

# International Agency for Research on Cancer



Governing Council  
Fifty-sixth Session

GC/56/Min.3  
Original: ENGLISH

*Lyon, 15–16 May 2014*  
*Auditorium*

## MINUTES OF THE THIRD MEETING

IARC, Lyon

Friday, 16 May 2014, at 09:00

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

Secretary: Dr Christopher P. Wild, Director, IARC

### CONTENTS

	Page
1. New proposed structure for presenting IARC's Programme and Budget	4
2. Plans for the preparation of IARC Medium-Term Strategy for 2016–2020	6
3. Report on publication activities including report on funding allocation	14
4. Requests for use of funds from the Governing Council Special Fund	
A. Scientific equipment	16
B. Support to IPSAS implementation	17
5. Appointment of new members of the Scientific Council ( <i>closed session</i> )	18
6. Clarification on the procedure for the election of the Director	19
7. Membership of the Subcommittee on the admission of new Participating States	21
8. Any other business	21
9. Election of Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson for next session	23
10. Date of next session	23
11. Closure of session	24

### Participating State Representatives

Dr Mark PALMER, <b>Chairperson</b> Dr Nathan RICHARDSON	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Professor Agnès BUZYN, <b>Vice-Chairperson</b> 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 ( <b>Rapporteur</b> )	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. NEW PROPOSED STRUCTURE FOR PRESENTING IARC'S PROGRAMME AND BUDGET: Item 20 of the Agenda** (Document GC/56/17)

The SECRETARY, introducing the item, explained that the Agency had not changed the structure of its programme and budget presentation for a number of biennia. The current methodology involved the preparation of Project Abstract Sheets (PAS) and was based on the nine programme areas shown in Annex 2 of Document GC/56/17. In determining future priorities based on the Medium-Term Strategy, the opportunity had been taken to examine the programme structure, to prepare a more flexible model and to better align the Medium-Term Strategy with the programme structure, the PAS and the budget. A draft project tree, giving an example of the new structure, had been provided in Annex 1.

The project tree had already generated useful discussion among senior scientists in-house. Level 2 of the tree corresponded most closely to the current programme areas shown in Annex 2. As PAS were prepared at the level of the scientific Sections and Groups, debates would continue on where the work fitted into the overall strategy and structure of the Agency's programmes.

The content of Annex 1 was provided for illustrative purposes: it was not a definitive structure for the future activities of the Agency since that would be developed during the course of the year as the Medium-Term Strategy was worked out, along with the programme and budget. The results would be presented to the Governing Council in 2015.

The new structure would have a number of benefits: it would provide a clearer picture to the Governing Council on how the projects outlined in the PAS and their respective budgets fitted into the overall plan of the Agency; it would be easier for IARC management to present its overall emphasis and focus; and it would help IARC personnel to see where the projects they were working on fitted into the picture as a whole.

The CHAIRPERSON invited members of the Governing Council to discuss the proposed new structure, drawing on their previous experience in developing programmes for the institutions with which they were associated.

Dr RICHARDSON (United Kingdom) said that the proposed structure was eminently sensible since it provided a much clearer view of how activities were aligned to the high-level visions of IARC.

Professor BAGGOLEY (Australia) approved the proposed changes in principle. He wished to know whether corporate and support activities would be presented in the project tree framework or separately. He further wished to know whether the new programme and budget structure would be presented to the Governing Council before the Medium-Term Strategy or submitted at the same time.

The SECRETARY explained that the Programme and Budget (2016–2017) would be prepared at the same time as the Medium-Term Strategy (2016–2020) and that both would be presented to the Governing Council in 2015. The support structure would be integrated into the programme and

budget and had been included in the project tree under: "Enable, promote and support the efficient conduct and coordination of research" (Level 2).

Professor BUZYN, Vice-Chairperson, speaking in her capacity as the Representative of France, warmly welcomed the changes: they reflected recommendations made in other international organizations that projects should be presented in terms of results rather than as a reflection of the internal workings of an institution.

Mr DE RAEDT (Belgium), echoing the remarks of the previous speaker, said that he fully supported the proposed changes since they would make the priorities of the Agency easier to understand.

Dr DARR (United States of America) appreciated the proposed structure for the new framework, the move towards a results-based approach and identified strategic objectives. He encouraged Participating States to take part in fine-tuning the definition of the strategic objectives and the results to be achieved. Members should work hand-in-hand with IARC in linking key activities to the objectives in order to ensure that concrete and relevant key performance indicators were defined and that, in preparing future budgets, the resources planned were linked directly to the results.

The CHAIRPERSON noted that comments had been supportive of the proposal.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution, entitled "New Proposed Structure for Presenting IARC's Programme and Budget" (GC/56/R15):

The Governing Council,  
Having considered Document GC/56/17 "New proposed structure for presenting IARC's Programme and Budget",  
Recalling its Resolution GC/55/R11 in which it decided to better align the Programme and Budget with the planning and implementing phases of the Medium-Term Strategies,  
APPROVES the principle of a proposed change to the IARC Programme and Budget structure, away from the current nine areas, in order to align it with a project tree structure to be developed and presented in the Medium-Term Strategy (2016–2020).

The resolution was **adopted**.

## **2. PLANS FOR THE PREPARATION OF IARC MEDIUM-TERM STRATEGY FOR 2016–2020: Item 21 of the Agenda (Document GC/56/18)**

The SECRETARY said that Document GC/56/18 set out how it was proposed to develop the Medium-Term Strategy for 2016–2020. During the course of the following 12 months, in-house discussions about project activities would be built into activities that supported the strategy and a results-based approach. The current Medium-Term Strategy measured some 10 to 12 pages in addition to an annex containing an implementation plan that identified the aims and expected outcomes of each scientific Section. That information was provided to each peer review panel.

The present proposal was that a draft strategy would be prepared by the Director, Senior Scientists and the Senior Leadership Team; it would be circulated for consultation throughout the Agency over a two-week period. The draft would then be considered by a joint Working Group comprised of members of the Governing Council and the Scientific Council: the balanced representation from the two Councils would allow an insight into policy-making as well as incorporating scientific expertise. It was hoped that there would be a spread of geographic representation. The resulting strategy would be submitted to the Scientific Council where it would be discussed and any proposed amendments made in January 2015. It would be submitted to the Governing Council for approval in May 2015 after which it would be implemented.

The timetable would be fairly tight given that a comprehensive draft would need to be submitted to the Scientific Council six weeks before its scheduled meeting.

He looked forward to receiving comments on the proposal as well as expressions of interest from members willing to participate in the joint Working Group.

Dr ROBBINS (Canada) said that the process provided an opportunity to reflect on IARC's past work. When formulating a strategic framework for institutions in Canada, a key consideration was the engagement of stakeholders encompassing the entire end-user activities that research would make a difference to. That process ensured that research was adopted in an efficient manner and that it was aligned with the needs of communities. Workshops formulated recommendations that were reported to a working group, helping to inform strategic directions. It had been found essential to include key performance measurements at the outset and to have a three-year review by an external panel to help keep work on track and to indicate any changes required. The most difficult aspect was to keep in mind the financial constraints of the strategic plan, which would lead to tough decisions on prioritization. Since IARC was increasing its extramural funding, the strategic plan might need to be aligned with global financial opportunities.

The SECRETARY said that the ongoing review during elaboration of the plan would need input from the Scientific Council; more use could be made of peer reviews in the mid-term review process. Concerning the financial plan, he acknowledged that implementation of the strategy in previous years had only been possible as a result of extrabudgetary income. The new plan would need to be ambitious and would not be achieved solely with the regular budget but he understood the suggestion that decision-making could be shaped by identifying potential extrabudgetary funding opportunities in important areas. Key performance measurements were envisaged in the

new plan although targets were easier to set, for instance, in relation to the production of key publications (e.g. IARC Monographs) than in more open-ended areas of research. In contrast to national situations, IARC had a global audience and therefore it was more difficult to identify and seek input from all of its stakeholders.

Mr DE RAEDT (Belgium) said that the process of identifying a strategic plan had given rise to similar questions in Belgium concerning the relationship between governing boards, scientific committees and secretariats. On the previous evening, the Director had shared his view of IARC as a body that provided research and evidence for policy-makers while retaining the independence of its research. He agreed with the view that it was not the role of the Governing Council to identify specific research projects or to micromanage the Agency. It would be preferable to focus on evidence-based discussions, explaining for instance that research was conducted on cancer prevention because 40% of cancers were preventable and it was therefore a cost-effective approach. Such an approach to strategy was preferable to producing a detailed document that set out activities for five years. He supported the comments of the Representative of Canada that there should be an open process to allow for reflection and consultation with Participating States following which the Secretariat could present its vision on what action should be taken and final decisions on the strategy could be taken.

The SECRETARY said that during his speech at dinner on the previous evening he had said that research should influence policy but that politics should not interfere with research. He had seen examples where an evidence-based approach presented within WHO had been modified as a result of political considerations. He wished to avoid similar situations where topics were chosen for research because of a political agenda. Refreshingly, he had had no experience of such influence by Governing Council members during his tenure at IARC.

He agreed that the strategy should cover not only the areas of work at IARC, but also how decisions were made about the types of projects in which it was involved, taking into consideration the projects that other organizations could not undertake. More thought would have to be given to how the draft strategy could be disseminated to Participating States and for wider consultation during the time available.

Dr HUTTEN (Netherlands) agreed that it was very important to listen to other parts of the world, to learn the political, policy and scientific perspectives of their work and to compare them with those of IARC. Information could be gathered in an interactive way, but the decisions on how the information was interpreted and the action to be taken should be made in the Working Group.

Dr DE ANDRÉS MEDINA (Spain) shared the views expressed by the Representative of the Netherlands. The formulation of the strategy should take into account questions of inclusiveness and cooperation between countries, relevance to society and what was feasible in relation to available funds. It would be advisable to have two or three budget scenarios. It would also be

critical to have deliverable goals and clear milestones in order to enhance accountability. Spain would be very happy to support the Medium-Term Strategy if those suggestions were recorded.

Professor BAGGOLEY (Australia) endorsed the proposal to create a Working Group and the process on which it was proposed that the group would embark. He hoped that the strategy would generate a few key areas that could be executed very well, rather than a larger number that would be too thinly spread. He noted that Professor Bishop, a member of the Scientific Council, had been nominated to join the Working Group. It appeared that a good process was being set up and he expected that a good result would be achieved.

Dr STEVENS (United States of America) supported the creation of a Working Group to consider and finalize the Medium-Term Strategy for 2016–2020. She was grateful to the Representative of Canada for his thoughts on the strategic framework. She was hopeful that the Working Group would start out on the right path based on the comments that Dr Wild had made on the previous day concerning IARC's unique contribution. She agreed with the Representative of Australia that the object would not be to develop a lengthy list, but a focused strategic framework.

The six representatives of the Governing Council to serve on the Working Group should not necessarily represent Participating States but regions or partnerships. She asked what was the projected timetable for the Working Group's deliberations.

Dr FALEH (Qatar) supported the ideas for development of the Medium-Term Strategy and concurred in many of the views that had been expressed by fellow members of the Governing Council. The Working Group should consider where IARC wished to position itself in relation to other cancer research institutions as well as its place among world rankings. Competition would not be the sole criterion, since part of IARC's role was to go beyond national boundaries, creating critical mass on certain research issues and fostering collaboration and networking between countries.

Dr RICHARDSON (United Kingdom) supported the comments of previous speakers on the need to focus on high-level ambitions rather than on detail, since the latter might be limiting. It might be helpful to consider national policy needs as part of the national cancer strategy input, as well as broader policy input. Professor Nicholas Jones, Scientific Council representative of the United Kingdom, would be able to contribute to the Working Group.

Dr BAUER (Austria) echoed the comments of previous speakers. She supported the proposed process in general but would prefer to see a broader consultation with stakeholders. She agreed with the Representatives of Belgium and Qatar that it would also be important to define IARC's position as a research agency and its interface with other organizations.

Dr RIVEDAL (Norway) supported the establishment of the Working Group and welcomed the balanced representation between Council representatives and the Secretariat. He agreed with the comments by the Representatives of Canada and the Netherlands that opinions from as many stakeholders as possible should be gathered early in the process. He asked to what extent the planning for the new building would be part of the strategic plan.

The SECRETARY said that, in preparation for the present meeting, the Secretariat had collated the national cancer control strategies of the Participating States as a first step to understanding their policy priorities. Their priorities would be an important part of the process. He agreed on the need to identify mechanisms for broader consultation over and above the work completed by the joint Working Group.

The Secretariat would require some time over the summer in order to produce a draft plan for submission to the representatives of the Working Group by the beginning of September, one month before the October face-to-face meeting of the joint Working Group. Further meetings could be held by videoconference or by correspondence.

The broad approaches of the Agency had been taken into account in the vision for the new building although further advice had been taken from the Scientific Council on the role and size of the biobank. The plan was for a flexible space that could be divided between laboratories and offices.

He had been encouraged by the comments concerning the higher-level nature of the document, rather than focusing too much on specific pieces of research. There would be a need to find a balance between that higher-level approach and the desire for key performance indicators; he was relieved that the tension between those two views was recognized. The strategy would need to be devised within the Agency's budget although he was aware that there were opportunities to achieve very much more with additional funds.

The CHAIRPERSON, referring to the question by the Representative of the United States concerning the workload of the Working Group, said that he viewed membership of the Group as a serious commitment: he hoped that its members would engage with the draft document and consult on its contents both before and after their meeting in October.

Professor BUZYN, Vice-Chairperson, speaking in her capacity as the Representative of France, said that the Governing Council could add value to the work on the strategy by providing a framework of guiding principles and values. The Representative of Spain, for instance, had spoken of the need to take into account societal impact and challenges. Other countries might consider that 50% of the budget should be spent on work that had an impact on society and 50% on research that had less immediate effect but focused on the longer term and innovation. The Working Group should discuss how the budget would be shared between the challenges present in the least developed countries and in developed countries, since that would influence scientific and technical decisions.

The CHAIRPERSON said that very important suggestions had been made on how the process would move forward and how the strategy could be developed; there had been considerable support for the mechanism proposed. The Director would consult with the Chairperson and Vice-chairperson of the Scientific Council and would seek to ensure that the Working Group had a balance between regional representation and scientific expertise. He sought volunteers for the Working Group from the Governing Council. It should be recalled that the costs of attending the meeting in Lyon would have to be met by individual participants.

Dr ROBBINS (Canada), Professor VAINIO (Finland), Professor BUZYN (France), Vice-Chairperson, Dr HUTTEN (Netherlands), Dr RIVEDAL (Norway) and Dr STEVENS (United States of America) indicated that they wished to become members of the Working Group.

Mr DE RAEDT (BELGIUM) said that he would not volunteer to join the Working Group provided that the process outlined in the resolution to be adopted reflected the comments of the Governing Council.

The CHAIRPERSON said that the Governing Board discussion would be reflected in the minutes of the meeting. Further balance in geographic representation for the Working Group could be sought when appointing members of the Scientific Council.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution, entitled "Plans for the preparation of the IARC Medium-Term Strategy for 2016–2020" (GC/56/R16):

The Governing Council,

Having considered Document GC/56/18 "Plans for the preparation of IARC Medium-Term Strategy for 2016–2020",

1. DECIDES to create a Working Group, comprised of six members of the Governing Council, four members of the Scientific Council, to be selected by the Director in consultation with the Scientific Council Chair and Vice-Chair, one representative of WHO, and three members of the IARC Secretariat (i.e. the Director and two senior IARC scientists) to consider and finalize a draft Medium-Term Strategy for 2016–2020;
2. REQUESTS the Director to proceed according to the timelines in Document GC/56/18;
3. NOMINATES Canada, Finland, France, Netherlands, Norway and the United States to participate in the Working Group; and
4. REQUESTS the Director to submit a draft version of the "IARC Medium-Term Strategy for 2016–2020" for discussion at the next Scientific Council meeting in January 2015 and a final version, incorporating the Scientific Council recommendations, for discussion and approval at the next regular session of the Governing Council in May 2015.

Mr DE RAEDT (Belgium) suggested adding, at the end of the first paragraph, the phrase “to define principles and values and consider strategic options and key performance indicators” in order to reflect the comments by the Representative of Canada and others. He proposed adding the words “to hold consultations prior to the first draft version” after the word “Director” in the fourth paragraph.

The CHAIRPERSON said that defining strategic options and key performance indicators in the resolution might be considered too constraining. It might be preferable to leave the strategy open.

Dr DE ANDRÉS MEDINA (Spain) agreed with the proposal to hold consultations.

The CHAIRPERSON advised that the points raised during the meeting had been important but it would be difficult to fit all of them into the resolution and still retain flexibility during the ongoing discussions.

Dr ROBBINS (Canada) said that a new paragraph 2 might be introduced to request the Director to develop a process to consult and engage with global stakeholders to provide input to the Medium-Term Strategy.

The CHAIRPERSON agreed that the objective was to ensure better consultation although he wondered how global engagement would be achieved.

Professor BAGGOLEY (Australia) said that, with their experience in developing strategies, members of the Governing Council would appreciate that a tight timetable was involved. The requirement to consult and engage globally might add an extra year to the work involved.

The SECRETARY concurred in the view expressed by the Representative of Australia. Nevertheless, he understood the spirit of the request for a broader consultation on the role of the Agency and the direction of the Medium-Term Strategy. He could proceed on the understanding that he would engage with as wide an audience as possible at an early stage but engagement with global stakeholders would not be possible in the time allowed.

The RAPPORTEUR asked whether the proposal by the Representative of Canada might be reworded as follows: “develop a process to consult important stakeholders” since that would remove the requirement to consult with all Member States of WHO.

Dr HUTTEN (Netherlands) said that it would not be possible to define a specific consultation process but it would be very important for the Director to keep the Governing Council informed of the consultation process that was being carried out.

The CHAIRPERSON noted that Participating States had wished to record in the resolution the need for stakeholder engagement; high-level principles; the development of strategic options; and key performance indicators.

The SECRETARY said that it would be important to retain wording that indicated that the Director would keep the Governing Council informed of the measures that were being taken.

The CHAIRPERSON asked whether it would be possible to request the Director to take into consideration the discussion held in the Governing Council.

Dr DE ANDRÉS MEDINA (Spain) said that a reference should be made first to the consultations, followed by a request that the Director should keep the Governing Council informed of the ongoing process. It would be more accurate to refer to "relevant" rather than "global" stakeholders.

Dr FALEH (Qatar) agreed that the reference to keeping the Governing Council informed should be placed at the end of the sentence. In response to the point raised by the Representative of Australia concerning the limited time available, perhaps the requirement to consult with global stakeholders could be qualified with the words "where possible".

Dr STEVENS (United States of America), referring to the requirement that the Director should keep Governing Council members informed, asked whether the first draft would be confidential. Perhaps the first draft could be sent to Governing Council members and to the Working Group at the same time; Governing Council members would then have an opportunity to send their comments to the members of the Working Group. The members of the Working Group would then be representative of a wider set of views than those of their own State or region and they would share the responsibility for wider consultation with the Director.

The SECRETARY said that the first draft of the strategy could be shared with all members of the Governing Council and therefore it was not confidential in that sense. It would be for the Council to decide with whom it wished to consult.

Dr STEVENS (United States of America) said that language to that effect could be introduced into the resolution. She wondered with whom the Director was authorized to consult.

The RAPPORTEUR said that she had understood that members of the Working Group would consult with other relevant stakeholders, including those members of the Governing Council who were not members of the Working Group. As the Representative of the United States had said, the process of consultation was in part the responsibility of the Working Group. She wondered whether that position could be reflected in the resolution.

Dr DE ANDRÉS MEDINA (Spain), speaking in support of the view expressed by the United States, asked whether the request to consult could be widened to include “the Director and members of the Working Group”. The term “global stakeholders” should be replaced by “key relevant stakeholders” since consultations might be conducted at regional level.

Dr HUTTEN (Netherlands) said that he had thought that the consultation would be the starting point of the process and that the views gathered from it would be used in drafting the new strategy. There would not be time to consult on the strategy once it had been drafted. The Director would keep members of the Working Group informed throughout the process.

The CHAIRPERSON said that his understanding of the consultations corresponded with that of the Representative of the Netherlands. Perhaps paragraph 2 could be reworded: “request the Director and the Working Group to take into account the discussions held during the 56<sup>th</sup> session of the Governing Council, ensure early engagement of relevant stakeholders and inform the Governing Council on the ongoing process”. The text added to paragraph 4 could then be removed and the wording concerning defining values and principles could be retained.

Professor BUZYN, Vice-Chairperson, speaking in her capacity as the Representative of France, said that she had mentioned the need to define values and principles, as they would be essential to guide the drafting of a strategic document. It was not necessary to mention them specifically in the resolution given that the present discussions were to be taken into account.

Dr DE ANDRÉS MEDINA (Spain) said that it was his understanding that both the Director and the Working Group would be requested to submit the draft version of the strategy.

The CHAIRPERSON explained that the Working Group would help in preparing the document, but it would be sent out by the Director, on behalf of the Agency.

Mr COMISKEY (Ireland) suggested that the Director could present the draft.

The CHAIRPERSON said that the draft would be sent electronically but that the word “submit” was the standard terminology used.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the amended version of the draft resolution, entitled "Plans for the preparation of the IARC Medium-Term Strategy for 2016–2020" (GC/56/R16):

The Governing Council,

Having considered Document GC/56/18 "Plans for the preparation of IARC Medium-Term Strategy for 2016–2020",

1. DECIDES to create a Working Group, comprised of six members of the Governing Council, four members of the Scientific Council, to be selected by the Director in consultation with the Scientific Council Chair and Vice-Chair, one representative of WHO, and three members of the IARC Secretariat (i.e. the Director and two senior IARC scientists) to consider and finalize a draft Medium-Term Strategy for 2016–2020;
2. REQUESTS the Director and the Working Group to take into account the discussions during the 56<sup>th</sup> Governing Council session, to ensure early engagement of relevant stakeholders and to inform Governing Council on the ongoing process;
3. REQUESTS the Director to proceed according to the timelines in Document GC/56/18;
4. NOMINATES Canada, Finland, France, Norway, the Netherlands and the United States of America to participate in the Working Group; and
5. REQUESTS the Director to submit a draft version of the "IARC Medium-Term Strategy for 2016–2020" for discussion at the next Scientific Council meeting in January 2015 and a final version, incorporating the Scientific Council recommendations, for discussion and approval at the next regular session of the Governing Council in May 2015.

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

### **3. REPORT ON PUBLICATION ACTIVITIES, INCLUDING REPORT ON FUNDING ALLOCATION: Item 18 of the Agenda** (Document GC/56/15)

Dr GAUDIN (Head, Communications), drawing attention to the report in Document GC/56/15, said that the reorganization of publication activities had continued from the previous year with the appointment of a new Knowledge Manager. The new manager had become actively involved in the publications programme, including a thorough review of existing publications processes and procedures. The Agency had begun transitioning from print-only to digital editions and as many copies of the *World Cancer Report 2014* had been distributed in ePub as in paper format, a trend that would continue on the path to all-digital publishing. The review, which had been conducted with an external consultant, had included an evaluation of distribution channels: it had concluded that the business model that relied on WHO Press as an exclusive distributor was no longer competitive and efficient. Consequently, the agreement with WHO Press had been modified and IARC would henceforward distribute its own digital products while print copies of publications would continue to be distributed by WHO Press. The revenue from publications continued to be driven by sales of the WHO Classification of Tumours, which represented 99% of publication-related revenue and 96% of sales.

The Communications Group had led the effort to make the new online publication, PubCan, a model for publishing up-to-date cancer information as an online resource. The database was at the trial stage and encompassed several volumes of the WHO Classification of Tumours, the ICD-O-3 nomenclature, and the risk-factors base of the Monographs, for cross referencing and searching. It included building a financial model for better cost recovery for publications and sustained programmatic vision. In order to continue rolling out the digital distribution model, increased revenue would be required.

Mr ALLEN (Director of Administration and Finance) said that in 2013, the revenue from the publication programme had been €759 782. Since the previous year, there had been standing approval from the Governing Council, to automatically allocate 75% of that revenue to the publication programme and therefore the allocation in 2014 had been limited to €525 000. Currently, there were two drivers for income: the first was the attempt to move to two Blue Books per year by accelerating their publication, a process that had been facilitated by the decision to move away from print. The second driver had been to strengthen capacity in order to speed up publication of the Blue Books. The Governing Council was requested to lift the 75% ceiling and to approve the allocation of additional funds.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution, entitled "Report on publication activities" (GC/56/R12):

The Governing Council,

Having reviewed Document GC/56/15 "Report on publication activities, including report on funding allocation",

1. NOTES the Report with great interest;
2. NOTES that the net income to the Governing Council Special Fund from sales of publications in 2013 was €759 782 of which €525 000 was allocated to the publication programme;
3. DECIDES to remove the 525 000€ maximum amount stated in Resolution GC/55/R15, paragraph 1, while retaining the 75% return framework established in the same paragraph of that resolution; and
4. REQUESTS the Director to continue reporting annually on publication activities at IARC.

Dr Duk-Hyoung LEE (Republic of Korea) questioned the necessity of including the information in paragraph 2.

The CHAIRPERSON said that the language made clear the sums initially involved. He noted that there were no further requests to amend the second paragraph.

The resolution was **adopted**.

**4. REQUESTS FOR USE OF FUNDS FROM THE GOVERNING COUNCIL SPECIAL FUND:  
Item 19 of the Agenda**

**A. SCIENTIFIC EQUIPMENT (Document GC/56/16A)**

Mr ALLEN (Director of Administration and Finance) explained that two pieces of equipment were being requested: a bench-top next generation sequencer of medium capacity and a tandem mass spectrometer coupled to the UPLC. The costs of the equipment were set out in the document and further technical information could be provided during the present meeting if required.

The CHAIRPERSON noted that the purchase of the equipment had been approved by the Scientific Council.

Dr ROBBINS (Canada) said that he had no comments about the purchase of the specific equipment, but he wished to know whether a comprehensive maintenance plan had been put in place with respect to all new equipment.

The SECRETARY said that it had become practice in recent years to assess the global cost of maintenance contracts across the Agency and to set aside a proportion of the regular budget to cover them in part. Nevertheless, extrabudgetary funds were required to cover the full maintenance costs. It was also practice to negotiate for an extended warranty for all new equipment at the time of purchase.

Professor BUZYN, Vice-Chairperson, speaking in her capacity as the Representative of France, referred to the research environment in Lyon and asked whether it had been possible to enter into agreements to use equipment within other laboratories.

The SECRETARY said that discussions on available equipment were conducted on an ongoing basis with laboratories and the choice of equipment had been made taking into consideration what was already available in Lyon.

Dr DARR (United States of America) said that the United States supported the allocation of funds for the purchase of the equipment.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the draft resolution, entitled "Request for use of funds from the Governing Council Special Fund: A. Scientific Equipment" (GC/56/R13):

The Governing Council,

Having reviewed Document GC/56/16A "Request for use of funds from the Governing Council Special Fund: A. Scientific Equipment",

Noting that the Scientific Council supported the request for purchase of scientific equipment (Document GC/56/4),

Also noting that the Scientific Council commended the plan for sharing equipment between many Sections, acknowledged the importance of obtaining the equipment in a timely manner and expressed the importance of investing in new cutting-edge equipment to maintain IARC's leading scientific role,

AUTHORIZES the Director to use up to a maximum of €353 000 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:

	Quantity	Cost (€)
Bench-top next-generation sequencer of medium capacity	1	110 000 <sup>1</sup>
Tandem mass spectrometer coupled to UPLC	1	243 000
Total		353 000

<sup>1</sup> This estimate includes installation costs.

The resolution was **adopted**.

#### **B. IPSAS IMPLEMENTATION** (Document GC/56/16B)

Mr ALLEN (Director of Administration and Finance), reporting on progress on IPSAS implementation projects, recalled that a total of €400 000 had been set aside to fund them. The second release of funds was requested in order to allow the Agency to complete implementation.

Ms HERNANDEZ (Canada) inquired why there had been a delay in implementation of certain projects.

Mr ALLEN (Director of Administration and Finance) explained that it had been decided by the Governing Council that IARC would not follow the same route as WHO. Nevertheless, additional time had been taken in order to evaluate whether IARC should use a United Nations template for implementation of SAP. The implementation was expensive and care was being taken not to overcustomize SAP.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution, entitled "Request for use of funds from the Governing Council Special Fund: B. IPSAS implementation" (GC/56/R14):

The Governing Council,

Having considered Document GC/56/16B "Progress Report on post IPSAS implementation projects",

1. AGREES to release the budget of €200 000 remaining from the initial estimate, as approved in Resolution GC/55/R17, to be used for the implementation of the projects in the following five areas: A. Human resource management related to employee benefits; B. SAP upgrade; C. Implementation of the HR Position Management Module; D. Implementation of enhanced functionalities of SAP and E. Asset Management; and
2. REQUESTS the Director to report on the use of these funds at the 57<sup>th</sup> session of the Governing Council.

The resolution was **adopted**.

#### **5. APPOINTMENT OF NEW MEMBERS OF THE SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL (CLOSED SESSION): Item 22 of the Agenda** (Document GC/56/19)

The Governing Council met in closed session from 11:30 to 12:10.

On the resumption of the plenary session, the RAPPORTEUR read out the following resolution, **adopted** by the Governing Council in closed session, on the appointment of new members of the Scientific Council (GC/56/R17):

The Governing Council,

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

#### 1. APPOINTS

Dr Ole Raaschou-Nielsen, Denmark )

Dr Elisabete Weiderpass-Vainio, Finland )

Dr Ellen Kampman, The Netherlands ) to serve for four years on the Scientific Council

Dr Martin Rösli, Switzerland )

Dr Stephen J. Chanock, USA )

2. THANKS the outgoing members of the Scientific Council, Drs Ahti Anttila, Bettina Borisch, Mads Melbye, Martyn Smith and Piet van den Brandt, for their valuable work in the Scientific Council and for the contribution which they have made to the research activities of the Agency.

**6. CLARIFICATION ON THE PROCEDURE FOR THE ELECTION OF THE DIRECTOR:  
Item 23 of the Agenda** (Document GC/56/20)

Ms MCKEOUGH (WHO Office of the Legal Counsel) introduced the report on options for the procedure for election of the Director, contained in Document GC/56/20. The current procedure was governed by Rule 46 of the Rules of Procedure of the Governing Council, although there were a number of places where details were not specified. For example, there was no statement of the desirable characteristics and attributes of the candidate, nor any criteria for deciding which candidates should be shortlisted or interviewed. On two occasions, a search committee had been appointed to identify and interview suitable candidates, and more recently the Chairperson of the Governing Council and the Director-General of WHO had drawn up a shortlist of candidates for interview by the full Governing Council, taking into account the views expressed by Participating States. There was no specification of the procedure for the interviews or of the questions which candidates would be expected to answer. The Governing Council might wish to request the Secretariat to prepare options and proposals for discussion and/or action for consideration at its Fifty-seventh session in May 2015, or it might wish to appoint a Working Group from among its members to perform the same task.

Dr RICHARDSON (United Kingdom) said that the Governing Council should draw up a job specification for the post of Director, based on the criteria suggested in the report. Candidates should submit a curriculum vitae and their high-level vision of the future of the Agency. They should be interviewed by a subset of Governing Council members, who should draw up a shortlist of candidates for consideration by the full Council.

Professor AUTRUP (Denmark) asked whether there should be two different procedures: one when only new candidates had presented themselves and one when an incumbent Director was seeking reappointment.

Ms HERNANDEZ (Canada) said that the Secretariat should investigate the options further and submit suggestions for action to the Governing Council at its next session in 2015. Canada favoured the holding of a candidates' forum, as had been done for the appointment of the Director of the Pan American Sanitary Bureau, the Secretariat of the Pan American Health Organization. She would provide details of the process informally if members wished.

Dr BAUER (Austria), Dr STEBER-BÜCHLI (Switzerland), Rapporteur, Dr BALAS (Germany), Dr STEVENS (United States of America) and Dr HUTTEN (Netherlands) agreed that the Secretariat should submit suggestions for action at the next session of the Governing Council.

Dr DE ANDRÉS MEDINA (Spain) said that the Governing Council should make the final choice of candidate from a shortlist including a recommendation of the most suitable candidate.

The procedure should be the same whether an incumbent Director was seeking reappointment or the candidates were all new.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution on clarification of the procedure for the election of the Director (GC/56/R18):

The Governing Council,  
Having reviewed Document GC/56/20 "Clarification on the procedure for the election of the Director",  
Noting that a consistent set of procedures would benefit the process for selection of the Director of the Agency,

1. THANKS the Secretariat for the report; and
2. REQUESTS the Secretariat to report back to the Governing Council at its Fifty-seventh session in May 2015 with options and proposals for discussion and/or action.

The CHAIRPERSON, replying to a point raised by Dr DE ANDRÉS MEDINA (Spain), said that the options to be submitted by the Secretariat would not exclude the possibility of creating a Working Group of Governing Council members at a later date. Of course, the Secretariat would consult Governing Council members informally when drawing up the various options.

The SECRETARY said that the next year would be a busy one for the Governing Council and the Secretariat, with the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Agency and a new Medium-Term Strategy and programme and budget to prepare. Accordingly, the Governing Council might wish to postpone consideration of the current item until 2016. The next Director would not be appointed until 2018.

The CHAIRPERSON suggested that the phrase "its Fifty-seventh session in May 2015" should be replaced by "its Fifty-eighth session in May 2016".

**It was so agreed.**

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

## **7. MEMBERSHIP OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE ADMISSION OF NEW PARTICIPATING STATES: Item 24 of the Agenda**

In response to a request from the CHAIRPERSON, Professor BAGGOLEY (Australia), Dr BALAS (Germany), Dr TAKASAKI (Japan), Dr DE ANDRÉS MEDINA (Spain) and Dr STEVENS (United States of America) indicated their willingness to serve on the Subcommittee on the Admission of New Participating States.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution entitled "Membership of the Subcommittee on the Admission of New Participating States" (GC/56/R19):

The Governing Council,

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

Recalling its Resolution GC/53/R20 deciding that the number of members and composition of the Subcommittee shall be agreed upon at each regular session of the Governing Council,

DECIDES that this Subcommittee shall be composed of, in addition to the Chairperson of the Governing Council (member ex officio), the representatives of Australia, Germany, Japan, Spain and the United States of America who shall hold office until the next regular session of the Council.

The resolution was **adopted**.

## **8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

Dr DE ANDRÉS MEDINA (Spain) wished to inform the Governing Council that, in view of the difficult economic situation in his country, Spain would not be in a position to fulfil all of its financial undertakings to the Agency in the coming months. The Ministry of Health was attempting to persuade the Ministry of Finance of the value of intellectual cooperation with IARC with respect to a disease that had a dramatic effect on Spain's population. As soon as the economic situation improved in Spain, he was sure that the Ministry of Health would be able to fulfil all of its financial commitments to the Agency. He asked for the understanding of the Governing Council in the interim.

The Governing Council **noted** the statement by the Representative of Spain.

The CHAIRPERSON inquired whether representatives wished to raise any other items of business.

Dr STEVENS (United States of America) wished to highlight comments that had been made on gender balance during the closed-session discussions on the appointment of members of the Scientific Council. If only experienced scientists were selected, and if women had been precluded from gaining that experience, then they were necessarily excluded from leadership, succession planning and capacity building within the Scientific Council. She wondered whether consideration of gender balance could be introduced when making appointments to the Scientific Council at the next session of the Governing Council.

The CHAIRPERSON suggested that the Director should inform the Chairperson of the Scientific Council that potential candidates had related primarily to their scientific expertise and that the criterion of gender balance should be borne in mind. Perhaps consideration could be given as to whether appointments were made on the basis of country of origin or whether it would be possible to appoint scientists with varying levels of experience, with a view to introducing candidates with both new and established ideas. If that were the case, then it might be necessary to review the Statute.

The SECRETARY said that candidates for the Scientific Council were not put forward by the Agency but by Participating States. Additional information on the composition of the Scientific Council could be sent out to Participating States when inviting submission of candidates.

Professor BUZYN, Vice-Chairperson, speaking in her capacity as the Representative of France, thanked the Representative of the United States for having raised the important topic of gender balance and acknowledged the explanation of the Secretary that candidates for the Scientific Council were put forward by Participating States. She asked what policies or procedures existed with respect to gender balance when making appointments within the Agency. She noted that in France, no scientific committee was formed without considering gender balance.

The SECRETARY said that it was customary to consider gender balance when making appointments within the Agency; it was certainly the case with regard to the peer review panels.

The CHAIRPERSON noted that the Secretary would raise the issue of gender balance with the Chairperson of the Scientific Council.

It was so **agreed**.

The CHAIRPERSON and the SECRETARY paid tribute to the work of Professor Autrup of Denmark, acknowledging his strong support and his valuable and knowledgeable contribution to the Governing Council over many years. Professor Autrup would be leaving the Governing Council after the current session but he would be welcomed should he return to the Agency in other capacities in the future.

Professor AUTRUP (Denmark) recalled that his contribution to the Agency had begun in 1971 when he had worked at its regional centre in Nairobi. It had been a great pleasure to contribute to the work of IARC and he hoped to maintain contact with the Agency in the future.

**9. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON AND VICE-CHAIRPERSON FOR NEXT SESSION:  
Item 26 of the Agenda**

On the proposal of Professor BAGGOLEY (Australia), Dr Mark Palmer (United Kingdom) was unanimously re-elected as the Chairperson of the Governing Council, the proposal being seconded by Dr BAUER (Austria) and Dr DE ANDRÉS MEDINA (Spain).

On the proposal of Professor BAGGOLEY (Australia), Professor Agnès Buzyn (France) was unanimously re-elected as Vice-Chairperson, the proposal being seconded by Dr BAUER (Austria) and Dr DE ANDRÉS MEDINA (Spain).

**10. DATE OF NEXT SESSION: Item 27 of the Agenda**

The CHAIRPERSON said that it was usual to hold the next session on the Thursday and Friday before the World Health Assembly. As 2015 would be the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of IARC, he wondered whether there would be any comments on the arrangements.

Dr ROBBINS (Canada) said that, after some informal consultations, representatives had wondered whether it might be possible to give some flexibility to the arrangements by scheduling the next session of the Governing Council on the Wednesday and the Thursday with a day for the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary celebrations on the Friday preceding the World Health Assembly to allow for potential attendance at the celebrations by health ministers.

The SECRETARY said that he welcomed the idea. From a technical standpoint, it would be easier to hold the anniversary event after the Governing Council session.

Dr DE ANDRÉS MEDINA (Spain) hoped that high-level figures could be invited to attend the anniversary celebrations since it would help to raise the profile of IARC's work.

The RAPPORTEUR read out a draft resolution, entitled "Date of the Fifty-seventh session of the Governing Council" (GC/56/R20):

The Governing Council,

1. DECIDES to hold its next regular session in Lyon, France, on the Wednesday and Thursday preceding the opening of the World Health Assembly in the year 2015; and
2. REQUESTS the Director to inform members of the Council as soon as these dates are known.

The resolution was **adopted**.

#### **11. CLOSURE OF THE SESSION: Item 28 of the Agenda**

The CHAIRPERSON thanked participants for their contribution to the work of the Agency.

The SECRETARY thanked representatives for their support and wise advice concerning the future of the Agency. He also thanked the Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson and Rapporteur. He gave a special welcome to the observer from South Africa. He thanked the small team of Secretariat staff who had helped the meetings to run smoothly and the mutually-supportive administrative and scientific teams with whom it had been a pleasure to work on transforming the Agency in recent years.

The CHAIRPERSON declared the session closed.

**The meeting rose at 13:00**