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Trainee's Answer  
01/03/20XX  
Dear Ferdinand  
I am back to you with the memo as you have requested. If you have any comment I can modify the memo still today.   
BACKGROUND  
The goals of the European green deal and other climate change policies have underlined the strategic role plaied by batteries on reaching the environmental objectives. In fact, the batteries are necessary to boost the production of energy from renewable sources.   
The political agreement at EU level on the battery regulation is an important step. However, lithium, a key batteries material which is at the core of the batteries production cycle, is interested by a series of issues. These issues may compromise the goal of the proposal which aims at safe, sustainble and competitive batteries.  
In fact, from the adoption of the regulation by the Commission, the context is changed. Outside the EU, the US may become extremely attractive to establish lithium production cycles on their territory by means of the IRA. Within the EU, the possible upcoming decision of the European Chemical Agency (ECHA) about the risk for human health because of certain key lithium salts, may compromise our internal investments on lithium supply and refining.   
MAIN ISSUES  
Lithium is a key component of batteries. The global lithium demand will increase enormously in the next decade, and the global offer of lithium might not keep up the speed of the demand. This situation might be particularly critical in the EU where the lithium demand will be higher than in the rest of the world and the lithium mining and production is nonexistent.   
Nowadays, the EU depends on supply and refinement of Lithium from third countries. Opening lithium mines and establishing lithium refinement plants in Europe, as foreseen in the proposal, will reduce the dependency from the third countries.  
However, if ECHA will decide to classify some key lithium salts hazardous for human health, its is expected that there will be an increase in the costs for mining and producing lithium in Europe, with potential exodus of investors.  
In addition, on the other side of the Athlantic, the IRA makes extremely attractive to base lithium mining and refinement in the US terriotry.  
WAY FORWARD  
It is necessary to impement new measures in the batteries regulation to prevent troubles for the european market and update the regulation to the new context.  
Firstly, regarding the production chain of batteries, we need to align the attractiveness of the EU market to those determined in the US by means of the IRA. Therefore we must value the production made in the EU and grant an incentive for each major stage of the production process.   
Secondly, independently from the ECHA decision, we cannot exclude that in future additional risks for human health will arise in the batteries product chain. Therefore we need to integrate the batteries regulation with a system that values the production chains that respect the EU law in terms of protection of the human health and on the other hand hinders those production chains that do not comply with the requirements for human health established by the EU.   
In the long run, we will be able also to count on lithium recycling and on the use of new technologies like Direct Lithium Extraction (DLE) and Direct Lithium to production (DLP), and the use of materials alternative to lithium can be explored. However, we need to invest on EU reserach to make these paths much more concrete.  
Before our internal meeting, I will reach our collegues in ECHA for an update on the potential ban for certain lithium salts (the decision was expected by the beginning of this year). In case the ECHA will ban key lithiums salts, a revision of the impact assessment for the batteries regulation is desirable, the feasibility of this has to be checked during the internal meeting.  
AGENDA  
I've kept the agenda very simple and focused on our main issues for the ISC consultations:   
1 - Opening;  
2 - The proposal in the new context;  
3 - Fine-tuning the proposal:  
- the new global context and attractiveness of the EU market;  
- valuing protection of human health in the batteries production chain;  
4 - Next steps for the fine-tuning of the proposal;  
5 - Closing of the meeting.  
I am available to support you on introducing points 3 ad 4 in partiular.   
Looking forward  
YOU

Human Evaluator

# Actual Overall Score

OVERALL SCORE: 7.0/10

# Actual Overall Summary

Overall Summary:   
Summary  
  
The text serves as a memorandum detailing the EU's position and challenges with regard to lithium supply chains and their impact on battery production.   
The author touches upon multiple issues like dependency on third countries, possible changes in regulations, and strategic adjustments to stay competitive.   
The thesis statement is that the EU needs to update its regulation to maintain a sustainable, safe, and competitive lithium supply chain in light of new developments.  
  
The text is somewhat well-organized, but there are areas for improvement in clarity and specificity. Some paragraphs are too dense and could be broken down for easier understanding. While evidence to support claims is implied, more statistical data could strengthen the argument. There are multiple grammar and spelling errors   
  
Per Competency Score

# Actual Communication Score

COMMUNICATION SCORE: 7.0/10

# Actual Communication Summary

Communication Summary:   
While the layout of the text is logical, it could benefit from subheadings to delineate sections more clearly.  
  
The information is mostly communicated effectively, although some paragraphs are a bit dense. Breaking these down could improve communication clarity.  
  
The text does not have a specifically titled Introduction, Conclusions, or Recommendations section, which could improve its organizational structure.  
  
The tone of the document is professional and formal, suitable for its intended audience.  
  
The document could benefit from better formatting to enhance visual appeal. The use of bullet points and subheadings could make the text easier to navigate.

# Actual Tips/Errors

Tips/Suggestions for Improvement (if any):   
  
  
Spelling/Grammar Errors (if any):   
Spelling errors to correct:  
"plaied" should be "played"  
"sustainble" should be "sustainable"  
"impement" should be "implement"  
"reserach" should be "research"  
"terriotry" should be "territory"  
  
Grammar errors to correct:  
"If you have any comment I can modify" should be "If you have any comments, I can modify"  
"which is at the core of the batteries production cycle, is interested by a series of issues." should be "which is at the core of the battery production cycle, is affected by a series of issues."  
"its is expected that there will be an increase" should be "it is expected that there will be an increase"  
"I will reach our collegues" should be "I will reach out to our colleagues"  
"points 3 ad 4 in partiular" should be "points 3 and 4 in particular"

AI Evaluator

# Predicted Overall Score

Overall Score (out-off 10): 7.0

# Predicted Overall Summary

Overall Summary:  
  
The trainee's answer provides a good understanding of the main issues and challenges related to the lithium supply chain in the European Union. They correctly mention the goals of the European Green Deal and the importance of batteries in achieving environmental objectives. They also acknowledge the potential impact of the political agreement on battery regulation and the issues surrounding lithium, such as the possibility of the European Chemical Agency classifying certain lithium salts as hazardous for human health.   
  
However, there are several areas where the trainee's answer can be improved. Firstly, the trainee should have followed the email instructions and structured their response in the form of a memo. The trainee's answer lacks clear titles and subtitles, making it difficult to navigate. Additionally, the trainee should have included a titled Introduction section, as requested in the brief.  
  
Moreover, the trainee's answer lacks solid reasoning and convincing arguments. While they mention the issues related to the lithium supply chain, they do not provide concrete proposals or recommendations to address these issues. The trainee should have provided more specific and actionable suggestions for aligning the original proposal with the political priorities of the co-legislators.  
  
In terms of content, the trainee's answer addresses the required elements of the assignment and provides accurate information about the current situation of the lithium supply chain. However, they could have provided more quantitative data and referenced sources to support their statements. Additionally, the trainee does not mention any specific EU member states or provide information on non-EU countries or the international context, as requested in the brief.  
  
Overall, the trainee's answer demonstrates a basic understanding of the topic but lacks depth and specificity in their analysis and recommendations. The trainee should focus on structuring their response as a memo, providing more specific proposals and recommendations, and supporting their arguments with relevant data and references.  
  
Strong Points:  
- Recognizing the strategic role of batteries in reaching environmental objectives.  
- Identifying the issues and challenges related to the lithium supply chain in the EU.  
- Acknowledging the potential impact of the European Chemical Agency's decision on certain lithium salts.  
  
Areas for Improvement:  
- Structure the response as a memo with clear titles and subtitles.  
- Include a titled Introduction section as requested in the brief.  
- Provide more specific and actionable proposals and recommendations.  
- Support arguments with quantitative data and referenced sources.  
- Mention specific EU member states and provide information on non-EU countries or the international context.  
  
The quality, relevance, and conciseness of your arguments were limited.

# Predicted Communication Score

Communication Score (out-off 10): 7.0

# Predicted Communication Summary

According to the Notice of Competitions of current EPSO competitions, the only competency that will be assessed in the Case Study exam is Written Communication. Therefore, only this competency was assessed in your evaluation.  
  
Summary:  
Your memo provides a clear overview of the background and main issues related to the European Union's efforts to build a resilient lithium supply chain. You highlight the potential challenges arising from the classification of lithium salts as hazardous for human health and the competition from the US Inflation Reduction Act. Your proposed way forward suggests aligning the attractiveness of the EU market with the US through incentives and integrating the regulation with a system that values production chains compliant with EU requirements. However, there are areas where you can improve the clarity, organization, and style of your memo.  
  
Clarity:  
- The memo generally presents the information in a clear manner, but there are some areas where the language could be more concise and precise. For example, in the background section, instead of stating "The goals of the European green deal and other climate change policies have underlined the strategic role plaied by batteries on reaching the environmental objectives," you can simply state "Batteries play a strategic role in achieving the environmental objectives of the European Green Deal and other climate change policies."  
- In the main issues section, you mention that "The global lithium demand will increase enormously in the next decade, and the global offer of lithium might not keep up the speed of the demand." It would be helpful to provide some data or evidence to support this statement and make it more persuasive.  
  
Organization:  
- The organization of the memo could be improved to provide a clearer structure and flow of information. Consider using subheadings or bullet points to break down the different sections and make it easier for the reader to navigate through the memo.  
- The agenda section is a good addition, but it would be beneficial to provide more specific recommendations or proposals under each agenda item to align the original proposal with the co-legislators' priorities.  
  
Style:  
- The tone of your memo is appropriate for the audience, and you use formal language throughout. However, there are some areas where the language could be more concise and jargon-free. For example, instead of using phrases like "In fact, from the adoption of the regulation by the Commission, the context is changed," you can simply state "Since the adoption of the regulation by the Commission, the context has changed."  
- Be mindful of sentence structure and grammar. For example, in the sentence "Therefore we must value the production made in the EU and grant an incentive for each major stage of the production process," it would be clearer to say "Therefore, we must value the production made in the EU and grant incentives for each major stage of the production process."  
  
Overall, your memo provides a good foundation, but it would benefit from improvements in clarity, organization, and style. Consider revising and refining your content to ensure a more effective communication of your proposals and recommendations.

# Predicted Tips/Errors

TIPS/SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT:  
- Begin the memo with a clear and concise introduction that provides an overview of the topic and sets the context for the rest of the memo.  
- Use clear and concise language throughout the memo. Avoid using informal language or unnecessary phrases.  
- Organize the memo into sections with clear headings to improve readability and make it easier for the reader to navigate the content.  
- Provide more specific information and data to support your points and recommendations. This will add credibility to your arguments and make them more convincing.  
- Avoid using personal pronouns in the memo. Instead, use more formal language and refer to the European Union and its initiatives.  
  
SPELLING/GRAMMAR ERRORS:  
- "plaied" should be "played"  
- "sustainble" should be "sustainable"  
- "foreseen" should be "foreseen"  
- "terriotry" should be "territory"  
- "impement" should be "implement"  
- "reserach" should be "research"  
- "collegues" should be "colleagues"  
- "partiular" should be "particular"