

International Agency for Research on Cancer



**Governing Council
Fifty-eighth Session**

GC/58/R1

*Lyon, 19–20 May 2016
Auditorium*

IARC BIENNIAL REPORT 2014–2015

The Governing Council,

Having reviewed the IARC Biennial Report for 2014–2015 (Document GC/58/2),

1. EXPRESSES its satisfaction with the work accomplished; and
2. COMMENDS the Director and his staff on the Biennial Report.



**Governing Council
Fifty-eighth Session**

GC/58/R2

*Lyon, 19–20 May 2016
Auditorium*

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

The Governing Council,

Having reviewed the Director's Report (Document GC/58/3),

1. THANKS the Director for the Report and for the Key Performance Indicators provided therein;
2. REQUESTS the Director to continue this standard reporting on an annual basis; and
3. EXPRESSES its satisfaction with the Director's written and oral Reports.



**Governing Council
Fifty-eighth Session**

GC/58/R3

*Lyon, 19–20 May 2016
Auditorium*

REPORT OF THE SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL

The Governing Council,

Having reviewed the Report presented by the Fifty-second Scientific Council (Document GC/58/4) and the Director's response (Document GC/58/5),

1. NOTES the Report (Document GC/58/4) with great interest;
2. CONGRATULATES the members of the Scientific Council for their supportive and excellent work; and
3. COMMENDS the Director for his constructive responses to the recommendations of the Fifty-second Session of the Scientific Council and welcomes the Director's decision to present a document to the full Scientific Council in January 2017, covering plans for bioinformatics.



**Governing Council
Fifty-eighth Session**

GC/58/R4

*Lyon, 19–20 May 2016
Auditorium*

**FINANCIAL REPORT, REPORT OF THE EXTERNAL AUDITOR
AND FINANCIAL STATEMENTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31 DECEMBER 2015**

The Governing Council,

Having examined Document GC/58/7 ("Financial Report, Report of the External Auditor, and Financial Statements for the year ended 31 December 2015"),

1. THANKS the External Auditor for his report and opinion; and
2. APPROVES the Report of the Director on the financial operations of the Agency.

UPDATE ON THE “NOUVEAU CENTRE” PROJECT

The Governing Council,

Having considered Document GC/58/8 “Update on the “Nouveau Centre” project,

1. EXPRESSES its appreciation to the French national authorities, the Région Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes, the Métropole de Lyon and the City of Lyon for their continued efforts in support of the “Nouveau Centre” project;
2. WELCOMES the Secretariat’s continued cooperation with France as the host country, and local authorities, resulting in the progress of the “Nouveau Centre” project; and
3. REQUESTS the Director to keep the Governing Council and the Working Group on Infrastructure apprised of major future developments in relation to the “Nouveau Centre” project.

PRODUCTION OF STANDARD REPORTS INCLUDING IARC BIENNIAL AND INTERIM ANNUAL REPORTS

The Governing Council,

Recalling its Resolution GC/27/R4,

Having taken note of the recommendations of the Working Group to review the production of standard reports (Document GC/58/9),

1. THANKS the Scientific Council for its review of the proposals;
2. ADOPTS the recommendations on the production of standard reports contained in paragraph 7 of Document GC/58/9, to be effective from 2017;
3. DECIDES that the current practice of the Director making an Interim Annual report of the Agency's activities in odd-numbered years be replaced by the production of a list of publications of Agency staff and by an oral presentation by the Director of major scientific highlights; and
4. REQUESTS the Director to continue to publish, in even-numbered years, a Biennial Report reviewing the entire range of activities during the preceding two-year period.

EVALUATION APPROACH OF THE IARC MEDIUM-TERM STRATEGY (2016–2020)

The Governing Council,

Having considered Document GC/58/10 “Proposal for an evaluation approach of the IARC Medium-Term Strategy (2016–2020)”,

1. DECIDES to establish a Working Group, to discuss and define the metrics for evaluating the implementation of the IARC Medium-Term Strategy (2016–2020) that shall be composed of:
 - a. Five members of the Governing Council (the representatives of Canada, Finland, Germany, Turkey and United States of America),
 - b. Five members of the Scientific Council, to be selected by the Director in consultation with the Scientific Council Chair and Vice-Chair,
 - c. A representative of WHO, and
 - d. Three members of the IARC Secretariat (i.e. the Director and two senior IARC scientists),
2. REQUESTS the Director to submit the Working Group’s recommendations on this evaluation framework, for discussion at the Scientific Council meeting in January 2017, and a final version, incorporating the Scientific Council’s comments, for discussion and approval at the regular session of the Governing Council in May 2017;
3. REQUESTS the Director to carry out the evaluation of the IARC Medium-Term Strategy’s implementation in mid-2018, and submit his report for review by the Working Group in late-2018;
4. REQUESTS the Director to submit the Working Group’s comments and conclusions for discussion at the Scientific Council meeting in January 2019, and a final evaluation report incorporating the Scientific Council’s recommendations, for discussion at the regular session of the Governing Council in May 2019;
5. REQUESTS the Director to submit to the Governing Council in May 2020 an update to the implementation of the recommendations of the final evaluation report that were adopted by the Governing Council in May 2019; and
6. REQUESTS the Working Group to review the frequency and timing of evaluation of Medium-Term Strategies.

**Governing Council
Fifty-eighth Session**

GC/58/R8

*Lyon, 19–20 May 2016
Auditorium*

UPDATE OF THE GUIDELINES FOR PEER-REVIEWS AT IARC

The Governing Council

Having considered Document GC/58/11 "Update of the guidelines for Peer-Reviews at IARC",

1. THANKS the Scientific Council for reviewing the new guidelines and for its recommendation to approve them;
2. ADOPTS the update of the Guidelines for IARC Scientific Review Process contained in Annexes 1 and 2 of Document GC/58/11, appended hereto; and
3. REQUESTS the Scientific Council and the Secretariat to conduct future Scientific Reviews in accordance with the revised process appended hereto.

**Appendix to Resolution GC/58/R8
Guidelines for IARC Scientific Review Process
(reviewed by the Scientific Council in 2016)**

As a preamble to this document, it should be noted that it uses terminology regarding the scientific structure of IARC that is intended to be as general as possible, so as to accommodate possible future changes in structure and nomenclature.

- Section:* either comprises a single integrated research grouping or a number of research Groups working on complementary areas, which require review by a single review team. There is a Section Head, with overall responsibility and there may be a Deputy Section Head.
- Group:* comprises a number of researchers working on closely related topics in the same general scientific area led by a Group Head.
- Head:* Senior Scientist holding a role of Section Head, Deputy Section Head, or Group Head.
- Review Panel:* this is the group which will carry out periodic peer reviews of scientific Sections on behalf of the Scientific Council and comprised of both Scientific Council and external expert members. Review panels will consider the Section, where this is an integrated grouping, and, in cases where Sections have constituent Groups, will evaluate the individual Groups as well as the overall Section.

IARC Scientific Review process

A. Aims

1. Independent scientific review is essential to ensure the highest quality of research conducted by IARC.
2. The relevance of any research activity must be seen within the overall strategy for IARC as determined in the Medium-Term Strategy, approved by the Governing Council.
3. In order to ensure the highest quality of research, IARC will seek independent peer review conducted according to the highest international standards. The review process will involve a site visit by an expert Review Panel to assess both the past and proposed future work of the Sections and their composite Groups. A full report of the review will be prepared, which will include a Consensus Statement prepared by the Review Panel. Where deemed necessary by the Review Panel, additional reviews could be conducted between Section reviews.
4. Members of the IARC Scientific Council should play a key role in such Review Panels. However, these should be complemented by scientists of international repute from outside the Scientific Council.

B. Objectives

5. The objective is to conduct a detailed scientific review of the Sections and Groups, based on past achievements and future plans. The Review will evaluate the quality and scientific merit of the work and how well it fits with the overall mission and strategy of IARC. The Review will provide advice to the IARC Director on strategy for future research in the area covered by the Section. These reviews also provide the opportunity for senior scientific staff to reassess their own research aims and directions.

C. Selection of the Review Panel

6. Review Panels meet in the two days immediately preceding the Scientific Council session to which they are reporting.

7. Guidelines for selection of the Review Panel:

- a. A Chairperson for each Review will be nominated by the IARC Scientific Council at their meeting prior to the Review taking place. The Chairperson, except for exceptional circumstances, should be a current member of the Scientific Council and should be independent of the IARC scientific programme.
- b. The Review Panel should be comprised of approximately equal numbers of appropriately qualified members of the Scientific Council and non-members expert in the areas being reviewed.
- c. Members of such Review Panels should be scientists who have experience in the relevant research area, have outstanding research credentials and no conflicts of interest with the programmes being reviewed. Restricted involvement in IARC work is permissible but should always be declared in advance by inclusion in the WHO Declaration of Interest form.
- d. As each research Group will be reviewed in detail by at least two members of the Panel the Review Panel should be of sufficient size to allow for this.
- e. The process of identifying and inviting members of the Review Panel should occur as soon as possible after the Chairperson has been identified.
- f. Reviewers will be selected jointly by the Chair of the Review Panel, the Chair of the Scientific Council and the Director.
- g. After the Scientific Council meeting, the Director, in consultation with the Section and Group Heads, should provide the Chair of the Review Panel with several alternative names of potential reviewers, with short CVs/publication lists, to cover each field of research (considering the expertise of both Scientific Council members and external members).
- h. The Chair of the Review Panel, the Chair of the Scientific Council and the Director will discuss the potential external experts in one or more conference calls. The Director and the Section Head may object to any proposed reviewer on the grounds of conflict of interest, providing the objections and justification to the Review Panel Chair.

- i. Invitations to reviewers should be sent, and acceptance received, at least six months before the date of the Review. Conference calls should be used to identify alternates if necessary, following the above procedure.

D. Review documents

8. The written submissions from the scientists in each research Group and Section form the framework for the Review. They should be equally balanced between achievements and future plans, providing a comprehensive overview of the work performed during the last five years and of future short-, medium- and long-term research plans, of how this work fits with the IARC Medium-Term Strategy and its contribution to IARC's mission. The papers should provide sufficient detail for the Review Panel to assess the quality of the research proposals, the Section/Group's expertise and its abilities to achieve the goals.

9. The review documents should, subject to discussion between the Review Panel Chair and the Director, be prepared in the format detailed in Annex 1 below. Where a Section is composed of two or more Groups, an additional short Working Paper will be prepared for the full Section giving a general description, its strategic vision, its role within IARC, and its operational management.

10. The material relevant for the review should be distributed to the members of the Review Panel at least two months before the site visit.

11. The reviewers may query some elements of the report in advance with the Section Head. All these queries go through the Review Panel Chair to ensure that all Panel members are aware of the query and the response.

E. The Review

12. The Review Panel will conduct an in-depth evaluation of the past performance and planned activities of the Section and Groups and an assessment of their alignment to IARC's Medium-Term Strategy. In addition to providing an evaluation of the scientific output as a whole, the Review will include an assessment of the standing, managerial ability and research output of the Section, Deputy Section and Group Heads. The evaluation should go beyond the traditional academic measures used in the assessment of research quality (e.g. scientific discoveries, publications, extra-budgetary funding etc.) and also take into consideration indicators related to the particular mandate and mission of IARC, including contribution to the creation of collaborative networks, contribution to training and capacity building in developing countries and impact on the development of cancer control policy. In summary the Review Panel will assess:

- the quality of the scientific research programme;
- the congruence of the research programme with IARC's strategy;
- the broader contribution of the research Section/Group to the Agency's mission.

13. Where there are two or more Groups in a Section, the Review Panel Chair should assign at least two Panel members to review each Group, two months before the review. A panel member may be assigned more than one Group where necessary.

14. Because of time constraints during the Review meeting, it is suggested that a draft report, which will form part of the Consensus Statement, be produced prior to the meeting by the Review Panel members, based on the material provided.

15. The draft report should be based on the format of the Consensus Statement as given in Annex 2 below, but may be modified following discussion among the Review Panel. This draft report should be circulated to the other reviewers in advance.

16. The timetable of the review will be agreed in advance by the Chair of the Review Panel and the Director following submission of a draft timetable by the Secretariat.

17. The Director and Section, Deputy Section and Group Heads will have an opportunity for individual private meetings with the Review Panel.

18. Each Section/Group Head will make a brief presentation (approximately 30 minute presentation, 45 minute discussion, 30 minute evaluation). The presentation and discussion are conducted in the presence of all Section staff but the evaluation is carried out by the Review Panel in closed session. The presentation should be focused on the Section/Group's strategic plan and how this is to be achieved by the projects described in the Working Paper. The emphasis should be on research plans; only highlights of the past five years' achievements should be briefly presented. This session will provide the opportunity for the Review Panel to probe the details of the proposals and the ability to deliver the programme.

19. Following each presentation, the Review Panel will meet privately to discuss its findings and to identify any issues for which further clarification is required. The Section, Deputy Section and Group Heads may then be invited to respond to any queries and to discuss other pertinent issues.

20. The Review Panel members will also have an informal meeting with the scientists, students and post-docs in the Section. Junior members of the Section being reviewed will prepare posters that will be displayed in the area where lunch- and tea-breaks will be taken. The Review Panel will comment on the quality of the training environment.

F. Presentation and discussion of results

21. At the end of the Review, the Section, Deputy Section and Group Heads and the IARC Director will be debriefed by the Review Panel. This will include a brief summary of the assessment of the Panel and notification of the scores for the components of the programme.

22. The Review Panel will draft a Consensus Statement summarizing its findings and conclusions, based on the format in Annex 2 below.

23. Each Section/Group Head will be invited to identify any factual inaccuracies, which will be corrected and, if he/she wishes, to comment on and respond to the Consensus Statement. The Review Panel will then finalize its Consensus Statement for presentation to the IARC Scientific Council.

G. Submission to Scientific Council

24. The Consensus Statement of the Review Panel is provided to the IARC Scientific Council at the session immediately following the Review.
25. The Chairperson of the Review Panel will attend the Scientific Council meeting to present the report.
26. At this Scientific Council session, the Section/Group Head reviewed may be invited to respond to questions or to express responses to the review, but this must not imply any element of re-review.
27. The Director will respond to the findings of the Review Panel.
28. The Scientific Council discusses the Consensus Statement, the Director's response, finalizes and accepts the "Scientific Council Review Report of the Section" as a Scientific Council Working Paper. The Scientific Council summarizes the outcome of the review process as a part of its report to the Governing Council at its session following the Scientific Council.

H. Process resulting from the Review

29. In the event that the work of a Group, Section or individual researcher is determined to be unsatisfactory in terms of the science or in its alignment or contribution to the IARC strategy, the research may be terminated and the Section/Group disbanded. In such an eventuality, WHO Staff Rules and Regulations will be applied.
30. Following the meeting of the Scientific Council, the IARC Director will meet with the Section, Deputy Section and Group Heads reviewed to summarize the outcome of the Review.

I. Follow-up on the recommendations

31. During the second Scientific Council meeting after the Review, approximately one year after the review took place, the Director will present the actions that were taken on the Review recommendations.

ANNEX 1

Suggested format of Working Paper prior to review (changes in red)

The emphasis is to be on clarity and brevity.

For Sections composed of two or more Groups

- i. General description of the Section
- ii. Strategic vision of Section **and contribution to IARC's Medium-Term Strategy (MTS)**
- iii. Role of Section within IARC
- iv. Section's structure and operational management
- v. Recommendations for the Section by previous Review Panel(s)

For integrated Sections and for individual Groups within a Section

1. Introduction

- 1.1 General description of the Section/Group
 - 1.1.1 Strategic vision of Section/Group **and contribution to IARC's MTS**
 - 1.1.2 Role of Section/Group within IARC
 - 1.1.3 Current professional (indicate level) and other staff (including Ph.D. students) and visiting fellows
 - 1.1.4 Current vacancies
 - 1.1.5 Professional staff (indicate level) that left IARC in previous five years
 - 1.1.6 Operational management/mandates and responsibilities of senior scientists
 - 1.1.7 Brief CVs of **P staff**
 - 1.1.8 Training programmes/courses attended by Section/Group personnel
 - 1.1.9 Extended CV of Section/Group Head
- 1.2 The Section/Group's contribution to IARC's broader mission (as relevant)
 - 1.2.1 **Involvement in the creation and development of collaborative networks**
 - 1.2.2 **Involvement in the organization of training programmes/courses or other examples of research capacity building**
 - 1.2.3 **Impact on the development of public health policy, national or international guidelines/recommendations**
- 1.3 Recommendations for the Section/Group by previous Review Panel(s)

2. Research report

- 2.1 Past performance by the Section/Group
 - 2.1.1 Overall: landmarks/specific circumstances that influenced performance
 - 2.1.2 List of all significant projects in past five years
- 2.2 For each finished and longer-term ongoing project: 1 page (maximum) summary in the following format:

Title of project [add as many as necessary]

 - 2.2.1 Principal investigator
 - 2.2.2 Role of the Section/Group: initiator or collaborator, names and affiliations of main collaborators
 - 2.2.3 Funding source and amount
 - 2.2.4 Background/motivation
 - 2.2.5 Brief: design and methods
 - 2.2.6 Results
- 2.3 Publication list, containing publications from the Section/Group over the past five years categorized in peer-reviewed papers, book chapters/reviews with the five most significant papers starred
- 2.4 Copies of two key publications; and title pages of other major publications
- 2.5 A list of meetings at which Section/Group members have been invited speakers

3. Future research proposal

- 3.1 Strategic vision of the Section/Group for the next five years
 - 3.1.1 Overall
 - 3.1.2 Short, medium, and long-term goals
 - 3.1.3 Contribution to IARC's MTS
- 3.2 A one to two page summary for each shorter-term ongoing and planned project in the following format:

Title of project [add as many as necessary]

 - 3.2.1 Ongoing/planned
 - 3.2.2 Principal investigator
 - 3.2.3 Role of the Group: initiator or collaborator
 - 3.2.4 Funding source and amount/requested budget
 - 3.2.5 Background/motivation

- 3.2.6 Design and methods (sufficient detail should be provided to allow the reviewers to form an opinion on the feasibility of the proposed work)
- 3.2.7 Expected results and impact
- 3.2.8 Expected completion date
- 3.2.9 Relevance of project to goals of Section/Group and of IARC as a whole
- 3.3 Priority score of the ongoing and planned projects
 - 3.3.1 Essential
 - 3.3.2 Desirable
 - 3.3.3 Useful

If individual projects have been specifically requested or commissioned (e.g. by WHO), please indicate this.

ANNEX 2

Suggested format of Consensus Statement of Review Panel

1. The Section/Group's past work

- 1.1 Overview of work in the last five years
- 1.2 Critical appraisal of work in the last five years

2. The Section/Group's future plans

- 2.1 Overview of future plans and strategic vision
- 2.2 Critical appraisal of future plans

3. The Section/Group's assessment (SWOT)

- 3.1 Assessment of Strengths
- 3.2 Assessment of Weaknesses
- 3.3 Assessment of Opportunities
- 3.4 Assessment of Threats

4. Evaluation of the Section/Group

The **past performance** and **future plans** of each Group and of the Section as a whole should be scored independently for **quality** and **relevance**, as follows:

a. Assessment of scientific quality (using the six-point scale below)

A single score should be assigned for the work of each Group and for the Section as a whole.

It is essential that in determining their scores reviewers consider the narrative description given for each score.

As the score should reflect the complete portfolio of research from a Group or Section then the peer-review committee may choose a combination of categories to reflect heterogeneity within a Group or Section e.g. F/C.

In selecting a score the reviewers should take account of the role of IARC's research in the context of its mission (see section 1.2 in Annex 1), including conducting work in low- and middle-income countries and research which is difficult for national institutes or centres to perform.

Scoring – scientific quality:

- O** (Outstanding) Outstanding work of the highest international calibre, pioneering and trend-setting. This score will only be applied to exceptional programmes of work, not because a programme was particularly topical or in an under-researched area.
- F** (Forefront) Work that is at the forefront internationally and that, it is considered, will have an important and substantial impact.
- C** (Competitive) Work that is internationally competitive, of high quality, and will make a significant contribution.
- NC** (Not competitive) Work that is not considered competitive or high quality and is unlikely to make a significant contribution.
- U** (Unsatisfactory) Unsatisfactory or poor quality work.
- P** (Preliminary) Work that is too preliminary to rate, which should be continued and monitored/reassessed by the Director in the short- to medium-term with subsequent update to the Scientific Council.

b. Assessment of the relevance of the work to the mission of IARC

This should include how well the proposed work benefits from IARC's unique position, how well it appears to fit with the IARC strategy and mission and how it might impact on public health and/or policy.

A single score should be assigned for the work of each Research Group and for the Section as a whole.

Scoring – relevance to the mission:

Perfect fit This type of work is ideally suited to the mission of IARC.

Good fit This type of work is suited to the mission of the Agency.

Questionable fit Uncertain.

Poor fit Work which should not continue.

Scores should be accompanied by justifications and recommendations for action, where necessary.

5. Overall recommendations for the Section/Group



**Governing Council
Fifty-eighth Session**

GC/58/R9

*Lyon, 19–20 May 2016
Auditorium*

BIENNIAL REPORT OF THE OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY COMMITTEE (OHSC), 2014–2015

The Governing Council,

Having examined the “Biennial Report of the Occupational Health and Safety Committee (OHSC), 2014–2015” as contained in Document GC/58/12,

1. THANKS the Scientific Council for reviewing the Biennial Report of the Occupational Health and Safety Committee, 2014–2015;
2. NOTES that, according to the decision regarding the production of standard documents (Resolution GC/58/R6), the OHSC Biennial Reports will henceforth be presented to the Governing Council only;
3. EXPRESSES satisfaction with the arrangements which are in place to ensure the health and safety of the Agency’s staff; and
4. REQUESTS the Director to continue reporting biennially on occupational health and safety issues at the Agency.

**Governing Council
Fifty-eighth Session**

GC/58/R10

*Lyon, 19–20 May 2016
Auditorium*

REPORT ON PUBLICATION ACTIVITIES, INCLUDING REPORT ON FUNDING ALLOCATION

The Governing Council,

Having reviewed Document GC/58/13 "Report on publication activities, including report on funding allocation", and

Recalling its Resolution GC/51/R10 in which it requested the Director to report on an annual basis on publication activities,

1. NOTES the Report with great interest;
2. NOTES that the net income to the Governing Council Special Fund from sales of publications in 2015 was €700 413 of which 75% was allocated to the publication programme in 2016;
3. REQUESTS the Director, in accordance with the decision on the production of standard reports (Resolution GC/58/R6), to report biennially on publication activities at IARC; and
4. NOTES that the next report on publications activities will be at the 60th Session of the Governing Council in May 2018.

OPTIONS AND PROPOSALS REGARDING THE PROCEDURE FOR THE ELECTION OF THE DIRECTOR

The Governing Council,

Having reviewed Document GC/58/14 "Options and proposals regarding 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 Office of the Legal Counsel, WHO and the IARC Secretariat for their report;
2. REQUESTS the Secretariat to report back to the Governing Council at its Fifty-ninth session in May 2017 with specific proposals, reflecting the views expressed by the Governing Council during its Fifty-eighth session, for decision by the Governing Council at its Fifty-ninth session; and
3. NOTES that, depending on the decisions of the Governing Council concerning the selection of the Director at its Fifty-ninth session, amendments to the Rules of Procedure of the Governing Council may be required.

PROPOSED PRIORITIES FOR RESOURCES ACTIVELY MOBILIZED AS UNDESIGNATED VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS

The Governing Council,

Having reviewed Document GC/58/15 “Proposed priorities for resources actively mobilized as Undesignated Voluntary Contributions”,

Noting the increased cost of Fellowships,

Noting the mechanism for allocation of funds from the Special Account for Undesignated Voluntary Contributions in between its yearly sessions,

1. AUTHORIZES an increase of funds, from €34 650 to €80 000 per year, to finance two twelve-month Fellowships, as long as a sufficient balance is available in the Special Account for Undesignated Voluntary Contributions; and

2. APPROVES a standing authorization to the Director, for the period 2016–2020, to allocate *un-earmarked* funds mobilized into the Special Account for Undesignated Voluntary Contributions to the five priority projects, based on the Medium-Term Strategy, listed below:

- a. Global Initiative for Cancer Registry Development (GICR);
- b. IARC Monographs and IARC Handbooks of Cancer Prevention;
- c. The LMICs Biobank and Cohort Building Network (BCNet);
- d. IARC Training Fellowships;
- e. IARC Nouveau Centre Plus.

3. REQUESTS the Director to report to the Governing Council on the use of the Special Account for Undesignated Contributions on a yearly basis, clearly indicating funds actively mobilized and allocated according to the programmatic priorities listed above.



**ACCEPTANCE OF GRANTS AND CONTRACTS,
INCLUDING REPORT ON INTEREST APPORTIONMENT**

The Governing Council,

Having considered Document GC/58/16 “Acceptance of grants and contracts, including report on interest apportionment”,

In accordance with IARC Financial Regulations,

1. CONFIRMS the provisional approval given by the Governing Council Chair between sessions, in accordance with Resolution GC/52/R13, paragraphs 2 and 3, for the following three projects; two, (a) and (b) in collaboration with the private sector and one (c) over €500 000 per annum:

- (a) Global Initiative on Cancer Registries (GICR) [€467 460], ESTAMPA [€44 100], IARC Summer Course [€26 460], and BCNet biobanking [€26 460] [National Institutes of Health, National Cancer Institute (NIH/NCI), USA (through CRDF Global) in a total amount of €564 480 for 10 months];
- (b) Coordination of the International Birth Cohort Harmonisation Group [Ministry of the Environment, Japan (through Japan NUS Co., Ltd) in an amount of €65 540 for 24 months];
- (c) Extended follow-up of the participants of IARC-INDIA HPV vaccination study to evaluate the effectiveness of one, two and three doses of quadrivalent HPV vaccine in preventing cervical neoplasia [Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, USA in an amount of €2 670 697 for 60 months];

2. NOTES the post facto reporting of grants and contracts accepted by the Director as detailed in Document GC/58/16;

3. NOTES the amounts of interest income apportioned; and

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

International Agency for Research on Cancer



**Governing Council
Fifty-eighth Session**

GC/58/R14

*Lyon, 19–20 May 2016
Auditorium*

ACCEPTANCE OF DONATIONS

The Governing Council,

Having been informed by Document GC/58/17 of the unconditional donations accepted by the Director under the authority vested in him by Resolution GC/4/R3,

EXPRESSES its deep appreciation to the donors for their generous contribution to the research activities of the Agency.

International Agency for Research on Cancer



Governing Council
Fifty-eighth Session

GC/58/R15

Lyon, 19–20 May 2016
Auditorium

REQUEST FOR USE OF FUNDS FROM THE GOVERNING COUNCIL SPECIAL FUND: A. SCIENTIFIC EQUIPMENT – MEDIUM-TERM SUPPORT TO THE BIOBANK

The Governing Council,

Having reviewed Document GC/58/18A "Request for use of funds from the Governing Council Special Fund: A. Scientific Equipment – Medium-term support to the Biobank",

Noting that the Scientific Council supported the request for purchase of scientific equipment (Document GC/58/4),

AUTHORIZES the Director to use up to a maximum of €492 500 from the Governing Council Special Fund over a period of three years (2016–2018), subject to there being sufficient cash balances available in the Fund, for the acquisition of the following scientific equipment:

Description	Total Quantity	2016 Budget	2017 Budget	2018 Budget
Automatic LN2 tank	1	112 000		
Liquid nitrogen tank	5	90 000	60 000	
Liquid nitrogen piping	1	40 000		
-80°C freezers	12	44 000	44 000	44 000
-40°C freezers	3	2 200	2 200	2 200
Racks	216	10 800	10 800	10 800
Monitoring system for freezers	15	1 500	1 500	1 500
Monitoring system for LN2 tanks	50	7 500	7 500	
Sub-total		308 000	126 000	58 500
Total 2016–2018			492 500	

**REQUEST FOR USE OF FUNDS FROM
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL SPECIAL FUND:
B. UPGRADES TO IARC PREMISES SECURITY SYSTEMS**

The Governing Council,

Having considered Document GC/58/18B "Request for use of funds from the Governing Council Special Fund: B. Upgrades to IARC premises security systems – Physical security improvement plan",

Noting the vulnerabilities of IARC security systems, the recommendations from the external global security review led by the French Police on IARC premises, the minimum security measures of European UN premises established by the United Nations Department of Safety and Security (UNDSS), and IARC's consolidated physical security improvement plan,

1. AUTHORIZES the Director to use up to a maximum of €120 000 from the Governing Council Special Fund, subject to there being sufficient cash balances available in the Fund, to fund additional and necessary security measures, as summarized in the table in Document GC/58/18B; and
2. REQUESTS the Director to report on the use of these funds at the 59th session of the Governing Council.

International Agency for Research on Cancer



**Governing Council
Fifty-eighth Session**

GC/58/R17

*Lyon, 19–20 May 2016
Auditorium*

APPOINTMENT OF NEW MEMBERS OF THE SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL

The Governing Council,

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

1. APPOINTS

Dr Adèle Green, Australia)

Dr Roberto Salgado, Belgium)

Dr Atsushi Ochiai, Japan) to serve for four years on the Scientific Council

Dr Pilar Sánchez Gómez, Spain)

Dr Simon Tavaré, UK)

2. THANKS the outgoing members of the Scientific Council, Drs Nuria Aragonés, James Bishop, Nicholas Jones, Christos Sotiriou and Teruhiko Yoshida, for their valuable work in the Scientific Council and for the contribution which they have made to the research activities of the Agency.



**Governing Council
Fifty-eighth Session**

GC/58/R18

*Lyon, 19–20 May 2016
Auditorium*

MEMBERSHIP OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE ADMISSION OF NEW PARTICIPATING STATES

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 Canada, Germany, Italy, Spain and Sweden who shall hold office until the next regular session of the Council.

International Agency for Research on Cancer



**World Health
Organization**

**Governing Council
Fifty-eighth Session**

GC/58/R19

*Lyon, 19–20 May 2016
Auditorium*

DATE OF THE FIFTY-NINTH SESSION OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

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 2017; and
2. REQUESTS the Director to inform members of the Council as soon as these dates are known.



**Governing Council
Fifty-eighth Session**

GC/58/R20

*Lyon, 19–20 May 2016
Auditorium*

PROPOSAL FROM SPAIN FOR THE REPAYMENT OF ITS OUTSTANDING CONTRIBUTIONS

The Governing Council,

Having considered document GC/58/22 "Proposal from Spain for the repayment of its outstanding contributions",

1. APPROVES exceptionally the proposal from Spain to repay its outstanding contributions for 2014 and 2015, totalling €1 218 017, as follows:

- €674 759 to be paid in 2016;
- €271 629 to be paid before the opening day of the regular session of the Governing Council in May 2017; and
- €271 629 to be paid before the opening day of the regular session of the Governing Council in May 2018;

2. AGREES that in any given year the amount of the arrears must be received in full and credited to the outstanding contributions account of Spain, for reimbursement of the Working Capital Fund, before any contribution may be credited towards the General Fund and hence used for current programme activities.