

International Agency for Research on Cancer



**Governing Council
Fifty-second Session**

**GC/52/Min.2
Original: ENGLISH**

*Lyon, 13–14 May 2010
Auditorium*

RESTRICTED DISTRIBUTION

MINUTES OF THE SECOND MEETING

IARC, Lyon

Thursday, 13 May 2010, at 14:10

Chairperson: Professor Lars E. Hanssen (Norway)

Secretary: Dr Christopher P. Wild, Director, IARC

CONTENTS

	Page
1. Report of the Forty-sixth session of the Scientific Council (continued)	4
2. Director's response to recommendations of the Scientific Council	4
3. IARC Medium-Term Strategy and Implementation Plan for 2010–2014	5
4. IARC Education and Training	10
5. Statement by the IARC Staff Association	14
6. Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for the Agency	16
7. Biennial financial report and report of the External Auditor for the financial period 1 January 2008 to 31 December 2009	21
8. Long-term capital master plan (including options for financing)	25

Participating States Representatives

Professor Lars E. HANSSEN, <i>Chairperson</i> Mr Geir BUKHOLM Dr Henrietta BLANKSON	Norway
Dr Mark PALMER, <i>Vice-Chairperson</i>	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Dr Diane STEBER BÜCHLI, <i>Rapporteur</i>	Switzerland
Professor Jim BISHOP	Australia
Ms Simone MESNER	Austria
Dr Margareta HAELTERMAN Mr Lieven DE RAEDT	Belgium
Dr Morag PARK Ms Lucero HERNANDEZ Dr Howard MORRISON	Canada
Professor Herman AUTRUP	Denmark
Professor Pekka PUSKA	Finland
Ms Pascale FLAMANT Dr Rosemary ANCELLE-PARK	France
Dr Irene KEINHORST	Germany
<i>No Representative</i>	India
Ms Mary JACKSON	Ireland
Dr Stefano FAIS	Italy
Dr Masato MUGITANI Dr Takashi SUZUKI	Japan
Mr Jeroen HULLEMAN Ms Annemarieke RENDERING	Netherlands
Dr Duk-Hyoung LEE Dr Han-Suk KIM Dr Sohee PARK	Republic of Korea
Dr Oleg P. CHESTNOV Ms Nadezhda KULESHOVA	Russian Federation

Dr Carlos SEGOVIA	Spain
Professor Mats ULFENDAHL	Sweden
Mr James KULIKOWSKI Dr Joe HARFORD Dr Therese S. HUGHES	United States of America

World Health Organization

Dr Ala ALWAN, Assistant Director-General
Ms Joanne MCKEOUGH, Office of the Legal Counsel
Dr Andreas ULLRICH, Chronic Diseases Prevention and Management

Observers

Dr Marisa Dreyer BREITENBACH, National Cancer Institute, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
Dr Harry COMBER, Outgoing Chairperson, Scientific Council
Dr Edgar RIVEDAL, Incoming Chairperson, Scientific Council

International Union Against Cancer (UICC)

Mr Cary ADAMS, Executive Director

External Audit

Shri J.N. GUPTA, Additional Deputy Comptroller and Auditor General of India

Secretariat

Dr C.P. WILD, <i>Secretary</i>	Dr S. FRANCESCHI	Dr F. LESUEUR
Dr H. LAFIF	Dr N. GAUDIN	Dr H. OHGAKI
	Mr G. GUILLERMINET	Dr I. ROMIEU
Dr P. BRENNAN	Dr P. HAINAUT	Dr R. SANKARANARAYANAN
Dr G. BYRNES	Dr M. HEANUE	Dr N. SLIMANI
Dr V. COGLIANO	Dr Z. HERCEG	Mr M. SMANS
Ms D. D'AMICO	Dr O. KELM	Dr K. STRAIF
Dr D. FORMAN	Dr A. KESMINIENE	Dr M. TOMMASINO
	Mr P. KNOCHE	Dr L. VON KARSA

**1. REPORT OF THE FORTY-SIXTH SESSION OF THE SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL:
Item 7 of the Agenda** (Document GC/52/4) (continued)

**2. DIRECTOR'S RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL:
Item 8 of the Agenda** (Document GC/52/5)

The SECRETARY, responding to the points in the report of the Scientific Council that would not be covered elsewhere in the Agenda, said that the Agency had worked hard to increase its contact with the Scientific Council, holding telephone conferences every two months with the Chairs and Vice-Chairs of the Governing and Scientific Councils and including members of the Scientific Council in some of the advisory groups set up during the year. As a result of the strengthened contact, discussions between the Agency and the Scientific Council during the January meetings had improved. A new template, that provided more information, had been used in the Scientific Council report following the comments received from the previous session of the Governing Council. The Scientific Council had supported his responses to the peer review on the mechanisms of carcinogenesis, and his view that the Biobank should continue to be a priority. Acknowledging the strong peer review of the Section of Infections, he said that he would examine what support he could give to it going forward. Both he and his colleagues had appreciated the leadership shown by the Chair of the Scientific Council.

Dr HARFORD (alternate to Mr Kulikowski, United States of America) commended the Scientific Council for its report and the outgoing Chairperson for his leadership. He asked whether the Scientific Council or the Director had taken into account the impact of the reorganization of the Agency on the periodic review.

Dr COMBER, Outgoing Chairperson of the Scientific Council, said that the matter had been discussed in the context of the upcoming reviews. In the future, it was probable that Groups would be reviewed either by a single or by two separate review panels during the year. The Incoming Chairperson of the Scientific Council would ensure that the nine Sections, which had replaced the five clusters, would be reviewed on a regular basis.

The SECRETARY said that the proposed timing for the peer reviews of the nine Sections was set out in the Medium-term strategy. The Section of Genetics would be reviewed in the first year with a further two Sections being reviewed each year thereafter.

Dr PALMER (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), speaking in his capacity as Vice-Chairperson, recalled that the Governing Council had been working with the Scientific Council in order to amend the review process, which would include a change in the way in which reports were assessed and ratings given. He sought feedback in particular on whether the four criteria currently used in the scoring system were sufficiently nuanced to reflect accurately the science being assessed.

Dr COMBER, Outgoing Chairperson of the Scientific Council, said that the Scientific Council felt that it would be difficult to answer that question until further experience in using the new scoring system had been accumulated. There had been some suggestions that the system should be modified following the previous year's reviews, but it had been decided that it should run in its present form for a while longer before any changes were made. Although it was not as important to the Scientific Council as the verbal reports and the detailed written information provided, it was acknowledged that the scoring was perceived to be important from an external point of view. To some extent, the same argument was valid in relation to the Key Performance Indicators, since the Scientific Council would tend to assess performance through the text of a report rather than by looking solely at a number of synoptic indicators.

The CHAIRPERSON, recalling his years of experience with the governing bodies of IARC, said that he had been struck by the good working atmosphere that existed at present between the Director and the Scientific Council: it was an achievement of major importance for the Agency and the Governing Council.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution on the report of the Scientific Council (Resolution GC/52/R3):

The Governing Council,

Having reviewed the Report presented by the Forty-sixth Scientific Council (Document GC/52/4) and the Director's response (Document GC/52/5),

1. NOTES the Report with great interest;
2. CONGRATULATES the members of the Scientific Council for their constructive and excellent work; and
3. COMMENDS the Director for his constructive responses to the recommendations of the Forty-sixth Session of the Scientific Council.

The draft resolution was **adopted**.

**3. IARC MEDIUM-TERM STRATEGY AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR 2010–2014:
Item 9 of the Agenda** (Document GC/52/6)

The SECRETARY, illustrating his remarks with slides, said that, following the previous Governing Council meeting, a draft of the Medium-term strategy had been developed over the summer of 2009 in consultation with Agency scientists. The draft had then been evaluated by a Governing Council working group chaired by Dr Autrup of Denmark. In January 2010, a revised draft of the strategy had been submitted to the Scientific Council which had recommended that it should be adopted by the Governing Council. The strategy had been submitted to the Governing Council following some minor changes.

Outlining the structure of the document, he explained that the scope of the activities had been derived from IARC's Statute. Core priority areas, expected outcomes and resources had been identified and specific aims had been organized for each Section or Group. In a departure from previous practice, both the strategy and its implementation had been included in one document: the challenge during the drafting process had been to maintain a balance between the strategy, with its overview of the direction and the principles that the Agency should follow, and the detail of the studies that would allow the Governing and Scientific Councils to evaluate whether progress was being made.

The five principles on which the strategy was based were: (1) excellence in research; (2) collaboration in research, creating added value by promoting cooperation at the international level; (3) interdisciplinary research; (4) the Agency's worldwide mandate, especially the strong reputation it had built in low- and middle-income countries over many years; and (5) a renewed emphasis on education and training, playing a role in building a new generation of cancer researchers. The associated budget presupposed that the current balance between regular and extrabudgetary resources would be maintained, as the strategy could not be realized with contributions from Participating States alone.

Priority areas had been identified and included in the Annex to document GC/52/6. As a research organization, the Agency should maintain flexibility in the light of emerging priorities and new findings. The Agency's basic science and research into mechanisms was oriented towards translation into population studies. Areas that were not considered a priority were: major initiatives on new therapeutic approaches; identification of high penetrance genes; and fundamental mechanistic studies dissociated from understanding the causes of cancer at a population level.

The first priority area was describing the global cancer burden: he would like the Agency to be the definitive point of reference for accurate information on cancer occurrence and to make the information as accessible as possible. This Agency activity would also be a platform for research, highlighting the opportunity to understand patterns of cancer worldwide and the risk factors that created them. Cancer registration data was increasingly essential in evaluating the impact of prevention strategies, including targeted screening programmes. Expected outcomes included increasing cancer registration coverage, improved training tools for support to cancer registries and collaboration with organizations that shared the Agency's goals. The second priority area concerned the IARC Monographs, which set out the causes of cancer and were a key tool for cancer prevention. Timely publication was essential. The Agency was also considering how it might produce more quantitative data on carcinogenicity. The expected outcomes from the Monographs section were two to three volumes per year. One of the first topics to be examined in the following year would be mobile phones and cancer. An ad hoc advisory group would meet to recommend priorities for future review.

The third priority area focused on the causes of cancer: there was still a significant number of cancers for which the etiology was unclear. The challenges included understanding the interactions between genetic and environmental risk factors and the changing patterns and scale of cancers in low-income countries. There tended to be less focus on cancer research and its funding in that area. The priority risk factors were reflected in the structure of the Agency: infections; nutrition and metabolism; lifestyle and environmental exposures and genetics. All of

the Sections, including those that were laboratory-based, contributed to that priority area. Concerning the expected outcomes, with regard to Infections and Cancer Biology (ICB), the focus was on improved understanding of the persistence of infectious agents and clarification of the cancer risks associated with those infections while with regard to Infections and Cancer Epidemiology (ICE), the focus was on the human papillomavirus, hepatitis and HIV-related cancers. In the Environment Section, the Lifestyle and Cancer Group (LCA), would compute the risks associated with a number of different exposures, building on existing studies. It was proposed to produce two handbooks on tobacco control and one on alcohol. There would also be an international collaborative study on agricultural workers and cancer. Concerning Environment, the Radiation Group (RAD), outcomes would include more reliable estimates of the effects of low-dose radiation and a focus on radiation sensitivity following exposure in early life. For the three Nutrition and Metabolism Groups (NEP, DEX and BMA) the overall aims were to understand the role of diet, physical activity and obesity. In Genetics, the Genetic Epidemiology Group (GEP) would continue to identify common gene variants, particularly in relation to lung, head and neck cancers as well as the perhaps under-researched areas of germ-line and sporadic genetic alterations linked to kidney cancer. A large international pilot study on childhood cancers would also be evaluated. In the Genetic Susceptibility Group (GCS), the aim was to identify intermediate-risk genetic variants to melanoma, breast, kidney and tobacco-related cancers. The Genetic Services Platform would support research across the Agency.

Regarding the fourth priority area, Mechanisms of Carcinogenesis, there were opportunities to translate mechanistic information into biomarkers and other tools for application in population studies. Basic research on cancer was typically driven towards the clinical end of the spectrum and the purpose of IARC's research was to draw some of the science towards epidemiology and population-based studies in order to improve exposure assessment, improve the identification of susceptible individuals and understand the mechanisms of action at environmental levels of exposure. There was considerable overlap between the Sections and Groups involved in that area, with a major focus on Molecular Pathology and Mechanisms of Carcinogenesis. Expected outcomes for Molecular Pathology (MPA) were focused around understanding the etiology of brain tumours and the molecular genetics of brain cancer, as well as major activity concerning the WHO Blue Books. The expected outcomes for Molecular Carcinogenesis (MOC) included focusing on the mutations and the selection of cancer-causing mutations in tumours that were common in low-income countries. The Epigenetics Group (EGE) would focus on a new area of research, identifying how environmental risk factors modified the epigenetic markers and the expression of genes so that new pathways were opened up to explore the association between exposure and disease. The emphasis was on developing methods that could be applied in population studies.

The fifth priority area, Cancer Prevention, involved research into the effectiveness of intervention strategies and their implementation. Priority areas for prevention would include evaluation of vaccination against the hepatitis B virus and the human papillomavirus (HPV) and screening in relation to breast, cervix, oral cavity and colorectal cancer. There would be particular emphasis on quality assurance in cancer screening. A number of Sections would contribute, with a major focus on Early Detection and Prevention (EDP) and the Gambia Hepatitis Intervention Study (GHIS). Expected outcomes for Screening (SCR) would include an

evaluation of two-dose and three-dose HPV vaccination; evaluation of breast awareness and physical examination; the cost-effectiveness of two trials on cervical cancer screening; and initiation of research on implementation of prevention strategies. Expected outcomes for Quality Assurance (QAS) would include revising the European Code against Cancer and producing guidelines on breast, colorectal and cervical cancer.

The fifth priority area, Training, would be coordinated through a senior professional appointment. The Fellowship Programme would be strengthened and training would match the Agency's core competencies: cancer registration, epidemiology, molecular epidemiology and screening. Partnerships would be sought with other providers alongside research activity. Expected outcomes for Education and Training (ETR) would include an increased number of scientists supported by IARC training fellowships; improved training for junior scientists; and an enlarged set of courses put in place with other providers.

A Biostatistics Group (BST) had been developed to provide support across the Agency. It would collaborate with research groups inside and outside the Agency. The Laboratory Services and Biobank Group (LSB) would provide support to the Agency's laboratories; it would be overseen by the Laboratory Steering Committee and the Biobank Steering Committee.

An explicit IARC Communications Strategy would be developed over the coming year, with the aim of making information available as widely as possible; it would coordinate closely with WHO. A schedule of Scientific Council peer reviews had been planned. In summary, IARC would seek to describe the global cancer burden through a number of mechanisms that would feed into defining the causes of cancer and lead, in some cases, to the evaluation of preventions. The whole would contribute to policy-making with WHO and other partners.

Dr PARK (Canada) said that Canada supported the Medium-term strategy. It was important that the strategy should engage with the research community from Participating States. The work on discovery of biomarkers had been presented a number of times. She wondered how far IARC was engaged with the international cancer genome project.

The SECRETARY agreed that there should be engagement with researchers in Participating States. The Agency was involved with the international cancer genome project. He invited Dr Brennan to comment.

Dr BRENNAN (Head, Section of Genetics) said that the Agency was a member of the International Cancer Genome Consortium. It had been involved in the recently funded European Union project on kidney cancer with the main focus of the sequencing done in Paris, although there was potential for some of the work to be carried out in Lyon.

Dr SEGOVIA (Spain) said that Spain supported the Medium-Term Strategy and that IARC might need more support from developing countries, both because a large part of the Agency's work depended on registries and because the burden of disease was expected to increase in those countries. In addition, IARC's work should inform policy-making in relation to cancer. Therefore, developing countries should be given the opportunity to participate in the work of the Governing Council.

Ms RENDERING (alternate to Mr Hulleman, Netherlands) complimented IARC on the Medium-term strategy: there was certainly a need to focus on priorities and on the added value the Agency could bring. She supported the emphasis on prevention and the need for stronger evidence. The rational view on HPV vaccination was particularly appreciated since it would help governments to make informed decisions. She applauded the efforts to improve communication – there was a need to make the work of the Biobank better known.

Professor BISHOP (Australia) said that he supported the strategy. He applauded the emphasis on collaboration and research although the report might have presented a more structured approach to those areas and how they would be achieved, in particular in pursuing large-scale projects with other countries. He commended the evidence-based approach to interventions in low- and middle-income countries.

Dr FAIS (Italy) complimented the Agency on the clear strategy presented. However, he wondered why the common scientific strategy of focusing on nanomedicine in the early diagnosis of cancer had not been mentioned.

The SECRETARY said that the Agency had been involved in one recent European application regarding nanotechnology in medicine.

Dr HARFORD (alternate to Mr Kulikowski, United States of America) expressed support for the strategy and the thoroughness with which it had been put together. He would be grateful to learn more about any online or distance education and training that was led by the Agency. Concerning collaboration with scientists outside the Agency, he asked to what degree biobanking was a resource that could be tapped by scientists in Participating States. In particular, he wished to know whether an IARC scientist would have to be part of such a project or whether it could be tapped by others, even if there was no direct involvement from IARC.

The SECRETARY said that the Agency's Education and Training Group was considering using distance-learning technology – an area with considerable potential – and perhaps joining with external partners already using such techniques.

In principle, he could see no problem with the Agency acting as a link between researchers who had generated samples in the Biobank and other collaborators, although it could be quite complex to manage the samples and there would be some ethical questions to resolve. In his view, the Biobank would increasingly become a resource for the international community.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution on the IARC Medium-Term Strategy and Implementation Plan for 2010–2014 (Resolution GC/52/R4):

The Governing Council,

Having considered Document GC/52/6 "IARC Medium-Term Strategy and Implementation Plan for 2010–2014" and the Annex therein,

1. COMMENDS the Director and his staff on the document which clearly sets out strategic aims for IARC for 2010–2014;
2. THANKS the Working Group, composed of members of the Governing and Scientific Councils and a Representative of WHO, for considering and finalizing the draft Medium-Term Strategy, with the support of the Secretariat;
3. THANKS the Scientific Council for reviewing the draft Medium-Term Strategy document (SC/46/7) and for its comments and recommendation for approval by the Governing Council; and
4. ADOPTS the Agency's Medium-Term Strategy and Implementation Plan for 2010–2014, as contained in Document GC/52/6 and its Annex.

The draft resolution was **adopted**.

4. IARC EDUCATION AND TRAINING: Item 10 of the Agenda (Document GC/52/7)

The SECRETARY, illustrating his remarks with slides, said that education had been a statutory core activity since 1966; the Agency focused both on training courses and fellowships. More recently, the emphasis had been on developing local expertise, especially in low- and middle-income countries in the context of collaborative research projects. Before 2005, IARC had taught basic epidemiology and environmental health hazards in low- and middle-income countries. Since that time, there had been an IARC summer school on cancer epidemiology in Lyon and individual Groups organized courses on registration and screening. Fellowships were mostly post-doctoral, competitive, centrally funded and peer-reviewed. According to a 2004 review, 80% of fellows returned to their home country after training and 73% remained active in cancer research. IARC Fellowships made a substantial contribution to the development of cancer research in many countries. The Agency also had 80–100 trainees, masters, doctoral and technical students each year.

There had been a great deal of in-house discussion on how to plan training in the future, and consultation had taken place through the *ad hoc* international advisory group; as well as through informal discussions with IARC Participating States and UICC. Recommendations had been made by the Scientific Council at its 46th Session. It was planned to continue to focus training in IARC's areas of core expertise and courses would be more coordinated to ensure quality and to prevent fragmentation. The IARC Summer School would continue for the time being. The Agency would seek partnerships in providing courses. Priority would continue to be given to post-doctoral fellowships and to candidates or projects from low- and middle-income countries. An internal advisory committee would ensure strategic planning and delivery. It was proposed that fellows should be given a small grant to continue research in their country of origin upon their return and that international and national mentors should be assigned after the period of research in Lyon. Shorter-term fellowships might also be explored. The Fellowships budget would be increased through funding from the regular budget and from external sources. It was proposed to expand Education and Training through the assignment of a full-time post within the Agency. Finally, it was proposed to create an IARC Alumni Association to maintain a network of contacts worldwide.

Dr HARFORD (alternate to Mr Kulikowski, United States of America) expressed support for the direction proposed in education and training although a little more structure would be required: the internal advisory committee could explore the courses already available, including "train the trainer" courses, in order to support knowledge transfer. He would favour an emphasis on post-doctoral training and on a focused, strategic approach to encouraging interest in the field of research and public health.

The SECRETARY agreed that it was important to explore existing courses: in that regard, the Agency had suffered from the lack of a full-time staff member devoted to education and training and a much-needed review in that area could now be undertaken. The internal advisory committee had been tasked with examining how to develop education and training within and outside the Agency. Concerning training in Africa, there should be some reflection on the need to provide materials to Francophone as well as Anglophone countries.

Professor AUTRUP (Denmark) said that education and training were part of IARC's Statute but it was the first time in many years that he had seen a satisfactory and structured report presented on the subject. He also believed that the Agency should remain focused on post-doctoral students as the 80–100 more junior students mentioned would inevitably take the valuable time of IARC's senior scientists.

Dr PARK (Canada) also supported the direction of the education and training programme and the decision to maintain a focus on the Agency's core expertise. Canada, through the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CHR), would be interested in contributing to the expansion of the programme in the area of post-doctoral fellowships. She inquired whether the type of bilateral agreements that would be required for IARC to enter into with Participating States had been examined.

The SECRETARY, wishing to reassure the representative of Denmark, said that there was a limited number of pre-doctoral students at the Agency, most of whom were on short-term visits from local universities in Lyon from which they continued to receive support. The global figure of 80 students included post-doctoral students and visiting professors. The young students also contributed a great deal in respect of their interaction with the local research community; he was nevertheless aware of the draw on senior scientists' time. He had been encouraged by the comments of the representative of Canada. Concerning bilateral agreements, it was important that the stringency of the peer review should be maintained and that coordination should be through the Fellowships Committee at IARC so that the standards of appointment remained uniform. If there was no suitable candidate then an appointment would not be made. A collaborative link should be made between IARC and the home institution of the scientist.

Professor BISHOP (Australia) supported the direction outlined for the Education and Training Programme. In core areas such as registration, there might be groups in the Western Pacific Region able to collaborate with IARC in setting up courses, through the Australian Association of Cancer Registries. Such arrangements could provide value and be cost-effective.

The SECRETARY said that the model of regional collaboration described was certainly a good one and it was already followed by IARC: cancer registration courses had recently been held with the Pan American Health Organization.

Dr KEINHORST (Germany) also supported the stated direction for the Programme. She wished to learn whether the full-time staff member to be appointed to run the Education and Training Group was already present in the Agency.

The SECRETARY said that the post had been filled through the transfer of Mary Heanue, an existing staff member with interest and expertise in the area and who had already run the summer school for some time. By way of short-term investment into the Group, a visiting scientist (Dr Rodolfo Saracci) with expertise in the field had also been appointed.

Professor AUTRUP (Denmark), noting the existence of the internal advisory group, asked whether the selection process for visiting fellows included external reviewers.

The SECRETARY said that the Fellowship Selection Committee was composed of both internal and external members including representatives of WHO, UICC and an expert from Italy in view of the contribution by the Italian Association for Cancer Research to the Fellowships Programme. The Committee was chaired by an external expert.

Dr PARK (Canada) asked whether a single committee interviewed all of the candidates.

The SECRETARY said that individual members of the Committee conducted telephone interviews with candidates and then reported back to the Committee as a whole where all candidates were reviewed.

Dr PARK (Canada) asked whether membership of the Committee would be expanded in view of the increased contribution from Participating States.

The SECRETARY said that, by expanding the Committee, IARC could engage further with Participating States and therefore it would be of benefit to the Agency. The only balancing factor would be maintaining a manageable overall size of the Committee.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution on IARC Education and Training (Resolution GC/52/R5):

The Governing Council,

Having examined the proposed directions for the IARC Education and Training programme (ETR), as described in the annex to Document GC/52/7,

1. THANKS the Scientific Council for advising the Director on the future priorities and opportunities in this key area (Document GC/52/4);
2. APPROVES the direction to be taken by IARC in its pursuit of the Agency's Education and Training Programme, as described in the annex to Document GC/52/7; and
3. REQUESTS that a review of ETR be scheduled during the 48th Session of the Scientific Council in 2012.

The draft resolution was **adopted**.

5. STATEMENT BY THE IARC STAFF ASSOCIATION: Item 11 of the Agenda
(Document GC/52/8)

Dr MCKAY, Vice-Chairperson of the IARC Staff Association, said that there had been major changes at IARC in 2009, including the arrival of its new Director, Dr Wild, and the Director of Administration and Finance, Dr H. Lafif. A new phase of dialogue had been established between the Management and the Staff Association Committee and the staff in general: the Director provided monthly news to all staff through internal seminars and he set aside time to meet directly with staff through "Open door" sessions, as well as meeting regularly with members of the Committee. Monthly meetings with the Division of Administration and Finance and with Human Resources enabled the Staff Association to follow through on various issues of interest to the staff, and quarterly meetings with the Director and with Finance and Administration and Human Resources provided the opportunity to discuss more general issues.

The broadcasting of the Scientific and Governing Council meetings, making them accessible to all staff members, had demonstrated a commitment to transparency and a willingness to involve staff in governance events. The initiative was highly appreciated by staff members.

More recently, the Agency had invited the Director of Human Resources at WHO and the WHO Ombudsman, for a presentation of their respective duties to the IARC staff, followed by a question-and-answer session. The visit also marked the beginning of the administration's programme of increasing awareness against harassment and related issues. The Staff Association had been working on a new survey on the work environment, scheduled for 2011, in which a special section would be devoted to harassment.

At the previous Governing Council meeting, the Staff Association had expressed concern regarding the potential consequences that the economic crisis could have on employment at the Agency. The Staff Association wished to congratulate the Director for the measures taken to stabilize the least-secure positions in the Agency by limiting the number of temporary contracts to 17.

The Director had also confirmed his willingness to pay tribute to the Agency's staff by launching the first IARC Staff Day. For everyone involved, the event had been enjoyable and had provided a good opportunity for exchanging and sharing in an open environment where rank and function had no bearing. The Administration had also approved the setting-up of new recreational activities, supported by the Staff Association. The staff, including the young students and visiting scientists, had also shown their generosity during the various charitable activities undertaken during the year.

The Administration and the Committee had undertaken a joint initiative to consider the need to act on the Agency's environmental impact. Limiting greenhouse gas emissions generated by the Agency's activities and its dependence on fossil fuel consumption was a necessary part of an environmental and economic strategy that would soon become essential. The first stage had consisted of raising awareness among staff to lay the groundwork for responsible individual behaviour, followed by the implementation of an Agency-wide carbon footprint report. Efforts to reduce IARC's environmental impact would be taken into account.

Regarding the structural changes within the Agency, the Committee expressed satisfaction that the administrative and scientific reorganization of IARC put in place following the arrival of the Director had caused no reduction in posts. However, it was regrettable that the six months' study, which had led to the staff reassignments, had been made with only limited consultation either with the Staff Association or with some of the people concerned, creating a sense of uncertainty and discomfort among staff. The restructuring had also delayed the process of reclassification of general service posts for 2009, which had only been finalized one year later, a matter that had also caused concern. The reclassification of professional posts, previously managed by WHO, would be fully conducted at the Agency for the first time in 2010. The Committee hoped that all of the work would be done jointly with the staff and that the strengthening of the Human Resources team would respond to that expectation, since it was very important to the Committee.

In a few weeks' time, the Staff Association Committee would make a new call for candidates to replace four of its outgoing members. It was pleasing to note that the Administration recognized the significant workload of Committee members – which could be a barrier to potential applicants – and their duties were now acknowledged in the professional duties Performance Management and Development System (PMDS). He thanked his colleagues for their commitment, and strongly hoped that fellow staff members would ensure that the Staff Association Committee would continue to represent all IARC staff.

In concluding the address, he wished to pay tribute to Didier Colin, who had died on 1 November 2009. His meticulous work, good humour and kind spirit would be sorely missed by IARC staff.

The SECRETARY, welcoming the constructive and frank presentation, said that he wished to recognize the time spent by staff who joined the Staff Association Committee. In the past, the term "staff" had itself been somewhat divisive and he wished to emphasize his commitment to dealing with all of the people who worked for the Agency, including students and post-doctoral fellows, in an equitable manner. Efforts had been made to improve communication, demystifying the workings of the Agency by opening up meetings to staff. The Administration still made mistakes: he acknowledged and apologized for the stress caused during the clerical staff review, which had taken longer than it should have done. The Administration accepted the criticism and would learn from it. In mitigation, it had been frustrating to deal with a limited capacity in the Human Resources function and he had addressed that by increasing staffing in that area. He encouraged staff to recognize the efforts made on their behalf by staff in the Administration. He believed that encouraging an honest and open exchange would help both administrative and scientific staff to see themselves as one integrated Agency.

Professor PUSKA (Finland) said that he very much appreciated the constructive comments made: collaboration between staff and leadership was extremely important. The presentation had made reference to recreational and environmental activities but there had been no mention of activities to promote physical and mental health.

The SECRETARY said that no formal planning existed other than through the Staff Physician and the Staff Association, which organized some dance and physical exercise activities. He believed that the representative of Finland had raised an important point that should be given further consideration.

Dr MCKAY, Vice-Chairperson of the IARC Staff Association, wished to emphasize that the introduction of the IARC Staff Day had been appreciated by staff; it had been beneficial in developing a good spirit between the staff and the Administration.

The CHAIRPERSON thanked the Vice-Chairperson of the Staff Association for his presentation and welcomed the improved cooperation between the Association and the Agency.

The Council **noted** the statement by the IARC Staff Association.

**6. KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (KPIs) FOR THE AGENCY:
Item 12 of the Agenda** (Document GC/52/9)

The SECRETARY, illustrating his report with slides and introducing the report contained in document GC/52/9, said that it contained a proposal comprising principles and a draft set of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) which had been modified following consideration by the Scientific Council at its 46th Session.

By introducing KPIs for IARC, it should be possible to translate the Medium-term strategy into specific indicators at institutional level to measure whether the goals of the strategy were being achieved. KPIs should also be used to measure the trend in performance over time and the performance relative to predetermined targets or benchmarks. The KPIs should reflect the full breadth of IARC activities; present an opportunity to engage IARC staff in the Mission and core values of the Agency; and be transparent, well-communicated, flexible and involve staff. The risks associated included the administrative load for scientists and support staff; that KPIs could become an end in themselves; and that they could place undue pressure on individuals or Groups.

The Scientific Council had voiced some concern regarding the validity and appropriateness of KPIs for IARC and it had expressed its strong support for peer review as a preferred mechanism for monitoring and evaluation of the achievements of the Agency. The Scientific Council had recommended that the Director should include in his report to the Governing Council some of the elements covered in document SC/46/9.

It was proposed that KPIs should be included each year in the Director's report to the Governing Council in respect of: the amount of extrabudgetary funding attracted and the amount expended in relation to the regular budget; the number of publications and their ranking; education and training, including the number of courses taught; students, including the number from low- and middle-income countries and their destinations following completion of their assignments at IARC; and the volume of and revenue from sales of publications and their electronic availability.

In conclusion, it was proposed that peer review should remain the principle mechanism for evaluation of the Agency. However, complementary areas would be identified where the Governing Council would like to receive standard quantitative and qualitative reporting and those would be included in the annual written and oral reports of the Director. He did not propose to create specific targets at that stage.

Dr HARFORD (alternate to Mr Kulikowski, United States of America) commended the Director for his report, which accurately reflected the purpose of Key Performance Indicators. KPIs should not be used to put pressure on individuals, but to reflect the measurement of achievement of strategic goals. Peer review and KPIs could be applied where appropriate: the two were not necessarily in conflict. He supported the direction put forward in the Director's suggestions and, as more data was gathered over the following two years, goals could then be set.

Dr KEINHORST (Germany), noting that Key Performance Indicators were the subject of discussion in a number of international organizations, said that experience of how they were applied in scientific organizations was lacking. She would be grateful to receive information on how KPIs could be successfully applied, what type of indicators were used in scientific organizations and what problems had been encountered. She supported the view that more data should be gathered before the Governing Council decided whether KPIs should be introduced at the Agency. In the meantime, peer reviews should continue.

Ms FLAMANT (France) said that she had been disappointed that the document had not proposed indicators that were directly linked to the Agency's strategy. She had been reassured that the Director's oral presentation had mentioned the goals to be pursued and that KPIs would be used to measure how far the Medium-term strategy had been achieved. In the future, she hoped that indicators would be more closely linked to strategic priorities.

Dr PARK (Canada) recognized the importance of KPIs in measuring the achievement of strategic objectives. She supported the concerns raised by the representatives of Germany and the United States. If specific targets had not been identified, she wondered how IARC would measure whether it was achieving its goals. There was also some concern that KPIs could stand in the way of IARC fulfilling its significant mission to low- and medium-income countries.

Dr HAELTERMAN (Belgium) said that Key Performance Indicators were also a way to communicate with the outside world and with an organization's personnel. They could be used effectively in an operational context as a way to inspire progress.

Professor BISHOP (Australia) said that he supported the introduction of Key Performance Indicators on the basis described by the Director – in order to measure what was already being done in the organization. As presented, it appeared that there was already a plan to link

indicators to the adopted strategy. The peer-review process was central to the Agency and it appeared that all were agreed that it should continue in addition to the KPIs. IARC might wish to follow the practice of Australian research institutes, which had introduced indicators on collaboration in publications. The indicators proposed for IARC included information that would be needed to run the organization and he did not believe that they would prove unduly intrusive for staff.

Dr FAIS (Italy) said that he wished to defend the position of the Scientific Council on the role of peer reviewing of scientific projects in IARC. In some activities, such as epidemiological studies, the role of IARC was unique and there was no competitive research against which to benchmark it.

The SECRETARY, responding to the comment by the representative of Germany, said that the Agency had collated information on the measurements used in other academic and international organizations. The representative of France had emphasized that the indicators should match the goals set out in the Medium-term strategy and he undertook to ensure that it would be done in a more comprehensive manner. He agreed with the representative of Belgium that KPIs could be used to communicate with key stakeholders. Measuring collaboration was a point that had also been raised by scientists in the Agency: it would receive further attention. He was encouraged that a balance was favoured between peer review and other parameters. It would be important to begin to gather information accurately and to describe the methodology over one or two years and then to review and refine the indicators into a more target-oriented approach.

The CHAIRPERSON invited the Council to consider the draft resolution on Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for the Agency and to suggest wording for the fourth paragraph which would begin "Decides...".

Professor BISHOP (Australia) said that he agreed with the first three paragraphs which described the action already undertaken by the Director. The fourth paragraph should state that the indicators should be developed further and brought back to the Council for consideration.

Dr HARFORD (alternate to Mr Kulikowski, United States of America) requested that paragraph 3 should contain a reference to support for the adoption of the Key Performance Indicators. He agreed with the suggestion by the representative of Australia in respect of paragraph 4.

At the invitation of the CHAIRPERSON, the representatives of Australia and the United States of America provided amendments in writing to paragraphs 3 and 4.

Professor PUSKA (Finland) asked whether the reference to further development of KPIs suggested by the representative of Australia would relate to current or new indicators.

Dr SEGOVIA (Spain) asked whether the reference to "pilot" KPIs in paragraph 3 was necessary.

Dr HARMFORD (alternate to Mr Kulikowski, United States of America) suggested that the word "pilot" might be replaced by "initial" in paragraph 3.

Dr KEINHORST (Germany) suggested that a timeframe for completion of the evaluation process should be included. The date on which the Director would submit the report and the date on which the initial results would be discussed – perhaps in two or three years' time – could be added.

The CHAIRPERSON said that the Director could be requested to report to the Governing Council in one or two years' time.

Professor BISHOP (Australia) said that he expected that the Governing Council would wish to receive an annual review from the Director on the Key Performance Indicators.

Dr HARMFORD (alternate to Mr Kulikowski, United States of America), responding to the suggestion by the representative of Germany, said that the project would need to be implemented before it was evaluated.

Dr KEINHORST (Germany) said that the Director should report to both the Scientific Council and the Governing Council.

Professor AUTRUP (Denmark) requested that paragraph 4 should begin: "AGREES that the peer-review process continues...".

Dr HARMFORD (alternate to Mr Kulikowski, United States of America) asked whether the Scientific Council would be expected to provide input to the process before the matter was considered by the Governing Council.

Dr SEGOVIA (Spain) asked whether all members of the Governing Council were content that the Director should continue to develop the KPIs.

Professor BISHOP (Australia) said that paragraph 4 stated that the Director would report to the Governing Council on the progress made in developing the KPIs but it did not say that the indicators would be adopted.

Dr PARK (Canada), referring to the suggested phrase "initiate and evaluate the KPIs" in paragraph 3, asked whether the Director would report on the results of the evaluation to the Governing Council.

The SECRETARY said that the topic covered the scope and methodology of the KPIs on the one hand and the data that the Agency would provide on the other. It would be difficult to submit the data to Scientific Council by the following January – he had envisaged that the information would form a key part of the Director's report to the Governing Council. The Scientific Council might discuss additional or alternative measures that would be recommended to the Governing Council. Similarly, a distinction should be made concerning evaluation of the KPI measures, which was the present topic of conversation, and the evaluation of performance against KPI measures, which could be made in the future.

Dr KEINHORST (Germany) agreed with the explanation given by the Director.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the draft resolution on Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for the Agency (Resolution GC/52/R6), with the amendments proposed:

The Governing Council,

Having considered Document GC/52/9 "Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for the Agency" and the proposals therein,

Recognizing that the unique nature of IARC's mandate implies the need for a broad and flexible approach to evaluation,

1. THANKS the Scientific Council for its comments and recommendations on the KPIs (Document GC/52/4);
2. NOTES that the Scientific Council considers the current peer-review process to be an excellent method of performance evaluation for the research conducted within the particular context of the Agency;
3. In addition SUPPORTS implementation and evaluation of initial KPIs as described by the Director in his report GC/52/9, covering a review of scientific publications, information dissemination and publishing, grants and contracts, and education and training (principally courses and fellows); supplemental information may be provided by reporting on other specific areas linked to the Medium-Term Strategy or to core activities which illustrate the impact of the Agency; and
4. AGREES that peer-review process continues and that the Director will further develop KPIs for input by the next Scientific Council and consideration by the Governing Council.

The draft resolution, as amended, was **adopted**.

7. BIENNIAL FINANCIAL REPORT AND REPORT OF THE EXTERNAL AUDITOR FOR THE FINANCIAL PERIOD 1 JANUARY 2008 to 31 DECEMBER 2009: Item 13 of the Agenda (Document GC/52/10)

Mr KNOCHE (Administration and Finance Officer) said that the financial reports were submitted to the Governing Council for approval in accordance with Article VI of the Financial Regulations. The accounts were fully compliant with the United Nations System Accounting Standards (UNSAS). The format of the report had been changed to bring it into line with International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSAS). It was proposed to make IARC's accounts IPSAS-compliant by the end of 2010.

The Regular Budget for the biennium 2008/2009 was US\$ 44.751 million. The rate of collection of contributions from Participating States was 94.53% of the 2008/2009 assessments as at 31 December 2009. The shortfall of US\$ 2.45 million had been financed by a temporary transfer from the Working Capital Fund. The Agency had experienced a significant budgetary exchange loss in 2008/2009 which had been incurred because the average US\$/€ exchange rate during the biennium had been lower than the rate used for the approved programme budget by about 14%. As a consequence, an amount of US\$ 3.9 million had been utilized from the Governing Council Special Fund to cover part of the exchange loss in accordance with GC Resolutions GC/49/R9 and GC/51/R5.

In respect of the Working Capital Fund, when Austria had joined IARC in 2008, US\$ 50 000 had been credited to the Fund, bringing the approved Fund level to US\$ 4.6 million. In 2009, US\$ 2.45 million had been temporarily transferred to the Regular Budget to cover the shortfall in the receipt of assessed contributions, bringing the fund level down to US\$ 2.15 million. US\$ 1.36 million of the outstanding 2009 assessments had been received in 2010, and the Fund level had increased to the equivalent of US\$ 3.51 million as at 4 May 2010. The current status of the Governing Council Special Fund could be found in document GC/52/Inf.Doc. No.2 and included all the commitments against the Fund for the present year. The uncommitted balance was some €3.5 million.

The Voluntary Contributions Account included designated and undesignated voluntary contributions. As shown in schedule 1, total income amounted to US\$ 22.16 million in 2008/2009, as compared to US\$ 23 million in 2006/2007. Expenditure had amounted to US\$ 23.1 million as compared to US\$ 21.6 million in 2006/2007. The Account balance of the Voluntary Contributions Account was US\$ 11.796 million as at 31 December 2009.

Mr GUPTA (External Audit) said that the external audit of the Agency had been assigned to the Comptroller and Auditor-General of India for the financial periods 2008–2009 and 2010–2011 in accordance with resolution WHA 60.7.

Management was responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements, in accordance with the United Nations System Accounting Standards (UNSAS). The overall presentation of the financial statements had changed significantly from that used in the

previous biennium. Management's responsibility included: designing, implementing and maintaining internal controls relevant to the preparation and fair presentation of financial statements that were free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error; selecting and applying appropriate accounting policies; and making accounting estimates that were reasonable in the circumstances.

The responsibility of the External Auditor was to express an opinion on the financial statements based on the audit. The External Auditor had conducted its audit in accordance with International Standards on Auditing, which stipulated that ethical requirements should be complied with and that the audit should be planned and performed in order to obtain reasonable assurance that the financial statements were free from material misstatements.

In the opinion of the External Auditor, the financial statements presented fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the Agency, its financial performance and its cash flows for the period 1 January 2008 to 31 December 2009. The audit included an overall review of the prevalent internal controls and substantive testing of transactions in key areas of financial activity. The audit also aimed to ascertain compliance with the regulations and rules governing the functioning of IARC. The External Auditor's observations and recommendations had been discussed with the senior management and had been issued in the form of a Management Letter. The External Auditor would monitor implementation of the recommendations.

The working relationship with IARC management had been constructive and the audits performed had been facilitated by excellent cooperation and dialogue. Professional reliance had been placed wherever necessary on the work of internal oversight. He expressed his sincere appreciation to the Director and the officials of the Agency for the cooperation and courtesy extended to them.

The CHAIRPERSON asked whether a detailed report, which contained suggestions and advice concerning future financial management, had been provided to the Director.

Mr GUPTA (External Audit) said that recommendations had been provided in a Management Letter in 2008 and 2009. The Agency's management had been found to have a constructive approach to all the recommendations received.

Mr KNOCHE (Administration and Finance Officer), responding to a question from the CHAIRPERSON, said that page 25 of document GC/52/10 reflected the status of collection of contributions as of 31 December 2009 and that, since that time, funds had been received from Italy and a small balance been paid by the United States of America.

Dr PALMER (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), speaking in his capacity as Vice-Chairperson, asked whether the funds available in the Governing Council Special Fund would meet the requirements that would be discussed under subsequent agenda items.

Mr KNOCHE (Administration and Finance Officer) said that the status of the Governing Council Special Fund as of April 2010 could be found in document GC/52/Inf.Doc. No.2. The uncommitted balance that was available to spend was €3.5 million. It should be borne in mind that further income would be received during the year.

Dr PALMER (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), speaking in his capacity as Vice-Chairperson, said that it was important to record that additional income was expected since the balance of the fund was €3.5 million, although €3.5 million worth of requests had been submitted.

Mr KNOCHE (Administration and Finance Officer) said that the reservations and commitments had been included for the whole biennium and a maximum exchange rate loss had been allowed for. Therefore, it seemed that there was enough money in the Fund to finance the activities that would be requested.

Dr HOLFORD (alternate to Mr Kulikowski, United States of America) asked for current information on the exchange rate loss between the United States dollar and the euro.

Mr KNOCHE (Administration and Finance Officer) said that the exchange rate loss experienced thus far was significantly less than it had been in the previous biennium. An analysis had been conducted in previous years showing that about 80% of expenditure was conducted in euros and about 20% was conducted in United States dollars, the latter being for the most part for payment of professional staff salaries, which were calculated in accordance with the practice in the United Nations System. Responding to a question from Dr HOLFORD (alternate to Mr Kulikowski, United States of America) he confirmed that the exchange rate loss experienced had been as a result of the decline of the euro against the United States dollar. It had been unfortunate that when the Agency's budget had been calculated in United States dollars, the value of the euro had increased dramatically and now that the budget was calculated in euros, the value of the United States dollar had increased.

Dr KEINHORST (Germany) said that she shared the concerns expressed by the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland that there would be insufficient funds in the Governing Council Special Fund to meet the requests that would be made under Agenda Item 16.

Mr KNOCHE (Administration and Finance Officer) said that the Governing Council Special Fund could only be used with the approval of the Governing Council. Document GC/52/Inf.Doc. No.2 set out the requests that had already been authorized. There could be no possibility that any unforeseen expenditure could be disbursed from the Fund. Responding to questions from Ms HERNANDEZ (alternate to Dr Park, Canada) he explained that the format of the report,

which matched that used in WHO, had been changed dramatically in line with new reporting requirements. He undertook to review and improve the presentation in order to ensure clarity.

Ms HERNANDEZ (alternate to Dr Park, Canada), referring to the report of the Internal Auditor to the Sixty-third World Health Assembly contained in document A63/38, said that paragraph 18, which was devoted to IARC, noted the risks associated with implementation of the integrated enterprise resource planning system. The report also noted the risk of errors in the reporting of expenditure. She wished to know whether the deficiencies highlighted in the report would be remedied in time for the biennium 2010–2011.

Mr KNOCHE (Administration and Finance Officer) said that a new system had been implemented and customized in 2008. After a lengthy period of negotiation, the system integrator had eventually accepted responsibility for the problems experienced with the design and they had been rectified. The accounts for 2008–2009 had been properly closed. The situation had been stabilized and there was no longer any risk of disruptions although it would probably take another two or three years to implement the final improvements.

The SECRETARY invited Mr Knoche to comment on the projected income from sales of publications, which would be allocated to the Governing Council Special Fund.

Mr KNOCHE (Administration and Finance Officer) said that page 11 of the financial report (document GC/52/10) showed that revenue-producing activities had generated US\$ 1.7 million in income from publication sales in 2008–2009. It was estimated that at least US\$ 1.2 million would be generated from publication sales in 2010–2011. Responding to a question from the CHAIRPERSON, he explained that Argentina had paid the money it owed in full in 2009.

Ms HERNANDEZ (alternate to Dr Park, Canada) said that in examining the financial statements in the previous and the current year, her delegation had found it hard to understand what was the existing balance of the Governing Council Special Fund, its projected income and existing and expected commitments. She requested that the information should be provided in a clear form in future.

Mr KNOCHE (Administration and Finance Officer) said that document GC/52/Inf.Doc. No.2 showed the information requested but it had been prepared at a late stage: he would endeavour to prepare the information in advance for the next session of the Governing Council. Following an explanation from the SECRETARY that confusion had arisen because the report indicated the current status of the Governing Council Special Fund but it did not provide a projection of income (which the Agency was reasonably confident that it would receive from the sale of publications), he undertook to re-issue the document with the addition of that information.

Dr HARFORD (alternate to Mr Kulikowski, United States of America) requested that the draft resolution should thank the staff of IARC for preparing the financial report.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution on the Biennial financial report and report of the External Auditor for the financial period 1 January 2008 to 31 December 2009 (Resolution GC/52/R7):

The Governing Council,

Having examined the Biennial Financial Report and Report of the External Auditor for the financial period 1 January 2008 to 31 December 2009 (Document GC/52/10),

1. ACCEPTS the Report of the Director on the financial operations of the Agency; and
2. THANKS the External Auditor for his report and opinion as well as the staff of IARC in preparing the report.

The draft resolution was **adopted**.

8. LONG-TERM CAPITAL MASTER PLAN: Item 14 of the Agenda (Document GC/52/11)

Dr LAFIF (Director, Division of Administration and Finance) drawing attention to the report contained in document GC/52/11, said that the tower was 38 years old and the Biological Resource Centre (BRC) building had not been renovated since it had been built in 1994. In May 2007, the Governing Council had established a Working Group to examine infrastructure projects, which had reported in May 2009. The Governing Council had recommended that the Secretariat should continue its negotiations with the City of Lyon concerning essential works. The City of Lyon had agreed to fund the replacement of one central heating boiler in 2010 and one in 2011 and it had proposed that a study should be carried out on the building works required.

It was proposed that the Secretariat should present a capital master plan in 2011, as that would allow time to produce a proper analysis of space needs following a reorganization of the Agency's staff and it would enable the findings of a carbon footprint study and an energy consumption study to be incorporated into it.

It had been calculated that to replace the air-conditioning heating and cooling system would cost €2.87 million. The Secretariat was awaiting a reply from the City of Lyon as to whether it would assist with the funding of part of the work at a cost of €1.050 million. If the central air conditioning collapsed in summertime, the building would have to be evacuated, since all of the windows were sealed shut. The Secretariat requested that, in the event that the air-conditioning showed signs of nearing collapse, permission would be granted to borrow €1.050 million from the Governing Council Special Fund on the understanding that it would be repaid by the City of Lyon.

Dr KEINHORST (Germany), recalling that she had taken part in the Working Group, said that she was not sure that the external auditor (SOCOTEC) had identified replacement of the heating and air-conditioning systems as priorities in his report. If the external auditor had not foreseen those problems, then perhaps there were other major items that should be brought to the attention of the Governing Council. Perhaps the work should be evaluated to ensure that it was carried out in the most cost-effective manner.

Dr LAFIF (Director, Division of Administration and Finance) said that a study had been conducted some years previously: the urgent work identified as a result had been costed and set out in Annex 2 of document GC/52/11. Items 1–4, amounting to the sum of €1.050 million, had been prioritized as the most urgent. It was possible that serious problems could result at any time due to the age of the buildings. It was clear that any work carried out would be done in partnership with the City of Lyon, the owner of the building.

Dr PARK (Canada) inquired why the insurance payment received in respect of the flooding had been so low.

Mr GUILLERMINET (Administrative Services Officer) said that the insurance company had inspected the damage caused to the BRC building as a result of the flooding, taking into account any natural degradation due to the age of the building. The works to restore the flood damage had been estimated at €10 860, from which the insurance policy excess of €7 500 needed to be deducted. Without the excess, the policy itself would have been a great deal more expensive. Therefore the Agency had only received some €1 000 from the insurance payout. In addition, in order to modernize the building at the same time as repairing the flood damage, the sum of €100 000 would be needed.

Dr PALMER (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), speaking in his capacity as Vice-Chairperson, asked what was the nature of the obligation of the City of Lyon in respect of the building and what was the likelihood of their repaying the loan.

Dr LAFIF (Director, Division of Administration and Finance) said that the City of Lyon was obliged to provide the building in working condition and therefore the sum requested would be a loan to be repaid.

The SECRETARY said that he had received an encouraging response concerning the air-conditioning when he had raised the issue at a recent meeting with the Mayor of Lyon. He had sent a letter to the Mayor and awaited a written response.

Dr PARK (Canada) asked whether there had been any discussions on a possible time limit within which the loan would be repaid.

Dr LAFIF (Director, Division of Administration and Finance) said that he was hopeful that the City of Lyon would be able to carry out the work without any need for the Agency to advance the money but it would be helpful to have the authorization to do so as a stop-gap measure should the need arise. If borrowed, the money would have to be repaid in a relatively short period of time.

Ms FLAMANT (France) said that IARC had not engaged in discussions on investment with the City of Lyon for some time and it would be helpful to continue those discussions now that they had restarted. It was her understanding that discussions had been positive and that the money would be paid.

Dr LAFIF (Director, Division of Administration and Finance) said that it would take some time for the City of Lyon to put together a budget but he believed that the request from IARC had been positively received.

Dr PARK (Canada) requested that paragraph 3 of the draft resolution should make reference to funds being mobilized from the Governing Council Special Fund subject to there being sufficient cash balances available, thus avoiding the possibility that there could be a deficit.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution on the Long-term capital master plan (including options for financing) (Resolution GC/52/R8):

The Governing Council,

Having been informed by Document GC/52/11 "Long-term Capital Master Plan (including options for financing)" on the progress made,

Taking into account the significant changes in the organizational structure of the Agency and in the strategy,

1. THANKS the City of Lyon for its dialogue with the Agency and for its involvement/support in the planning of the most urgent repairs and maintenance of the Agency's tower building;
2. REQUESTS that a detailed analysis of office and laboratory space needs and a plan for future infrastructure projects, including options for financing, be presented and discussed at the next regular session of the Governing Council;
3. AUTHORIZES the Secretariat to use up to €1 050 000 from the Governing Council Special Fund as an advance to replace the air-conditioning system in case of risk of a major breakdown of the system. The intent is that this sum or any portion of this sum which is used to replace the air-conditioning system will be reimbursed to the Governing Council Special Fund from funds to be mobilized by the City of Lyon for this purpose. Any work would be done in agreement with the City of Lyon and would be subject to there being sufficient cash balances in the Fund.

The draft resolution, as amended, was **adopted**.

The meeting rose at 18:25.