

With a 27 year experience in radiation measurement, monitoring and safety assessment across all areas of radiation use in South Australia from within the government agency responsible for regulating activities in that field (now retired), I have encountered the full range of public opinion about the safety issues involved. It is my opinion that the public is poorly informed and often misinformed about these issues and that the work of the Commission can provide a valuable public education service as follows.

For each of the findings, evidence to the Commission presumably falls into several categories such as:

- Accepted by the Commission as factually true, supported by commonly accepted knowledge
- Considered by the Commission to be factually untrue and contrary to commonly accepted knowledge
- Informed opinion likely to be grounded in facts
- Misinformed opinion
- Opinion intended to mislead the Commission

While the body of evidence to the Commission is published in various forms many members of the general public will have little or no ability to place it in categories such as those above.

It would be useful for the Commission to publicly identify at least the first of those categories and any of the others as the commissioner sees fit. While the findings of the royal commission will be viewed by some based on their own preformed bias and prejudice many members of the public simply want the facts and to be able to identify the first category above would be useful. It would allow the well intentioned to extend their understanding and have greater confidence in the findings.

The work of the royal commission will continue to be a resource well beyond the publication and immediate response to the Final Findings but there is a serious risk that some of the evidence that the commission may have found to be unsupported or lack validity would still be used by some members of the community to undermine the Final Findings.