

Comments on HLEG Draft Report

My concerns are the following

1)

Who will be the members of the governing board and executive committee ?
how will they be elected

2) How will the budgets be allocated and who will choose the grants. How will the needs for transparency and objectivity be granted?

3) Basically, how will the grant be administered in a way that promotes the interests of Europe rather than the organisers

4) What fraction of the total budget will be needed for administration?

5) How will Melody support the needs for national expertise in radiation protection in those countries that do not qualify to be members?. How will Melody work in order to promote and support the collaboration between scientists in Europe.

6) Will Melody provide for innovative, response mode radiation research. The process appears to be managerially heavy and if all the research is channelled through one platform with defined goals, there will be no funding for hypothesis driven response mode radiation protection research in Europe.

7) is it wise to channel all radiation protection research in Europe through a single, managerially heavy system - many good quality laboratories do not like the paperwork required for EU grants - all funding for radiation protection research to these workers might be lost.

The challenge for radiation research, a multidisciplinary subject, is to have grants of a size that promotes interaction and progress whilst also aiming to promote interdisciplinary interactions. All the feedback from EU funding (not just radiation protection) is that very large grants with a large number of participants are not highly effective. Are there any strategies to promote interactions between groups but maintain bite size funding units - this is the real challenge,

Penelope Jeggo
University of Sussex