

# International Agency for Research on Cancer



World Health  
Organization

Governing Council  
Fifty-fifth Session

GC/55/Min.3  
Original: ENGLISH

*Lyon, 16–17 May 2013*  
*Auditorium*

**RESTRICTED DISTRIBUTION**

## MINUTES OF THE THIRD MEETING

IARC, Lyon

Friday 17 May 2013, at 08:30

Chairperson: Professor Pekka Puska (Finland)

Secretary: Dr Christopher P. Wild, Director, IARC

### CONTENTS

	Page
1. Update on “Nouveau Centre” project including Building for the future: the scientific vision behind the “Nouveau Centre”	4
2. Proposed Programme (2014–2017) and Budget (2014–2015) (continued)	16
3. Statement by the IARC Staff Association	21
4. Report on publication activities	23
5. Requests for use of funds from the Governing Council Special Fund <sup>1</sup>	24
A. Two-year extension of approved allocation of funds for legal and architectural advice for the “Nouveau Centre” project	24
B. Revenue from publications	25
D. Scientific equipment	25
E. Support to IPSAS implementation	26
F. Support for High Performance Computing capacity	27
6. Biennial Report of the IARC Ethics Committee (IEC), 2011–2012	28
7. Acceptance of donations	29
8. Acceptance of grants and contracts and return of interest income to Grants	29

---

<sup>1</sup> Item 19C was cancelled and therefore not discussed.

### Participating State Representatives

Professor Pekka PUSKA, <i>Chairperson</i> Dr Sakari KARJALAINEN	Finland
Dr Mark PALMER, <i>Vice-Chairperson</i> Dr Rhoswyn WALKER	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Dr Morag PARK, <i>Rapporteur</i> Ms Lucero HERNANDEZ	Canada
Professor Christopher BAGGOLEY	Australia
Dr Hemma BAUER	Austria
Mr Lieven DE RAEDT	Belgium
Dr Luiz Antonio SANTINI Dr Marisa Dreyer BREITENBACH	Brazil
Professor Herman AUTRUP	Denmark
Professor Agnès BUZYN	France
Dr Chariklia BALAS Dr Irene KEINHORST	Germany
Professor G.K. RATH ( <i>unable to attend</i> )	India
Dr Susan O'REILLY	Ireland
<i>No Representative</i>	Italy
Dr Masato MUGITANI Dr Makiyo IWATA	Japan
Dr Jack HUTTEN Mr Jeroen HULLEMAN	Netherlands
Dr Edgar RIVEDAL Dr Henrietta BLANKSON	Norway
Dr FALEH Mohammed Hussain Ali	Qatar

Dr Sung Woong RA Dr Jeongseon KIM Dr Yeol KIM	Republic of Korea
Ms Lidia GABUNIYA	Russian Federation
Dr María José G. SUSO	Spain
Professor Mats ULFENDAHL ( <i>unable to attend</i> ) Dr Karin SCHMEKEL	Sweden
Dr Diane STEBER-BÜCHLI	Switzerland
Professor Murat TUNCER	Turkey
Dr Lisa STEVENS Ms Gabrielle LAMOURELLE Ms Mary Blanca RIOS Dr Jeff GLENN	United States of America

### **World Health Organization**

Dr Oleg CHESTNOV, Assistant Director-General  
Ms Joanne MCKEOUGH, Office of the Legal Counsel

### **Observers**

Professor Mads MELBYE, Chairperson, Scientific Council

Professor Jean-Pierre BOISSEL, Chairperson, IARC Ethics Committee

### **Union for International Cancer Control (UICC)**

Mr Cary ADAMS, Executive Director

### **External Audit**

Mr Lito Q. MARTIN (*unable to attend*), Commission on Audit, Philippines

### **Secretariat**

Dr C.P. WILD, *Secretary*

Mr D. ALLEN  
Dr S. FRANCESCHI

Ms A. BERGER  
Dr F. BRAY  
Dr P. BRENNAN  
Dr G. BYRNES  
Ms D. D'AMICO  
Mr P. DAMIECKI  
Dr D. FORMAN  
Ms E. FRANÇON

Dr N. GAUDIN  
Dr Z. HERCEG  
Dr R. HERRERO  
Dr A. KESMINIENE  
Dr D. LOOMIS  
Dr J. MCKAY  
Dr M. MENDY  
Dr R. NJIE  
Dr H. OHGAKI  
Dr I. ROMIEU

Dr R. SANKARANARAYANAN  
Ms A. SANTHIPRECHACHIT  
Dr A. SCALBERT  
Dr J. SCHÜZ  
Dr N. SLIMANI  
Dr E. STELIAROVA-FOUCHER  
Dr K. STRAIF  
Dr M. TOMMASINO  
Dr L. VON KARSA  
Dr J. ZAVADIL

**1. UPDATE ON “NOUVEAU CENTRE” PROJECT INCLUDING BUILDING FOR THE FUTURE: THE SCIENTIFIC VISION BEHIND THE “NOUVEAU CENTRE”:** Item 16 of the Agenda (Documents GC/55/9A and GC/55/9B)

Mr ALLEN (Director of Administration and Finance), illustrating his remarks with slides, recalled the history of the IARC buildings following the founding of the Agency in the 1970s: the IARC Tower had been built with funding from central, Department and City resources and ownership vested in the City of Lyon. An agreement for provision of premises would be valid until 2032 and ownership of the subsequently-built Latarjet, BRC and Sasakawa buildings would transfer to the City of Lyon if they were vacated by the Agency.

The Tower was in a poor state of repair and asbestos had been used in its construction. In addition, the space was no longer suited to current needs. Studies carried out by the Secretariat and the City of Lyon in 2012 had shown that the Tower was beyond repair in the long run. The Director's office flooded when it rained and a number of leaks and other failures in air conditioning had caused the evacuation of several offices and floors of the building. The City of Lyon had accepted responsibility for urgent and major works which were to be completed by 2014 and were designed to contain the problems in the short term.

After having considered three different options to solve the problems in the longer term: to refurbish the Tower; to demolish the Tower and rebuild on the same land; or to build on new land, the City of Lyon had expressed a preference for the third option. In Resolution GC/54/R5, the Secretariat had been requested to consult with the Working Group on Infrastructure and with the Chairpersons and Vice-Chairpersons of the Governing and Scientific Councils on any decisions concerning the appearance of the new building and to ensure that no mandatory costs were incurred by Participating States as a result of the “Nouveau Centre” project; voluntary contributions however would be welcomed. Talks with local authorities had confirmed that there was strong support for IARC to remain in Lyon and the Gerland site, which would be dedicated to scientific research, was the preferred location for the new construction. The Urban Community of Lyon (Grand Lyon) would project-manage the construction and become the Agency's new landlord.

Four local partners had agreed to fund 49.9% of the project provided that the French Government would fund 50.1%. Coordination was ongoing with the Ministries of Research, Foreign Affairs and Health and clear indications of strong support for the project had been received. The ground had been prepared for immediate bidding for design works in the hope that the green light would be given on finance.

IARC's role in the project was as convener and support to project management, as well as fundraiser. Decisions would need to be taken in order to avoid delays on some issues such as surrender of the current buildings, which would have little residual value. City of Lyon had estimated that the Latarjet and BRC buildings and land could have a market value of 4 million Euros and it was possible that the Agency could negotiate back their value.

Concerning the design priorities in “building for the future”, the Governing Council had held long discussions in 2012, ensuring that time was taken to reflect on the long-term needs of the Agency and to accommodate current and future activities. Following advice from several Governing Council members, the Director had prepared document GC/55/9B which looked at

the design rationale for the new building in line with the scientific vision of the Agency and which incorporated: an integrated design that combined laboratory, office and shared spaces in order to promote informal exchanges; shared facilities for laboratory resources; dedicated space for biobank facilities; flexible and expandable IT infrastructure; and support for IARC's mission of promoting collaboration and training through meeting facilities and working spaces for staff and visitors. The Agency was also seeking a low environmental footprint and it had estimated that there would be substantial reductions in running costs in the move to a modern building. A more horizontal building would provide more laboratory space and fewer corridors.

The Scientific Council had held a lively discussion on the Director's document on the scientific vision behind the "Nouveau Centre", with many colleagues being able to share their experience of similar projects. They were keen to see that the different scientific strengths of IARC were built into the new design. They were supportive of a flexible design that envisioned different ways of working and, in principle, of the plan to house the Biobank.

The authorities had insisted that the WHO Office in Lyon, which housed approximately 30 staff, should be incorporated into the new IARC-managed building. Following discussions with WHO, IARC's concerns had been alleviated and it was confident that the integration of WHO colleagues would bring benefits to the Agency.

IARC asked that the Governing Council should recognize the need to continue negotiating and moving forward with the project and for leeway to negotiate for any compensation arising from the sale of the land and buildings. Agreement was sought for IARC to share the new building with the WHO Office in Lyon. The Governing Council was requested to delegate authority for continuation of the project to the Working Group on Infrastructure so that work could begin as soon as a decision on funding had been received from central government. The Governing Council was further requested to recognize the scientific vision paper prepared by the Director for the design of the "Nouveau Centre".

Dr MUGITANI (Japan) said that he had no objection to the "Nouveau Centre" project but he was very much concerned about the Princess Takamatsu and Sasakawa Halls. He had received an indication that Mr Sasakawa might make another contribution to the construction cost of a new Hall.

The CHAIRPERSON expressed deep appreciation to Japan for its continued support to IARC and to the new building.

Professor MELBYE (Chairperson, Scientific Council), commenting on the Scientific Council's discussions concerning the "Nouveau Centre", said that members had decided that it would not be possible to agree on the size of the laboratories without a concrete project plan but there had been agreement on the need for maximum flexibility in order to accommodate different research projects. Since the Agency's founding, the model had moved from paperwork to a combination of applied science and research collaboration for which

laboratory space and biobank materials were needed. It was a challenge to foresee what facilities would be required in the future. A configuration that would promote collaboration between small- or medium-sized sections within IARC would certainly be beneficial to the Agency's ability to attract scientists and promote collaboration.

Dr KEINHORST (Germany) said that there had been considerable progress since the last Governing Council meeting. She expressed appreciation for the commitment of the Government of France, the City of Lyon and other stakeholders. As a member of the Working Group on Infrastructure she thanked the Secretariat for having kept its members informed in a timely manner. It was understandable that the Government of France should take time in deciding when the funds should be spent although it was crucial that a firm commitment was received before further progress was made. It would be helpful to have further information on the legal basis for the surrender of the buildings. With regard to the scientific vision and its implementation, a general concept had been provided and the next step would be to develop a more concrete vision. The timetable for the building works appeared to be very tight. It would be important to engage an independent consultant in the planning process and for IARC to remain involved. In the statement he had given in connection with his reappointment, the Director had given a very strong view of IARC's vision, its financing and the uniqueness of the institution: she would find it helpful to receive a document that captured that information.

Dr BAUER (Austria) thanked the local authorities and the host country for their efforts and endorsed the plans outlined thus far. However, she supported the views of Germany that it would be premature to have a final decision since detailed financial plans were not available. It would be important to gain an idea of the costs of the building itself and of the additional costs including laboratory furniture. She would be supportive of the integration of the WHO Office although it would be important to ensure that WHO covered the associated costs.

Dr KARJALAINEN (Finland) thanked the Secretariat for the great progress made in the planning of the new building. Finland supported the plans presented and believed that the project would be very successful. The new building presented a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to create a physical space where collaboration and innovation flourished – along the lines of the knowledge creation environment championed by Japanese professor Ikujiro Nonaka. He hoped that an exceptional building would be created.

Professor AUTRUP (Denmark) said that he shared the views expressed by the Chairperson of the Scientific Council and the representative of Finland. While he appreciated the work that had been accomplished he stressed the need to design a space that would meet the future needs of the Agency. He agreed that the Biobank was an asset and laboratory space should be devoted to it. However, laboratory space was expensive and care should be taken to see that it was designed for appropriate scientific experiments. There were practical questions to

be considered: given that the economic situation in France – as in most European countries – was depressed, was the timetable of 5–7 years realistic? In addition, it was proposed to build on a former industrial site: had IARC made sure that the land was not contaminated with carcinogens?

Professor BUZYN (France) read out a statement by the Prime Minister of France drafted following a meeting of the Ministries of Health, Research and Foreign Affairs which had taken place that week: "France recalls its attachment to the work of IARC and to its presence in Lyon at the heart of a zone of excellence in research and health. It supports the search for new premises for the Agency. However, it has questions regarding the size and costs involved in the current building project. The French Government would need to have a clear understanding of the project. Consequently, the French Ministries concerned have been mandated to carry out a detailed examination of the building project in order to gain a better understanding of its size and costs, in coordination with IARC and other stakeholders, including Grand Lyon. Following the analysis and after consultation with the partners involved, France will revert to the Secretariat in the coming weeks. It is hoped that Participating States will make an exceptional contribution to the financing of the premises." The last sentence had been formulated bearing in mind the size of the Nouveau Centre and the possibility that it might need to be extended. If the Governing Council wished to increase the size of the premises and the number of staff, the French authorities did not believe that they would be able to assume the additional costs.

Professor TUNCER (Turkey) supported the idea of the new building since there were a number of problems with the current building and the IARC project was getting bigger each year. However, he was doubtful that a building of 12 000 m<sup>2</sup> could be built within two years. The timetable and the technical specifications of the building would need to be redefined and the total costs for the project would need to be calculated.

Dr FALEH (Qatar) supported the idea of the new building and commended the commitment of the host country. He agreed that it would be important to design a flexible building that could be adapted to a changing environment and expanded to meet future requirements. In response to the request for contributions from Participating States, he wished to see the design, understand the costs and learn whether it was possible to make a designated contribution to a set part of the building.

The CHAIRPERSON, speaking in his capacity as representative of Finland, agreed that the building design should be flexible. In his experience, modern laboratories tended to require less space since equipment was decreasing in size and becoming more automated. However, space should certainly be found for the Biobank. He had been surprised to learn of the proposal to share the building with the WHO Office in Lyon. The new building could be used to promote IARC's global reputation in cancer research. He thanked the Government of

France for its efforts and anticipated that IARC would continue to negotiate fruitfully with a view to remaining permanently in France.

Ms HERNANDEZ (Canada) thanked the Government of France for its willingness to maintain IARC's presence in Lyon although she was concerned by the challenges it faced in so doing. In principle, Canada supported the idea of the Nouveau Centre although written confirmation concerning the funding would be required from the Government of France before any further steps were agreed.

She understood that the state of the buildings was precarious and that it might be necessary to transfer ownership of them without any form of compensation. She asked what would happen if the current premises had been transferred before the new ones had been completed. She supported the request from the local authorities to house the WHO Office in the new building provided that the responsibilities of each party in the arrangement were clearly outlined. The design of the "building for the future" would need to be realistic and feasible, bearing in mind that there might be costs for new furnishings as well as for the building itself. Any final decisions in respect of the project should not be delegated to the Working Group on Infrastructure but should involve all of IARC's Participating States in order to ensure transparency and accountability. The representative of Belgium had raised the issue of how IARC should work in the future: she was not convinced that the Agency needed a large building since it could build a model based on collaboration with other research centres.

Mr DE RAEDT (Belgium), referring to the statement by the representative of France, said that he did not believe that the Governing Council had requested to move to larger premises: indeed, he recollected that, during discussions in 2012, some Governing Council members had been critical of the proposal to increase the surface area of the building.

The SECRETARY, responding to comments made, recalled his involvement in the construction of an interdisciplinary building in Leeds over a four-year period before he had joined IARC. Summarizing the present situation, he pointed out that it was not possible to maintain the status quo since the poor condition of the present building meant that there were occasions when it had to be closed. In the meantime, the Agency was under the obligation to fulfil certain contracts and the timeframe from one Governing Council meeting to another created problems further down the line.

The size and design of the new building, including the number of floors, would depend on the site chosen and the footprint that would be allocated. He would welcome an in-depth review by the French authorities of the norms existing in France and the potential to discuss and change the size and scale of the project in the light of that assessment. He reassured the Governing Council that once an outline design had been established, the Secretariat would revert to the Scientific Council and to the Governing Council for advice.

Both local partners and the national Government had indicated the importance of including the WHO Office in the new building. It was clear that the agreement would be for an IARC building with rental space for WHO which would be paid for locally; the involvement of WHO in the design phase to ensure that its requirements were met should not slow down the process.

Additional thought should be given to the role of the Working Group on Infrastructure and that of the Governing Council in the decision process, since the creation of major delays in the project could prove difficult if the current building experienced a major failure before the new building was ready.

Mr ALLEN (Director of Administration and Finance), responding to comments, thanked the representative of Japan for having followed up his discussions with Mr Sasakawa; the Agency looked forward to continuing the tradition of having a Princess Takamatsu and Sasakawa Hall in the new building. He further thanked the representative of Qatar for the potential interest shown in helping the Government of France to fund the new building. The Secretariat welcomed the proposal by the Government of France to conduct a more in-depth study of the project. Funds had been set aside for legal advice in order to cover the impact on the Agency in the event of non-completion and to ensure that it was protected throughout the process. The Secretariat would ensure that the host country's studies and the Scientific Council's comments were documented.

With reference to the full costs of the project, the Agency had already put in place policies in order to ensure that there was no more investment in the present building and that any furniture purchased was flexible and modular so that it could be moved to the new premises. The land on which the new building would be built had been studied for contamination and one research institute had already been built there.

Dr KEINHORST (Germany) asked whether the Government of France would look to Participating States for financial contributions in the event that there was an increase in the size of the new building or in the number of staff. If that were the case, it would influence the decision on whether to delegate matters to the Working Group on Infrastructure. The Government of Germany would not agree to the introduction of mandatory financial contributions for the new building and she was surprised that the possibility had been introduced at such a late stage in the planning process.

Mr ALLEN (Director of Administration and Finance) said that an approximate 15% increase in the footprint of the building had been suggested but the overall size was flexible and could be adjusted in discussions with the Government of France. The costs of the additional space, which measured 500–600 m<sup>2</sup> and had been planned to allow the Agency to adapt to possible staff increases over a 30-year period, would not be large. In addition to that space, the proposed new structure to house the Biobank had been strongly supported by the Scientific Council.

Professor BUZYN (France) said that the Government of France was aware of the urgency of the situation and ministers had been mandated to work on the project over the next six weeks. Ministers would need to know the precise number of people projected to work at the site so that the size of the laboratories and offices could be calculated according to French norms.

Dr SANTINI (Brazil) thanked IARC for the important initiative it was taking despite the international financial crisis. In addition to the current infrastructure requirements it would be necessary to think about future challenges that would make knowledge and research in the field of cancer increasingly necessary. Since cancer was a problem faced by humanity, IARC might seek support for the building project from the international scientific and business community as well as society as a whole.

The CHAIRPERSON, summarizing the comments made, said that representatives were aware of the time pressure faced by the Agency and had expressed good support for continued negotiations with the Government of France provided that mandatory financial contributions from other Participating States were excluded. He was sure that all of the observations made would be taken into account by the Secretariat. He invited participants to consider the draft resolution on the matter.

The RAPPORTEUR read out a draft resolution entitled "Update on the "Nouveau Centre" project: building for the future" (GC/55/R12), which read as follows:

The Governing Council,

Having considered Documents GC/55/9A (Update on "Nouveau Centre" project) and GC/55/9B (Building for the future: the scientific vision behind the "Nouveau Centre"),

1. ENDORSES the continuing efforts towards securing financing and moving forward with the "Nouveau Centre" project, including the location and project management structures proposed;
2. AGREES, in the case the host country and the local partners provide suitable alternative premises that meet the Agency's requirements and on financial conditions and terms to be agreed between the Secretariat and the City of Lyon, to surrender the IARC owned buildings on the current premises without compensation;
3. AGREES, in line with the host country's and local partners' communication, that the WHO Office in Lyon may be included in the "Nouveau Centre" project, subject to arrangements to be agreed;
4. DELEGATES to its Working Group on Infrastructure, among on-going decisions on important stages of the project, the final decision on agreeing with the "Nouveau Centre" project in the case the host country and local partners confirm their agreement to provide the required funding prior to the next Governing Council regular session;

5. RECOGNIZES that the principles outlined in Document GC/55/9B (Building for the future: the scientific vision behind the "Nouveau Centre") are consistent with the vision for the future activities of the Agency;
6. THANKS the Scientific Council for its recommendations on the design of the "Nouveau Centre" (Document GC/55/4); and
7. REQUESTS the Director to maintain maximum flexibility in any new building, to create an environment that maximizes collaboration across Sections, and to ensure an architectural impact consistent with the status, role and success of the Agency.

Dr KEINHORST (Germany) proposed the addition of two new paragraphs, the first of which would read: "AFFIRMS the need for a timely decision on the concrete financial commitments of the French Government and the local partners;" and the second: "REITERATES that Participating States are not in a position to make mandatory contributions with regard to the capital costs of the future infrastructure project;".

Dr BAUER (Austria) asked whether the wording in paragraph 4 meant that the final decision on the "Nouveau Centre" would be taken by the Governing Council, or that it would be delegated to the Working Group on Infrastructure.

Mr DE RAEDT (Belgium) said that it would be going too far to delegate the final decision to the Working Group on Infrastructure; in his view, the decision should be taken by the Governing Council.

Ms HERNANDEZ (Canada) suggested that, in order to avoid creating obstacles for the decision-making process, a web-based special session of the Governing Council could be held, thus avoiding the need to travel to Lyon. It would not be appropriate for the Working Group to take a decision since the role of a working group was to provide recommendations.

Mr ALLEN (Director of Administration and Finance) said that the draft resolution had been worded to provide for the approval of the project by the Working Group on Infrastructure in the event that the Government of France confirmed its commitment to fund the project in six weeks' time, as planned, since that would avoid any delays with the project. An extraordinary session of the Governing Council could be called or the decision postponed until the following regular meeting if that was the wish of Participating States.

Ms MCKEOUGH (WHO Office of the Legal Counsel), responding to a question by the CHAIRPERSON, said that the possibility of holding a web-based session of the Governing Council without a physical meeting was not provided for in the rules. It might be possible for the Working Group on Infrastructure to conduct a web-based consultation with

members of the Governing Council before taking a decision since that would not be considered a special session.

The CHAIRPERSON noted that the Working Group could be mandated to consult Participating States.

Ms RIOS (United States of America) said that it would be very unusual for a working group to give a final decision on a project of that size. She supported the request by Germany to add a paragraph to the effect that Participating States should not be expected to make mandatory contributions to the project.

The CHAIRPERSON said that it would be more appropriate if paragraph 3 were to end with the words: "subject to arrangements not compromising the requirements of IARC".

Dr KARJALAINEN (Finland) agreed that it was not possible to delegate a decision of that kind to the Working Group and the Director. He asked whether it would be possible for members of the Governing Council to communicate a vote or decision in writing in response to a specific proposal.

Ms MCKEOUGH (WHO Office of the Legal Counsel) said that she would reflect on the possibility that a web-based or written communication procedure could be used.

Professor BAGGOLEY (Australia) said that he was sure that an out-of-session deliberation by the Governing Council could be arranged, since it was a method used in many areas of working life. It was clear that flooding, asbestos and other problems would make the current buildings unusable for another seven years. It would also make sense to design a flexible building that could be adapted to meet future needs. The Governing Council seemed to be content with the "Nouveau Centre" project provided that it was paid for by the French Government. It would be essential to learn the facts and to review decisions taken at the previous Governing Council, since it was possible that a small contribution might be requested of Participating States.

Dr O'REILLY (Ireland) supported the intention to have a new building although she could not contemplate the introduction of a mandatory contribution. It would be extremely helpful to hold a meeting of the Governing Council, in whatever form, since the Governing Council must endorse the project. It would also be important to gain a clearer understanding of the intention of the French national and local authorities and of the maintenance costs and those relating to any additional members of staff.

Mr ALLEN (Director of Administration and Finance) said that the Government of France was taking a number of decisions that would ensure that it had an envelope of funds in order to begin the first phase of the project. Technical specifications would be determined and an architect then hired to develop the plans that would lead to the construction project. The Governing Council would be consulted at each stage of the project but the current request was simply to begin the design phase.

The CHAIRPERSON said that he believed there was a good consensus on the main decision although some requests would require amendments to the draft resolution.

The RAPPORTEUR read out an amended version of the draft resolution (GC/55/R12):

The Governing Council,

Having considered Documents GC/55/9A (Update on "Nouveau Centre" project) and GC/55/9B (Building for the future: the scientific vision behind the "Nouveau Centre"),

1. RECOGNIZES that the state of IARC's buildings is in severe disrepair and that working conditions for the staff are no longer suitable and reminds the host country of the responsibility to provide adequate infrastructure;
2. RECOGNIZES there is an urgent need to move forward with the "Nouveau Centre" project;
3. ENDORSES the continuing efforts towards securing financing and moving forward with the "Nouveau Centre" project, including the location and project management structures proposed;
4. AFFIRMS the need for a timely decision on the concrete financial commitments of the French Government and the City of Lyon;
5. AGREES, in the case the host country and the local partners provide suitable alternative premises that meet the Agency's requirements and on financial conditions and terms to be agreed between the Secretariat and the City of Lyon, to surrender the IARC owned buildings on the current premises without compensation;
6. AGREES, in line with the host country's and local partners' communication, that the WHO Office in Lyon may be included in the "Nouveau Centre" project, subject to arrangements not compromising the requirements of IARC;
7. DELEGATES to its Working Group on Infrastructure, among on-going decisions on important stages of the project, the final recommendation on agreeing with the "Nouveau Centre" project on the condition that the host country and local partners formally confirm their agreement to provide the required funding prior to the next Governing Council regular session;
8. RECOGNIZES that the principles outlined in document GC/55/9B (Building for the future: the scientific vision behind the "Nouveau Centre"), are consistent with the vision for the future activities of the Agency;

9. REQUESTS the Director to maintain maximum flexibility in any new building, to create an environment that maximizes collaboration across Sections, and to ensure an architectural impact consistent with the status, role and success of the Agency;
10. REITERATES that Participating States are not in a position to make mandatory contributions with regard to the capital costs of the future infrastructure project; and
11. THANKS the Scientific Council for its recommendations on the design of the "Nouveau Centre" (Document GC/55/4).

Mr ALLEN (Director of Administration and Finance) recommended that the words "City of Lyon" in paragraph 5 be changed to "host country and local partners".

Ms MCKEOUGH (WHO Office of the Legal Counsel) said that, having consulted with WHO headquarters, she could confirm that it would not be possible for the Governing Council to meet intersessionally, although it would be possible to take a decision. The terms of the decision would have to be very clear and agreed in advance. If the Working Group on Infrastructure was required to consult with the Governing Council and to receive a "yes-or-no" decision then she could draft language to that effect for inclusion in paragraph 7.

Dr STEVENS (United States of America) asked what was the anticipated timeline for the decision that would be included in paragraph 7 since the paragraph currently made reference to a regular session of the Governing Council. She had not heard a proposed timeline for a decision on architectural design.

Mr ALLEN (Director of Administration and Finance) said that the first step was to learn from the French Government whether the envelope of funds was ready in order to begin the design phase of the project.

Professor BUZYN (France) said that the French authorities understood the urgency of the problems IARC was facing. She would do her best to facilitate an early start to the project.

The CHAIRPERSON asked whether the Governing Council wished to amend paragraph 7 of the draft resolution in the light of the information provided by the WHO Legal Counsel.

Ms MCKEOUGH (WHO Office of the Legal Counsel), responding to question from Ms HERNANDEZ (Canada), said that the Governing Council could decide to delegate a decision to a working group; alternatively, the Governing Council could decide to proceed with an intersessional arrangement as she had indicated.

Dr BAUER (Austria) asked whether it would be possible for paragraph 7 to indicate that the Governing Council delegated authority to the Working Group on Infrastructure to make a recommendation on proceeding with the design.

Mr ALLEN (Director of Administration and Finance) said that if the Governing Council gave its agreement to the project, the Government of France would begin to spend money on planning the design phase provided that it had found the funds to do so; it was then likely that proposals for architectural drawings would be presented to the Governing Council for decision in two years' time. The Governing Council would continue to make inputs to the project but it would be difficult to reverse it at that stage. The decision required at present was whether to move forward with the project in partnership with the French authorities; no decisions on the building itself were being taken at that time.

Dr KEINHORST (Germany) said that if paragraph 7 was to provide for a "yes-or-no" decision by the Governing Council it could be rephrased to the effect that the Governing Council delegated to the Working Group on Infrastructure, the final recommendation with regard to the beginning of the "Nouveau Centre" project. She envisaged that the Working Group on Infrastructure would give a recommendation to begin the project provided that the financing had been secured and that Governing Council representatives would reply "yes" or "no" by email.

Ms MCKEOUGH (WHO Office of the Legal Counsel) suggested that the new paragraph 7 should read: "DECIDES that, before the Working Group on Infrastructure takes a final decision on the next steps under paragraph 7, the Working Group, through the Director, will write to the Governing Council to update the Council on progress and to ask the Council to reply 'yes' or 'no' to a recommended decision, with a deadline for reply. The Working Group will be bound by a majority view of the Governing Council received by the deadline;".

Dr PALMER (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Vice-Chairperson, speaking as a representative of his country and supported by Dr KEINHORST (Germany), suggested that the word "final" should be removed, since a final decision would not be taken for another two years.

The SECRETARY asked that it be made clear which nominated representative he should write to in each Participating State and what the procedure would be if there was no response.

Dr STEVENS (United States of America) asked whether a quorum, rather than a simple majority of Governing Council members, would be required.

Ms MCKEOUGH (WHO Office of the Legal Counsel) explained that a simple “yes” or “no” vote would be required to reach a majority view and that a quorum would not be necessary. WHO held a list of contact names for each Participating State and emails could be sent to current Governing Council representatives.

Dr PALMER (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Vice-Chairperson, speaking as a representative of his country, said that he did not see the need to include the first paragraph since the host country had already accepted its responsibility to provide adequate infrastructure.

Dr KEINHORST (Germany) said that she would prefer to keep the first paragraph in light of the statement given by France at the present meeting.

Dr PALMER (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Vice-Chairperson, speaking as a representative of his country, said that he believed the statement by France presented a reasonable position since it recognized the responsibility to continue its existing commitment, but questioned whether it had a responsibility to expand beyond it. For that reason, he suggested deleting the first paragraph.

Professor BAGGOLEY (Australia), Mr DE RAEDT (Belgium) and Dr KARJALAINEN (Finland) supported the proposal by the representative of the United Kingdom to delete the first paragraph.

Ms MCKEOUGH (WHO Office of the Legal Counsel), responding to a question from Dr KARJALAINEN (Finland), explained that under the proposed procedure the Working Group on Infrastructure, and not the Director, would take a decision after having sought the views of the Governing Council.

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

## **2. PROPOSED PROGRAMME (2014–2017) AND BUDGET (2014–2015): Item 14 of the Agenda** (Document GC/55/7 Rev.1) (continued)

Mr ALLEN (Director of Administration and Finance) presented the revised budget (2014–2015), which had been prepared at the request of representatives following discussion of the item on the previous day. A budget of €40.7 million was proposed, which included a €500 000 input from the Governing Council Special Fund. The contribution from the Governing Council Special Fund had been kept as low as possible since it was not felt appropriate that the Fund should be used for the running costs of the Agency.

The CHAIRPERSON recalled that a proposal had been received to form a working group to examine the scale of assessments going forward.

Dr HUTTEN (Netherlands) thanked IARC for having remodelled the budget and agreed to the new proposal. He believed that a fruitful discussion had been started on how to identify and support the unique work of IARC. It would be easier to explain the budget to ministries at home with such information. He agreed with the earlier remarks of the representative of Germany that the Director's statement on his reappointment was very promising; it provided a good starting point for exploration of IARC's future role.

Ms RIOS (United States of America) said that it would not be possible for her to accept even a small increase in the assessed contributions as a whole since she had authority to approve only a zero nominal growth budget. She wondered whether it would be possible to request the two new Participating States to fund the regular programme and budget. She understood that the United States of America would bear a small increase as a result of the change in the scale of assessments.

Ms GABUNIYA (Russian Federation) shared the view put forward by the representative of the United States of America. She had received no guidance concerning potential changes and therefore she could not approve the budget as presented.

Mr ALLEN (Director of Administration and Finance), seeking clarification, said that if the Russian Federation did not accept the change in the scale of assessments then there would be a €6.3 million cut in IARC's budget. In response to the representative of the United States of America he explained that a zero nominal growth budget would go against resolutions already passed by the Governing Council.

Ms RIOS (United States of America) clarified that she had difficulty with the proposed increase of 0.72% across the budget since the increase should be 0.0%.

The CHAIRPERSON asked whether the budget would be acceptable if the increase was 0.0%.

The SECRETARY said that although the sum might seem small, if the increase was reduced to 0.0%, the resulting loss would have a painful effect on posts at the Agency since it would come in addition to the significant impact of the €500 000 decrease which had been introduced in response to representatives' comments on the previous day.

Dr PALMER (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Vice-Chairperson, said that he had expressed support for the original budget on the grounds that the work of IARC was essential and that it should be delivered within an appropriate budget. He recalled that, at the meeting on the previous day, 12 of the 22 representatives had supported the budget in its original form. Since the representative of the Netherlands had now indicated that he could accept the budget in its present form, it seemed that a majority of Governing Council Members could agree to it. Any further squeeze on the Agency's budget might mean that it would not be able to carry out its work effectively. He requested a show of hands on the present budget before there was any further discussion on a 0.0% increase.

Professor BUZYN (France) said that she could only approve a zero nominal growth budget.

Mr DE RAEDT (Belgium) said that he was willing to support the current budget proposal.

Dr BAUER (Austria) supported the remarks by Belgium and the United Kingdom. The proposed increase of 0.72% was extremely small and any further decrease would mean a cut in the programme of the Agency. Therefore, Austria strongly supported the budget proposal.

Dr STEBER-BÜCHLI (Switzerland) said that she had been able to support the budget as originally presented on the previous day and she could also accept the current proposal.

Dr SUSO (Spain) said that she could not accept a budget increase.

Professor AUTRUP (Denmark) said that he could accept the revised budget.

Dr O'REILLY (Ireland) said that Ireland could have accepted the budget on the previous day and she could accept the current proposal. It would be preferable for IARC to have a small percentage increase.

Dr RIVEDAL (Norway) recalled that Norway had indicated its support of the original budget on the previous day. He strongly supported the position taken by Austria, Switzerland and the United Kingdom and hoped that the altered budget would be accepted by the Governing Council.

Dr KARJALAINEN (Finland) said that Finland had been ready to accept the original budget. He supported the current proposal and he hoped that it would be approved by the Governing Council.

Ms HERNANDEZ (Canada) said that she supported the position adopted by France, Spain and the United States of America.

The CHAIRPERSON, having requested an informal show of hands, said that a majority of more than two-thirds of the Governing Council appeared to be in favour of accepting the budget.

Mr ALLEN (Director of Administration and Finance) said that it seemed that the United States of America had requested zero nominal growth across the budget but he was unclear whether Canada, France, Spain and the Russian Federation could accept any increase at all in their contributions.

The CHAIRPERSON said that the separate issue of the scale of assessments would be addressed subsequently. Speaking in his capacity as representative of Finland, he said that Finland would strongly object if there were no increase at all in the contributions of Participating States.

Professor BUZYN (France) said that, after consultation, she was authorized to accept the budget presented that morning, with a strong demand for stability and the practice of economy in the coming years.

The CHAIRPERSON reminded participants that if there were no overall increase to the assessed contributions there would be a further loss of €250 000 to the Agency.

Ms RIOS (United States of America) asked whether, instead of making cuts in staffing, cuts could be made to other areas of the budget, such as the Director's development provision.

The SECRETARY said that it was not possible to reduce the non-staff budget since it would impact on the Agency's programme and in particular on its ability to initiate collaborative projects. Some 20% had been removed from the non-pay budget during the last two biennia and some research groups were operating with €80 000–100 000 per year to cover all of their operating costs. If IARC did not conduct those collaborative functions it could not fulfil its mission. Almost all of the Director's development provision was directed to projects throughout the biennium.

The amount of money at stake was small, with 250 000€ over two years shared among 22 Participating States, but significant. Nevertheless, it was important to have the full support of the Governing Council on the Agency's budget rather than forcing matters to a vote. Therefore he would prefer to adopt the position proposed by the representative of the United States of America. Recalling the generous bilateral assistance provided by Japan in the previous year, he hoped that individual Participating States might step in to provide dedicated funds in order to make up the shortfall.

The CHAIRPERSON said that it appeared that a consensus position could be achieved with zero nominal growth across the budget. It was also important to recall the comments by the Netherlands concerning the importance of maintaining IARC's vision and global position. It was to be hoped that Participating States and other stakeholders would continue to provide extrabudgetary funding.

Mr ALLEN (Director of Administration and Finance) confirmed that a zero percent growth in the assessed contributions from Participating States would give a budget of €40.4 million, which represented a budget increase of 2.55% over the previous biennium. There would still be an increase in contributions for some Participating States as a result of adopting the new scale of assessments.

The CHAIRPERSON asked whether the Governing Council was prepared to adopt the newly-revised budget.

Dr PALMER (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Vice-Chairperson, said that he would not vote against the budget in order to preserve the principle of consensus but that he wished to ensure that the United Kingdom's extreme disappointment on the budget decision that had been reached by the Governing Council was reflected in the minutes.

The CHAIRPERSON said that the draft resolution on the budget reflecting the decision taken would be presented later that day. The draft resolution on the proposed working group on the WHO scale of assessments was ready for consideration.

Mr ALLEN (Director of Administration and Finance) read out the draft resolution on the establishment of a working group to review the method of assessment of contributions (GC/55/R26):

The Governing Council,

Having noted the issue of potential fluctuations in impact on individual Participating States from changes to the WHO scale of assessments due to the current IARC method of assessment of contributions,

1. DECIDES to set up a Working Group to review the method of assessment of contributions and the principles as set out in Resolution GC/15/R9;
2. REQUESTS the Working Group to review options that minimize potential fluctuations to Participating States' contributions due to changes in the WHO scale of assessments, taking into account Governing Council deliberations on the subject as outlined in Resolution GC/51/R7;
3. DECIDES that the Working Group shall be composed of [insert names here] ; and
4. REQUESTS the Working Group to report back to the Governing Council on its findings and recommendations at the 56<sup>th</sup> session of the Governing Council.

The CHAIRPERSON noted that the representatives of Australia, Austria, Canada, Germany, Norway and the United States of America had indicated their willingness to join the Working Group. Their country names would be duly added to the draft resolution.

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

### **3. STATEMENT BY THE IARC STAFF ASSOCIATION: Item 17 of the Agenda** (Document GC/55/10)

Dr BYRNES (Chair, IARC Staff Association) thanked the Governing Council for the opportunity to speak on behalf of the Staff Association.

The staff considered it a privilege to work for the Agency, but also a great responsibility, which sometimes called for sacrifices. People would not be prepared to make those sacrifices unless there was mutual respect and a clear priority accorded to the common goal, which might be jeopardized by the potential for rivalry between Professional and General Service categories of staff, between scientific and administrative staff and between staff and management.

While the Agency's status as a small, localized institution within WHO and the wider United Nations system was fortunate in one sense, it also presented difficulties. Staff rules that suited the management of a large, decentralized administrative organization were not ideal for a small research institute on a single site. For example, students and postdoctoral Fellows played an essential role in the Agency, although that category of employment was not recognized in the United Nations system. Staff vacancies at the Agency were less

frequent and more specialized, so staff valued the opportunity to evolve within their existing posts. For that reason, they had found it difficult to accept the suspension of the Classification Review Committee and the blocking of the General Service salary scale, particularly since Professional-level salaries had continued to increase. It had also been announced at the 2012 Global Staff Management Council that new staff would not have access to continuing positions. The United Nations Human Resources system sought to create a climate of mutual respect and objectivity as a route to optimal productivity, but there were signs that that respect was becoming strained. The unfortunate fact that the IARC Host Agreement created different tax regimes for locally and internationally recruited staff continued to create tension.

Another negative factor was the physical state of the Agency's buildings. The closure of the Tower in the summer of 2012 for urgent repairs to the heating and ventilation system had caused considerable disruption and left many staff working in poor conditions. Pipes scheduled for replacement in the summer of 2013 had unexpectedly failed in February, and the Latarjet building had been left with no heating for several days.

The regular two-yearly anonymous climate survey had been conducted among the staff earlier that year. Some questions had been changed, at the expense of direct compatibility with earlier surveys, to separate Group- or Section-specific issues from those relating to the Agency as a whole. Many of the responses, which were annexed to the Staff Association's report, were very positive: staff were proud to work at the Agency, they felt they were treated equitably with respect to gender and other factors, and they agreed with the research direction of the Agency. Supervisors had confidence in their staff and encouraged ethical behaviour and the free exchange of ideas. However, there was also a significant level of discontent. Two questions on harassment had been included, rather than the previous one: the results, now expressed in the form of a five-point scale rather than the previous simple yes/no answer, indicated unacceptable circumstances for a relatively small number of staff, accompanied by disturbing individual comments. Some staff had noted that their problems were no longer current, but only because they had changed jobs within the Agency. They had all indicated that they knew of the organizational mechanisms for dealing with harassment, but that did not necessarily imply that the problems had been solved. The survey had also shown a significantly more negative perception of the fairness of recruitment procedures, especially within the scientific groups, despite the elaborate procedure intended to ensure a fair recruitment process.

He called upon Governing Council members to read the survey results with an open mind. The current economic situation and the associated fears and uncertainties had doubtless influenced the results, but there were also indications of other problems. He believed that the management had the necessary will to address the issues. If staff were to do their jobs properly, they needed adequate resources: a suitable building, money for research and salaries, and also stability and respect.

He thanked his fellow members on the Staff Association Committee. Unfortunately, however, owing to a number of injuries, retirements and resignations, there were not enough members to assure the Committee's continued operation, unless further candidates presented themselves at the eleventh hour.

The CHAIRPERSON expressed appreciation, on behalf of all members, for the excellent work of the staff. He was sure that the management would continue to address the issues raised in collaboration with the Staff Association. The Agency was nothing without its staff.

The Governing Council **took note** of the Staff Association statement.

**4. REPORT ON PUBLICATION ACTIVITIES: Item 18 of the Agenda** (Document GC/55/13)

Dr GAUDIN (Head, Communications Group) drew attention to document GC/55/13 on the publications programme. The publications team had merged with library services in order to create a more coherent structure and streamline the flow of information into and out of the Agency. A media team had been set up to complement the activities of the editorial and web teams. The issue of open-access publishing of Agency publications was under discussion at a senior level. It offered benefits for researchers, making their work immediately and freely available on the Internet and maximizing its potential impact. Similarly, WHO was discussing with a number of publishers the possibility of including WHO publications in their institutional repositories. A number of significant documents had been published in 2012, which were listed in the report, and a number of others were in the pipeline, including the *World cancer report*.

Dr GLENN (United States of America) commended the Agency's efforts to conduct and publish high-quality research. Open-access publishing played an important role in the advancement of science, but the Agency should ensure that it created a prudent open-access policy which took into account the interests of all stakeholders. The Agency's agreement with WHO Press should be renegotiated in order to ensure, as far as possible, an adequate return on the best-selling *WHO classification of tumours* series ("Blue Books").

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution on publications activities (GC/55/R13):

The Governing Council,

Having reviewed Document GC/55/13 "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**.

**5. REQUESTS FOR USE OF FUNDS FROM THE GOVERNING COUNCIL SPECIAL FUND: Item 19 of the Agenda (GC/55/Inf.Doc No.2)<sup>1</sup>**

Mr ALLEN (Director of Administration and Finance) drew attention to document GC/55/Inf.Doc No.2, which described the status of the Governing Council Special Fund.

**A. Two-year extension of approved allocation of funds for legal and architectural advice for the “Nouveau Centre” project (Document GC/55/14A)**

Mr ALLEN (Director of Administration and Finance) recalled resolution GC/54/R6, by which the Governing Council had authorized the sum of €115 000 to be used, if necessary, for potential business continuity expenses (€70 000) and for potential legal and specialized architectural services (€45 000) to ensure IARC's best interests if the “Nouveau Centre” project advanced rapidly between Governing Council sessions. The Secretariat had, indeed, used most of the first sum (€65 964) to cover the cost of moving staff to alternative accommodation and purchasing refrigerators and air conditioning units during the renovation work which had taken place in the summer of 2012. The balance of €4036 would be returned to the Governing Council Special Fund. The second sum had not yet been needed: the Governing Council was requested to extend the provision for a further two years.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution on a request for the use of funds from the Governing Council Special Fund: A. two-year extension of approved allocation of funds for legal and architectural advice for the “Nouveau Centre” project (GC/55/R14):

The Governing Council,

Having reviewed Document GC/55/14A “Request for use of funds from the Governing Council Special Fund: A. Two-year extension of approved allocation of funds for legal and architectural advice for the “Nouveau Centre” project”,

Recalling its Resolution GC/54/R6, in which it authorized a one-year financial provision for potential business continuity expenses (€70 000) and for potential legal and specialized architectural design advice (€45 000),

1. APPROVES the Secretariat's proposal to return the balance of €4036 from the €70 000 provision for potential business continuity expenses to the Governing Council Special Fund (Document GC/55/14A); and
2. AUTHORIZES a two-year extension to the provision of €45 000 from the Governing Council Special Fund for potential legal and specialized architectural design advice, in order to ensure proper participation and influence throughout the design stage of the “Nouveau Centre” project; this authority being dependent upon there being sufficient cash balances available in the Governing Council Special Fund.

The draft resolution was **adopted**.

---

<sup>1</sup> Item 19C was cancelled and therefore not discussed.

**B. Revenue from publications** (Document GC/55/14B)

Mr ALLEN (Director of Administration and Finance) recalled that, for some years, the Governing Council had authorized the Secretariat, on an ex-post-facto-basis, to use a proportion of the revenue obtained from publications sales in the previous biennium to support publications activities in the current biennium. That practice had caused some administrative and cash-flow problems, and it was now proposed that the Secretariat should be authorized to use a sum equivalent to 75% of the previous year's revenue, or €525 000, whichever was the lower. The latter figure was intended to act as an upper limit, in case revenue from publications should rise sharply, as it was expected to do as more publications were made available for sale online.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution on a request for the use of funds from the Governing Council Special Fund: B. Revenue from publications (GC/55/R15):

The Governing Council,

Having reviewed Document GC/55/14B "Request for use of funds from the Governing Council Special Fund: B. Revenue from publications",

Noting the need to ensure proper yearly planning of amounts available to the publication programme,

1. APPROVES a standing authorization to the Director to recover, on a yearly basis, the lower of either:

- 75% of the previous year's revenues from sales of publications, or
- €525 000

2. AUTHORIZES that any unused balance at the end of the first year of the biennium be carried forward to the following year; and

3. DECIDES that any unused balance at the end of the biennium will be returned to the Governing Council Special Fund.

The draft resolution was **adopted**.

**D. Scientific equipment** (Document GC/55/14D)

Mr ALLEN (Director of Administration and Finance) drew attention to the rationale for the proposed purchase of new scientific equipment, as explained in document GC/55/14D. The purchases were mainly intended to replace out-of-date equipment. The Scientific Council had approved the purchases, and had advised that the necessary funds should be taken from the Governing Council Special Fund, since much of the equipment was used by several Groups or Sections, and it was therefore difficult to finance it from research grants obtained by a single Group or Section.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution on a request for the use of funds from the Governing Council Special Fund: D. Scientific equipment (GC/55/R16):

The Governing Council,

Having reviewed Document GC/55/14D "Request for use of funds from the Governing Council Special Fund: D. Scientific Equipment",

Noting that the Scientific Council recommended that the suggested purchases be approved by the Governing Council (see Document GC/55/4),

AUTHORIZES the Director to use up to a maximum of €485 295 from the Governing Council Special Fund, subject to there being sufficient cash balances available in the Fund, for the acquisition of the following scientific equipment:

	<b>Approximate price (€)</b>
Pyrosequencing system 96-well PyroMark Q96 MD	120 215
Liquid handling system for pre-PCR procedures	106 450
Liquid handling system for immunoassays	74 000
Liquid handling system for PCR products	109 630
Liquid handling system for ChiP assays	75 000
Total	485 295

The draft resolution was **adopted**.

**E. Support to IPSAS implementation** (Document GC/55/14E)

Mr ALLEN (Director of Administration and Finance) noted that the Agency's adoption of the International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSAS) had required changes in business processes and IT systems, and shown up a need to strengthen the oversight of financial management – points which had been highlighted by the External Auditor. The Secretariat was requesting authorization of the funds required to determine the full cost of the proposed changes.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution on a request for the use of funds from the Governing Council Special Fund: E. Support to IPSAS implementation (GC/55/R17):

The Governing Council,

Having reviewed Document GC/55/14E "Request for use of funds from the Governing Council Special Fund: E. Support to IPSAS implementation",

Noting that the adoption of the International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSAS) has required changes in business processes and IT systems, and a need to strengthen the oversight of financial management of the Agency,

1. ACKNOWLEDGES that the estimated cost of €400 000 is required to support IPSAS implementation through SAP and other system enhancements;
2. APPROVES an initial budget of €200 000 to enable the Agency to initiate the procurement processes through which the actual costs will be confirmed, subject to there being sufficient cash balances available in the Fund; and
3. REQUESTS the Director to provide a project update and confirm the required funding at the next regular session of the Governing Council in May 2014.

Replying to a point raised by Ms HERNANDEZ (Canada), Mr ALLEN (Director of Administration and Finance) said that, after reviewing the experiences of other international agencies which had introduced IPSAS, the Secretariat was confident that a sum of €400 000 maximum would be sufficient to cover those functions for which corporate data management was required. Other functions could be covered by less expensive, peripheral systems.

The draft resolution was **adopted**.

#### **F. Support for high-performance computing capacity**

Mr ALLEN (Director of Administration and Finance) said that, on the recommendation of the Scientific Council, the Secretariat had made a considerable investment in high-performance computing (HPC) capacity in 2012, concentrating mainly on the areas of networking and information backup. An internal working group had now considered the scientific computing needs of the Agency, and had recommended a number of upgrades to the existing capacity, which would form a sound base on which individual Groups and Sections could build to meet needs associated with a particular project.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution on a request for the use of funds from the Governing Council Special Fund: F. Support for high-performance computing capacity (GC/55/R18):

The Governing Council,

Having reviewed Document GC/55/14F "Request for use of funds from the Governing Council Special Fund: F. Support for High Performance Computing capacity",

Noting that informatics and bioinformatics have become key components of modern scientific research techniques,

Further noting that the Scientific Council's supported HPC in the Agency (Document GC/55/4),

APPROVES the use of up to €150 000 from the Governing Council Special Fund for the provision of increased storage and processing speed for the benefit of the Agency's scientific activities, subject to there being sufficient cash balances available in the Fund.

The draft resolution was **adopted**.

**6. BIENNIAL REPORT OF THE IARC ETHICS COMMITTEE (IEC), 2011–2012:  
Item 20 of the Agenda** (Document GC/55/11)

Professor BOISSEL (Chairperson, IARC Ethics Committee) introduced the Committee's report (Document GC/55/11). He thanked all members of the Committee for their active participation in its work. The membership had remained the same, except that Dr Bakary Sylla had been replaced by Dr Ghislaine Scélo, following the former's retirement from the Agency. The Committee had met 10 times in 2011–2012, with some members attending by videoconference. It had considered 73 projects, of which 53 had been approved straight away; seven had been approved conditionally, of which five had since been fully approved and two were still pending; 13 had been rejected initially, of which five had since been resubmitted and approved, six were pending and two had not been resubmitted. Thus the total number of projects approved over the biennium was 63. The Committee had also held two special sessions, the first in December 2011 on the societal impact of its work, in the light of concerns about the dissemination of research findings, and the second in June 2012 on incidental findings, particularly within the context of human genomic studies using the new exome or whole genome sequencing methodologies. The reports of those meetings would be issued soon. The Committee had consulted the IARC Ethics Advisory Group, a small group of international experts which provided specialist expertise to help it resolve complex ethical issues, on the subject of incidental findings.

The SECRETARY thanked the members of the Committee for their dedicated work, which was essential to the proper functioning of the Agency.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following resolution on the biennial report of the IARC Ethics Committee (2011–2012) (GC/55/R19):

The Governing Council,

Having examined the Biennial Report of the IARC Ethics Committee (2011–2012), as contained in Document GC/55/11,

1. WELCOMES the Biennial Report of the IARC Ethics Committee (2011–2012);
2. THANKS the Chairperson, Professor Jean-Pierre Boissel, for his presentation of the report; and
3. REQUESTS the Director to continue reporting biennially on issues related to ethics at the Agency.

The draft resolution was **adopted**.

**7. ACCEPTANCE OF DONATIONS: Item 21 of the Agenda** (Document GC/55/15)

Ms SANTHIPRECHACHIT (Administration and Finance Officer) gave details of the unconditional donations accepted by the Director during 2012, amounting to €11 491, which had been credited to the Special Account for Undesignated Voluntary Contributions. A letter of thanks and a copy of the resolution adopted by the Governing Council at its current session will be sent to each donor.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution on acceptance of donations (GC/55/R20):

The Governing Council,

Having been informed by Document GC/55/15 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**.

**8. ACCEPTANCE OF GRANTS AND CONTRACTS AND RETURN OF INTEREST INCOME TO GRANTS: Item 22 of the Agenda** (Document GC/55/16)

Ms SANTHIPRECHACHIT (Administration and Finance Officer) drew attention to eight grants and contracts which had been accepted by the Director since the previous session of the Governing Council, and two further projects being submitted for prior approval, to a total value of €13.85 million.

Under Article 5.6 of the IARC Financial Regulations, interest earned on designated voluntary contributions was credited to miscellaneous income. However, some donors required the Agency to credit the interest income to the account from which the project was managed, normally as a condition of the contribution agreement. In the past, the Governing Council had exceptionally agreed to a waiver of Article 5.6 in those circumstances. However, in some cases, the donor had expected the Agency to comply with its requirements before the necessary waiver had been obtained from the Governing Council, which exposed the Agency to some legal and reputational risk. The Secretariat therefore proposed that the Governing Council should approve, for a number of projects listed in Document GC/55/16 and for all similar projects in future, the exceptional crediting of interest to the account associated with the project, provided that such a course of action was required by the signed contribution agreement for the project. The Secretariat would report to the Governing Council at every regular session on the amount of interest thus credited. For the current year, the sum in question was €17 500.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution on acceptance of grants and contracts (GC/55/R22):

The Governing Council,

Having considered Document GC/55/16 "Acceptance of grants and contracts and return of interest income to grants",

In accordance with IARC Financial Regulations,

1. AUTHORIZES the Director to seek funding for the following:

(a) Translation of Genetic, Epidemiological and Tumour cell findings in Hodgkin lymphoma and EBV stratified Risk groups (TOGETHER) [European Commission, Research Executive Agency (EC REA) in an amount of €3 436 690 for 72 months]; and

(b) Infections in Cancers among the Immunosuppressed [European Commission, Research Executive Agency (EC REA) in an amount of €6 078 924 for 72 months];

2. APPROVES an exception to Article 5.6 of IARC's Financial Regulations to allow IARC to comply with the donors' regulations in case any interest is earned for the following projects:

(a) From the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation for: Monitoring HPV vaccination and HPV screening programmes to promote sustained implementation in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs); US\$ 2 199 688 (Document GC/55/16);

(b) From the European Commission for: The Evolution of Cancer in Ageing Societies: An International Perspective; €201 932 (Document GC/55/16);

3. NOTES the post facto reporting of grants and contracts accepted by the Director as detailed in Document GC/55/16; and

4. COMMENDS the staff on its success in winning competitive research grants.

The draft resolution was **adopted**.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution on return of interest income to grants – standing authorization (GC/55/R23):

The Governing Council,

Having reviewed Document GC/55/16 "Acceptance of grants and contracts and return of interest income to grants",

Noting that Article 5.6 of IARC Financial Regulations requires that interest earned on grants or special contributions that are earmarked by the donor for financing a special project (i.e. "designated voluntary contributions") is credited to miscellaneous income,

1. AUTHORIZES the Director to exceptionally credit interest earned on designated voluntary contributions to their respective accounts, when the crediting of interest in this manner is a clearly stated requirement of the signed contribution agreements; and
2. REQUESTS the Director to report on interest income credited in accordance with paragraph one of this resolution at each regular session of the Governing Council.

The draft resolution was **adopted**.

**The meeting rose at 12:40**