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway, BORA – University of Bergen
280 Open Research Archive, 2025.

² <https://worldtrans-horizon.eu>

- 281 O'Neill, B. C., Kriegler, E., Ebi, K. L., Kemp-Benedict, E., Riahi, K., Rothman, D. S., van Ruijven, B. J., van Vuuren, D. P.,
282 Birkmann, J., Kok, K., Levy, M., and Solecki, W.: The roads ahead: Narratives for shared socioeconomic pathways
283 describing world futures in the 21st century, *Global Environ. Change*, 42, 169–180,
284 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.01.004>, 2017.
- 285 O'Neill, B., van Aalst, M., Zaiton Ibrahim, Z., et al.: Key risks across sectors and regions, in: *Climate Change 2022:
286 Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Sixth Assessment Report of the
287 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, Cambridge University Press, 2411–2538,
288 <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009325844.025>, 2022.
- 289 Pindyck, R. S.: The use and misuse of models for climate policy, *Rev. Environ. Econ. Policy*, 11, 100–114,
290 <https://doi.org/10.1093/reep/rew012>, 2017.
- 291 Pörtner, H.-O., Roberts, D. C., Adams, H., et al.: Technical summary, in: *Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation and
292 Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on
293 Climate Change*, Cambridge University Press, 37–118, <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009325844.002>, 2022.
- 294 Rajah, J. K., Blanz, B., Kopainsky, B., and Schoenberg, W.: An endogenous modelling framework of dietary behavioural
295 change in the fully coupled human-climate FRIDA v2.1 model, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 18, 5997–6022,
296 <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-18-5997-2025>, 2025.
- 297 Ramanathan, V. and Coakley, J. A.: Climate modeling through radiative-convective models, *Rev. Geophys.*, 16, 465–489,
298 <https://doi.org/10.1029/RG016i004p00465>, 1978.
- 299 Ramme, L., Blanz, B., Wells, C. D., Wong, T. E., Schoenberg, W., Smith, C., and Li, C.: Feedback-based sea level rise
300 impact modelling for integrated assessment models with FRISIAv1.0, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 18, 10017–10052,
301 <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-18-10017-2025>, 2025.
- 302 Saltelli, A., Tarantola, S., Campolongo, F., and Ratto, M.: *Global sensitivity analysis: The primer*, Wiley, Chichester, UK,
303 304 pp., 2008.
- 304 Schoenberg, W., Blanz, B., Rajah, J. K., Callegari, B., Wells, C., Breier, J., Grimeland, M. B., Lindqvist, A. N., Ramme, L.,
305 Smith, C., Li, C., Mashhadi, S., Muralidhar, A., and Mauritzen, C.: An overview of FRIDA v2.1: a feedback-based, fully
306 coupled, global integrated assessment model of climate and humans, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 18, 8047–8069,
307 <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-18-8047-2025>, 2025.
- 308 Schumpeter, J. A.: *Capitalism, socialism and democracy*, Harper & Brothers, New York, NY, USA, 1942.
- 309 Seneviratne, S. I., Zhang, X., Adnan, M., et al.: Weather and climate extreme events in a changing climate, in: *Climate
310 Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the
311 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, Cambridge University Press, 1513–1766,
312 <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157896.013>, 2021.
- 313 Sobol, I. M.: On the distribution of points in a cube and the approximate evaluation of integrals, *USSR Comput. Math. Math.
314 Phys.*, 7, 86–112, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0041-5553\(67\)90144-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0041-5553(67)90144-9), 1967.

315 Sterman, J. D.: Business dynamics: Systems thinking and modeling for a complex world, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY,
316 USA, 982 pp., 2000.

317 van Valkengoed, A. M., Perlaviciute, G., and Steg, L.: Representing the drivers of lifestyle change in integrated assessment
318 models: Introducing the Motivation, Agency, and Past Behaviour (MAP) framework, Environ. Res. Commun., 7,
319 032001, <https://doi.org/10.1088/2515-7620/acb162>, 2025.

320 Wells, C. D., Blanz, B., Ramme, L., Breier, J., Callegari, B., Muralidhar, A., Rajah, J. K., Lindqvist, A. N., Eriksson, A. E.,
321 Schoenberg, W. A., Köberle, A. C., Wang-Erlandsson, L., Mauritzen, C., Grimeland, M. B., and Smith, C.: The
322 representation of climate impacts in the FRIDA v2.1 Integrated Assessment Model, Geosci. Model Dev., 19, 1229–1260,
323 <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-19-1229-2026>, 2026a.

324 Wells, C. D., Ramme, L., Smith, C., Breier, J., Muralidhar, A., Li, C., Gjermundsen, A., Schoenberg, W. A., Blanz, B., and
325 Mauritzen, C.: FRIDA-Clim v1.0.1: a simple climate model with process-based carbon cycle used in the integrated
326 assessment model FRIDA v2.1, Geosci. Model Dev., 19, 1429–1453, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-19-1429-2026>, 2026b.
327

328

329 **APPENDIX: Best practices for running experiments: Type of research question vs type of experiment**

330 There are many kinds of experiments one may wish to run with FRIDA. How to set up each experiment depends partly on
331 the research questions one attempts to answer. We have identified four types of research questions that require their own
332 type of experiments in FRIDA:

333 **Research question type 1:** *What happens to the system if we introduce this or that change (structure or policy) to the model*
334 *sometime in the future?* For instance: what happens if we introduce a global carbon tax in 2030, or a new central bank target
335 for inflation in 2040, or a moratorium on the extraction of fossil fuels in 2050? This type of experiment is easy to perform:
336 one changes the relevant lever, or parameter, or flux in the relevant year and compares the EMB run to the experimental run.
337 These are hypothetical “what if”- type questions.

338 **Research question type 2:** *What would have happened to the system if this or that change (to structure or policy) was*
339 *introduced in past times?* For instance: what would the system have looked like if the carbon tax had been implemented in
340 1990. In this case the experiment is made the same way as in the previous case, except that the change is introduced to the
341 calibration period, so we compare a factual and a counterfactual system (the EMB run vs the experimental run). This can be
342 applied both to policy changes (i.e. carbon taxes) as well as system structure, i.e. including or not including a feedback or a
343 physical process. These are hypothetical “what if”- type questions.

344 **Research question type 3:** *How does the impact of introducing a change in FRIDA compare to a similar change in another*
345 *model?* For instance: how would FRIDA and model X compare in their response to a moratorium on fossil fuels in 2050?

346 This comparison is straightforward, one must simply make sure that the introduction is of the same magnitude and speed,
347 and that it is initiated at the same point in time.

348 **Research question type 4:** *What is the difference between models at various levels of maturity?* Specifically, what was the
349 impact of including this or that process/feedback in an upgrade of FRIDA? For instance: what is the impact of using complex
350 vs simple feedbacks from climate to the human side? Or: what are the impacts of the improvements made to FRIDA 2.1,
351 compared to FRIDA 1.0? In this case we compare two different models, for instance FRIDA 1 and FRIDA 2, or FRIDA 2
352 and FRIDA2simpleClimateFeedbacks. It must be recognized that the impacts of the differences between the two models will
353 spill over to the entire system, i.e. the impacts will be system-wide, so the interpretation of these impacts will be complex.
354 This approach is to be used for analysis of model differences, not for hypothetical what-if questions like the ones in number
355 1 and 2. This approach is extremely labor intensive, because it requires full model recalibration, so it should be used
356 sparingly.

357

358