|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **S No.** | **Point for Input** | **Input** |
| **1.** | Priority areas for Cancer Research In India | A. Cancer stem cells/leukemic stem cellsB. BiomarkersC. India (mostly) specific cancer  |
| **2**. | Suggestions to make the Task Force more effective | A. Merit based grant B. RFA for attracting multi-institutional projectsC. Inviting more cancer biology experts (clinician/researcher) from India or abroad during the task force meeting and getting their view.  |
| **3.** | Designing modes for creation of Institutional/ Infrastructure/ Fellowships/ Training programmes: to be created for increasing the effectiveness of Cancer Research | A. Can be discussed in the meetingB. C. |
| **4.** | Relationship and mechanism with International Cancer funding agencies: possibility for exploring joint funding programs | A. As far as I know DBT does it, however, cancer specific can be done with the well known international cancer organizations like cancer research UK, Ludwig cancer institute and others. B. C.  |
| **5.** | To achieve the balance between PI driven and generated program grants/ monitoring of the same | A. Grant monitoring is a must. The member secretary should make sure that the progress report is send to the same persons who actually reviewed the grants (3 external and 2 internal). Grant should be closed if not found suitable (except a proper explanation is given by the PI). B.C. |

Merit based grant: Grants should be sanctioned solely based on the merit of the proposal and not on the basis from where it is coming (Institute/University/IISER/NISER/NIPER/IIT/NIT/region based et al.). A point based system should be initiated and in that the three external reviewers (reviewers should get atleast 45 days to review the grants) should give a point depending on the strength of the proposal, research question/hypothesis, expertise of the PI/collaborators. Now add up the points and if it is below a certain cut-off mark, it should be rejected and should not come to the committee. If the proposal passes the cut off mark, two internal moderators (atleast 15-20 days should be given to read the proposal) should be assigned who should ask maximum number of questions to the PI (the PI should be asked to present a strict 10 mins presentation followed by questions, if any). The committee should keep two days for grant review and it should be twice a year.

The progress report can be circulated to the same reviewers (who actually reviewed the grant, 3+2) following which chairman can take a decision and should not come to the meeting (if some adverse comment is not made which needs to be discussed by the moderators).
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