

1. Secretariat's response to requests from Members

- a) Rapidity of response
- b) Helpfulness of response

Comments: *None*

Responses received	Average score
11	4,9
11	4,8

2. Quality of Consortium's communications (e.g. regular updates, meeting minutes, etc.)

- a) Clarity of communication
- b) Transparency of communication
- c) Completeness of communication
- d) Timeliness of communication

Comments:

- *Not detailed enough*
- *Need for clearer timelines, more reminders, and better tracking of timelines*
- *Changes in meeting Agendas should be indicated more clearly*
- *Assembly meetings provides a very good overview to those Member representatives not directly involved in every day work*

Responses received	Average score
10	4,3
10	4,5
10	4,4
10	4,4

3. Quality of requests sent to Members (e.g.: data-requests, vote requests, etc.)

- a) Clarity of composition of requests
- b) Timing of requests
- c) Handling/feed-back on outcomes of requests to Members

Comments:

- *Need for more regular feed-back on quantity and quality of information received from Members, and use/application of received information*
- *Need for more detailed and clear requests, especially if these requests are sent on short notice or with tight deadlines*
- *Ideally, WG and TAP should review data requests before wider circulation*

Responses received	Average score
11	3,9
11	4,0
11	4,0

4. TAP performance

Responses received	Average score
6	3,8

Comments:

- *Presentations should provide more basic background explanations before entering into high level technical assessments and recommendations*
- *Need for more pro-active contributors and precious metals chemistry and (eco-)toxicology experts (new Members may provide such resources)*
- *Difficult to follow-up on TAP's work but Members have an overall trust in the experts of TAP*

5. Work Groups performance (Cost-sharing, Legal, Precious Metals, Rhenium)

Responses received	Average score
7	3,8

Comments:

- *Need for more pro-active contributors and metal-specific experts*
- *Need for more project management to keep track of objectives, timelines and cost by participants and Secretariat/Scientific Manager*
- *Need for more transparency on WG input to technical work and less dependence on TAP's work*

6. Member's involvement in Consortium's activities

Responses received	Average score
9	4,2
9	4,3

- a) Level of inclusion/opportunity to participate in operational structure
- b) Opportunity to participate to/influence decision-making

Comments:

- *Need for more involvement from some Members*