

International Agency for Research on Cancer



Governing Council
Fifty-third Session

GC/53/Min.3
Original: ENGLISH

Lyon, 12–13 May 2011
Auditorium

RESTRICTED DISTRIBUTION

MINUTES OF THE THIRD MEETING

IARC, Lyon

Friday, 13 May 2011, at 09:10

Chairperson: Professor Pekka Puska (Finland)

Secretary: Dr Christopher P. Wild, Director, IARC

CONTENTS

	Page
1. Plan for future infrastructure projects (including options for financing) (continued)	4
2. Proposed Programme (2012–2015) and Budget (2012–2013) (resumed)	5
3. Statement by the IARC Staff Association	11
4. Biennial Report of the IARC Institutional Review Board (IRB), 2009–2010	14
5. Requests for use of funds from the Governing Council Special Fund	
A. Scientific equipment	15
B. Additional financial support for Senior Scientist Awards	16
C. Temporary increase in the level of the Working Capital Fund	18
6. Admission of a new Participating State – Turkey	18
7. Report on publication activities	22
8. Acceptance of donations	23
9. Acceptance of grants and contracts	23
10. Membership of the Subcommittee on the Admission of new Participating States	24
11. Any other business	25
12. Election of Chairperson for next session	25
13. Date of next session	26
14. Appointment of new members of the Scientific Council (<i>closed session</i>)	26
15. Closure of session	27

Participating States Representatives

Professor Pekka PUSKA, <i>Chairperson</i> Professor Harri VAINIO	Finland
Dr Mark PALMER, <i>Vice-Chairperson</i>	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Professor Jim BISHOP, <i>Rapporteur</i>	Australia
Dr Hemma BAUER	Austria
Mr Lieven DE RAEDT	Belgium
Dr Morag PARK Ms Lucero HERNANDEZ Dr Louise PELLETIER	Canada
Professor Herman AUTRUP	Denmark
Ms Pascale FLAMANT Dr Rosemary ANCELLE-PARK Dr Agnès BUZYN Dr Gilles LANDRIVON	France
Dr Irene KEINHORST	Germany
<i>No Representative</i>	India
Ms Patsy CARR	Ireland
Professor Valentino MARTELLI	Italy
Dr Masato MUGITANI Dr Shiho TAKAOKA	Japan
Mr Jeroen HULLEMAN	Netherlands
Mr Geir BUKHOLM	Norway
Dr Byung-Yool JUN Dr Mi-Ra PARK Dr Sohee PARK	Republic of Korea

Dr Oleg P. CHESTNOV Ms Julia BAKONINA	Russian Federation
Dr Carlos SEGOVIA	Spain
Professor Mats ULFENDAHL	Sweden
Dr Diane STEBER BÜCHLI	Switzerland
Professor Murat TUNCER	Turkey
Dr Joe HARFORD Mr Edward FARIS	United States of America

World Health Organization

Dr Ala ALWAN, Assistant Director-General
Dr Luis GOMES SAMBO, Regional Director, WHO Regional Office for Africa (AFRO)
Ms Joanne MCKEOUGH, Office of the Legal Counsel
Dr Andreas ULLRICH, Chronic Diseases Prevention and Management

Observers

Dr Edgar RIVEDAL, Outgoing Chairperson, Scientific Council
Professor Ian FRAZER, Incoming Chairperson, Scientific Council
Professor Jean-Pierre BOISSEL, Chairperson, IARC Ethics Committee (IEC)

Dr Javier OSATNIK, Executive Committee Member, National Cancer Institute	Argentina
Dr Luiz Antonio SANTINI, Director General, Brazilian National Cancer Institute	Brazil

Union for International Cancer Control (UICC)

Mr Cary ADAMS, Executive Director

Secretariat

Dr C.P. WILD, *Secretary*

Dr H. LAFIF

Dr R. BAAN
Dr F. BRAY
Dr P. BRENNAN
Dr G. BYRNES
Ms D. D'AMICO
Mr P. DAMIECKI
Dr D. FORMAN
Dr S. FRANCESCHI

Dr N. GAUDIN
Dr P. HAINAUT
Dr Z. HERCEG
Dr O. KELM
Dr A. KESMINIENE
Mr P. KNOCHE
Dr J. MCKAY
Dr M. MENDY
Dr H. OHGAKI
Dr M. PLUMMER

Dr I. ROMIEU
Dr R. SANKARANARAYANAN
Dr A. SCALBERT
Dr J. SCHÜZ
Dr N. SLIMANI
Dr E. STELIAROVA-FOUCHER
Dr K. STRAIF
Dr B. SYLLA
Dr M. TOMMASINO
Dr L. VON KARSA

1. PLAN FOR FUTURE INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS (INCLUDING OPTIONS FOR FINANCING): Item 15 of the Agenda (Document GC/53/11) (continued)

The RAPPORTEUR read out an amended draft resolution on the Plan for future infrastructure projects (including options for financing) (GC/53/R11), which reads as follows:

The Governing Council,

Having considered Document GC/53/11 "Plan for future infrastructure projects (including options for financing)",

Recalling its Resolutions GC/51/R8 and GC/52/R8,

1. THANKS the City of Lyon and France, the host country, for their continuous support to the Agency;
2. NOTING the risks to the Agency posed by the current state of disrepair of the tower building and its poor fit to the future strategy of the Agency,
3. AUTHORIZES the Agency to collaborate with France, as the host country, and the City of Lyon to consider in detail possible alternatives to the option of full renovation of the tower and the auditorium, including the option of a new building, for consideration by the Governing Council at its 54th Session;
4. REQUESTS the Director to ask the City of Lyon to accept responsibility, under the terms of the existing Convention between the Agency and the City of Lyon, for the provision of adequate infrastructure and the requisite repairs needed, to safeguard the scientific activities of the Agency while a solution is being found for this situation; and
5. Further REQUESTS that a detailed analysis of possible alternatives, including options for financing and financial implications for Participating States, be presented and discussed at the next regular session of the Governing Council.

Ms HERNANDEZ (alternate to Dr Park, Canada) made a formal request for all documents for IARC Governing Council meetings to be made available to Participating States 60 days in advance in order to allow them sufficient time to engage in the necessary consultations. She said that although the draft resolution was much improved by the amendments, she thought it sensible for the Governing Council to consider whether a new building was necessarily what IARC needed. She suggested that new modi operandi, such as developing capacity in other countries or developing a network of collaborating centres, also be considered.

Professor MARTELLI (Italy) suggested that relocation to another country ought to be considered including the option of Italy.

The CHAIRPERSON said that the need to consider possible alternatives was covered in the last paragraph of the draft resolution and that the broader issues could be discussed at an appropriate time. He took note of the request for documents to be provided 60 days in advance of meetings.

Ms FLAMANT (France) emphasized her Government's commitment to hosting IARC, but said that she would abstain in a vote on the matter as she lacked a mandate to negotiate in that regard.

The CHAIRPERSON said that the Agency appreciated France's support as host country.

The draft resolution was **adopted**.

2. PROPOSED PROGRAMME (2012–2015) AND BUDGET (2012–2013): Item 11 of the Agenda (Document GC/53/7) (resumed)

Mr KNOCHE (Administration and Finance Officer) drew attention to a newly revised version of the proposed Programme (2012–2015) and Budget (2012–2013) (Document GC/53/7 Revision No.2), and in particular to Summary Table C therein. He set out a new proposal that would maintain the regular budget at the level initially proposed, but finance it by injecting €1 million over two years from the Governing Council Special Fund. He then drew attention to Summary Table D, which detailed how that proposal would affect the contributions of individual Participating States: depending on their group classification, most would see their contributions increase slightly (by between 0.11% and 0.74%) but countries assigned eight units would in fact see a slight fall in their contributions (-0.16%). He recalled that the rather larger increase shown for India was due to its change of percentage in the WHO scale of assessments, resulting in a change of group in the IARC group classification, and for Austria to its recent membership.

The CHAIRPERSON thanked the Director and his staff for their work on the new proposal.

Dr KEINHORST (Germany) expressed her appreciation for the work done and said she thought the solution a good one. She sought and received from Mr KNOCHE (Administration and Finance Officer) confirmation that she had understood correctly that the proposal was to cover part of the regular budget by using €500 000 each year over two years from the Governing Council Special Fund.

Ms HERNANDEZ (alternate to Dr Park, Canada) requested information on the situation of the Governing Council Special Fund.

Mr KNOCHE (Administration and Finance Officer) referred the Governing Council to information document GC/53/Inf.Doc. No.2, entitled "Governing Council Special Fund – Anticipated Status of the Fund by 30/12/2011", which showed that the Fund was expected to have an uncommitted balance of €1.5 million at the end of 2011. He said that given other income to the Fund that could be expected over the course of the biennium, he felt comfortable that the Fund would remain adequate to meet its other liabilities if the proposal was adopted, although the capacity to buy new equipment would be restricted.

Ms CARR (Ireland) said that although she appreciated the efforts made she had no mandate to agree any increase.

Ms FLAMANT (France) said that she took a positive view of the proposals, but wished to know more about the nature of the other income expected into the Governing Council Special Fund.

Mr KNOCHE (Administration and Finance Officer) gave the examples of the contributions arrears scheduled to be repaid by the Russian Federation and income resulting from the admission of any new Participating States, as well as small amounts of miscellaneous income, such as interest earned.

Ms HERNANDEZ (alternate to Dr Park, Canada) asked about the situation of the Working Capital Fund and whether it was still necessary for money to be transferred to it from the Governing Council Special Fund.

Mr KNOCHE (Administration and Finance Officer) explained that he thought it financially prudent to proceed with the proposed transfer of €1.6 million to the Working Capital Fund, which could then be reimbursed to the Governing Council Special Fund once Spain's outstanding payments had been received as agreed. However, he said that the €1.5 million uncommitted balance of the Governing Council Special Fund took account of that proposed transfer.

Dr PALMER (United Kingdom), Vice-Chairperson, said that the Governing Council must consider fully the future implications of using money from the Governing Council Special Fund to fund the regular activities of the Agency. He said that the proposed arrangement would serve to keep contributions artificially low, so that when negotiating the next budget the Governing Council would face even larger increases or have to dip into the Special Fund again.

The CHAIRPERSON, speaking on behalf of Finland, concurred. He said that it was important that the work of the Agency could continue and that the Governing Council must reach a compromise that took into account the concerns of Participating States.

Mr HULLEMAN (Netherlands) said that he was satisfied with the solution proposed.

Ms HERNANDEZ (alternate to Dr Park, Canada) said that the Governing Council must be clear about its goal – if the aim was to cover a shortfall for the biennium, the exceptional nature of the arrangement should be spelled out, but if the aim was to increase the budget, then that should be discussed.

Dr BAUER (Austria) said that although she could agree to the proposal, she shared concerns about storing up problems for the future.

Dr HARMOND (United States of America) warned against viewing contributions paid by newly admitted Participating States – which were the Governing Council Special Fund's main source of income – as a way of reducing costs to the existing membership. He said that that would make it more difficult to attract new members, as prospective Participating States looked to do more than maintain the status quo when they applied to join.

The CHAIRPERSON said that the immediate task before the Governing Council was to approve a budget for the following two years. He noted that differences in how Participating States were affected were due to calculations over which the Governing Council had no control.

Mr BUKHOLM (Norway) asked whether the differences in the relative contributions of Participating States represented a new model or applied only for the budget under discussion.

Mr KNOCHE (Administration and Finance Officer) explained that the methodology for assessing the relative contributions of Participating States remained unchanged and that the differences were the result of India's recent reclassification under the World Health Organization scale of assessments from zero units to one unit.

Mr DE RAEDT (Belgium), having expressed his support for the proposal, proposed finding a way for reflection about the proposed budget for 2014–2015 to begin earlier, in order to avoid the Governing Council being confronted with decisions of that nature so late in the process.

The CHAIRPERSON said that the need for the Governing Council to participate in long-term planning and for Participating States to be kept informed had been noted.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution on the Proposed Programme (2012–2015) and Budget (2012–2013) (GC/53/R7):

The Governing Council,

Having reviewed the Agency's Proposed Programme (2012–2015) and Budget for the biennium 2012–2013, as contained in Document GC/53/7, and summary tables Revision 2,

1. APPROVES the budget for the biennium 2012–2013 at the level of €39 419 315;
2. DECIDES that the budget shall be financed by annual assessments on Participating States as follows:
 - (1) €19 016 960 shall be assessed on Participating States on 1 January 2012,
 - (2) €19 402 355 shall be assessed on Participating States on 1 January 2013,
3. DECIDES that €1 000 000 shall be exceptionally charged directly to the Governing Council Special Fund;
4. RESOLVES to appropriate the amount of €39 419 315 for the biennium 2012–2013 as follows:

Appropriation section	Purpose of appropriation	Amount (€)
1.	Governing and Scientific Councils	158 378
2.	Scientific Programme	28 484 878
3.	Administrative programme	10 776 059
	Total appropriated	39 419 315

5. DECIDES that the Director shall have authority under Financial Regulations Article III, Paragraph 3.3 to transfer credits between sections of the budget, provided that such transfers do not exceed 15% of the section from which the credit is transferred. Transfers in excess of 15% of the section from which the credit is transferred may be made with the prior written concurrence of the majority of the Members of the Governing Council;

6. DECIDES to grant authority to the Director to use a maximum of €1 000 000 in the biennium 2012–2013 from the Governing Council Special Fund to cover the agreed budgetary costs due to currency realignments, subject to availability of cash balances in the Fund; and

7. REQUESTS the Director to report on the use of the Fund for this purpose in future financial reports.

The CHAIRPERSON asked whether the Governing Council was ready to adopt the draft resolution.

Ms HERNANDEZ (alternate to Dr Park, Canada) asked for clarification of the situation the Governing Council could expect to face in 2014.

Mr KNOCHE (Administration and Finance Officer) said that it would be difficult to cut the budget further. He pointed out that the Governing Council was scheduled to discuss admission of one new Participating State later that morning, and said other countries were interested in joining. However, he said that predicting what the situation might be in 2014 was difficult.

Dr PALMER (United Kingdom), Vice-Chairperson, said that he thought paragraph 6 should refer to "unforeseen" rather than "agreed" budgetary costs due to currency realignments.

Dr KEINHORST (Germany) asked why the draft resolution approved a budget of €39 419 315, whereas the total shown in Summary Table D was €38 419 315.

Mr KNOCHE (Administration and Finance Officer) explained that the total budget included the €1 million that was to come from the Governing Council Special Fund.

Dr SEGOVIA (Spain) asked whether the €4 million increase in personnel costs that had caused the problem, which was to be partly covered for the 2012–2013 biennium by using €1 million from the Governing Council Special Fund, would have to be reabsorbed by the contributions of Participating States in 2014.

Mr KNOCHE (Administration and Finance Officer) said that the total budget of €39.4 million took into account the €4.3 million increase in staff costs, which had been covered by a €2.5 million reduction in the programme and a €1.5 million increase in the budget. He said that the proposal was for that €1.5 million increase to be financed partly through slight increases in assessed contributions and partly from the Governing Council Special Fund. He said that the question of how the Governing Council might choose to finance the increase in 2014 remained open – it might do so by increasing the contributions of Participating States, by making use of the Governing Council Special Fund again, or by some other means.

Dr SEGOVIA (Spain) asked whether the Governing Council would in effect be delaying the increases in contributions that had been originally proposed.

Mr KNOCHE (Administration and Finance Officer) said that it was not a question of delaying the increase, since the proposal was for the money to be taken out of the Governing Council Special Fund. He said that the Governing Council would not necessarily have to fund the increase by approving increased contributions when it negotiated the Agency's next budget.

The SECRETARY said that he understood that the Governing Council was troubled by the question of how the increase in the budget would be financed in subsequent biennia. He offered

reassurance that the magnitude of effect was such that it would be offset by the admission of just one new Participating State, for example. He made it clear that the Governing Council approved each budget independently of earlier budgets, and that using the Governing Council Special Fund to cover the shortfall in the short term therefore did not preclude the Council from deciding two years on to reduce the budget for the following biennium, if that proved necessary.

Mr FARIS (alternate to Dr Harford, United States of America) said that he supported the solution set out in the second revised proposal. He said that although he shared concerns about the future, the proposed arrangement was not highly extraordinary but implied a desire not to reduce the programme of the organization but to find a way of financing it within existing resources. He said that the Governing Council Special Fund was derived from surplus income, which included his country's late-paid contributions for the previous biennium. He said that the Governing Council would in effect be deciding to carry over part of the assessed contributions from the present biennium in order to fund the programme in its entirety for the coming one.

He said that the systemic increase in personnel costs over time was an issue causing great concern throughout the United Nations system and expressed the hope that pressure applied in that regard by other affected organizations might result in changes that would bring some relief. He noted that salaries paid by the United States Government, which served as a benchmark for setting United Nations salaries, had been frozen due to domestic budget constraints.

The CHAIRPERSON recalled the saying that it was difficult to make predictions, especially about the future. He said that the discussion had been a constructive one and that the views expressed would be taken into account.

Dr BAUER (Austria) proposed that the Governing Council be provided with an overview of developing staff costs at its Fifty-fourth session in preparation for the budget discussions at its Fifty-fifth session.

Ms HERNANDEZ (alternate to Dr Park, Canada) said she wished to know whether IARC had plans to recruit new staff.

The SECRETARY took note of Dr Bauer's request and said that he had plans to recruit only those staff listed in the budget and any posts funded through external grant applications.

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

3. STATEMENT BY THE IARC STAFF ASSOCIATION: Item 16 of the Agenda
(Document GC/53/10)

Ms LAMANDÉ, Chairperson of the IARC Staff Association Committee, expressed staff members' appreciation of the annual opportunity to air their expectations and satisfactions, frustrations and concerns to the Governing Council. Presenting the results of the 2011 Work Climate Survey, which had been conducted in the form of an electronic survey, in total anonymity over a six-week period, she said that analysis of the 149 questionnaires that had been validated had shown the work climate at IARC to be good. Recalling that at its Fifty-second session the Governing Council had requested more information concerning cases of harassment, she explained that the seven individuals (4.7%) who had replied to the effect that they had been subject to harassment had not completed and returned the specific supplementary questionnaire offered to them. She said that feelings of harassment had decreased considerably compared to 2007 and 2009 levels, but that efforts must be maintained in order to eliminate the problem entirely.

She said that communication, in particular with regard to the administrative processes and the basis for decisions – had been identified as an area in which improvement was needed. She also said that the Staff Association Committee needed to raise staff members' awareness of its role in order to attract new candidates. She noted that career development opportunities were a key concern and that demand for professional development training was strong; she said that survey respondents had particularly mentioned a need for supervisors to receive management training. However, she observed that the staff response to the Performance Management and Development System (PMDS) introduced by the Administration had been mixed, with some Agency staff seeming to believe that career progression was impossible without leaving IARC. She suggested that establishing real "career plans" might help to solve that problem. She also noted a perceived tension between the administrative services and the scientific groups, and the perception that bureaucracy was too cumbersome.

She welcomed steps taken to promote collaboration between the Administration and the Staff Association Committee. She also welcomed the Director's initiative to set up a videoconference room and the decision to plan Section Reviews during Scientific Council sessions, which had helped to reduce the Agency's largely travel-related carbon footprint. She mentioned concerns over the possible financial consequences for IARC staff of a recent change in French law on childcare benefits, which she said risked reducing the Agency's attractiveness as an employer locally. She asked that a joint working group be set up with the Administration concerning IARC's possible adoption of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) salary scale. Lastly, she said that responses to the Work Climate Survey had generally been positive, that staff members respected their co-workers and were proud to work for IARC: 75% of respondents had said they had little reason to leave IARC.

Dr HARFORD (United States of America) noted with satisfaction the refreshing contrast with previous years and congratulated the Administration on improving relations with staff. He invited Ms Lamandé to comment on the ease or difficulty of finding people willing to serve on the Staff Association Committee, which he said was indicative of the degree to which staff members perceived the Staff Association as serving their needs.

Professor VAINIO (Finland) congratulated the Staff Association on the clear improvements and emphasized the importance of follow-up to the results of the Work Climate Survey. He said that some element of harassment was to be expected in any organization, but that what mattered was how that was dealt with. He said that IARC now seemed to be on the right path and that the Agency's staff was one of its assets. He welcomed the Staff Association's interest in sustainability issues.

Dr KEINHORST (Germany) welcomed the progress made and asked whether the Staff Association Committee had communicated to the Administration any specific suggestions it had about how communications between the Administration and the staff could be improved. She requested further information about the proposed adoption of the UNESCO salary scale.

Ms FLAMANT (France) acknowledged that staff members were directly affected by the condition of the building in which they worked and said that as the host country, France would continue to work with IARC in discussions to improve the situation. She offered to act as intermediary with the appropriate Government department as concerned implications of the new French law on childcare benefits. She said that internal communications had clearly been improved by measures put in place since Dr Christopher Wild had taken office as Director, and that the Agency should keep up the good work.

Ms LAMANDÉ, Chairperson of the IARC Staff Association Committee, said that recruiting candidates to the Staff Association Committee was still difficult – only one candidate had come forward by the deadline, which would probably be extended. She said that a forthcoming blog would explain the role of the Committee, which she hoped would help to attract volunteers. She agreed that the results of the Work Climate Survey meant little if action was not taken, and that the next step should be collaborative discussions. She emphasized that communications between the Staff Association Committee and the Administration were in good health – the communication problem concerned the Administration's failure to adequately explain to the staff in general the rationale behind administrative decisions. She said that the decision-making process was poorly understood. In that regard, she welcomed the updates made to the IARC web site explaining the composition and role of its various bodies. With regard to the proposed adoption of the UNESCO salary scale, she said that the primary concern of the Staff Association was the considerable additional workload that its adoption would entail.

Dr KEINHORST (Germany) said that she would appreciate further explanation.

Dr LAFIF (Director of Administration and Finance) said that a salary scale based on local salaries had been established for Lyon some years earlier. He explained that the International Civil Service Commission was considering changing to one salary survey per country, which would mean that as for the post adjustment the salary scale for General Service staff in Lyon could be derived from the UNESCO scale set in Paris. However, UNESCO would not be able to undertake its salary survey

until 2013. He said that the main difficulty for IARC was that it was not possible to conduct a cost efficient salary survey in Lyon for such a short period. He said that it would be more cost-effective for IARC to apply an adjustment to a salary scale determined in Paris, based on indices such as the cost of living index. However, although WHO headquarters in Geneva had taken up the matter on IARC's behalf, the International Civil Service Commission had persisted in its view that IARC should conduct a salary survey – although the process would require six months' work and the results would be obsolete within two years. He noted that it took a year for the results of a salary survey to be published. He said that he believed that a sustainable solution would be reached in 2013.

Ms LAMANDÉ said that the Agency's human resources department had already met with the French Social Security Office about the changes to childcare payments, but that different members of staff had different interpretations of the calculations involved. She said that clarification of the real implications of the changes would therefore be welcome.

The SECRETARY thanked the Chairperson of the Staff Association Committee for the clarity of her presentation. He said that an active Staff Association was a key component of a healthy organization and he thought that time pressures were one of the reasons for the difficulty in attracting candidates to the Committee. He encouraged staff members to volunteer. He said he wished to thank the Staff Association and the staff generally and said that he tried to encourage constructive criticism. He said that the results of the Work Climate Survey had been encouraging, but he acknowledged that there remained much to do. He said that for a small organization offering sufficient opportunities for career development was particularly challenging and that there was a need to be creative in the way that career plans were put together. He said that he was trying to bring in more efficient, information technology-based workflows. He said that he planned to hold open "town hall" meetings, which he hoped would help to explain the constraints the Administration worked under and help staff members to understand better the basis for decisions made. He noted that 80% of the organization's carbon footprint was travel, 75% of which was for people travelling to the Agency, rather than away from it, which he said was a function of the Agency's nature as a collaborative organization. He asked staff to be patient, and recognize that the Administration was under pressure to do the routine things, which led to frustration that it could not also work on more developmental aspects. He said that as a small organization IARC needed its staff to be one team, and that if staff members had criticisms they should also come along with solutions.

The Governing Council **took note** of the report and the discussion.

4. BIENNIAL REPORT OF THE IARC INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD (IRB), 2009–2010: Item 17 of the Agenda (Document GC/53/12)

Professor BOISSEL (Chairperson of the IARC Ethics Committee), illustrating his remarks with slides, presented structural changes to the IARC ethical review process that had taken place over the previous two years. He explained that the Ethics Review Committee and the Institutional Review Board had been merged into a single body, which since 2010 had been known as the IARC Ethics Committee. He noted that ethical approval from the IARC Ethics Committee was conditional on local ethical approval, and that multi-centre projects required separate approval for each centre. He also noted that not all projects implied new fieldwork. He said that the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC) was a source of many project applications. He explained that all projects were assessed against the following criteria: whether the question was relevant, worth answering and clearly presented; whether the rationale was strong enough; whether the study design and logistics were likely to result in an unbiased answer; whether the burden to participants was acceptable in terms of individual and collective ethics; and whether the project met international and local ethical rules. He noted that of the 60 projects reviewed by the two committees in 2009–2010, 51 had passed at first consideration, two had been rejected, six had required clarification and one had not been evaluated as it did not deal with human materials or subjects.

Dr KEINHORST (Germany) asked why such a high proportion – five out of seven – of the members of the IARC Ethics Committee were from France and said that she would like to see greater geographical balance in its membership.

Professor BOISSEL (Chairperson of the IARC Ethics Committee) agreed. He said that the reasons for the imbalance were largely historical, as the membership of the subsumed committee had been predominantly from France. He said that as the teleconferencing approach had been found to work successfully, he expected that membership of the new committee would become more international in future.

The SECRETARY thanked Professor BOISSEL for his leadership of the IARC Ethics Committee, which was an important aspect of the Agency's work.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution on the Biennial Report of the IARC Institutional Review Board (IRB), 2009–2010 (IARC Ethics Committee (IEC) as from September 2010) (GC/53/R12):

The Governing Council,

Having examined the Biennial Report of the IARC Institutional Review Board (IRB) 2009–2010, as contained in Document GC/53/12,

Recalling its Resolution GC/51/R14 establishing a single Committee, "The IARC Institutional Review Board (IRB)",

1. WELCOMES the Biennial Report of the IARC Institutional Review Board (IRB), 2009–2010;
2. THANKS the Chairperson, Professor Jean-Pierre Boissel, for his presentation of the report;
3. NOTES the decision made by the Committee to change its name from "The IARC Institutional Review Board (IRB)" to "IARC Ethics Committee (IEC)"; and
4. REQUESTS the Director to continue reporting biennially on issues related to ethics at the Agency.

The draft resolution was **adopted**.

**5. REQUESTS FOR USE OF FUNDS FROM THE GOVERNING COUNCIL SPECIAL FUND:
Item 18 of the Agenda**

A. Scientific equipment (Document GC/53/13A)

The SECRETARY said that in January 2011 a proposal had been made to the Scientific Council, which had been very supportive of the need to replace the listed items of routine scientific equipment. He said that the items had been identified as priorities through a Laboratory Steering Committee and would be used by a number of Groups across the Agency. He explained that the items were of the kind that it was difficult to include on grant proposals as they constituted part of the core equipment for any operating laboratory, but that the size of the items made it difficult to purchase them out of the regular budget. However, he noted that there was a slight difference in the total cost, as it had proved possible to find the money for one of the items in the regular budget.

The CHAIRPERSON said that he thought it important for IARC to keep equipment up to date.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution on requests for use of funds from the Governing Council Special Fund: A. Scientific Equipment (GC/53/R13):

The Governing Council,
Having reviewed Document GC/53/13A "Requests for use of funds from the Governing Council Special Fund: A. Scientific Equipment",
Noting that the Scientific Council supported the request for purchase of scientific equipment (see Document GC/53/4),
AUTHORIZES the Director to use up to a maximum of €230 000 from the Governing Council Special Fund for the acquisition of the following scientific equipment:

- a. Two DNA aliquoting robotic apparatuses and one multi-well plate reader;
- b. One solid phase extraction robot;
- c. Two Real-Time PCR detection systems;
- d. One high performance sonicator.

The draft resolution was **adopted**.

B. Additional financial support for Senior Scientist Awards (Document GC/53/13B)

The SECRETARY said that in addition to IARC post-doctoral fellowships, the Agency also offered one senior scientist award each year, which was normally granted to a scientist who already had strong collaborative links with IARC. He said that he had become increasingly convinced of the value of visiting senior scientists, as they tended to stimulate long-term collaborations and helped the Agency to develop expertise in a specific area of activity. He said that the Scientific Council had identified biostatistics as an area in which the Agency would benefit from the expertise of a visiting senior scientist, but had also been supportive of the more general principle of asking the Governing Council for support for additional senior visiting scientists. He said that he had been exploring with several possible partners the possibility of bringing in additional bilateral funding for such posts. He explained that in 2011 IARC had received eight applications of exceptionally high quality; since the bilateral funding was not yet in place, he asked for approval to fund two additional awards at a cost of up to US\$ 80 000 each. He explained that the actual cost depended on the particular applicant, as sometimes only top-up funding was required. He said that he considered it an extremely positive sign that so many outstanding scientists wished to come to IARC and he wished to ask the Governing Council's approval to use US\$ 160 000 to make two additional awards in 2011.

Dr HARMON (United States of America) asked to hear more about the particular expertise offered by the individuals in question, and with which units they would be most likely to be interacting, including the appointment already made.

The SECRETARY said that the senior visiting scientist already appointed would work primarily within the Section of Infections but also with the Biobank Group. He characterized the other applicants as one who would work in the Section of Environment and Radiation who had particular interests in ionizing radiation and analysis of nuclear workers and non-ionizing radiation and mobile phone exposures; one who had a strong interest in human papillomavirus infection, and so would also work in the Section of Infections but who had a strong link to the laboratory side; and a professor of biostatistics, who the Secretary felt would make a very strong contribution to IARC.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution on request for use of funds from the Governing Council Special Fund: B. Additional financial support for Senior Scientist Awards (GC/53/R14):

The Governing Council,
Having reviewed Document GC/53/13B "Request for use of funds from the Governing Council Special Fund: B. Additional financial support for Senior Scientist Awards",
Noting the large number of excellent applications received for the IARC Senior Visiting Scientist Award in 2011,
Further noting that the Scientific Council supported the request (see Document GC/53/4),

1. AUTHORIZES the Director to use up to a maximum of US\$ 160 000 from the Governing Council Special Fund to finance up to two additional Senior Visiting Scientist Awards in 2011–2012;
2. ENCOURAGES the Director to develop further Senior Visiting Scientist opportunities at the Agency.

Dr HARMON (United States of America) suggested that the words "up to two" be removed to allow the Director maximum flexibility within the financial cap. The sentence should now read: "AUTHORIZES the Director to use up to a maximum of US\$ 160 000 from the Governing Council Special Fund to finance additional Senior Visiting Scientist Awards in 2011–2012."

The CHAIRPERSON proposed that the last paragraph be removed as the details had not been discussed.

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

C. Temporary increase in the level of the Working Capital Fund (Document GC/53/13C)

Mr KNOCHE (Administration and Finance Officer) said that despite an agreement reached with Spain regarding repayment of its arrears, he considered it financially prudent to proceed with the proposed transfer in order to ensure that the level of the Working Capital Fund was sufficient to cope in the event of more than one Participating State failing to pay its contributions. He said that the money would be reimbursed to the Governing Council Special Fund as the outstanding contributions from Spain were received.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution on requests for use of funds from the Governing Council Special Fund: C. Temporary increase in the level of the Working Capital Fund (WCF) (GC/53/R15):

The Governing Council,

Having reviewed Document GC/53/13C "Request for use of funds from the Governing Council Special Fund: C. Temporary increase in the level of the Working Capital Fund (WCF)",

Noting the financial risk to the Agency deriving from the delay in the receipt of payment of the 2009, 2010 and 2011 assessed contributions from one Participating State,

1. AUTHORIZES the Director to transfer €1 600 000 from the Governing Council Special Fund to the Working Capital Fund; this authority being dependent upon there being sufficient cash balances available in the Governing Council Special Fund; and
2. DECIDES that this amount will be gradually reimbursed to the Governing Council Special Fund upon receipt of each of the above-mentioned outstanding contributions.

The draft resolution was **adopted**.

6. ADMISSION OF A NEW PARTICIPATING STATE – TURKEY: Item 14 of the Agenda
(Document GC/53/19)

The SECRETARY said that Turkey had begun exploring the possibility of joining IARC before his own term of office had begun. He noted that it was an exciting time for cancer research in Turkey, where in addition to cancer registry programmes there was a great interest in screening and tobacco control. He said that Turkey was in the process of establishing a National Cancer Institute which would act as a key focal point for interaction. He said that Turkey's application for admission had been made following a meeting with the Turkish Minister of Health earlier in 2011.

Dr PALMER (United Kingdom), Vice-Chairperson and Chairperson of the Subcommittee on the Admission of New Participating States, said that the members of the Subcommittee had been unanimous in agreeing that Turkey's submission met the criteria and therefore recommended that the Governing Council accept Turkey's application.

He said the Subcommittee had also determined a need to meet again by teleconference before the Fifty-fourth session of the Governing Council in order to discuss at greater length the criteria for and implications of admitting new Participating States, on matters such as voting procedure for example.

Dr HARFORD (United States of America) said that his institute had worked with Turkey since 2002 and that he could therefore add his personal endorsement of Turkey's membership to that of his country. He commended the commitment that the Turkish Ministry of Health had shown to the creation of centres for cancer registry, treatment and early detection, especially in comparison to others in the region which had more resources. However, he said he wished to register his usual objection to the practice of phasing in new Participating States' contributions: countries that were ready to participate should also be ready to assume their full financial responsibilities from day one.

The CHAIRPERSON said that that practice was one that the Subcommittee intended to discuss.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution on admission of Turkey as a new Participating State (GC/53/R22):

The Governing Council,

Having examined the request from the Government of Turkey for admission as a Participating State in the International Agency for Research on Cancer (Document GC/53/19),

1. DECIDES pursuant to Article XII of the Statute of the Agency, that Turkey be admitted as a Participating State in the Agency;
2. EXPRESSES great satisfaction at the admission of this new Participating State; and
3. AUTHORIZES the Director to use the unbudgeted assessments from Turkey for 2012–2013 towards the scientific programme activities of the Agency.

He proposed that the last paragraph be redrafted to read simply "towards the activities of the Agency".

Ms HERNANDEZ (alternate to Dr Park, Canada) asked whether it would be more prudent for the unbudgeted assessments to go into the Governing Council Special Fund.

Mr KNOCHE (Administration and Finance Officer) explained that unbudgeted assessments would automatically become part of the Governing Council Special Fund and were not kept separately. He said that as there was no time limitation on spending the money, adopting the resolution as drafted would not create any financial difficulty.

Dr HARFORD (United States of America) asked whether the draft resolution, if adopted, would remove the requirement on the Director for spending to be approved by the Governing Council.

The SECRETARY said that it was his understanding that the proposal was in line with the precedent that had been followed when a new Participating State had joined, which was that unbudgeted contributions went into the Governing Council Special Fund but became available to the Director immediately. He noted that such funds had been the only area of flexibility available to him as a new Director joining the Agency. He added that past practice had been to invite the new Participating State to specify a priority area in which that money should be spent, but that Turkey had not communicated any specific requirements in that regard.

Dr HARFORD (United States of America) wished to know the level of contribution that Turkey would be required to make in 2012–2013.

Mr KNOCHE (Administration and Finance Officer) said that Turkey's group classification under the WHO scale of assessments meant that it would be assigned one unit, which he thought equated to approximately €1 million.

Dr KEINHORST (Germany) expressed concern that unbudgeted contributions from Turkey might be spent, when it had been her impression that the money would be used to replenish the Governing Council Special Fund.

Mr KNOCHE (Administration and Finance Officer) explained that although the contributions that would be paid by Turkey constituted an income for the Governing Council Special Fund, other sources of income, such as arrears payments from the Russian Federation, meant that the money from Turkey was not required in order to cover the €1 million that was to be used for financing the regular budget. He emphasized that such monies provided flexibility that was extremely useful in the financial management of the Agency, in particular for managing expenses that carried over from one biennium to the next.

Dr PALMER (United Kingdom), Vice-Chairperson, asked the Secretary whether he planned to spend the unbudgeted contributions received from Turkey on anything specific or to hold it for emergencies. He said that his preference would be for the money not to be spent without a new authorization from the Governing Council.

The SECRETARY said that it had been the custom to allow a new Participating State some influence as to how the unbudgeted contributions might be spent, but that in the absence of any such instruction the default position was to use as a model the wording adopted when Austria had been admitted. He emphasized the value of the financial breathing space the unbudgeted

contributions provided and said that the money might for example be invested in small initiatives that could lead to larger grant applications.

The CHAIRPERSON, speaking on behalf of Finland, said that although it might be useful to pay attention to certain specific features in new Participating States, in principle the Agency was a collective agency in which the Participating States participated in collective work.

Ms HERNANDEZ (alternate to Dr Park, Canada) emphasized that times had changed. She said she supported keeping the unbudgeted contributions in the Governing Council Special Fund in order to provide a cushion for the future.

Professor BISHOP (Australia), Rapporteur, said that in his opinion it was important to let management manage and that the Governing Council should trust the Director to manage the organization responsibly. He said he therefore supported according the Director a degree of flexibility.

Dr HOLFORD (United States of America) said that as he understood it, the calculations in the budget had not taken account of any contributions that might be received from Turkey, and that the draft resolution would in effect release those unbudgeted contributions for the Director to use as he saw fit.

The CHAIRPERSON said that he saw no proposals for amendments.

The draft resolution was **adopted**.

The CHAIRPERSON congratulated the representative of Turkey on his country's admission to IARC and invited him to take a seat at the Governing Council table.

Professor TUNCER (Turkey) thanked the Governing Council for admitting his country to membership of IARC. He asked for Turkey's unbudgeted contribution to be put towards the Agency's activities in cancer screening. He described the situation of cancer in his country, illustrating his remarks with slides. The cancer incidence rate was increasing because of Turkey's ageing population and increased life expectancy, but also because more cases were being recorded since the establishment of a national cancer registration network in 2003. Breast cancer was the most common type among women, and lung cancer the most common among men. Cancer incidence was projected to rise to 400 per 100 000 population by 2030, which would require a cancer control budget four times higher than the current level.

There were nine population-based cancer registries, covering over 25% of the population. Prevention activities focused on tobacco use and environmental factors, including asbestos: the rate of mesothelioma, a lung cancer usually caused by exposure to asbestos, was 1000 times the global average. It was estimated that 1 million people were exposed to asbestos occurring naturally in the environment. Other prevention programmes sought to promote physical activity and healthy eating and combat obesity.

A screening programme for breast, cervical and colorectal cancer had been launched in 2004, operating to European Union standards. A network of 124 education and early diagnosis centres (KETEM) covered the entire country, with their own web site and telephone hotline. Over the previous three years, the screening programme had detected 1500 asymptomatic breast tumours measuring less than 1 cm in diameter. The cost of cancer screening, diagnosis and treatment, even in private medical facilities, was fully reimbursed by the Government. A palliative care system had been set up in collaboration with WHO. The Government planned to set up 54 new cancer centres by 2015, since Turkey was a large country and many patients had difficulty getting to the existing centres.

Turkey hoped to assume a leading role in cancer education and prevention in the region. It was already a member of many regional organizations and hoped to increase its collaboration with WHO and UICC, to the benefit of all concerned. *(Applause)*

7. REPORT ON PUBLICATION ACTIVITIES: Item 19 of the Agenda (Document GC/53/14)

Dr GAUDIN (Office of the Director, Communications Group) said that the Communications Group supported those IARC Sections which produced the Agency's main publications, such as the Monographs series, the Blue Books and the Handbooks on Cancer Prevention. It also supported other IARC Sections by providing or commissioning editorial support services, translations, layout, printing and promotion by the distributor, WHO Press.

Sales of publications had been lower over the previous year, partly because the latest volume in the Blue Books series had been published only late in 2010, but revenue had been less badly affected because of the new agreement with WHO Press, which meant that a higher percentage of sales revenue was paid to IARC. He thanked the Governing Council for its support for the publications programme.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution on publication activities (GC/53/R16):

The Governing Council,
Having reviewed Document GC/53/14 "Report on publication activities",

1. NOTES the Report with great interest; and
2. REQUESTS the Director to continue reporting annually on publication activities at IARC.

The draft resolution was **adopted**.

8. ACCEPTANCE OF DONATIONS: Item 21 of the Agenda (Document GC/53/15)

Mr KNOCHE (Administration and Finance Officer) said that the Secretariat reported annually to the Governing Council, giving details of small donations to the Agency, mostly made by individual members of the public. A letter of thanks, incorporating a copy of the resolution, would be sent to each donor.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following resolution on acceptance of donations (GC/53/R17):

The Governing Council,
Having been informed by Document GC/53/15 of the unconditional donations accepted by the Director under the authority vested in him by Resolution GC/4/R3,
EXPRESSES its deep appreciation to the donors for their generous contribution to the research activities of the Agency.

The draft resolution was **adopted**.

9. ACCEPTANCE OF GRANTS AND CONTRACTS: Item 22 of the Agenda
(Document GC/53/16)

Mr KNOCHE (Administration and Finance Officer) said that the Secretariat reported annually to the Governing Council on the grants and contracts accepted by the Director to a value of over €100 000 per annum.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution on the acceptance of grants and contracts (GC/53/R18):

The Governing Council,
Having considered Document GC/53/16 "Acceptance of grants and contracts",
In accordance with IARC Financial Regulations,
1. NOTES the post facto reporting of grants and contracts accepted by the Director as detailed in Document GC/53/16; and
2. COMMENDS the staff on its success in winning competitive research grants.

The draft resolution was **adopted**.

10. MEMBERSHIP OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE ADMISSION OF NEW PARTICIPATING STATES: Item 23 of the Agenda

The CHAIRPERSON invited nominations for the Subcommittee on the Admission of New Participating States. The current members were the representatives of Canada, Germany, Japan, United Kingdom and himself, ex officio.

Dr PARK (Canada), Dr KEINHORST (Germany), Dr MUGITANI (Japan) and Dr PALMER (United Kingdom), Vice-Chairperson, expressed their willingness to continue on the Subcommittee.

Dr SEGOVIA (Spain) and Dr HARFORD (United States of America) expressed interest in joining the Subcommittee.

Ms McKEOUGH (Office of the WHO Legal Counsel) noted that the original resolution creating the Subcommittee (GC/18/R14) stated that it should consist of two members and two alternates, plus the Chairperson. If the Governing Council wished to expand the membership, it would need to take a formal decision to that effect.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following amended draft resolution on membership of the Subcommittee on the Admission of New Participating States, drafted in consultation with Ms McKeough (GC/53/R20):

The Governing Council,

Recalling its Resolution GC/18/R14 nominating members of the Subcommittee on the Admission of new Participating States and the requirement to nominate new members at the end of each session of the Council,

1. DECIDES that this Subcommittee shall be composed of the representatives of interested Participating States in addition to the Chairperson of the Governing Council (member ex officio). The representatives who shall hold office until the next regular session of the Council shall be those of Canada, Germany, Japan, Spain, UK, and the USA.
2. Further DECIDES that the number of members and composition of the Subcommittee shall be agreed upon at each regular session of the Governing Council.

The draft resolution was **adopted**.

11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS: Item 24 of the Agenda

Replying to a question from Dr KEINHORST (Germany), the CHAIRPERSON said that the decision just taken regarding the Subcommittee on the Admission of New Participating States did not automatically apply to the other subsidiary bodies of the Governing Council, such as the Working Group on Infrastructure. He suggested that the Working Group should continue its activities with its current membership over the next year.

It was so **agreed**.

Replying to a question from Dr PARK (Canada), the SECRETARY said that his earlier concerns regarding possible conflicts of interest, particularly in respect of certain IARC publications, had now been resolved.

12. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON FOR NEXT SESSION: Item 25 of the Agenda

On the proposal of Dr STEBER BÜCHLI (Switzerland), seconded by Dr PARK (Canada), Professor Puska was unanimously re-elected as Chairperson of the Governing Council.

The CHAIRPERSON thanked the Governing Council for the confidence it had placed in him.

13. DATE OF NEXT SESSION: Item 26 of the Agenda

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution on the date of the Fifty-fourth session of the Governing Council (GC/53/R21):

The Governing Council,

1. DECIDES to hold its next regular session in Lyon, France, on the Thursday and Friday preceding the opening of the World Health Assembly in the year 2012; and
2. REQUESTS the Director to inform members of the Council as soon as these dates are known.

The draft resolution was **adopted**.

14. APPOINTMENT OF NEW MEMBERS OF THE SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL (CLOSED SESSION): Item 20 of the Agenda (Document GC/53/17)

The Governing Council met in closed session from 12:55 to 13:40.

On the resumption of the plenary session, the RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution on the appointment of new members of the Scientific Council (GC/53/R19):

The Governing Council,

In accordance with the provisions of Article VI of the Statute of the Agency,

1. APPOINTS

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| Dr Cornelia Ulrich, Germany |) | |
| Dr Thangarajan Rajkumar, India |) | |
| Dr Deirdre Murray, Ireland |) | |
| Dr Luca Gianni, Italy |) | |
| Dr Inger Gram, Norway |) | to serve for four years on the Scientific Council |
| Dr In-Hoo Kim, Republic of Korea |) | |
| Dr Sergei Tjulandin, Russian Federation |) | |
| Dr Paul W. Dickman, Sweden |) | |
| Dr Murat Gültekin, Turkey |) | |

2. THANKS the outgoing members of the Scientific Council, Dr Y.-J. Bang, Dr M. Blettner, Dr H. Comber, Dr G. Forni, Dr H. Grönberg, Dr E.J. Rivedal, Dr V. Shanta and Dr D.G. Zaridze, for their valuable work in the Scientific Council and for the contribution which they have made to the research activities of the Agency.

The draft resolution was **adopted**.

15. CLOSURE OF SESSION: Item 27 of the Agenda

The CHAIRPERSON thanked all members of the Governing Council, the Director and his staff for their contribution to a successful session, including the adoption of the budget for the next biennium, and once again welcomed Turkey as the 22nd Participating State of the Agency.

The SECRETARY thanked the Governing Council for the confidence it had shown in himself and the staff. The Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson had provided valuable support for the Administration through the regular teleconferences held over the year. He thanked the support staff who had ensured that the session ran smoothly, and paid tribute to two long-serving IARC staff members, Finance Officer Ms Dorotea Pantua and Budget Assistant Mr Charles Augros, who were to retire shortly.

The CHAIRPERSON declared closed the Fifty-third Session of the Governing Council.

The meeting rose at 13:45.