

International Agency for Research on Cancer



**Governing Council
Fifty-seventh Session**

**GC/57/Min.3
Original: ENGLISH**

*Lyon, 13–14 May 2015
Auditorium*

MINUTES OF THE THIRD MEETING

IARC, Lyon

Thursday, 14 May 2015, 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. Proposed Programme and Budget (2016–2017) (continued)	4
2. Report on publication activities, including report on funding allocation	7
3. IARC policy on open access publishing in scientific journals	8
4. Requests for use of funds from the Governing Council Special Fund	11
A. Scientific equipment	
B. June 2016 Conference	
C. Support to IPSAS implementation	
5. Proposed Programme and Budget (2016–2017) (resumed)	14
6. Update on the “Nouveau Centre” project	16
7. Statement by the IARC Staff Association	18
8. Acceptance of grants and contracts, including report on interest apportionment	20
9. Acceptance of donations	21

Participating State Representatives

Dr Mark PALMER, <i>Chairperson</i>	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Dr Adam BABBS	
Professor Agnès BUZYN, <i>Vice-Chairperson</i>	France
Mr Jean-Baptiste ROUFFET	
Dr Stephen M. ROBBINS	Canada
Ms Lucero HERNANDEZ, <i>Rapporteur</i>	
Professor Christopher BAGGOLEY	Australia
Dr Britta KUNERT	Austria
Mr Lieven DE RAEDT	Belgium
Dr Luiz Antonio SANTINI (<i>unable to attend</i>)	Brazil
Professor Mads MELBYE	Denmark
Professor Juhani ESKOLA	Finland
Professor Eero PUKKALA	
Dr Chariklia BALAS (<i>unable to attend</i>)	Germany
Dr Jagdish PRASAD	India
Mr Keith COMISKEY	Ireland
Professor Walter RICCIARDI (<i>unable to attend</i>)	Italy
Dr Filippo BELARDELLI	
Dr Eiji HINOSHITA	Japan
Dr Rachid BEKKALI	Morocco
Dr Latifa BELAKHEL	
Dr Marianne DONKER	Netherlands
Mr Marc FAKKEL	
Dr Edgar RIVEDAL	Norway
Dr Karianne SOLAAS	
Dr FALEH Mohammed Hussain Ali	Qatar
Dr Eui-Jun PARK	Republic of Korea
Dr Dukhyoung LEE	
Dr Svetlana AXELROD	Russian Federation
Ms Lidia GABUNIYA	
Dr Olga KOVALEVA	
Dr Andrey KAPRIN	
Dr Rafael DE ANDRÉS MEDINA	Spain

Professor Mats ULFENDAHL	Sweden
Dr Karin SCHMEKEL (<i>unable to attend</i>)	
Dr Diane STEBER-BÜCHLI	Switzerland
Professor Abdullah Murat TUNCER	Turkey
Dr Lisa STEVENS	United States of America
Ms Mary Blanca RIOS	
Dr Mona SARAIYA	

World Health Organization

Dr Oleg CHESTNOV, Assistant Director-General, Noncommunicable Diseases and Mental Health
Ms Joanne MCKEOUGH, Office of the Legal Counsel
Dr Andreas ULLRICH, Senior Adviser to ADG/NMH, IARC Liaison Officer

Observers

Professor Cornelia ULRICH, Outgoing Chairperson, Scientific Council
Professor James F. BISHOP, Incoming Chairperson, Scientific Council
Professor Béatrice FERVERS, Chair, IARC Ethics Committee
Mr Cary ADAMS, Chief Executive Officer, Union for International Cancer Control (UICC)

External Audit

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

Mexico

Dr Alejandro MOHAR BETANCOURT (*unable to attend*)

Secretariat

Dr C.P. WILD, *Secretary*
Mr D. ALLEN
Ms A. BERGER
Dr F. BRAY
Dr P. BRENNAN
Dr G. BYRNES
Ms D. D'AMICO
Mr P. DAMIECKI
Dr S. FRANCESCHI
Ms E. FRANÇON

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

Dr R. SANKARANARAYANAN
Ms A. SANTHIPRECHACHIT
Dr A. SCALBERT
Dr J. SCHÜZ
Dr N. SLIMANI
Dr K. STRAIF
Dr M. TOMMASINO
Dr J. ZAVADIL

1. PROPOSED PROGRAMME AND BUDGET (2016–2017): Item 11 of the Agenda
(Document GC/57/8) (continued)

The SECRETARY said that the approval of the Medium-Term Strategy on the previous day had been a strong affirmation of the direction IARC was to take. In response to the Governing Council's discussion on the budget, some of the figures had been remodelled to produce a reduced proposal. Over recent years, he had tried to maintain the numbers of scientific staff and groups in order to deliver the programme of work but also because the scientific capacity helped IARC to generate extrabudgetary funds. In re-examining the posts, he had sought to maintain the new post in the Gambia Hepatitis Intervention Study for which a senior clinical hepatologist had already been recruited to run the programme and pursue the associated fieldwork opportunities. He proposed to maintain the investment in the flagship Monographs programme for which it would be advisable to shift the core costs to the regular budget over time, thus relieving the Agency of the pressures exerted by external bodies which currently provided some 50% of funding. There would also be investments in programme implementation work.

He had been able to find a reduction of just over €500 000 in the regular budget by the following means: running the summer schools just once in the 2016–2017 biennium (a saving of €70 000); postponing the support for training and capacity-building in the biobanking for low- and middle-income countries; cancelling the planned two Tumour Seminar Series (a saving of €40 000); continuing with just one senior pathologist rather than following the strong advice of the Scientific Council to strengthen the pathology provision, particularly in support of the WHO Classification of Tumours series; cutting one scientist post from dietary surveillance from 2017; and downgrading a post within the cancer registry. It would be very difficult to find a further €450 000 to €500 000 in savings.

Mr ALLEN (Director of Administration and Finance) said that, in accordance with the explanation provided by the Secretary, it would not be possible to remove a total of €1 million from the regular budget without harming the scientific programme and, therefore, the Agency proposed to make savings of €500 000 and to seek a budget of €43.4 million. The gap between the original proposal and the revised budget could be funded either through contributions from existing Participating States or through continued reliance on the Governing Council Special Fund.

The CHAIRPERSON asked whether representatives could indicate any change in position since the previous evening, in particular with respect to their policy on zero-nominal growth.

Ms RIOS (United States of America) asked whether the two posts that the Secretary proposed to cut were existing posts or from the additional six posts in the new programme and budget. She sought further explanation on how the cuts would affect implementation of the Medium-Term Strategy.

The SECRETARY said that the two posts would be cut from the six additional posts originally proposed in the new programme and budget. The removal of one of the posts in dietary surveillance would affect the rollout of methodology to countries requesting assistance unless extrabudgetary sources of funding could be found. The post cut in connection with the WHO Classification of Tumours series would affect the pace of production of updates, which were currently being managed at intervals of five or six years. The withdrawal of the Summer School would impact 65 people from low- and middle-income countries in 2016; although the Agency would continue its commitment to training, it would not be able to hold all planned training events. The saving in the cancer registry post was a grading question.

Professor ULRICH (Outgoing Chairperson, Scientific Council) said that the Scientific Council had provided very strong feedback on the need for a senior pathologist to strengthen the pathology programme since it provided a unique resource for scientists as well as additional income. There was a need to support biobanking in low- and middle-income countries since it was an activity that was not supported outside of IARC. Similarly, IARC was unique in providing outreach and methodology in dietary surveillance. The Scientific Council had supported the proposed programme and budget.

Dr DONKER (Netherlands) said that her Government expected agencies such as IARC to fulfil their mandates on a zero-nominal growth basis and to maintain budgetary discipline, introducing new research lines where they could to replace redundant activities. The Governing Council had agreed that extra attention should be focused on prevention but the funds should be found from within the existing budget. Whatever was decided for 2016, she did not wish to revisit a similar discussion on the budget in 2017, 2018 and 2019.

The SECRETARY said that restructuring across the Agency had resulted in the abolition of 13 posts in the previous two years and the creation of different posts that matched the requirements of the changing programme. The Agency had undergone a long process of adapting posts to the new activities in the Medium-Term Strategy. He understood the expectation that the budget should not increase although, thanks to the Agency's hard work in expanding its work internationally, the addition of new Participating States meant that there was a bigger budget for which a balance would be struck between, on the one hand, absorbing statutory cost increases and, on the other hand, allowing new areas to be added or existing areas to be strengthened. The recent addition of the new Participating States of Brazil and Qatar had created expectations that the Agency could do more.

The CHAIRPERSON recalled that the Governing Council had last agreed to an increase in statutory contributions in 2007, although the Agency had borne substantive statutory increases in staff costs as a result of changes at the ICSC level since that time. Inflation had also eaten into the purchasing power of the scientific budget. The argument that organizations should operate within existing budgets had some traction, but if the Agency continued in the same manner for 50 years,

there would not be a budget. The Governing Council should take into account not only good financial practice and management, but also the practical influence of the outside world. The Agency had made considerable efforts to propose reasonable budgets, taking into account the economic crisis, and it would be difficult to justify a zero-nominal growth budget in successive years.

Dr DONKER (Netherlands) said that she might be able to approve the budget for 2016, but that she did not want to revisit the subject of budget increases in future years.

The CHAIRPERSON said that it would not be feasible for the Agency to have a zero-growth budget for an unlimited time. There would always be a need for the Governing Council to discuss and to approve the Agency's budget.

Ms RIOS (United States of America) said that the Agency's budget had increased in recent years as a result of new membership and through use of the Governing Council Special Fund. The current budget proposal was not a zero-nominal growth budget but one that would cover inflation and the increase in statutory costs; it would also allow for a small amount of growth, although not as much as the Agency had originally requested. The position of the United States remained as it had indicated on the previous day.

Mr ALLEN (Director of Administration and Finance) said that all increases since 2010, which had been of approximately 3% per year, had been made to cover statutory costs; furthermore, all of those increases had been covered by contributions from new Participating States and from the Governing Council Special Fund. During the previous three biennia, the impact on contributions from existing Participating States had been negative overall, with an increase for one group and decreases for the remainder.

Dr DE ANDRÉS MEDINA (Spain) said that he shared the opinion of the representative of the Netherlands; his parliament had also adopted a policy of "zero increases". The funding climate had changed and it would be necessary for the Agency to be skilful enough to obtain additional funding from different sources since Participating States, at least those in the European Region, would not be able to agree to more than a zero increase. He did not expect that climate to change in the short term.

Mr DE RAEDT (Belgium) said that he had received confirmation from his Capital that the zero-nominal growth policy must be strictly enforced.

The CHAIRPERSON said that it was clear that the additional €500 000 could not be secured from Participating States; he asked whether the Governing Council would support or oppose the use of funds from the Governing Council Special Fund to cover the amount sought and to tide the Agency over the present financial crisis.

Professor MELBYE (Denmark) said that he supported the use of the Governing Council Special Fund to solve the immediate problem; he hoped that circumstances would change in Europe in the future.

Professor BAGGOLEY (Australia), Professor ESKOLA (Finland), Professor TUNCER (Turkey), and Dr STEBER-BÜCHLI (Switzerland), indicated their support for the proposal to use the Governing Council Special Fund.

The CHAIRPERSON proposed that consideration of the item should be suspended pending the amendment of the draft resolution to reflect the support of the Governing Council for use of the Governing Council Special Fund.

It was so agreed.

2. REPORT ON PUBLICATION ACTIVITIES, INCLUDING REPORT ON FUNDING ALLOCATION: Item 12 of the Agenda (Document GC/57/9)

Dr GAUDIN (Head, Communications), drawing attention to the report in document GC/57/9, highlighted that a key focus of activity had been the transition from print to online publishing. The Communications Group had established its own licence and workflows and developed a digital dissemination strategy. A recent review of IARC's publishing activities had been conducted and the Group had been inspired by its conclusions. The commercial agreement for distribution of IARC's print publications continued, but IARC had taken over publication of all e-products. The Agency had expanded its agreements with e-book aggregators. The Group continued its support of PubCan development and a Web Architect had been recruited for a period of one year. The WHO Classification of Tumours series generated 94% of the overall publications sales revenue. In accordance with Resolutions GC/55/R15 and GC/56/R12, 75% of the revenue from the sale of IARC publications in 2014 had been allocated to the publication programme in 2015.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution, entitled "Report on publication activities" (GC/57/R10):

The Governing Council,

Having reviewed Document GC/57/9 "Report on publication activities, including report on funding allocation",

1. NOTES the Report with great interest;
2. NOTES that 75% of the revenue from the sale of IARC publications in 2014 amounting to €596 420 was allocated to the IARC publication programme in 2015; and
3. REQUESTS the Director to continue reporting annually on publication activities at IARC.

The resolution was **adopted**.

3. IARC POLICY ON OPEN ACCESS PUBLISHING IN SCIENTIFIC JOURNALS: Item 13 of the Agenda (Document GC/57/10)

Ms LEE (Knowledge Manager), illustrating her remarks with slides, provided a definition of open access literature as the "free, immediate and online availability of research articles". Scholarly publishing could be traced back some 350 years in a process where scholars wrote for free and publishers profited from dissemination. Digital technologies had opened up avenues of access and distribution although there were constant pressures due to the growth in research output. Definitions of "gold", "hybrid" and "green" types of open access were provided in the report. In January 2015, IARC had adopted an open access policy in recognition of its obligation, as a publicly funded institution, to share knowledge broadly, in ways that were free of both cost barriers and use restrictions. The scope of IARC's policy applied to research where the lead or corresponding author was an Agency author or where IARC had taken a lead role in a project but it did not include books that it had published itself. IARC strongly encouraged authors to choose one of the three routes to open access. It was estimated that it would cost IARC US\$ 1 million annually if it were to make all of its output immediately and openly available; however, in the short term, the Agency proposed to increase the number of articles available at a cost of €50 000 per year, funded from the Governing Council Special Fund.

Dr BABBS (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) commended the proactive approach to open access publication taken by the Agency and recognized the financial challenges involved in achieving the open access set-up. However, similar schemes in other parts of the world had met with limited success and mandatory schemes had been adopted in order to achieve the desired levels of compliance. He wished to know: what was the time frame envisaged for IARC to move from a voluntary to a mandatory scheme; how it was proposed to monitor compliance; whether existing procedures were adapted to deal with decisions on access which had to be taken

at the time of acceptance or even at the time of submission; and whether IARC had considered collaboration with WHO as an alternative to creating its own repository.

Ms LEE (Knowledge Manager) said that mandatory schemes were ultimately preferable to optional schemes. No timeline had been determined for converting open access into a mandatory policy and she hoped that the Agency would work gradually towards that goal. With respect to monitoring compliance, the library contained a database of staff publications and work would continue on tracking lead authors and on follow-up with Section Heads. A key objective would be to develop a fair and balanced approach to selecting high-priority articles. A total of 369 articles had been published in 2014, of which 34 had been published as hybrid and 66 as gold. The Agency was paying for a very small number of purchase orders compared to the significant publishing that was already taking place in hybrid or gold; she would investigate the matter further. There had been discussions on how IARC might collaborate with WHO but there would be costs associated with joining Europe PubMed Central.

Professor MELBYE (Denmark) said that the field was fast-moving and it was wise to fund the project over a three-year period as recommended by the Scientific Council. If IARC had been entirely funded by Participating States he would have favoured an immediate move to open access, however, IARC was also dependent on other types of public funding and therefore needed to publish in the highest-impact journals.

Professor BAGGOLEY (Australia) said that, until he had read the document, he had been unaware of the extent of the costs of an open access policy. He asked whether the policy would be affordable.

The SECRETARY said that, given the state of the Governing Council Special Fund, the cost would be affordable, particularly since it would be spread over three years. Projections of cost pressures had been tested against the Fund. The project was relevant to the Agency's goals and policy decisions; internal discussions had taken place on the need to continue to publish in high-quality journals in order to maintain funding.

Ms LEE (Knowledge Manager) said that, concerning affordability, there was a disparity between the number of gold and the number of hybrid articles that had been published in 2014, which suggested that IARC had been able to draw on the funds of collaborating institutions; thus, the Agency could push for open access without having to take on the burden.

Professor BUZYN, Vice-Chairperson, speaking in her capacity as the representative of France, said that she supported the principle of open access publications. She agreed with the comments by the representative of Denmark since it would be necessary for the Agency to remain pragmatic

and to show that it could publish in high-impact journals. The publication policy could be reviewed in two or three years' time.

Dr STEVENS (United States of America) asked whether the green category was less expensive.

Ms LEE (Knowledge Manager) said that, for the green category, there was no article processing charge but there was a cost implication: if IARC was to join the Europe PubMed Central via WHO, it would be responsible for part of the membership dues. Part of the costs associated with green open access were a little difficult to project since the Agency would be paying for the technical infrastructure, the database that held it, and also for significant staff time to manage the content.

Dr STEVENS (United States of America) said that the United States Centers for Disease Control was engaged in a similar process. However, the United States was supportive of the proposal to use up to €50 000 per annum from the Governing Council Special Fund in order to fund an open access policy.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution, entitled "IARC Policy on open access publishing in scientific journals" (GC/57/R11):

The Governing Council,

Having reviewed Document GC/57/10 "IARC Policy on open access publishing in scientific journals",

1. REITERATES that, as described in its Statute, the Agency is committed to the dissemination of its research;
2. AGREES with the recommendation from the Scientific Council for a nuanced approach recognizing the financial realities whereby the Agency prioritizes journal articles identified for open access distribution;
3. REQUESTS the Secretariat to present a review and an evaluation of the implementation of its Open Access policy at the Scientific Council in 2017; and
4. APPROVES the use of up to a maximum of €50 000 per annum for three years from the Governing Council Special Fund, subject to there being sufficient cash balances available in the Fund, to cover article processing charges for open access publishing in journals.

The resolution was **adopted**.

**4. REQUESTS FOR USE OF FUNDS FROM THE GOVERNING COUNCIL SPECIAL FUND:
Item 14 of the Agenda**

A. SCIENTIFIC EQUIPMENT (Document GC/57/11A)

Mr ALLEN (Director of Administration and Finance), illustrating his remarks with slides, said that a request had been made for basic scientific equipment as set out in the document. It would not be possible to purchase the equipment from grant donations, since donors expected the Agency to have the equipment already, nor would it be possible to find the resources from within the regular budget, hence the request to use funds from the Governing Council Special Fund.

Dr DONKER (Netherlands) accepted that the scientific equipment was required in order to conduct the Agency's work. She wondered, however, whether any evaluation had been made, in efficiency and in monetary terms, of the possibility of using laboratory equipment in Participating States.

The SECRETARY said that the possibilities for collaboration with other laboratories depended on the type of equipment involved. The Agency shared some specialized equipment with laboratories in the City of Lyon; it had also assisted in the development of research laboratory capacity in some countries, for example, it had helped to set up the capacity for India to carry out in-country analysis for large projects on the human papillomavirus. The equipment requested represented core platforms that supported research groups across the Agency.

Mr ALLEN (Director of Administration and Finance), responding to a question from Professor TUNCER (Turkey), said that costs were estimated through market research and, once approval had been obtained, prices were determined through competitive bidding in an open tender process.

Professor ULRICH, Outgoing Chairperson, Scientific Council, said that request was modest and concerned core equipment that would be used across the scientific groups.

Dr STEVENS (United States of America) said that the United States approved the budget for the purchase of what seemed to be core scientific equipment.

Dr ROBBINS (Canada) said that the equipment requested was standard laboratory equipment and therefore he supported its purchase.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution, entitled "Request for use of funds from the Governing Council Special Fund: A. Scientific Equipment" (GC/57/R12):

The Governing Council,

Having reviewed Document GC/57/11A "Request for use of funds from the Governing Council Special Fund: A. Scientific Equipment",

Noting the support from the Scientific Council on the request to purchase scientific equipment (Document GC/57/4),

AUTHORIZES the Director to use up to a maximum of €496 570 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	Approximate unit price (€)	Total price (€)
a) DNA extraction platform			
Nucleic acid small volume extractor	1	101 470	101 470
96-channel pipetting head	1	59 000	59 000
b) ELISA Plate reader	1	50 000	50 000
c) Vacuum concentrator	1	50 000	50 000
d) PCR platform			
Modular high-throughput thermal cycler	3	28 960	86 880
Real Time detection system	3	22 000	66 000
Digital droplet PCR	1	83 220	83 220
Total			496 570

The resolution was **adopted**.

B. JUNE 2016 CONFERENCE (Document GC/57/11B)

Mr ALLEN (Director of Administration and Finance) recalled that, at its Fifty-sixth session, the Governing Council had agreed to allocate up to €50 000 to the production and publication of a book celebrating the first 50 years of IARC and to allocate €100 000 for a conference to be held in Lyon on 7–10 June 2016. Since the costs of the anniversary book had been lower than anticipated, it was requested that the money initially set aside for its production could be allocated to cover potential shortfalls in the funding for the 2016 conference.

Dr ROBBINS (Canada) suggested that it might be possible to link the conference with a meeting of the Union for International Cancer Control (UICC) that was due to be held in October 2016 in Paris¹ and perhaps to cooperate in efforts to bring in similar speakers in some areas.

¹ <http://www.uicc.org/2016-world-cancer-congress-paris-france>

The SECRETARY said that the proposal by the representative of Canada was tabled for discussion at the UICC Board meeting to be held later that month. It might be that some of the "50 for 50" future cancer leaders from low- and middle-income countries could participate in both events. With respect to financing, it was hoped that the conference would attract sponsorship but the reallocated funds from the book would provide the Agency with some security to begin planning.

Dr STEVENS (United States of America) said that the United States encouraged IARC to find additional sponsorship and partners but the proposal to reallocate funds was a good idea.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution, entitled "Request for use of funds from the Governing Council Special Fund: B. June 2016 Conference" (GC/57/R13):

The Governing Council,
Having reviewed Document GC/57/11B "Request for use of funds from the Governing Council Special Fund: B. June 2016 Conference",
Recalling its Resolution GC/56/R11 in which it authorized the Director to use up to €50 000 for the production, printing and translation of the book "IARC, the first 50 years: 1965–2015",

1. NOTES that the Director was able to identify alternative sources of financing during 2014–2015 to cover the costs of the aforementioned book and thus did not use the allocated sum from the Governing Council Special Fund for this purpose; and
2. AUTHORIZES the Director to use the previously allocated sum of €50 000 from the Governing Council Special Fund for the 2016 June Conference in case of any shortfall from sponsorship and registration fees.

The resolution was **adopted**.

C. SUPPORT TO IPSAS IMPLEMENTATION (Document GC/57/11C)

Mr ALLEN (Director of Administration and Finance) said that, with some difficulty, the Administration had managed to contain the costs of IPSAS implementation within the €400 000 envelope authorized by the Governing Council. A report on actual expenditure would be provided in the following year.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution, entitled "Request for use of funds from the Governing Council Special Fund: C. Progress Report on post IPSAS implementation projects" (GC/57/R14):

The Governing Council,
Having reviewed Document GC/57/11C "Progress report on post IPSAS implementation projects",
Recalling its Resolutions GC/55/R17 and GC/56/R14 and the need for the Director to report on the use of the funds to support the adoption of the International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSAS),
THANKS the Director and his staff for this progress report.

The resolution was **adopted**.

5. PROPOSED PROGRAMME AND BUDGET (2016–2017): Item 11 of the Agenda
(Document GC/57/8) (resumed)

The CHAIRPERSON invited the Governing Council to consider the draft resolution which reflected the decisions taken earlier that morning. Responding to a query from Professor MELBYE (Denmark), he said that the figures had been rounded. In response to a question from Dr DONKER (Netherlands) he confirmed that the sum of €500 000 mentioned in paragraph 7 of the draft was to be allocated for a two-year period. It was customary at IARC to authorize the Director, in accordance with the Financial Regulations, to transfer credits between sections of the budget and a limit of 15% had been used in the past.

The SECRETARY said that, under the old budget, it had been somewhat simpler to split the transfer of up to 15% between the three budget appropriation sections but that he envisaged that it might be more complicated to do so over the six current categories.

The CHAIRPERSON said that it might be of some comfort to the Governing Council to note that it had approved a limit of 15% every year since 1969.

Ms SANTHIPRECHACHIT (Administration and Finance Officer) said that the exchange rate given in the draft resolution was the exchange rate at the time that the budget had been prepared in 2014. A sensitivity analysis had been performed to make sure that the exchange rate did not cause problems within the following two years.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution, entitled “Proposed Programme and Budget (2016–2017)” (GC/57/R9):

The Governing Council,

Having reviewed the Agency’s Proposed Programme and Budget for the biennium 2016–2017, as contained in Document GC/57/8 and summary tables Revision 1,

1. APPROVES the budget for the biennium 2016–2017 at the level of €43 413 599;
2. ACKNOWLEDGES that the presentation of the proposed budget for 2016–2017 is aligned with the structure set out in the newly introduced IARC Project Tree, presented in the IARC Medium-Term Strategy for 2016–2020 (Document GC/57/7 and Annexes 1–3);
3. DECIDES that the budget shall be financed by annual assessments on Participating States as follows:
 - (1) €21 106 763 shall be assessed on Participating States on 1 January 2016,
 - (2) €21 806 836 shall be assessed on Participating States on 1 January 2017,
4. DECIDES that €500 000 shall be exceptionally funded from the Governing Council Special Fund;
5. RESOLVES to appropriate an amount of €43 413 599 to the six main Level 2 objectives for the biennium 2016–2017 as follows:

Section	IARC Project Tree – Level 2 Objectives	Amount (€)
1.	Describe the occurrence of cancer	3 170 478
2.	Understand the causes of cancer	12 325 676
3.	Evaluate and implement cancer prevention and control strategies	4 420 264
4.	Increase the capacity for cancer research	10 281 347
5.	Provide strategic leadership and enhance the impact of the Agency’s contribution to global cancer research	4 458 253
6.	Enable and support the efficient conduct and coordination of research	8 757 581
	Total	43 413 599

6. DECIDES that the Director shall have authority under Financial Regulations Article III, Paragraph 3.3 to transfer credits between sections of the budget, provided that such transfers do not exceed 15% of the section from which the credit is transferred. Transfers in excess of 15% of the section from which the credit is transferred may be made with the prior written concurrence of the majority of the Members of the Governing Council;
7. DECIDES to grant authority to the Director to use a maximum of €500 000 in the biennium 2016–2017 from the Governing Council Special Fund to cover unforeseen budgetary costs due to currency realignments, subject to availability of cash balances in the Fund, noting the base rate of exchange for 2016–2017 is €0.729/US\$; and
8. REQUESTS the Director to report on the use of the Fund for this purpose in future financial reports.

The resolution was **adopted**.

Dr PRASAD (India) said that it was important for the Governing Council to continue to support IARC; he would fully endorse a small increase to the budget in order to ensure that its scientists could continue to fight cancer and work freely.

6. UPDATE ON THE “NOUVEAU CENTRE” PROJECT: Item 15 of the Agenda
(Document GC/57/12)

Mr ALLEN (Director of Administration and Finance), introducing the item, recalled that, at its Fifty-sixth session, the Governing Council had agreed on the size of the new building at 11 060 m² with an estimated cost of €48.3 million. Mr Delestra, who had been responsible for the project on behalf of the French authorities since its inception, would give an update on the “Nouveau Centre”.

Mr DELESTRA (Métropole de Lyon) said that, in view of their convergent strategies on research and development, IARC was considered to be a valuable partner to the City of Lyon and to the wider region. It was proposed that IARC should move to a new, specialized urban site that was dedicated to biotechnology and to centres of excellence in academic and scientific research which would provide 30 000 jobs in the sector. The proximity of the university and scientific institutions would provide opportunities for IARC to form useful partnerships. The site was being developed close to an urban park and with all the transport links and leisure facilities required for scientists and visitors.

The budget for the new building, which had been estimated to be €48 million, would be funded by the French State and local government. The tender process for the architect would be conducted in 2016 and design studies would be expected by 2017. Building works would commence in 2018 and be completed by 2020. No contribution would be required from IARC for rent or for building costs. The French authorities would continue their dialogue with the Agency in order to ensure that the new building corresponded to its needs.

Mr ALLEN (Director of Administration and Finance) expressed gratitude for the commitments made by the host country institutions. A meeting of the Infrastructure Working Group had been held in November 2014 in order to present the initial findings of the “Programmiste” study; the Secretariat had worked with the host country institutions in order to finalize the report. Given the commitments made by the host country, the Governing Council was requested to officially endorse the “Nouveau Centre” project, thereby allowing the Secretariat to enter into formal agreements which would be required for further progress.

Professor BAGGOLEY (Australia) said that, on behalf of Australia, he wished to convey his appreciation for the commitment of the Government of France and the regional and metropolitan authorities in promoting the continued presence of IARC in France. He encouraged IARC to sign the agreement by the end of the year.

Dr HINOSHITA (Japan) welcomed the progress made for the "Nouveau Centre" and expressed sincere appreciation for the efforts of the Secretariat and the Government of France. He looked forward to the finalizing in the draft plans of the meeting rooms in the new space; the Japanese Government hoped that they would be named the "Sasakawa" and "Takamatsu" meeting rooms.

The SECRETARY said that it was important to maintain a link with the past and the Agency would not fail to discuss the two names when the time came.

Mr DE RAEDT (Belgium) congratulated and thanked France for its generous support for the new building. He, too, wished to endorse the project proposal.

Ms RIOS (United States of America) commended IARC and the many players who had found such a very good solution. The United States fully supported the project and looked forward to the next updates on the construction.

The CHAIRPERSON, speaking as the representative of the United Kingdom, said that he was pleased that the finances had been agreed and the United Kingdom was supportive of the project.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution, entitled "Update on the "Nouveau Centre" project" (GC/57/R15):

The Governing Council,

Having considered Document GC/57/12 "Update on "Nouveau Centre" project",

1. THANKS the representatives of the Métropole de Lyon for their presentation of the latest information, developments and for their recommendations in relation to the final specifications for the building, its design and cost estimates for the entirety of the "Nouveau Centre" project;
2. RECOGNIZES, with appreciation, the commitments made by the host country and the strong support received from the local counterparts both for IARC's continued presence in France and in Lyon and the continued efforts to ensure comfortable occupation of the current premises;
3. NOTES, with appreciation, that Participating States are not being requested to make mandatory contributions with regard to the capital costs of the infrastructure project; and
4. AUTHORIZES the Secretariat to sign a contract with the Métropole de Lyon accepting the proposed infrastructure project, which matches the scope approved in Resolution GC/56/R7.

The resolution was **adopted**.

7. STATEMENT BY THE IARC STAFF ASSOCIATION: Item 16 of the Agenda (Document GC/57/13)

Mr DURAND (IARC Staff Association Committee) said that, since December 2013, the Staff Association had re-established ties with other WHO and United Nations Staff Association Committees. At the beginning of 2015, confirmation of the agreements required for the budget and building of the "Nouveau Centre" had been met with relief by all staff, in particular those recruited locally who feared for the stability of jobs if the Agency were to leave Lyon. However, the layout of the future premises, especially the much-feared introduction of open working spaces, continued to cause concern.

In December 2014, the Staff Association Committee had launched its biennial Work Climate Survey which recorded improvements over the previous survey in the following areas: knowledge of procedures in the event of harassment; information on IARC strategy; cooperation between the scientific and administrative sections; and equal treatment of all staff members and opportunities for developing new skills. However, work satisfaction, working conditions and the trust in work by supervisors had fallen slightly. The survey also showed that the most positive point was pride in working at IARC. 18 people, or 12.2% of respondents, reported that they had been harassed in 2014 although it was not possible to compare that data directly with the previous survey. Furthermore, the 360° evaluation exercise introduced by the Administration, in which some staff members assessed their first-level supervisors, did not have a great deal of effect. The Committee would favour an enquiry among staff to assess the medium-term impact of the 360° evaluation. The Work Climate Survey also showed that staff considered the level of cooperation within the Agency to be very good and several comments asked for more shared activities or events aimed at bringing staff together. Some staff had taken part in the "United Nations Inter-Agency Games", 10 years after the last IARC participation. The Association sincerely thanked the Administration, which had supported the initiative by offering two extra days paid leave to Staff taking part (subject to agreement by their supervisors); it was regrettable that some supervisors had refused to allow members of their group to take up that opportunity.

In 2013, the Administration had suspended the Classification Review Committee and replaced it with a system requiring the restructuring of an entire Group, cost-neutral for the payroll, before a position could be considered for reclassification. In June 2013, the Director, in response to the results of the 2012–2013 Work Climate Survey, announced that the system would be reviewed in 2015 "to ensure that it meets the requirements of the Agency and guarantees a reasonable career progression for staff". The year 2015 had arrived and the Committee would be watching to ensure that the announcement was followed through. Several groups in the Agency had been restructured in 2014, resulting in a tense work climate throughout the process, which had been highly stressful for the staff involved. The restructuring had led to two people leaving the Agency after many years of service and two people being reallocated to positions with tasks very different to those of their previous jobs. The Committee had asked the Administration to improve its communication with groups concerned in any future restructuring.

At the beginning of 2015, the Administration had introduced generic job descriptions for laboratory technicians working in the Agency, setting out the types of tasks to be performed by the General Service (GS) grades. Eventually, all staff would receive generic job descriptions. For forthcoming reviews, the Committee had asked the Administration to ensure that supervisors of the jobs

concerned were consulted from the outset. The Staff Association Committee strongly supported the idea of the occasional use of teleworking. Ms Françoise Nocquet, WHO Human Resources Director, had also invited IARC to implement a teleworking policy.

It was hoped that new candidates would be found to take part in the Staff Association elections to ensure the long-term future of the Committee and the sustainability of its actions. The main difficulty faced by Committee members was probably that of representing staff in line with their expectations. He hoped that he had presented their ideas as fairly as possible and thanked the members of the Governing Council for listening to their views.

The CHAIRPERSON said that the Governing Council welcomed hearing the comments of the Staff Association. He asked whether sufficient numbers of staff had joined the Association.

Mr DURAND (IARC Staff Association Committee) said that only seven members of staff belonged to the Staff Association Committee, three of whom were leaving in June. He hoped that new staff would be elected at that time.

Professor BAGGOLEY (Australia) asked for further information concerning the 360° feedback and why there had been no changes in behaviour as a result.

Mr ALLEN (Director of Administration and Finance) said that the feedback on the 360° had been somewhat surprising. All 28 senior managers had participated in the feedback exercise and a full week of training had ensued. Further targeted leadership training would take place.

Dr RIVEDAL (Norway) said that it was very important for each institution to have a staff association and he thanked the IARC Staff Association for their important work. It would be important for the Association to be involved in the move to the new building.

The CHAIRPERSON said that most modern offices were designed as open plan areas and there were benefits to working in that environment.

Dr ROBBINS (Canada) thanked the Staff Association and pointed out that an open plan office could have benefits for productivity and collaboration. He sought clarification concerning the cases of harassment.

Mr DURAND (IARC Staff Association Committee) said that the 18 cases of harassment had been divulged in confidence in the survey but that they had not been brought as formal complaints. One of the problems in assisting staff was not to keep people isolated and to make sure that they were able to report harassment.

The SECRETARY said that it was important that the Staff Association had the freedom to report to the Governing Council; he welcomed their involvement.

He endorsed the work of the Staff Association. The classification review would be finalized later that year. The Administration was working with WHO colleagues who were experts in the field of post classification in order to put in place a better system with specific functions for specific grades. There had been engagement between supervisors and staff, but he took on board the need for early consultation.

The restructuring had been stressful for staff although management had tried to conduct it as openly and as quickly as possible. The human resources officer had held meetings with Group Heads and individual staff members.

He had been very concerned to read the numbers of staff reporting harassment. No formal complaints of harassment had been received, but any complaint would be treated seriously. Training on interpersonal leadership would supplement the full training on harassment, which had already taken place. The staff physician could be approached at any time and WHO had just appointed a new ombudsman with whom concerns could be raised.

Mr DE RAEDT (Belgium) said that he had not enjoyed the experience of working in an open plan office and he found it to have a negative impact on productivity. He hoped that the policy would be reconsidered.

Dr STEBER BÜCHLI (Switzerland) said that the report had been very interesting and that any report of harassment was of great concern.

The Governing Council **noted** the report.

8. ACCEPTANCE OF GRANTS AND CONTRACTS, INCLUDING REPORT ON INTEREST APPORTIONMENT: Item 17 of the Agenda (Document GC/57/14)

Ms SANTHIPRECHACHIT (Administration and Finance Officer) said that document GC/57/14 contained details of grants and contracts received in the previous year.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution, entitled "Acceptance of grants and contracts, including report on interest apportionment" (GC/57/R16):

<p>The Governing Council, Having considered Document GC/57/14 "Acceptance of grants and contracts, including report on interest apportionment", In accordance with IARC Financial Regulations,</p>
--

1. AUTHORIZES the Director to seek funding for the following:
Five-year extension of the grant to support the IARC Monographs on the Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans [National Institutes of Health/National Cancer Institute (NIH/NCI), USA in an amount of €3 466 065 for 60 months];
2. AUTHORIZES the Director to seek funding for the two projects below, involving collaboration with the private sector, and for which collaborations were formalized with Memoranda of Understanding:
 - a) Development, field testing and evaluation of the efficacy of a hand-held, portable and affordable thermo-coagulator to prevent cervical cancer in low- and middle-income countries [National Institutes of Health/National Cancer Institute (NIH/NCI), USA in an amount of €842 895 for 48 months]; and
 - b) Development and clinical validation of a multi-type HPV E6-E7 oncoprotein test for cervical cancer screening and triage in low- and middle-income countries [National Institutes of Health/National Cancer Institute (NIH/NCI), USA in an amount of €877 739 for 48 months];
3. NOTES the post facto reporting of grants and contracts accepted by the Director as detailed in Document GC/57/14;
4. NOTES the amounts of interest income apportioned; and
5. COMMENDS the staff on its success in winning competitive research grants.

The resolution was **adopted**.

9. ACCEPTANCE OF DONATIONS: Item 18 of the Agenda (Document GC/57/15)

The CHAIRPERSON invited the Governing Council to consider document GC/57/15.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution, entitled "Acceptance of grants and contracts, including report on interest apportionment" (GC/57/R17):

The Governing Council,
Having been informed by Document GC/57/15 of the unconditional donations accepted by the Director under the authority vested in him by Resolution GC/4/R3,
EXPRESSES its deep appreciation to the donors for their contribution to the research activities of the Agency.

The resolution was **adopted**.

The meeting rose at 12:50