

International Agency for Research on Cancer



**Governing Council
Sixty-first Session**

**GC/61/Min.3
Original: ENGLISH**

*Lyon, 16–17 May 2019
Auditorium*

MINUTES OF THE THIRD MEETING

IARC, Lyon

Friday 17 May 2019, at 09:00

Chairperson: Professor Mads Melbye (Denmark)

Secretary: Dr Elisabete Weiderpass, Director, IARC

CONTENTS

	Page
1. Appointment of new members of the Scientific Council	4
2. Proposed Programme Budget (2020–2021) (<i>continued</i>)	4
3. Biennial Report of the IARC Ethics Committee (IEC), 2017–2018	13
4. Update on the "Nouveau Centre"	13
5. Requests for support from the Governing Council Special Fund	16
6. Statement by the IARC Staff Association	17
7. Acceptance of grants and contracts, including report on interest apportionment	19
8. Acceptance of donations	19
9. Projection of short videos to illustrate selected IARC activities	20

Participating State Representatives

Professor Mads MELBYE, <i>Chairperson</i>	Denmark
Dr Stephen M. ROBBINS, <i>Vice-Chairperson</i>	Canada
Ms Kate TROTTER	
Professor Brendan MURPHY, <i>Rapporteur</i>	Australia
Ms Elisabeth TISCHELMAYER	Austria
Mr Lieven DE RAEDT	Belgium
Dr Ana Cristina PINHO MENDES PEREIRA	Brazil
Dr Markku TERVAHAUTA	Finland
Ms Tuula HELANDER	
Professor Norbert IFRAH	France
Dr Jocelyne BÉRILLE	
Mr Thomas DUBOIS	
Ms Barbara LÜBBEN	Germany
Dr Orsolya PACSAY-TOMASSICH	Hungary
Professor Péter NAGY	
Dr Zoltán MÁTRAI	
Dr Nilambuj SHARAN	India
Professor Reza MALEKZADEH	Iran (Islamic Republic of)
Mr Keith COMISKEY	Ireland
Professor Silvio BRUSAFERRO	Italy
Dr Mauro BIFFONI	
Dr Hiroyuki HORI	Japan
Dr Hitoshi NAKAGAMA	
Mrs Kay OHARA	
Dr Latifa BELAKHEL	Morocco
Mr Henk SOORSMA	Netherlands
Mr Jeroen HULLEMAN	
Professor Pål Richard ROMUNDSTAD	Norway
Dr Al-Hareth M. AL-KHATER	Qatar
Dr Tae Ho YOON	Republic of Korea
Mrs Jee Young KIM	
Mr Bong Geun YUN	
Dr Jae Kwan JUN	
Dr Igor KOROBKO	Russian Federation
Dr Sergey IVANOV	
Dr Alexey NOVOZHILOV	
Dr Rafael DE ANDRÉS MEDINA	Spain

Dr Sandra KLEINAU Dr Karin SCHMEKEL	Sweden
Dr Diane STEBER-BÜCHLI <i>No Representative</i>	Switzerland Turkey
Dr Mark PALMER Dr Mariana DELFINO-MACHIN	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Dr Ann CHAO Dr Gabrielle LAMOURELLE Mr Patrick CONNALLY	United States of America

World Health Organization

Dr Soumiya SWAMINATHAN, Office of the Director-General, WHO

Ms Sigrid KRANAWETTER, Principal Legal Officer, Office of the WHO Legal Counsel

Observers

Dr Samar AL-HOMOUD, Chairperson, IARC Ethics Committee

Dr Christine FRIEDENREICH, Incoming Chairperson, Scientific Council (*unable to attend*)

Dr Sonali JOHNSON, Head, Knowledge, Advocacy and Policy, Union for International Cancer Control (UICC)

Professor Giske URSIN, Outgoing Chairperson, Scientific Council

External Audit

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

Secretariat

Dr E. WEIDERPASS, *Secretary*
Dr T. LANDESZ

Dr M. ALMONTE
Dr P. BASU
Ms A. BERGER
Dr F. BRAY
Dr P. BRENNAN
Dr I. CREE
Ms D. D'AMICO

Dr P. FERRARI
Ms E. FRANÇON
Dr M. GUNTER
Dr K. GUYTON
Dr Z. HERCEG
Dr R. HERRERO
Dr O. KELM
Dr Z. KOZLAKIDIS
Dr B. LAUBY-SECRETAN
Dr T. LEE

Mr F. LOZANO
Dr V. MCCORMACK
Dr J. MCKAY
Ms A. SANTHIPRECHACHIT
Dr A. SCALBERT
Dr J. SCHÜZ
Dr I. SOERJOMATARAM
Dr M. TOMMASINO
Dr J. ZAVADIL

1. APPOINTMENT OF NEW MEMBERS OF THE SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL: Item 13 of the Agenda (Document [GC/61/15](#))

The Governing Council met in closed session from 09:00 to 10:30. Following resumption of the meeting in open session, the RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution entitled "Appointment of new members of the Scientific Council" (GC/61/R14):

The Governing Council,
In accordance with the provisions of Article VI of the Statute of the Agency,

1. APPOINTS

Professor Ulrike Haug, Germany)
Professor Péter Nagy, Hungary)
Professor Ravi Mehrotra, India)
Professor William Gallagher, Ireland)
Dr Pietro Pichierri, Italy) to serve for four years on the Scientific Council
Dr Karima Bendahhou, Morocco)
Professor Tone Bjørge, Norway)
Professor Jong Bae Park, Republic of Korea)
Professor Sergey Ivanov, Russian Federation)
Professor Gunilla Enblad, Sweden)

2. THANKS the outgoing members of the Scientific Council, Drs Boris Alekseev (Russian Federation), Jonas Bergh (Sweden), Jenny Chang-Claude (Germany), Jerome Coffey (Ireland), Eugenia Dogliotti (Italy), Karima El Rhazi (Morocco), Kadir Mutlu Hayran (Turkey), Lalit Kumar (India), Dukhyoung Lee (Republic of Korea) and Giske Ursin (Norway) for their valuable work in the Scientific Council and for the contribution which they have made to the research activities of the Agency.

The resolution was **adopted**.

2. PROPOSED PROGRAMME AND BUDGET (2020–2021): Item 10 of the Agenda (Document [GC/61/6](#)) (continued)

The CHAIRPERSON, recalling the discussions held on the previous day, inquired whether members had consulted with their capitals concerning the four budget scenarios presented.

Mr CONNALLY (United States of America) said that, in accordance with its zero nominal growth policy, the United States was not prepared to accept an increase in assessed contributions. However, in recognition of the unfortunate situation caused by the unexpected withdrawal of Turkey, he could accept scenario 2 in order to cover the assessed contributions that would have been paid by the Participating State.

Dr BELAKHEL (Morocco) said that her capital was not in favour of an increase in the budget; she recommended that the Agency should prioritize its work and focus on encouraging new

Participating States to join in order to increase the resources available. Morocco could accept scenario 2 since it was close to zero nominal growth.

Ms LÜBBEN (Germany) said that, having consulted with her capital, she could accept scenario 1: but even that acceptance was a considerable concession on the part of Germany, since it represented a move away from a very strict zero nominal growth policy. She was eager to reach agreement on the budget by consensus and urged members of the Governing Council to agree to scenario 1.

Ms TROTTER (Canada) said that, in the interests of avoiding disruption to IARC's ongoing work and in light of the small gap between the assessed contributions of Turkey and the Islamic Republic of Iran, her capital could agree to scenario 2.

Dr TAE HO YOON (Republic of Korea) said that he supported the continued activities of IARC. His authorities had accepted the proposed budget before appreciating that Turkey had withdrawn: he could nevertheless still accept scenarios 3 or 4.

Dr DE ANDRÉS MEDINA (Spain) requested that agreement on the budget be reached by consensus. He had a mandate to agree to scenario 1 with the possibility that the decision might be further revised.

Dr SHARAN (India) said that, while he appreciated that resources were required to support the activities of IARC, he was only in a position to support scenario 1.

The CHAIRPERSON said that a sum of €250 000 separated scenarios 1 and 2. He hoped that those members who had expressed an opinion in favour of scenario 1 would be able to support scenario 2.

Mr DE RAEDT (Belgium) said that he had heard from his capital and could agree to scenario 2.

Dr PINHO MENDES PEREIRA (Brazil) said that, although she was not authorized to accept any increase in the budget, she would be pleased to invite the Director to visit the Minister of Health of Brazil in order to convince him of the importance of the work of IARC.

The SECRETARY accepted the invitation put forward by the member for Brazil.

Professor BRUSAFERRO (Italy) said that the initial position of his capital had been to support scenario 1 but it was ready to support scenario 2.

Professor MURPHY (Australia), Rapporteur, echoed the remarks of the Chairperson: the gap between scenarios 1 and 2 would represent a very small amount of money for each Participating State. The Governing Council could not afford to allow the Agency to fall back any further than it would do under scenario 2.

Ms TISCHELMAYER (Austria) said that as scenario 2 represented zero nominal growth, she could accept it.

Mr CONNALLY (United States of America), responding to the remarks made by the Chairperson and by the member for Australia, said that it was not just a question of contributing a specific amount of euros, but about setting a precedent whereby existing Participating States would be expected to cover the assessed contributions of those that had withdrawn. The fears of a number

of members might perhaps be addressed by including language in the draft resolution to the effect that Participating States were supporting scenario 2 as a one-time option, that they were not setting a precedent and that the assessments of departing Participating States would have to be considered separately in the future.

Ms TROTTER (Canada) supported the remarks by the member for the United States; she wished to propose language for the draft resolution.

Dr TERVAHAUTA (Finland) said that Finland still supported scenario 3.

The CHAIRPERSON said that it was his impression that scenario 2 had the support of the majority of Participating States.

Dr BÉRILLE (France) said that France accepted scenario 4, believing that it was important to support IARC at such a crucial stage in the elaboration of the budget for the following biennium. France could also support scenario 2.

Dr STEBER-BÜCHLI (Switzerland) supported the positions set out by the members for Finland and France: the forthcoming biennium was a very important period and she would have preferred to see a higher increase than the one set out in scenario 2.

The CHAIRPERSON said that it would be difficult for all Participating States to accept scenarios 3 or 4. He did not want to propose a vote that might lead to an imposition of too high a budget on some Participating States. He asked whether all members could support scenario 2.

Dr DE ANDRÉS MEDINA (Spain) said that he had received confirmation from his authorities that they could accept scenario 2.

The CHAIRPERSON noted that a majority of Participating States (22 members) had indicated their support for scenario 2 and therefore that budget scenario would be adopted for the forthcoming biennium.

Dr LANDESZ (Director of Administration and Finance), speaking at the invitation of the Chairperson, introduced the concept of the Core Voluntary Contributions Account (CVCA), a mechanism that was already in use in WHO and which was intended to cover gaps between core budget requirements and the level of assessed contributions. Since the current proposed budget was higher than scenario 2, it was proposed to set up a CVCA at IARC in order to receive pledges from Participating States for core activities. If the mechanism were approved, a report on the CVCA would be provided on an annual basis under the voluntary contributions subaccount.

Ms TROTTER (Canada) acknowledged the difficult situation with respect to the budget and appreciated that IARC was exploring other methods to raise funds. However, Canada strongly advocated that IARC should move forward with the current, prudent approach, developing the budget and workplan on the basis of secured resources. Activities should only be expanded when extrabudgetary resources had been obtained. Trying to plan future work without secured funds could put the Agency at risk with respect to predictability and performance.

Professor MURPHY (Australia), Rapporteur, said that he supported the idea of the CVCA, which would formalize the structure with respect to the receipt of voluntary contributions.

Mr SOORSMA (Netherlands) said that, in principle, he supported the definition of a more solid financial base for IARC. It would be important that more than one or two countries should contribute to the CVCA.

Dr SCHMEKEL (Sweden) said that she agreed with many of the remarks by the member for Canada but, given Turkey's unexpected withdrawal, Sweden would provide a voluntary contribution that would compensate for the difference between scenario 4 and scenario 2. She requested that additional language should be added to the draft resolution to the effect that the Statute would be amended to prevent a Participating State from leaving abruptly in the future, thus ensuring a bigger buffer in the budget.

Dr PALMER (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) said that he was grateful for the proposal to introduce a mechanism that would allow the Agency to receive voluntary contributions. The United Kingdom would be prepared to make a contribution that made up the difference between scenario 4 and scenario 2. A voluntary account would facilitate the inflow of additional funds.

Ms TROTTER (Canada) said that any change in the conditions with respect to withdrawal should be reviewed and understood by a Participating State before they joined. It should be recognized that such a condition might lead to delays in decisions by countries preparing to join the Agency. She sought confirmation that there was currently no barrier to a Participating State making additional voluntary contributions or to IARC including those contributions in a biennial budget. If the contributions were received after a budget had been drafted, the funds could still be used as IARC chose.

Dr LANDESZ (Director of Administration and Finance) said that IARC had the freedom to receive specific pledges although it could not spend the money as it saw fit if conditions were attached by donors. The Statute differentiated between permanent or fixed costs, which were funded by assessed contributions, and special projects, which could be funded by voluntary contributions.

The independent science of the Agency must be protected and secured through core funding of the relevant activities. IARC did not want to reach the same stage as WHO, which only received 20% to 30% of its funding from assessed contributions. In the present situation, a CVCA could be used by Participating States to provide contributions over and above those agreed in scenario 2. The IARC brand should be further strengthened and promoted in order to attract additional funding streams.

Mr CONNALLY (United States of America) said that he appreciated the creative thinking around keeping the Agency funded, but he agreed with the member for Canada that IARC should be wary of funding core functions with voluntary contributions since it contained an inherent risk. Furthermore, the departure of Turkey should not set a precedent for the way future withdrawals were handled. With respect to the proposal by Sweden, the United States was not yet ready to adjust the rules governing the departure of Participating States.

Mr DE RAEDT (Belgium) recalled that the Governing Council had agreed on a proposal concerning seven priority projects, which were to be funded by voluntary contributions. He asked what was the status of those projects and why it was proposed to introduce a CVCA when a first attempt at priority projects had not been fully developed.

Dr SHARAN (India) endorsed the idea of the CVCA, since it would furnish the means to supplement IARC's activities while providing flexibility to Participating States to support the Agency over and above their assessed contributions.

Dr LANDESZ (Director of Administration and Finance) said that, in 2016, the Governing Council had agreed to fund seven priority projects from undesignated voluntary contribution account and the Agency had developed brochures that explained the purpose of the projects and required resources to potential donors. It was unlikely that opening up other avenues for resource mobilization would detract from the projects that had already begun. The purpose of the CVCA would be to fund core activities by covering the gap between scenario 2 and the amount required to implement the proposed programme.

Professor ROMUNDSTAD (Norway) supported the concept of the CVCA and recognized the need to achieve additional funding. He would raise the matter with his authorities but, for the time being, he could not promise to make a contribution to the account.

Ms LÜBBEN (Germany) welcomed creative ideas such as the CVCA: it might not be a sustainable method of funding but it would provide flexibility to Participating States. However, she queried the need for an additional account since IARC already had the possibility to issue single invoices and to attract voluntary contributions. Although she was not in a position to offer formal agreement to the proposal by the member for Sweden to change the rules governing withdrawal by a Participating State, she supported it in principle. Wording on a resolution could be developed during the year for agreement at the next meeting of the Governing Council.

Dr HORI (Japan) agreed with many of the points raised by the member for Canada: lessons should be learned from the experience of WHO, where only some 25% of resources were funded through assessed contributions and it was a struggle each year to secure stable funding. He believed that the Agency's core funding should be achieved through assessed contributions. Japan would not be in a position to provide contributions through a CVCA.

Dr TERVAHAUTA (Finland) supported the idea of the CVCA and echoed the remarks of the members for Norway and Sweden.

Dr KOROBKO (Russian Federation) said that he supported the concept of the CVCA given that it would provide a flexible means of funding but he also agreed with the member for Canada that secure methods must be found to fund the core budget.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution entitled “Proposed Programme and Budget 2020–2021” (GC/61/R5):

The Governing Council,

Having reviewed the Agency’s Proposed Programme and Budget for the biennium 2020–2021, as contained in Document [GC/61/6](#) and summary tables [Revision 1](#);

1. APPROVES the budget for the biennium 2020–2021 at the level of €44 149 793;
2. ACKNOWLEDGES that the presentation of the proposed budget for 2020–2021 is aligned with the IARC Medium-Term Strategy for 2016–2020 (Document [GC/57/7](#) and Annexes 1–3);
3. DECIDES that the budget shall be financed solely by annual assessments on Participating States as follows:
 - (1) €21 865 751 shall be assessed on Participating States on 1 January 2020,
 - (2) €22 284 042 shall be assessed on Participating States on 1 January 2021,
4. RESOLVES to appropriate an amount of €44 149 793 to the six main Level 2 objectives of the IARC Project Tree (Document GC/57/7 and Annex 3) for the biennium 2020–2021 as follows:

Section	IARC Project Tree – Level 2 Objectives	Amount (€)
1.	Describe the occurrence of cancer	3 633 223
2.	Understand the causes of cancer	11 972 571
3.	Evaluate and implement cancer prevention and control strategies	4 153 150
4.	Increase the capacity for cancer research	10 103 795
5.	Provide strategic leadership and enhance the impact of the Agency’s contribution to global cancer research	5 006 803
6.	Enable and support the efficient conduct and coordination of research	9 280 251
	Total	44 149 793

5. 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;
6. DECIDES to grant authority to the Director to use a maximum of €500 000 in the biennium 2020–2021 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 2020–2021 is €0.819/US\$; and
7. REQUESTS the Director to report on the use of the Fund for this purpose in future financial reports;
8. RESOLVES that the adoption of this budget does not set a precedent for Participating States in future in contributing additional funds to compensate for the loss of a Participating State;
9. RESOLVES that IARC will develop a Core Voluntary Contribution Account to supplement the regular budget; and
10. REQUESTS that management consider options for a potential change of the Statute of IARC to require a longer termination period of financial obligations for withdrawing Participating States and to present these options for consideration at the next Governing Council meeting.

Ms TROTTER (Canada) requested that the final paragraph should contain the following wording: “recalls resolution [GC/51/R7](#), which decided that ‘no Participating State shall have an increase in its contribution as a consequence of the admission of a New Participating State’¹ and notes that the admission of a new Participating State does not automatically imply an increase to the budget of IARC equivalent to their contribution”.

The CHAIRPERSON asked why it would be necessary to refer to resolution GC/51/R7.

Ms TROTTER (Canada) said that she was concerned by the practice of assuming that the arrival of a new Participating State meant that the budget would go up while there was no corresponding assumption that it would decrease when a Participating State left the Agency. It should be for the Governing Council to decide on those matters.

Dr DE ANDRÉS MEDINA (Spain) suggested that the withdrawal of a Participating State should be aligned with each financial biennium: if the Agency introduced a two-year notification period, it would be assured of some financial predictability.

The CHAIRPERSON thanked the member for Spain for his contribution, which would be helpful in drafting a resolution for consideration at the next session of the Governing Council.

Dr PALMER (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) said that he did not agree with the amendment put forward by the representative for Canada: the intention of the budget proposed was to deliver the research of the Agency in accordance with the Medium-Term Strategy and how the Governing Council paid for it did not determine the amount that would be set. It seemed unnecessary to add comments to a resolution that had already been passed, especially if the purpose was to try to justify never making an increase in the budget. Furthermore, he did not see the necessity to change the Statute with respect to the terms of departure of a Participating State since the notification period would not affect the biennium that followed the departure. Changing the Statute would not solve the problem with the budget and he therefore requested that the amendment by Canada should be withdrawn.

The CHAIRPERSON suggested that the amendment put forward by Canada could be considered subsequently, during a discussion on the notice required for withdrawal by a Participating State.

Ms TROTTER (Canada) said that her authorities’ acceptance of scenario 2 had been accompanied by a requirement to introduce the amendment she had proposed and in particular the statement that the arrival of a new Participating State did not automatically imply an increase in the budget. She could agree to withdraw the first part of the amendment, which referred to resolution GC/51/7, provided that the second statement would remain.

Dr STEBER-BÜCHLI (Switzerland) said that, in line with remarks by the member for the United Kingdom, she believed that consideration of the budget was a separate matter to any budgetary problems that might be experienced as a result of a Participating State joining or leaving the Agency. Any proposed amendment to the Statute should be drafted by members of the Governing Council and not by the management of IARC.

¹ See page 239 of IARC Handbook of Resolutions – 23rd Edition – 1965–2018
<http://governance.iarc.fr/ENG/Docs/Resolutions2018.pdf>

Ms KRANAWETTER (Office of the WHO Legal Counsel) said that any amendment to the Statute would require a two-thirds majority of the membership of the Governing Council and acceptance by the World Health Assembly; it would therefore be a major undertaking.

Mr CONNALLY (United States of America) said that he agreed with the member for the United Kingdom that the withdrawal of Turkey created problems with the current budget, but it did not necessarily affect what was decided for the future. He would prefer to maintain language in the resolution to indicate that current decisions did not set a precedent with respect to future departures.

Ms KRANAWETTER (Office of the WHO Legal Counsel) said that, in practice, the contributions of a new Participating State were not immediately added to the budget, but were assigned to unbudgeted income. Resolution GC/51/R7 stated that no Participating State would have an increase resulting from the admission of a new Participating State. She would therefore prefer to delete the reference to resolution GC/51/R7 in the present context.

Dr BÉRILLE (France) suggested that the amendment by Canada should be deleted.

Ms LÜBBEN (Germany) said that she supported the amendments proposed by the member for Canada and the comments made by the members for Canada and the United States. She did not believe that it would be appropriate to refer to "management" in a resolution. She wished to know why the budget amounts recorded under paragraph 3 were different for 2020 and 2021.

Ms SANTHIPRECHACHIT (Administration and Finance Officer) explained that the total amount of the budget for the biennium was unchanged but the impact of the €3 million in cuts differed according to the budget lines for each year.

Dr KLEINAU (Sweden) agreed with the member for Switzerland that any proposed amendment to the Statute should be drafted by members of the Governing Council and not by the management of IARC.

Dr PALMER (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) said that, during the Financing Dialogue and during the discussions held on the previous day, some 12 or 13 Governing Council members had indicated that they could support the budget as originally proposed and the budget as presented in scenario 4. Therefore, he did not believe that any precedent had been set by the decision to support scenario 2, since it was lower than the budget that could have been accepted by a significant number of members. The language proposed in the amendment was negative and damaging to the credibility of Governing Council support to the Agency. The decision had been reached after a negotiation on a budget presented to deliver the science of the Agency and it was not related to the decision of Turkey to withdraw nor to the decision of Hungary to join IARC.

Ms TROTTER (Canada) said that she wished to suggest more positive wording for inclusion in the resolution: "Notes that the impact on the regular budget, of admission or withdrawal of Participating States, is decided by the Governing Council on a case-by-case basis".

Mr COMISKEY (Ireland) echoed the remarks made by the United Kingdom and Sweden. He believed that, irrespective of any amendments made to the resolution, it was the responsibility of the Governing Council to decide on the budget every two years. If each member of the Governing Council insisted on including an amendment that reflected their negotiating position, the resolution would be extremely long. He would prefer the resolution to be brief and to reflect the decision to adopt scenario 2.

Mr CONNALLY (United States of America) agreed with the members for the United Kingdom and Ireland that the Governing Council met in order to determine the budget, but IARC was one international organization among many. The way that negotiations were conducted at IARC would impact the discussions held in other forums and would be taken into account in the next budget cycle at the Agency. The way Turkey's departure was handled would set a benchmark for the way in which future departures were handled. Noting in the resolution that the admission or withdrawal of Participating States would be handled on a case-by-case basis reflected the views expressed by Governing Council members. He could agree to a reference to the Core Voluntary Contribution Account provided that it was clear that there was no obligation for it to be funded by IARC or by Participating States.

Dr PALMER (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) said that he did not see any need to include a reference to the impact on the regular budget of the admission or withdrawal of a Participating State but, if it was required in order for Canada and the United States to accept the resolution then he would not raise any further objection to it.

The CHAIRPERSON, speaking in his capacity as the member for Denmark, supported the view expressed by the member for the United Kingdom.

The CHAIRPERSON asked whether members wished to join the Working Group to consider options for a potential change to the Statute of IARC. He noted that Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom would join him in that task.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the revised versions of the final three paragraphs of the resolution:

"8. NOTES that the impact on the regular budget of the admission or withdrawal of Participating States is decided by the Governing Council on a case-by-case basis;

9. RESOLVES that IARC will establish a Core Voluntary Contribution Account to supplement the regular budget; and

10. REQUESTS that a Working Group (comprising Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the Chair) of the Governing Council consider options for a potential change of the Statute of IARC to require a longer termination period of financial obligations for a withdrawing Participating State and to present these options for consideration at the next Governing Council session".

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

3. BIENNIAL REPORT OF THE IARC ETHICS COMMITTEE (IEC), 2017–2018: Item 14 of the Agenda (Document [GC/61/9](#))

Professor AL-HOMOUD (Chair, IARC Ethics Committee), illustrating her remarks with slides, drew attention to the written report of the IARC Ethics Committee. The 10 members of the Committee were senior individuals with expertise in bioethics or other areas. Of the evaluations conducted during the biennium, 89% of new projects had been approved, 16% had been conditionally approved and 5% had not been approved. Of the 59 resubmissions, 88% had been approved. Much of the approval was done by members of the Committee working online so as to expedite the work in as timely a fashion as possible. The Standard Operating Procedures had been reviewed and redistributed. An IARC Ethics Advisory Group provided advice from an external perspective. The Committee continued to monitor the chrysotile asbestos study. A "Research Ethics" page had been developed on the Learning and Development Portal which offered training opportunities and online courses for the staff of IARC: the Secretary had taken a number of these courses. The Committee could also play a major role in helping middle-income countries to develop their own online ethics courses as well as templates for data protection and misconduct.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution, entitled "Biennial Report of the IARC Ethics Committee, 2017–2018" (GC/61/R8):

The Governing Council,
Having examined the Biennial Report of the IARC Ethics Committee 2017–2018, as contained in Document GC/61/9,
1. WELCOMES the Biennial Report of the IARC Ethics Committee 2017–2018, as contained in Document GC/61/9,
2. THANKS the Chairperson, Professor Samar Al-Homoud, 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**.

4. UPDATE ON THE "NOUVEAU CENTRE": Item 15 of the Agenda (Document [GC/61/10](#))

Ms FRANÇON (Administrative Services Officer), illustrating her remarks with slides, recalled that IARC had been created in 1965 and that a host country agreement had been signed between WHO and the Government of France in 1967. The Tower building had been constructed in the early 1970s thanks to funding received from the French Government and from the Department and City of Lyon. The building had been furnished and the laboratories had been equipped using voluntary contributions received from Participating States. The City of Lyon remained the owner of the building and it was occupied by IARC under an agreement that was due to expire in 2032. Subsequently, the Biological Resources Centre (BRC), the Latarjet Buildings and the Sasakawa Memorial Hall had been built on land owned by the City of Lyon with funds provided by the Governing Council.

Since 2008, technical reports had detailed the poor state of the buildings and the Governing Council had agreed with the recommendation by the local authorities that IARC would move to a "Nouveau Centre". At the end of 2015, the French Government and local authorities had signed an agreement with a financial envelope of €48 million to fund the new building and the City of Lyon had carried out essential ad-hoc repairs to the present site in order to ensure the continuity of IARC activities. An increase in the funding had been agreed with Gérard Collomb, the President of Métropole de Lyon and Mayor of the City of Lyon, in 2016.

After an 18-month international bidding process, a project was chosen that offered best value for money as the most modern and innovative building with low energy consumption. Following further detailed design studies, discussions had taken place with the Métropole de Lyon on costs that fell outside of the budget scope, such as the physical move and the installation of IARC's operations, including the samples in the biobank which required specialized transportation. Notwithstanding savings made within the Agency and sums to be provided by the City of Lyon following the sale of the Latarjet and BRC buildings, additional funding remained to be mobilized. Efforts had already been made to identify potential donors and a resource mobilization officer would soon be in place.

Three funding scenarios were presented:

- The basic scenario for which €3.3 million remain to be mobilized, for mandatory requirements;
- The standard scenario, presented in previous years, for which €7.8 million remain to be mobilized for minimum working requirements;
- The optimal scenario for a fully operational smart building, for which €11.8 million remain to be mobilized.

The SECRETARY expressed her gratitude to the French authorities for their generous support for the Nouveau Centre project.

Ms TROTTER (Canada) asked why certain items described as incurring supplementary costs, such as the half-glass walls within the new building, were not included in the main building costs. Who would be responsible for the costs of the security arrangements specified by the United Nations Department of Safety and Security? Could other scientific institutions, in Lyon or elsewhere in Europe, share the biobanking facilities and contribute to their costs?

Ms LÜBBEN (Germany) expressed her concern that the unfunded portion of the costs of the Nouveau Centre project had actually increased since the previous session of the Governing Council. Had the fundraising campaign launched in February 2019 yielded any results? She thanked the Secretariat for presenting a number of possible scenarios for showing various levels of funding; it would be helpful if such information could be presented at an earlier stage in future.

Dr KOZLAKIDIS (Head, Laboratory Services and Biobank Group) said that the Secretariat had already begun to talk with local hospitals and other health-care facilities – rather than research institutes – in Lyon with a view to sharing the biobank facilities.

Ms FRANÇON (Administrative Services Officer) said that the need to add glass partitions between offices and corridors in the new building had emerged only after submission of the final design

and had therefore not been included in the contract agreed with the French authorities. If resources could not be raised for them, ordinary partitions would be installed instead, although those would block much of the natural light from outside. The security installations required under United Nations rules were classified as equipment rather than buildings and had, accordingly, been included in the part of the budget payable by the Agency.

Dr LANDESZ (Director of Administration and Finance) said that the Secretariat had determined the needs and projected costs before beginning the fundraising campaign. The interview process for the new resource mobilization officer was now complete. Work was currently under way to identify potential institutions or individuals that might be willing to invest in the project, and a brochure had been prepared explaining the procedure for naming a conference room or some other building facility on the new site in return for a suitable donation. Compared with other fundraising projects, €10 million was actually a relatively modest sum: many international organizations, including WHO and the United Nations, has succeeded in attracting substantial donations, interest-free loans and other forms of assistance.

The CHAIRPERSON invited the Governing Council to consider a draft resolution on the Nouveau Centre project.

Ms TISCHELMAYER (Austria), Ms LÜBBEN (Germany), Dr DE ANDRÉS MEDINA (Spain) and Dr STEBER-BÜCHLI (Switzerland) suggested amendments to the draft.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the revised draft resolution, entitled "Update on the 'Nouveau Centre'":

The Governing Council,

Having considered Document [GC/61/10](#) "Update on the 'Nouveau Centre'",

1. EXPRESSES its appreciation to the City of Lyon for their continued efforts to ensure adequate conditions of the current premises;
2. EXPRESSES its appreciation to all French partners, i.e. the French Government, Région Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes, Métropole de Lyon, and City of Lyon, for their continued support and cooperation with the Secretariat on the "Nouveau Centre" project;
3. ACKNOWLEDGES that the remaining unfunded balance of at least €5.96 million should be mobilized prior to the planned move to the "Nouveau Centre" in 2021;
4. ENCOURAGES Participating States to contribute towards this target through voluntary contributions;
5. REQUESTS the IARC Director to explore alternative sources of funding and to present a funding strategy with projections for resource mobilization and potential contingency plans at the next Governing Council Session; and
6. 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.

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

**5. REQUESTS FOR SUPPORT FROM THE GOVERNING COUNCIL SPECIAL FUND:
Item 16 of the Agenda (Documents [GC/61/11](#) and [GC/61/Inf.Doc. No.2](#))**

The CHAIRPERSON drew the attention of the Governing Council to the two requests for funding from the Governing Council Special Fund relating, respectively, to the purchase of equipment for the DNA extraction platform and software and databases for metabolomics and to investment in the HELPER study on the eradication of *Helicobacter pylori* to reduce the incidence of gastric cancer in the Republic of Korea. The Scientific Council had reviewed those proposals and recommended that the requested funds should be released.

Ms LÜBBEN (Germany) said that, while both requests were very worthwhile, the Governing Council Special Fund was intended to provide funding for unforeseen situations. An appropriate financial strategy was required to ensure that projects such as the HELPER study were fully funded throughout their lifetime.

Dr HERRERO (Head, Section of Early Detection and Prevention) noted that, to date, the HELPER study had been fully funded by the Republic of Korea. The additional funding that had been requested would enable the study to reach its target cohort of at least 5000 randomized participants and maximize the impact of the enormous efforts already put into a unique study.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution, entitled "Request for support from the Governing Council Special Fund" (GC/61/R10):

The Governing Council,	
Having reviewed Document GC/61/11 "Request for support from the Governing Council Special Fund",	
Noting the support from the Scientific Council on the request to purchase scientific equipment and to invest in the HELPER study (Document GC/61/3 "Report of the Fifty-fifth session of the Scientific Council"),	
AUTHORIZES the Director to use up to a maximum of €500 000 from the Governing Council Special Fund, subject to there being sufficient fund balance, for the acquisition of scientific equipment detailed below (€300 000) and for investment in the HELPER study (€200 000):	
	Approximate cost (€)
Equipment for the DNA extraction platform	
High-throughput DNA extraction system	224 000
Gel imager	20 000
Sub-total	244 000
Software and databases for metabolomics	
Compound Discoverer software	20 500
Software upgrades	35 500
Sub-total	56 000
Investment in the HELPER study	
Staff cost for participating centres	100 000
Research activities and operational costs for participating centres	55 000
Materials and equipment cost	15 000
Monitoring visits	30 000
Sub-total	200 000
Total requested budget	500 000

The resolution was **adopted**.

6. STATEMENT BY THE IARC STAFF ASSOCIATION: Item 17 of the Agenda (Document [GC/61/12](#))

Ms MOLDAN (Chairperson, IARC Staff Association) reported on the activities of the Association over the past year. The current Staff Association Committee comprised nine members and one part-time secretary. It met at least twice a month and held regular meetings with the Director, the Director of Administration and Finance and the Human Resources Officer. It was represented on the Occupational Health and Safety Committee, the Early Career Scientists Association and other internal committees. Two members of the Committee had attended the fourth WHO Global Executive Office meeting in Manila, Philippines: the 2019 meeting was due to be held at the Agency.

The Committee's main focus in the first few months of 2019 had been the biennial work climate survey. The survey had enjoyed an excellent response rate and had produced valuable recommendations from staff. The vast majority of staff were proud to work for the Agency, found their work satisfying and felt that their supervisors had confidence in them. However some concerns had been raised about working modalities, the lack of in-house career opportunities and a perceived deterioration in respect towards staff on lower grades. The Staff Association had discussed those perceptions with senior management, who had responded positively. The priorities of the Staff Association Committee over the coming year would be more flexible working arrangements, more transparency in career opportunities and further work to prevent all types of harassment. The second Respectful Workplace Day, held on 7 December 2018, had involved all staff in discussions and working groups on the theme of scientific integrity.

The Staff Association organized weekly gym, Pilates, Zumba and yoga classes and regular lunchtime walks. A team of athletes had represented the Agency at the United Nations Inter-Agency Games in Lisbon, Portugal. Social events included a ski trip and book club meetings and a series of international dinners. The Staff Association sold IARC-branded merchandise, with the profits being used to sponsor participation in local sporting events and to purchase or renew sports equipment. A bimonthly newsletter had been launched to keep all staff informed about the Staff Association's activities. She thanked her colleagues for their commitment and enthusiasm and senior management for their openness to the staff's concerns.

The SECRETARY said that senior management had taken due note of the concerns and priorities expressed by staff. Harassment would not be tolerated in any form. However, it was difficult to provide a range of career opportunities, given the budget constraints facing the Agency.

The Governing Council **took note** of the statement of the Staff Association.

7. ACCEPTANCE OF GRANTS AND CONTRACTS, INCLUDING REPORT ON INTEREST APPORTIONMENT: Item 18 of the Agenda (Document [GC/61/13](#))

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution, entitled "Acceptance of grants and contracts, including report on interest apportionment" (GC/61/R11):

The Governing Council,

Having considered Document [GC/61/13](#) "Acceptance of grants and contracts",

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 project:

Coordination of the International Birth Cohort Harmonisation Group [Ministry of the Environment, Japan (through Mitsubishi Research Institute Group) and Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety, Germany in an amount of €60 060 (€30 030 from Japan and €30 030 from Germany) for 12 months];

2. NOTES the post facto reporting of grants and contracts accepted by the Director as detailed in Document GC/61/13;

3. NOTES the amounts of interest income apportioned; and

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

The resolution was **adopted**.

8. ACCEPTANCE OF DONATIONS: Item 19 of the Agenda (Documents [GC/61/14](#) and [GC/61/17](#))

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution, entitled "Acceptance of donations (1)" (GC/61/R12):

The Governing Council,

Having been informed by Document [GC/61/14](#) of the unconditional donations accepted during the year 2018 under the authority vested in the Director by Resolution GC/4/R3,

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

The resolution was **adopted**.

The RAPPORTEUR read out a second draft resolution, entitled "Acceptance of donations (2)", relating to the donation of the copyright of and proceeds from the sales of a book written by an IARC Fellow from Norway (GC/61/R13):

The Governing Council,
Having been informed by Document [GC/61/17](#) of the in-kind donation accepted by the Director and the Governing Council Chairperson jointly in accordance with Resolution GC/4/R3,
AUTHORIZES the full amount of revenues generated by future sales of the children's book provisionally titled "Dad has cancer" to be credited to the Governing Council Special Fund as publication revenues, and allocated to the activities of the Education and Training Group.

The resolution was **adopted**.

**9. PROJECTION OF SHORT VIDEOS TO ILLUSTRATE SELECTED IARC ACTIVITIES:
Item 20 of the Agenda**

A series of 1–2-minute video clips was shown, taken from the IARC Research Worldwide project (<https://researchworldwide.iarc.fr>) and intended to offer insights into the ways the Agency's work made a difference in cancer prevention through screening, training of researchers, participation in worldwide collaborative projects and implementation of innovative approaches in cancer control and prevention.

The meeting rose at 13:15.