

International Agency for Research on Cancer



**Governing Council
Fifty-seventh Session**

**GC/57/Min.4
Original: ENGLISH**

*Lyon, 13-14 May 2015
Auditorium*

MINUTES OF THE FOURTH MEETING

IARC, Lyon

Thursday, 14 May 2015, at 15:05

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

Secretary: Dr Christopher P. Wild, Director, IARC

CONTENTS

	Page
1. Appointment of new members of the Scientific Council	4
2. Biennial Report of the IARC Ethics Committee (IEC), 2013–2014	5
3. Membership of the Subcommittee on the admission of new Participating States	6
4. Any other business	7
5. Election of Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson for next session	10
6. Date of next session	10
7. Closure of session	10

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, <i>Secretary</i>	Dr N. GAUDIN	Dr R. SANKARANARAYANAN
Mr D. ALLEN	Dr Z. HERCEG	Ms A. SANTHIPRECHACHIT
Ms A. BERGER	Dr R. HERRERO	Dr A. SCALBERT
Dr F. BRAY	Dr A. KESMINIENE	Dr J. SCHÜZ
Dr P. BRENNAN	Dr D. LOOMIS	Dr N. SLIMANI
Dr G. BYRNES	Dr J. MCKAY	Dr K. STRAIF
Ms D. D'AMICO	Dr M. MENDY	Dr M. TOMMASINO
Mr P. DAMIECKI	Dr R. NJIE	Dr J. ZAVADIL
Dr S. FRANCESCHI	Dr H. OHGAKI	
Ms E. FRANÇON	Dr I. ROMIEU	

1. APPOINTMENT OF NEW MEMBERS OF THE SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL (CLOSED SESSION): Item 19 of the Agenda (Document GC/57/16)

The Governing Council met in closed session from 14:10 to 15:05.

The CHAIRPERSON said that, during the discussion held in closed session, members of the Governing Council had voiced the view that they had insufficient information on which to base their choice of appointees to the Scientific Council. Participating States had nominated candidates with excellent qualifications, but the Governing Council needed to make appointments based on a balance of expertise. He proposed that a discussion on improving the process for selection of appointees should be undertaken by the Director and the Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson, with the Chairperson of the Scientific Council.

The SECRETARY said that he supported the suggestion by the Chairperson. More broadly, it would be helpful to assess the scientific strengths in cancer research of potential new Participating States in order to match that information with the gaps on the Scientific Council. In the past, he had not entered into direct dialogue with Governing Council members on that issue.

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/57/R18):

The Governing Council,

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

1. APPOINTS

Dr Jenny Chang-Claude, Germany)	
Dr Lalit Kumar, India)	
Dr Jerome Coffey, Ireland)	
Dr Eugenia Dogliotti, Italy)	
Dr Karima El Rhazi, Morocco)	to serve for four years on the Scientific Council
Dr Giske Ursin, Norway)	
Dr Dukhyoung Lee, Republic of Korea)	
Dr Boris Ya. Alekseev, Russian Federation)	
Dr Jonas Bergh, Sweden)	
Dr Kadir Mutlu Hayran, Turkey)	

2. THANKS the outgoing members of the Scientific Council, Drs Paul W. Dickman (Sweden), Luca Gianni (Italy), Inger Gram (Norway), Murat Gültekin (Turkey), In-Hoo Kim (Republic of Korea), Deirdre Murray (Ireland), Thangarajan Rajkumar (India), Sergei Tjulandin (Russian Federation) and Cornelia Ulrich (Germany) for their valuable work in the Scientific Council and for the contribution which they have made to the research activities of the Agency.

2. BIENNIAL REPORT OF THE IARC ETHICS COMMITTEE (IEC), 2013–2014: Item 20 of the Agenda (Document GC/57/17)

Professor FERVERS (Chair, IARC Ethics Committee), illustrating her remarks with slides, said that the Ethics Committee ensured that the scientific, clinical and methodological aspects of research at IARC safeguarded the rights and welfare of research participants through the consistent application of the highest ethical standards. The Committee met five times per year to give an ethical evaluation of all IARC projects within its competence. Key reference texts for ethical review included the Declaration of Helsinki (10th version 2013); the International Ethical Guidelines for Biomedical Research Involving Human Subjects (2002); and the WHO Standards and operational guidance for ethics review of health-related research with human participants (2011). In 2013–2014, the Committee had reviewed 66 new projects, of which 56 had been cleared after the first review, seven had been given conditional approvals and three had not been approved. Of 14 re-submissions, 11 had been cleared, one had been given conditional approval and two had not been approved. The Committee was continuing to monitor the ASBEST study and to report to the Director of IARC on an annual basis. A simplified review process had been developed for the EPIC studies.

Among the ethical challenges and practical issues raised by incidental findings in genomic studies were the advent of new technologies in molecular biology, genetics and bioinformatics. A consensus was emerging in favour of a conditional return of information to research participants on clinically relevant and “actionable” incidental findings. There was an absence of internationally agreed guidelines on the management of the return of information on incidental findings, particularly in a research context. The Committee considered that the conditions were currently not fulfilled for implementing the return of information on incidental findings in genomic research and it was preparing a discussion document to engage IARC scientists and external collaborators on the subject.

The ethics review of research involved consideration of situations in which financial or other personal considerations might compromise or appear to affect the conduct or reporting of research. Potential conflicts of interest were dealt with at different levels; all members of the Committee and all IARC personnel received ethics training. Forthcoming plans included an update of the Rules and Procedures and of the Standard Operating Procedures and the design of a web-based platform to support the submission and processing of projects and to facilitate submission.

In the ensuing discussion, Professor BUZYN (France), Dr STEVENS (United States of America), Dr ROBBINS (Canada) and Dr PRASAD (India) expressed appreciation for the work of the IARC Ethics Committee and acknowledged the complex international environment in which it was conducted. The management of incidental findings in genomic studies and the conditional return of research to participants, particularly in “actionable” incidental findings, required serious contemplation and could perhaps be better evaluated with the scientific community at the global level.

The SECRETARY thanked the former Chair of the Ethics Committee, Professor Jean-Pierre Boissel, and the current Chair, Professor Fervers, for their leadership. The Committee created an awareness of some of the ethical issues around cancer research, particularly in low- and middle-income countries, that had a value that went beyond the analysis of individual projects. There had been discussion as to whether the paper developed on incidental findings should be made public, and the matter would be further considered by the IARC Ethics Committee.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution on the Biennial Report of the IARC Ethics Committee (IEC) for 2013–2014 (GC/57/R19):

The Governing Council,

Having examined the Biennial Report of the IARC Ethics Committee (2013–2014), as contained in Document GC/57/17,

1. WELCOMES the Biennial Report of the IARC Ethics Committee (2013–2014);
2. THANKS the Chairperson, Professor Béatrice Fervers, for her presentation of the report; and
3. REQUESTS the Director to continue reporting biennially on issues related to ethics at the Agency.

The resolution was **adopted**.

3. MEMBERSHIP OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE ADMISSION OF NEW PARTICIPATING STATES: Item 21 of the Agenda

In response to a request from the CHAIRPERSON, Professor BAGGOLEY (Australia), Dr ROBBINS (Canada), Dr PRASAD (India), Dr DE ANDRÉS MEDINA (Spain) and Professor TUNCER (Turkey) put forward their names for membership of the Subcommittee on the admission of new Participating States.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution on membership of the Subcommittee on the admission of new Participating States (GC/57/R20):

The Governing Council,

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

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, Canada, India, Spain and Turkey, who shall hold office until the next regular session of the Council.

The resolution was **adopted**.

4. ANY OTHER BUSINESS: Item 22 of the Agenda

Dr STEVENS (United States of America) requested that, in addition to the evaluation plan that had already been agreed, the Agency should give some thought to how to communicate how specific scientific projects met the goals of the Medium-Term Strategy.

In addition, she proposed that a new joint Scientific Council and Governing Council working group on budget priorities could be set up so that budget decisions could be taken in a considered manner. It was disappointing, for instance, that a decision had been taken to cut a pathologist position, in direct contradiction of the advice of the Scientific Council. The working group could also consider the introduction of different funding models, which could be used to overcome budget shortfalls.

The SECRETARY explained that each element of the proposed budget had been supported by the Scientific Council and therefore the adjustment to the budget had necessarily required removing items which the latter had already approved. It was the role of the Director to make proposals concerning the budget and therefore he did not understand what would be the role of the proposed working group in that regard. The proposal to identify other funding mechanisms would be welcome.

Dr STEVENS (United States of America) said that it would be useful, when considering budget proposals, for the Governing Council to understand how the cutting or addition of posts impacted the ability of the Agency to perform.

The SECRETARY said that the budget proposals had been communicated, with explanations concerning the posts, three months in advance of the Governing Council meeting.

Mr FAKKEL (Netherlands) said that the establishment of a joint working group would enable the Governing Council to better establish budget priorities.

Professor BAGGOLEY (Australia), supported by Professor ESKOLA (Finland), said that it was for the Governing Council to approve the budget but it was for the Director to make choices on the

appointment of posts. If the Governing Council began to make decisions concerning individual budget allocations, it would be behaving like an executive body rather than as a board. Therefore, he did not support the suggestion by the representative of the United States of America.

Dr DE ANDRÉS MEDINA (Spain) and Professor TUNCER (Turkey) supported the proposal by the representative of the United States of America because it created room for better interaction between the Governing Council and the Scientific Council.

Professor MELBYE (Denmark) said that good communication already existed between the Governing Council and the Scientific Council and therefore he supported the view put forward by the representative of Australia.

Professor ULFENDAHL (Sweden) agreed fully with the view of the representative of Australia: he had confidence in the ability of the Director in budget allocation matters and he did not support the founding of a new working group.

Dr BABBS (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) said that he supported the views put forward by the representatives of Australia, Denmark and Sweden: it was for the Director of the Agency to prepare his vision and to present it to the Scientific Council and to formulate his strategy based on the advice he received.

Professor BUZYN (France) said that she was a little uncomfortable with the proposal by the representative of the United States of America because the membership of the new working group would be restricted in number and therefore it would not be representative of the membership of IARC. She supported the views of the representatives of Australia, Sweden and the United Kingdom.

Dr FALEH (Qatar) agreed with the representative of Australia that there should be a distinction between the board and the executive: it was not for the Governing Council to interfere in the detailed allocation of each budget item. He did not support the proposal to form a new working group.

Dr RIVEDAL (Norway) said that he did not support the suggestion to form a working group, as it would lead the Governing Council to enter into an area that was the responsibility of the Director and his staff. He echoed the views of the representatives of Australia, Denmark and others.

Mr COMISKEY (Ireland) said that, in general, he was very supportive of initiatives that created dialogue but the creation of a proposed working group might lead to further confusion in the decision-making process. Furthermore, it was for the Governing Council to approve the budget. It might be helpful to place the budget on the agenda on the first day of the meeting to allow further time for reflection following initial discussion.

Dr STEVENS (United States of America) wished to clarify that her comments had in no way meant to imply a lack of ability on the part of the Director but were intended to find a way to engage in an increased conversation on scientific priorities and budget decisions.

The CHAIRPERSON asked the representative of the WHO Office of the Legal Counsel to explain the implications of setting up a joint working group or subcommittee. Although a majority of Governing Council members did not seem to be in favour of the course of action proposed, they might wish to reflect on it during the coming year.

Dr STEVENS (United States of America) said that she favoured waiting until the following year for further discussion on her proposal. She noted that the Secretary had received favourably the suggestion that alternative models of funding could be sought.

Ms HERNANDEZ (Canada) said that she understood the concerns of the representative of the United States in seeking to ensure a better alignment between the scientific priorities and budgetary decision-making, although she shared the concerns expressed around the table. She believed that it was important that decisions on the budget were taken by the Governing Council as a whole and not by a smaller group.

Ms MCKEOUGH (WHO Office of the Legal Counsel) said that the Governing Council had the authority to set up working groups and subcommittees. In the past, the Governing Council had considered whether any subcommittee had a coherent function and whether it was acting within the mandate of the Governing Council and was not taking over functions of the Scientific Council or of the Director. The reporting mechanism of such a subcommittee and any budgetary requirements it might have in order to hold meetings would need to be established. Would it be an ad hoc or a standing committee?

The CHAIRPERSON said that Governing Council members might find an exchange of information very helpful but the question would be to determine the best way of achieving that aim. He proposed that the Governing Council should welcome the suggestion and examine it further at its fifty-eighth session.

It was so **agreed**.

5. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON AND VICE-CHAIRPERSON FOR THE NEXT SESSION: Item 23 of the Agenda

On the proposal of Professor MELBYE (Denmark), Dr Mark Palmer (United Kingdom) was unanimously re-elected as the Chairperson of the Governing Council, the proposal being seconded by Dr DE ANDRÉS MEDINA (Spain) and Dr FALEH (Qatar).

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

6. DATE OF NEXT SESSION: Item 24 of the Agenda

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution on date of next session (GC/57/R21):

The Governing Council,

1. DECIDES to hold its next regular session in Lyon, France, on the Thursday and Friday preceding the opening of the World Health Assembly in the year 2016; and
2. REQUESTS the Director to inform members of the Council as soon as these dates are known.

The resolution was **adopted**.

7. CLOSURE OF SESSION: Item 25 of the Agenda

The CHAIRPERSON looked forward to the 50th anniversary celebration events that would be held on the following day. He thanked participants for their contribution to the Agency.

The SECRETARY thanked the Chairperson for his guidance during the meeting and his commitment during the course of the year through a series of teleconferences. He thanked the City of Lyon and the French authorities for their immense support as the host country for the Agency and for the additional contribution of Professor Buzyn (France) in that regard. It was a special pleasure to welcome Morocco as a new Participating State. He was grateful to Scientific Council members for their engaging discussions and support. He thanked Ms McKeough (WHO Office of the Legal Counsel) for her wise advice, the Agency's scientific team and all the staff who had worked hard to prepare the present meeting. He, too, looked forward to the celebrations to be held on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of IARC.

The CHAIRPERSON declared the session closed.

The meeting rose at 16:20.