

International Agency for Research on Cancer



**Governing Council
Fifty-sixth Session**

**GC/56/Min.2
Original: ENGLISH**

*Lyon, 15–16 May 2014
Auditorium*

MINUTES OF THE SECOND MEETING

IARC, Lyon

Thursday, 15 May 2014, at 14:30

Chairperson: Dr Mark Palmer (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)

Secretary: Dr Christopher P. Wild, Director, IARC

CONTENTS

	Page
1. Statement by the IARC Staff Association	4
2. Annual Financial Report, Report of the External Auditor and Financial Statements for the year ended 31 December 2013	6
3. Amendment to IARC Financial Regulations	8
4. Report from the Governing Council Working Group on the Review of the method of assessment of contributions	10
5. Acceptance of grants and contracts, including report on interest apportionment	12
6. Acceptance of donations	13
7. Update on the “Nouveau Centre” project	14
8. Biennial Report of the Occupational Health and Safety Committee (OHSC), 2012–2013	18
9. Plans for IARC 50 th Anniversary in 2015	19

Participating States Representatives

Dr Mark PALMER, Chairperson Dr Nathan RICHARDSON	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Professor Agnès BUZYN, Vice-Chairperson Mr Armel T'KINT DE ROODENBEKE	France
Professor Christopher BAGGOLEY	Australia
Dr Hemma BAUER	Austria
Mr Lieven DE RAEDT	Belgium
Dr Luiz Antonio SANTINI (<i>unable to attend</i>) Dr Marisa Dreyer BREITENBACH	Brazil
Dr Stephen M. ROBBINS Ms Lucero HERNANDEZ	Canada
Professor Herman AUTRUP	Denmark
Professor Juhani ESKOLA Professor Harri VAINIO	Finland
Dr Chariklia BALAS	Germany
Professor G.K. RATH (<i>unable to attend</i>)	India
Mr Keith COMISKEY	Ireland
<i>No Representative</i>	Italy
Dr Yousuke TAKASAKI Mr Kenji OKADA	Japan
Dr Jack HUTTEN Mr Jeroen HULLEMAN	Netherlands
Dr Edgar RIVEDAL Dr Karianne SOLAAS	Norway
Dr FALEH Mohammed Hussain Ali	Qatar
Dr Duk-Hyoung LEE	Republic of Korea
Dr Svetlana AXELROD Ms Lidia GABUNIYA Professor Boris ALEXEEV	Russian Federation
Dr Rafael DE ANDRÉS MEDINA	Spain

Professor Mats ULFENDAHL	Sweden
Dr Diane STEBER-BÜCHLI (Rapporteur)	Switzerland
Professor Murat TUNCER (<i>unable to attend</i>)	Turkey
Dr Lisa STEVENS	United States of America
Dr Charlie DARR	
Dr Pamela PROTZEL-BERMAN	

World Health Organization

Dr Oleg CHESTNOV, Assistant Director-General
Ms Joanne MCKEOUGH, Office of the Legal Counsel
Dr Andreas ULLRICH, Medical Officer, Prevention of Noncommunicable Diseases (PND)

Observers

Ms Sandhya SINGH South Africa

Professor Mads MELBYE, Outgoing Chairperson, Scientific Council (*unable to attend*)
Professor Cornelia ULRICH, Incoming Chairperson, Scientific Council

Union for International Cancer Control (UICC)

Mr Juerg BOLLER, Chief Operating Officer

External Audit

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

Secretariat

Dr C.P. WILD, *Secretary*

Mr D. ALLEN

Dr S. FRANCESCHI

Dr R. SANKARANARAYANAN

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

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. STATEMENT BY THE IARC STAFF ASSOCIATION: Item 9 of the Agenda (Document GC/56/6)

Mr Geoffroy DURAND (President of the Staff Association Committee (SAC)) thanked the Governing Council for the opportunity to make a presentation on behalf of IARC staff. The Staff Association Committee had reformed in December 2013 after having been suspended in June 2013 as only three members remained on the SAC. The call for candidates in September 2013 had not been successful. Consequently, no one had represented the Committee at the Global Staff/Management Council in October 2013, and IARC staff had lost that channel of dialogue with the Administration. In June 2014, there would be a new call for candidates to replace the three outgoing Committee members and it was hoped that there would be enough candidates to ensure sustainability. Following the suspension, members had tried to communicate more effectively so that the entire staff could better understand the Committee's work.

On 20 March 2014, the Committee, the Director of Administration and Finance and the Human Resources Officer had held their first working meeting. Two meetings with the Director would also be held each year. At the meeting in March, a number of topics were broached. Many topics had already been brought to the attention of the Administration: The Classification Review Committee had been suspended in January 2013 and replaced with a system that necessitated the restructuring of an entire Group before a position could be considered for reclassification. Staff had been concerned about the change and the Committee would ensure that the system would be reviewed in 2015 as the Director had announced. The Committee would also ensure that training and career development plans announced by the Administration were implemented.

The Committee had requested that the Administration invite a representative of the WHO Staff Health Insurance to IARC to explain the recent changes implemented from 1 January 2014 regarding the reimbursement of disaster expenses to all insured people.

Some staff members would like the Administration to study and implement a teleworking system in special circumstances such as public transport strikes, extreme weather events or high pollution peaks. The initiative was not currently envisaged by the Administration.

Many decisions would be made during 2014 on the "Nouveau Centre" project: the selection of its location, the launch of the architectural competition and the drafting of the "Nouveau Centre" specifications. The Committee wished to make sure that Agency staff were adequately consulted during the development of the "Nouveau Centre" and to create a working group composed of staff members and SAC representatives in collaboration with the IARC Occupational Health and Safety Committee.

The Staff Association's presentations to previous Governing Councils had mentioned that many people working at IARC were referred to as "non-staff" and that the term had a negative connotation for fellowship students, doctoral students, postdoctoral scientists and trainees. The term no longer existed, and all colleagues working, collaborating or studying at IARC were now called "IARC personnel".

In 2013, a 360° evaluation exercise had been implemented, allowing some staff members to assess their first-level supervisors. The new system had received a cautious welcome from some staff members since they did not know exactly how the information would be used and whether

anonymity would be preserved. Reflecting on those comments, the Administration had requested the company responsible for implementing the 360° exercise to summarize the responses and retrieve the inputs in one language only before reporting the results to IARC.

The electronic Staff Performance Management and Development System (e-PMDS) had been available online at IARC since January 2014. All IARC staff had been trained on how to use the new tool. A number of staff had commented on the limited feedback provided by their direct supervisors and amendments had therefore been made. The process required staff members to select competencies in order to improve their expertise in certain areas. The SAC would remain vigilant concerning the quality and the manner in which training was provided.

In his response to the outcome of the Work Climate Survey 2012–2013 in June 2013, the Director had written that the Administration would organize mandatory training on harassment awareness. The Staff Physician had held two presentations on work-related stress, and the number of attendees showed that the topic was of primary concern for the staff. Since WHO did not offer harassment awareness training, the Administration had established its own training programme in May 2014.

The Committee's work was important within IARC but also outside the Agency, thanks to its involvement in the Global Staff/Management Council and its partnership with the Federation of International Civil Servants' Associations. He hoped that the next elected Committee would be composed of many more members. He wished the Committee every success.

The SECRETARY commended the Staff Association Committee (SAC) members for their commitment to the success of the Agency and for the time they devoted on behalf of their colleagues. He encouraged new members to step forward, since the SAC was essential to the running of IARC. Several important matters had been brought to the attention of the Administration by the SAC, some of which had been addressed and some of which were ongoing. The Work Climate Survey had influenced the priority accorded to a number of issues, including leadership training and the 360° review. On the classification review, he acknowledged that the topic would be addressed within the agreed time frame. Personnel of the Agency would certainly be consulted on the "Nouveau Centre" during the planning phase. It was disappointing that the harassment training had not been provided within a shorter time scale but it had now been held for all personnel. The topic of harassment would be monitored on an ongoing basis. He did not have an adversarial view of relations between the SAC and the Administration: that was an old model that was not appropriate for a small organization with very simple lines of communication. In his experience, the SAC had been vocal and, on a number of occasions, forceful, while at the same time remaining constructive.

Professor ESKOLA (Finland) expressed appreciation for the SAC report and the comments by the Secretary. According to the European Agency for Safety and Health at Work (OSHA), some 51% of employees suffered from work-related stress. In IARC, where staff came from all over the world and stayed for a limited period of time, without their families and working under pressure, it was important that management did whatever it could in order to support the Staff Association. Supported staff would lead to enhanced productivity. He was confident that the Director and

management could work with the Staff Association in order to improve the position of the SAC as a respected partner.

The CHAIRPERSON welcomed the many opportunities for constructive dialogue and hoped that more personnel would join the Committee.

The Governing Council **noted** the report.

2. ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT, REPORT OF THE EXTERNAL AUDITOR AND FINANCIAL STATEMENTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31 DECEMBER 2013: Item 10 of the Agenda (Document GC/56/7)

Ms SANTHIPRECHACHIT (Administration and Finance Officer), illustrating her remarks with slides and introducing Document GC/56/7, said that she would provide the background to the preparation of the financial statements; present the opinion and recommendations on behalf of the External Auditor; and, as requested by the Governing Council, provide an update on implementation of previous recommendations. She would also highlight the key financial information of the Agency.

As she had explained at the previous session of the Governing Council, IARC had moved from a cash basis of accounting to a full accrual basis of accounting in 2012 and therefore the financial statements had been prepared in compliance with IPSAS for the second time in 2013. While IPSAS required that financial statements were prepared on an annual basis, the Agency had a biennial budget and Statement V gave additional information on biennium budget utilization for comparison with the approved budget. The complete set of financial statements prepared by the Agency comprised Statements I to V, comprehensive notes to financial statements, and Schedules 1–4 provided supplementary financial information. The order of the financial statements had been revised in the current reporting period for Statements I and II. Prior to 2013, the Statement of Financial Performance was Statement I while the Statement of Financial Position was Statement II.

Two accounting policies had been changed in 2013 leading to the need for prior period adjustments for recognition of the publication inventory and change in accounting policy on arrears of assessed contributions from Participating States. The IARC publication inventory had been removed from WHO and was shown in IARC's accounts. Details of adjustments to the restated financial statement could be found in Schedule 4 and Note 4: "Prior period adjustments".

In the External Auditor's opinion, IARC's financial statements presented fairly, in all material respects, the financial position as at 31 December 2013, and its financial performance, changes in net assets/equity, cash flow, and the comparison of budget and actual amounts and that they were in full compliance with IPSAS.

In addition to the audit of the financial statements, the auditors had reviewed key operational processes of the Agency and they had made recommendations in respect of inventory management; procurement management; and SAP project management.

Two of the six recommendations from the audit of the previous year concerning documenting of benefits of IPSAS implementation and addressing the funding gap of ASHI liability had been implemented and the remaining four were in progress.

In the budget of the previous year, the Governing Council had agreed to support the enhancement of the SAP and asset management systems to meet the challenges of the new reporting requirements under IPSAS.

Efforts to formalize the Enterprise Risk Management Framework had been initiated and further progress was expected during the course of 2014.

Turning to the financial highlights, the total regular budget for 2012–2013 had been approved for €39.4M; €19.5M for 2012 and €19.9M for 2013. €1M had been financed from the Governing Council Special Fund and €38.4M from assessments from Participating States.

Schedule 3 of the note to the financial statements showed the status of collection of assessed contributions as at 31 December 2013, with 95.8% of 2013 assessed contributions having been collected. Additional contributions had been received that year bringing the collection of 2013 contributions to 100%. Of the assessed contributions from Participating States due in 2014, 50.92% had been received to date and 10 Participating States had paid in full.

The activities planned for the previous biennium had progressed very well and 99.8% of the approved budget had been utilized. The small balance of €92 578 had been credited to the Governing Council Special Fund. Savings made had been largely due to the freeze of the General Service salary scale and a no gain/no loss revised scale for Professional staff. The change of functional currency to the euro had significantly reduced foreign currency exchange exposure for the Agency. Only €77 000 from the €1 million approved by the Governing Council (for the biennium) had been used in 2012 to cover the unforeseen budget costs due to currency realignments. The cost of €69 000 in 2013 had been absorbed within the approved regular budget.

The first €34 650 from the first contribution of the new Participating States, Brazil and Qatar, had been credited to the Working Capital Fund in accordance with Resolution GC/5/R14. Following the provision approved by the Governing Council in 2011 in Resolution GC/53/R15 for the temporary transfer of €1.6 million from the Governing Council Special Fund to the Working Capital Fund to fund arrears of assessed contributions, the full €1.6 million had been returned upon receipt of two instalments from Spain. The Working Capital Fund had also been used to temporarily finance the regular budget, pending receipt of assessed contributions from Participating States, in accordance with IARC Financial Regulations, Article V, paragraph 5.3. The Working Capital Fund balance at year-end was €3.292 million.

The Governing Council Special Fund remained stable, with a closing balance of €9.187 million. This fund balance includes €5.624 million of approved allocations that have not been spent. The GCSF projection covering the period 2014–2017 is provided in GC/56/Inf.Doc. No.2.

The Voluntary Contributions Account included designated and undesignated contributions and its balance stood at €11 million at the end of the year. Based on grants and agreements already signed, the Agency expected to receive €8 million in deferred revenue in future years: details of this account by donor were provided in Document GC/56/Inf.Doc. No.3.

Under the Special Account for Programme Support Costs, revenue was collected from designated voluntary contributions at the standard rate of 13%. During 2013, the Agency had made it a priority to collect and clear overdue account receivables and some €0.643 million had been recovered. The Fund had a balance of €3.158 million at the year end. Funds from the account would be invested in IARC support functions during the current biennium.

Participating States – Others comprise of Common Fund Account and Special Purpose Fund Account. These two accounts previously were shown on separate lines in the Financial Statements and combined this year following the recommendation from the Auditor. Common Fund Account is the total of inventory value and net book value of Property, Plant and Equipment (PP&E). The Special Purpose Fund account represented the unfunded portion of employee benefit liabilities.

Ms HERNANDEZ (Canada) said that the unqualified opinion issued by the External Auditor with regard to the 2013 financial accounts was an important recognition of the transparency and accountability of the Agency's financial management. Canada was pleased that the auditor had noted that the Agency was in compliance with IPSAS. The status of collection of assessed contributions had been 95% in 2013 and it was to be hoped that a similar level would be achieved in 2014. Canada followed with interest IARC's management of the After Staff Health Insurance (ASHI) service.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution, entitled "Financial Report, Report of the External Auditor and Financial Statements for the year ended 31 December 2013" (GC/56/R4):

The Governing Council,
Having examined Document GC/56/7 ("Financial Report, Report of the External Auditor, and Financial Statements for the year ended 31 December 2013"),

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

The resolution was **adopted**.

3. AMENDMENT TO IARC FINANCIAL REGULATIONS: Item 11 of the Agenda (Document GC/56/8)

Ms SANTHIPRECHACHIT (Administration and Finance Officer), introducing the item, recalled that in Resolution GC/54/R18, the Governing Council had decided to change the way in which new Participating States paid their assessed contributions. As a result, it would be necessary to amend the IARC Financial Regulations as set out in Document GC/56/8.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution, entitled "Amendment to IARC Financial Regulations" (GC/56/R5):

<p>The Governing Council, Having considered Document GC/56/8 "Amendment to IARC Financial Regulations", DECIDES to amend Article IV – Provision of Funds (paragraph 4.3) of the Financial Regulations of the Agency, to read as follows:</p>	
Present text	Amended text
<p>Article IV – Provision of Funds</p> <p>4.3 New Participating States admitted under the provisions of Article III of the Statute shall be required to pay 25% of a full contribution in the first year of membership from which the amount due to the Working Capital Fund shall be appropriated, 50% of a full contribution in the second year of membership, 75% of a full contribution in the third year of membership and 100% of a full contribution in the fourth and following years of membership.</p>	<p>Article IV – Provision of Funds</p> <p>4.3 New Participating States admitted under the provisions of Article III of the Statute shall be required to pay one third of a full contribution in the first year of membership from which the amount due to the Working Capital Fund shall be appropriated, two thirds of a full contribution in the second year of membership and 100% of a full contribution in the third and following years of membership.</p>

Ms MCKEOUGH, Office of the Legal Counsel, speaking at the request of the CHAIRPERSON in response to a question raised by the representative of Spain, said that an abstention could be used in the event of a vote, but it could not be used where a resolution had been put forward for adoption. In the present case, Members of the Governing Council could express a view, which would be recorded in the report of the meeting.

Dr DE ANDRÉS MEDINA (Spain) said that the proposed new method did not sufficiently take into account the relative wealth of Participating States. He did not wish to prevent adoption of the resolution but he requested that consideration be given to adjusting the formula in the future.

The CHAIRPERSON explained that the wealth of new Participating States had been discussed two years previously; however, the concerns of the representative of Spain would be duly noted.

The resolution was **adopted**.

4. REPORT FROM THE GOVERNING COUNCIL WORKING GROUP ON THE REVIEW OF THE METHOD OF ASSESSMENT OF CONTRIBUTIONS: Item 12 of the Agenda (Document GC/56/9)

Mr ALLEN, (Director, Administration and Finance), speaking on behalf of the Working Group on the Review of the method of assessment of contributions, said that the Working Group had been set up as a result of the large fluctuations experienced in Participating States' contributions due to a change in the WHO scale of assessments. The Working Group had been tasked to examine ways to potentially limit the fluctuations year-on-year. A report, setting out the seven different options that had been initially considered, was contained in Annex 1 to Document GC/56/9. Three of those options had been retained for further consideration and a further two options had been included. A differentiated membership model had been examined, similar to that used by ITU, which included not only States but also other types of organizations including from both the public and private sectors. Guided by the principle as outlined in Document GC/54/15 that Participating States should be able to participate in the scientific and technical work of IARC, it was concluded that the differentiated model would not be suitable for IARC.

The Working Group had considered what factors could reduce the impact of the fluctuations and how to retain the principle of attractiveness. The Working Group had decided that none of the solutions put forward provided a clear advantage over the present model, which had been in use since 1976. Therefore, the Working Group recommended that the Agency should continue with the current method of assessments. He invited other members of the Working Group to provide additional information.

Professor BAGGOLEY (Australia), speaking as a member of the Working Group, expressed appreciation for the modelling of the options, which had been provided by the Secretariat in the report. He confirmed that the Working Group had concluded that the current process was the best of all the options that it had considered.

Mr ALLEN, (Director, Administration and Finance), responding to a suggestion by Mr DE RAEDT (Belgium) to keep the 70:30 split and to maintain the WHO/United Nations scale of assessments for the 30% share, said that it was his understanding that the share had been put in place in order not to overburden Participating States and to maintain the principle of sharing the budget as equally as possible. The Agency had just 24 Participating States while in the case of WHO, the scale was shared between 193 Member States.

Dr DE ANDRÉS MEDINA (Spain) asked whether a more radical approach could be considered that would take into account the scales practised in international organizations other than WHO. The present approach could deter additional countries from joining IARC and it did not tackle the systemic problem of the need for a fair contribution from all Participating States.

Dr BAUER (Austria), speaking as a member of the Working Group, said that a long discussion had been held on the various models and that it had been agreed that retaining the current model would be the most practical approach. Responding to the comments by the representative of Spain, she said that 70% of the budget was shared equally among all Participating States and that it was justified that each State should have equal voting rights.

Dr STEVENS (United States of America) recalled that her delegation had been instrumental in requesting the formation of the Working Group. She agreed that an accurate summary of the discussions had been given and supported the consensus to stay with the current mode of assessment.

Dr RICHARDSON (United Kingdom) commended the preparatory work completed by the Secretariat. Since no system was perfect, he favoured the adoption of a pragmatic approach and, on examination of the present data, he believed the current model to be the fairest.

Dr STEBER BÜCHLI (Switzerland) echoed the views of previous speakers: an interesting lesson had been learned in reviewing the models and the option chosen had been deemed to be the best and fairest.

Ms HERNANDEZ (Canada), speaking as a member of the Working Group, said that one of the problems experienced had been that no one option could meet the concerns of all of the members of the Working Group. The present model did not provide a perfect solution but it did provide an element of predictability.

Professor ESKOLA (Finland) supported the proposal to retain the present model.

The CHAIRPERSON said that a valuable exercise had been undertaken in evaluating the data; he thanked members of the Governing Council for their support of the proposal to retain the present model.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution, entitled "Report from the Governing Council Working Group on the Review of the method of assessment of contributions" (GC/56/R6):

The Governing Council,

Recalling its Resolution GC/55/R26, in which it established a Working Group to review the method of assessment of contributions and requested this Working Group to report back on its findings at the 56th session,

1. AGREES with the conclusion of the Working Group that there is merit in keeping the current method of assessment of contributions that has been implemented for almost 40 years without major issues; and
2. DECIDES that the current method of assessment of contributions as set out in Resolution GC/15/R9 be maintained.

Dr DE ANDRÉS MEDINA (Spain) said that he did not think that the right solution had been chosen although he acknowledged the work of the Working Group; he understood that the option chosen had been the result of a compromise between Participating States. He would not object to the resolution provided that his statement was recorded.

The CHAIRPERSON said that the reservations by the Representative of Spain would be noted and that Spain might wish to put forward another model in the future.

The resolution was **adopted**.

5. ACCEPTANCE OF GRANTS AND CONTRACTS, INCLUDING REPORT ON INTEREST APPORTIONMENT: Item 15 of the Agenda (Document GC/56/12)

Ms SANTHIPRECHACHIT (Administration and Finance Officer), introducing the item, said that a report was provided annually to the Governing Council on the acceptance of grants and contracts. Certain grants were reported under section 1 of Document GC/56/12 on post facto reporting with a total value of €5.3 million. Three grants had been reported under prior approval in section 2, with a total of €4.8 million. The grant application for the final item recorded under prior approval had not been accepted and it could therefore be excluded from consideration. The Secretariat stood ready to answer any questions. At the previous session of the Governing Council, members had given a standing authorization for interest income apportionment. The Agency had apportioned interest income to 10 grants for 2012 and 2013 totalling €38 280. Details of the interest apportioned to each grant were provided in the annex to the present document and in Document GC/56/Inf.Doc. No.3.

Professor BAGGOLEY (Australia) said that he would be grateful to receive information subsequently on the project in paragraph 1.13 on the multicentric study of cervical cancer screening and triage with human papillomavirus testing.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution, entitled "Acceptance of Grants and Contracts" (GC/56/R9):

The Governing Council,

Having considered Document GC/56/12 "Acceptance of grants and contracts, including report on interest apportionment",

In accordance with IARC Financial Regulations,

1. AUTHORIZES the Director to seek funding for the following:
 - (a) Enhancing the collection of Cancer Data in Low- and Middle-Income Countries [Bloomberg Philanthropies, USA in an amount of €2 801 455 (US\$ 3 832 360) for 48 months];
 - (b) Updates to the European Guidelines for Quality Assurance in Breast Cancer Screening and Diagnosis [European Commission (EC DG SANCO) in an amount of €1 407 294 (US\$ 1 925 163) for 18 months];
2. NOTES the post facto reporting of grants and contracts accepted by the Director as detailed in Document GC/56/12;
3. NOTES the amounts of interest income apportioned; and
4. COMMENDS the staff on its success in winning competitive research grants.

The resolution was **adopted**.

6. ACCEPTANCE OF DONATIONS: Item 16 of the Agenda (Document GC/56/13)

Ms SANTHIPRECHACHIT (Administration and Finance Officer) said that a total of €14 350 in donations had been accepted in 2013 and credited to the Special Account for Undesignated Contributions. A letter of thanks had been sent to each donor.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution, entitled "Acceptance of Donations" (GC/56/R10):

The Governing Council,

Having been informed by Document GC/56/13 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 resolution was **adopted**.

7. UPDATE ON THE “NOUVEAU CENTRE” PROJECT: Item 13 of the Agenda (Document GC/56/10)

Mr ALLEN (Director, Administration and Finance), illustrating his remarks with slides, provided a brief history of the premises, which had been built following the signing of a host country agreement between France and WHO in 1967. A study presented to the Governing Council by the Secretariat in 2011 had shown that a number of issues had been raised with regard to the buildings. The Governing Council had recommended that the Secretariat should liaise closely with the City of Lyon to examine possible solutions. The City of Lyon had commissioned a technical study, which had concluded that urgent major repairs costing €2.4 million were required immediately. A second study had examined three options for housing IARC in the future: refurbishing the present building; demolishing the buildings and rebuilding on the same site; or building on a new site. The City of Lyon had budgeted the €2.4 million for the urgent repairs. Governing Council resolutions in 2012 and 2013 had recognized with alarm the state of the building, had recognized with gratitude the support by the City of Lyon and had agreed to explore the recommended option of a “Nouveau Centre” on a new site. The Governing Council had underlined that no mandatory contributions should be required from Participating States for the project (Resolution GC/54/R5). An update had been provided to the Governing Council in 2013; the Council had endorsed the project plan which had been put together by the local authorities, with input from IARC, as presented in the Director’s report. It had been agreed that the present buildings would be surrendered once the “Nouveau Centre” was available (Resolution GC/55/R12). It had been further agreed that WHO colleagues in Lyon could also be housed in the new premises provided that did not compromise the requirements of IARC. A mechanism for final approval for the project had been put in place in the event that financing became available between Governing Council meetings.

The host country had not been in a position to give a final decision on the full financing of the project in 2013 since it wished to conduct a review of the design parameters and the costs that had been put together by the local authorities. The independent review had resulted in adjusted calculations that did not impact on the laboratory or meeting space requirements or numbers of staff foreseen by IARC.

Work on the “Nouveau Centre” had progressed over the previous 12 months; the local authorities had launched the bid for writing the specifications and a contract was ready for signature with Grand Lyon. A project timeline had been outlined from the detailed specifications study to the opening of the “Nouveau Centre” in December 2018. The project would be managed by Grand Lyon which would have authority over decision making, however, as the beneficiaries, IARC would play a part within the project management team. The Agency would have input at critical stages including confirmation of the detailed specifications and selection of an architect.

Emergency repairs to the present premises were due to be completed by the end of July 2014. Most of the risks had been eliminated but the improvements would not hold indefinitely. Many old pipes remained and one or two leaks occurred each week. The building was becoming less adapted to the needs of IARC as it moved into different areas of science; a number of issues had been identified in connection with the electrical systems and wiring. There was a semi-permanent leak between the kitchens and the Director’s office. The building had very high energy consumption. The ventilation and air compressor systems continued to pose serious risks in terms

of interruptions to work, including evacuation of the building. All of the risks enumerated placed a strain on the Agency's financial resources and were the source of problems on a daily basis.

Mr T'KINT DE ROODENBEKE (France) said that the French Ministries of Health, Research and Foreign Affairs had continued to discuss the project and to coordinate through the office of the new Prime Minister in order to define and agree on their responsibilities. The Ministries would continue to work in the weeks and months ahead towards a sustainable solution.

The CHAIRPERSON welcomed the continuing support of the Government of France and noted that discussions on the precise financing were still ongoing.

Dr TAKASAKI (Japan) applauded the progress achieved on the "Nouveau Centre" project. He requested that the names of the Princess Takamatsu and Sasakawa Halls would be retained in the new building.

The SECRETARY gave assurance that, as it approached its 50th anniversary celebrations, the Agency was conscious of the naming of the Princess Takamatsu and Sasakawa Halls and it would take the theme of continuity into account as it moved forward with the "Nouveau Centre".

Dr DE ANDRÉS MEDINA (Spain) welcomed the progress made by the French Government in taking forward the project. He requested that the important matters to be delegated to the Working Group on Infrastructure should be more clearly defined.

The CHAIRPERSON explained that the responsibilities of the Working Group on Infrastructure were to provide ongoing advice on the project but they could be included in terms of reference.

Dr DE ANDRÉS MEDINA (Spain) asked whether the terms of reference could be attached to the resolution mentioned in Document GC/56/10.

Mr ALLEN (Director, Administration and Finance) explained that Document GC/56/10 quoted from Resolution GC/55/R12, which had been agreed in the previous year.

Dr RICHARDSON (United Kingdom) said that it was clearly important that IARC should be closely involved in the specification and design activities, but its role in the project management and build activities was not clear. As the build progressed, there might be snags and design issues with their associated financial costs; the Director and the Agency should be closely involved in the ongoing plans for the building.

Mr ALLEN (Director, Administration and Finance) confirmed that IARC would be fully engaged in the project management team and had been involved in reviewing the bids for the technical specifications although it should be borne in mind that the procurement process and the build would be governed by French laws. The Governing Council was currently considering the role it would play, with the assistance of the Scientific Council, in relation to the higher-level decisions.

Mr COMISKEY (Ireland) understood the problems experienced by IARC in its current accommodation. He wondered whether the operating costs of the new building would be lower or higher than at present and whether there would be any capital requirements for equipment or other costs for the new building.

Mr ALLEN (Director, Administration and Finance) said that there would be capital costs for the new building, including the move and technical equipment. It had been planned to modernize the biobank and to create additional laboratories. The space that would be allocated by the architect would also influence what type of equipment the Agency would procure. The French authorities would be responsible for moving the Agency to the new premises. Concerning operating costs, a study was currently being conducted at the request of the French authorities to determine how long the Agency could remain in its current building and it would include an evaluation of the operating costs in the new building.

Dr STEVENS (United States of America) said that the concept of relocating to a new site appeared to be the most effective option in terms of costs, time and logistics. She commended the negotiations with Grand Lyon and the City of Lyon in order to ensure that IARC could remain in Lyon. It was pleasing that a solution had been found that would not cause Participating States to make additional mandatory contributions. She supported the recommendation to invite two members of the Scientific Council to join the Governing Council Working Group on Infrastructure in discussing the design of the space. She cautioned that decision making should proceed cautiously and judiciously since the French Government had still not given its formal commitment.

Ms HERNANDEZ (Canada) supported the remarks by the Representative of the United States. Regarding the work of the Working Group on Infrastructure, she noted that Resolution GC/55/R12 mentioned the provision of a written communication concerning a decision on the infrastructure from the Governing Council and she requested that the Governing Council should be given the information sufficiently in advance to allow for full internal consultations before that communication was required. She asked the WHO Office of the Legal Counsel to advise whether more than 50% would constitute a majority view in the Council.

Ms McKEOUGH (WHO Office of the Legal Counsel) confirmed that a Governing Council majority would comprise 50% plus one member. Since the Governing Council was at present comprised of 24 members, the opinions of 13 members would represent a majority view. Responding to a

further question from Ms HERNANDEZ (Canada), she confirmed that the number was absolute and would correspond to the number of IARC Governing Council members and not to the number of members that had replied.

Mr ALLEN (Director, Administration and Finance) said that each stage of the project required a decision. The Governing Council had been asked to agree to the overall project in 2013 on the basis of the vision paper and scope of the project, given that the resources were to be put forward by the host country. The Governing Council had decided to wait until the French authorities had confirmed in writing their overall financing of the project before giving their agreement.

The RAPPORTEUR read out a draft resolution entitled "Update on the "Nouveau Centre" project" (GC/56/R7), which read as follows:

The Governing Council,

Having considered Document GC/56/10 "Update on the "Nouveau Centre" project", and recalling its Resolution GC/55/R12,

1. AFFIRMS the need for a timely decision on the concrete financial commitments of the French Government and the local partners;
2. RECOGNIZES the efforts made by the host country towards ensuring the continued presence of the Agency in France and particularly the efforts of the counterparts in Lyon;
3. APPROVES the adjusted project scope as outlined in the document;
4. NOTES the estimated project timelines with appreciation;
5. INVITES two Scientific Council members [to be selected by the Director in consultation with the Scientific Council Chair and Vice-Chair] to attend meetings of the Governing Council Working Group on Infrastructure when the Working Group is discussing the detailed specifications and architectural designs for the "Nouveau Centre" project, for the purpose of providing technical advice to the Working Group on this topic; and
6. REQUESTS the Director to consult the Working Group on Infrastructure on a regular and timely basis to move the "Nouveau Centre" project forward.

The CHAIRPERSON, responding to a request by Dr DE ANDRÉS MEDINA (Spain), explained that the Working Group was not a decision-making body: it was a review body that provided advice.

The resolution **was adopted**.

8. BIENNIAL REPORT OF THE OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY COMMITTEE (OHSC), 2012–2013: Item 14 of the Agenda (Document GC/56/11)

Dr LE CALVEZ KELM (Chairperson, Occupational Health and Safety Committee) said that the Occupational Health and Safety Committee (OHSC) had 16 members who represented each laboratory; the epidemiology groups; the administration; the staff physician and the laboratory safety officer. The Committee met every two to three months in order to discuss any health and safety issues at IARC with the aim of providing the best working conditions. The Committee communicated with all IARC staff through the minutes that were issued after each meeting and posted on the intranet. Following the retirement of Dr Robert Baan from the post of Chairperson of the OHSC, she had assumed the role. A new staff physician had been appointed in 2014.

All newcomers to IARC received a general safety introduction and laboratory staff received an additional briefing on laboratory safety rules and good practices. The Committee had explored interactive ways to communicate information on health and safety at work and it had introduced a quiz as part of that initiative. Risks associated with handling liquid nitrogen had been dealt with in two refresher courses. A refresher course had also been provided for L3 laboratory users. Radioactivity was still periodically used in three laboratories and, following an inspection by the French safety authority (Autorité de Sûreté Nucléaire) in June 2012, improvements had been made to personnel surveillance measures. A request for the renewal of the IARC Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) authorization had been submitted to the French authorities in August 2013. Improvements had been made to the IARC biobank, including the installation of two surveillance cameras in each of the cryogenic rooms. Action to be taken following incidents and accidents had been addressed through the quiz and discussed at a fire safety exercise. Blood tests were conducted before each staff member's annual check up and would be adapted to specific potential chemical exposure.

Professor VAINIO (Finland) recalled that in earlier discussions there had been mention that, in spite of the removal of asbestos some 25 years ago, asbestos had been detected in parts of the building. He wished to know whether asbestos fibre levels were detectable and if so, how they compared with the outdoor air.

Dr LE CALVEZ KELM (Chairperson, Occupational Health and Safety Committee) said that several measurements of asbestos fibres had been made and zero fibres had shown so far inside IARC. Asbestos might exist in the pipes and old equipment but staff did not touch the equipment.

Professor VAINIO (Finland) observed that "zero fibres" was an impossibility since there were always some background levels, depending on the sensitivity of the method used to measure them.

Mr ALLEN (Director, Administration and Finance) confirmed that the actual level detected had been 0.15 and it was therefore negligible. Responding to a further comment by Professor VAINIO (Finland), he confirmed that the tests had been carried out by professional organizations.

Dr ROBBINS (Canada) recommended that aspects of occupational health and safety should be integrated into the design of the new building and to bring it to the attention of the Working Group on Infrastructure as soon as possible.

Dr LE CALVEZ KELM (Chairperson, Occupational Health and Safety Committee) said that a working group would be convened to gather the experience and perspectives of staff on health and safety.

Mr ALLEN (Director, Administration and Finance) said that tours were also being conducted at institutions that had been newly built in order to gain information.

The RAPPORTEUR read out a draft resolution entitled "Biennial report of the Occupational Health and Safety Committee (OHSC), 2012–2013" (GC/56/R8), which read as follows:

The Governing Council,

Having examined the "Biennial Report of the Occupational Health and Safety Committee (OHSC), 2012–2013" as contained in Document GC/56/11,

1. THANKS the Scientific Council for reviewing the Biennial Report of the Occupational Health and Safety Committee, 2012–2013;
2. EXPRESSES satisfaction with the arrangements which are in place to ensure the health and safety of the Agency's staff; and
3. REQUESTS the Director to continue reporting biennially on occupational health and safety issues at the Agency.

The resolution was **adopted**.

9. PLANS FOR IARC 50th ANNIVERSARY IN 2015: Item 17 of the Agenda
(Document GC/56/14)

The SECRETARY said that it gave him much pleasure to introduce the item concerning plans for IARC's 50th Anniversary, an occasion that could be used to draw attention to the Agency's future relevance. It was proposed to mark the anniversary with a short history of IARC, its major achievements and future directions. The principles on which the Agency had been founded, which had been summarized by President Charles de Gaulle: "cooperation among peoples; improvement of the human condition; and advancement of science" still resonated at the present time. IARC had a remarkable history in its contribution to the global cancer community: seminal studies on cancers of the liver, cervix and oesophagus; the IARC Monographs, Handbooks on Cancer Prevention, reference sources on global cancer statistics; and the training of several generations of cancer researchers worldwide. Drawing on the remarkable written and photographic archives of IARC, the story of its achievements would serve to reinforce the Agency's mission and its values.

It was planned to formally celebrate the anniversary immediately before the 57th session of the Governing Council when a symposium, with guest keynote speakers, would be held. Seminars would be open to the local scientific communities, and available by webcast. A reception would be hosted in the evening by the City of Lyon. It was hoped that the Director-General of WHO would be able to attend. The event would also celebrate the support of the City and region of Lyon over the previous 50 years and look forward to the "Nouveau Centre".

A major scientific conference was planned in Lyon for June 2016, with a focus on IARC's area of expertise: cancer research for cancer prevention, picking up the themes of the World Cancer Report. The bridge between cancer research and cancer policy would be a feature of the conference. It was hoped to attract exceptional speakers and participants. There would be an emphasis on enhancing collaboration and leadership, particularly between participants from low- and middle-income countries (LMICs); to that end, he hoped to introduce a "50 for 50" bursaries scheme.

A request was made for access to the Governing Council Special Fund to further the plans outlined. It was hoped to recover some of the conference costs through registration fees and sponsorships. Corporate sponsorships would not be accepted.

Dr RICHARDSON (United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom's Medical Research Council had celebrated its centenary with open days in order to promote an outreach to the broader scientific community. He wondered whether the Agency could consider holding open laboratory events for the local community and, in particular, for local students.

The SECRETARY said that open days had been held in the past and the idea would be taken into account in the planning.

Dr BALAS (Germany) gave her full support to the proposals put forward. She, too, agreed that open days could be successful. New media announcements could help to publicize the events while press releases could be issued on IARC's achievements by Participating States.

Mr DE RAEDT (Belgium) said that Belgium was currently celebrating the 50th anniversary of its national sickness insurance fund. There had been a focus on conferences to debate the future of sickness insurance. He strongly recommended that there should be a focus on the scientific conference that would allow reflection on future challenges in addition to the celebrations.

Professor VAINIO (Finland) supported the comments of the representatives of the United Kingdom and Germany on holding open day-type events and the proposal to have national press releases. He supported the Director's proposals for the celebrations and the funding of the publication and the scientific conference. He commended the proposal to develop leadership for LMICs.

The CHAIRPERSON, speaking on behalf of the United Kingdom, said that the United Kingdom would be willing to put funds towards four or five of the bursaries for scientists from LMICs mentioned in the "50 for 50" scheme.

Dr RIVEDAL (Norway) expressed enthusiasm for the 50th anniversary celebrations and looked forward to attending the symposium and the scientific conference in the following year.

Dr BAUER (Austria) echoed the enthusiasm of previous speakers for the planned events and looked forward to the scientific conference.

Professor BUZYN, Vice-Chairperson, speaking as the Representative of France, said that she also strongly supported the proposed events. It would be useful to hold a side conference for the public on prevention issues.

The SECRETARY said that the occasion would provide an opportunity to work closely with the French National Cancer Institute and to celebrate the Agency's association with France, particularly in relation to the outreach aspects suggested by members of the Governing Council.

Professor BUZYN, Vice-Chairperson, speaking as the Representative of France, said that she accepted the proposal for collaboration.

Professor AUTRUP (Denmark) said that on a personal level he was very supportive of the activities proposed. Although his ministry could not make a contribution towards them, some alternative sources of funding could be sought in Denmark.

The CHAIRPERSON asked whether the open day and other additional activities could be covered under the resources that had already been planned.

The SECRETARY said that the resources requested would help to launch the activities; he expected to build the resource planning but would not request any additional funds at the present time.

The RAPPORTEUR read out a draft resolution entitled "Plans for IARC 50th anniversary in 2015" (GC/56/R11), which read as follows:

The Governing Council,

Having been informed by Document GC/56/14 of the plans for the celebration of IARC 50th Anniversary,

1. Strongly SUPPORTS the ideas of the Director for the celebration of the IARC 50th anniversary ;
2. AGREES to allocate up to 150 000€ from the Governing Council Special Fund to permit:
a) the production, printing and translation of the book "IARC, the first 50 years: 1965–2015" and translation of the earlier technical document on the origins of IARC (up to 50 000€ of the maximum 150 000€); b) to support planning of the international conference on cancer causes and prevention, including engagement of a professional conference organizer, the guarantee of reservation of venue, etc. (up to 100 000€ of the maximum 150 000€). Any unused portion of the allocation would be returned to the Governing Council Special Fund; and
3. SUPPORTS the Director's request that individual Participating States consider making voluntary contributions to support the organization of the conference, including the possibility to specifically designate part of the funds for the "50 for 50" bursaries for scientists from low- and middle-income countries.

Dr RICHARDSON (United Kingdom) suggested that the word "ideas" in paragraph 1 should be changed to "plans".

It was so agreed.

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

The meeting rose at 17:30