



**Governing Council
Sixty-seventh Session**

GC/67/3
7 March 2025

*Lyon, 6–8 May 2025
Hybrid format*

REPORT OF THE 61ST SESSION OF THE SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL

INTRODUCTION

1. The Sixty-first Session of the Scientific Council (SC) of the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), held remotely, was opened by Dr Luis Felipe Ribeiro Pinto (SC Chairperson), at 12:00 on Wednesday 12 February 2025. He welcomed the participants, including Dr Sirpa Heinävaara, Vice-Chairperson and the seven new SC members: Drs Adam Grant Elshaug (Australia), Eric Van Cutsem (Belgium), Hesham Elghazaly (Egypt), Tatsuhiro Shibata (Japan), Ali Saeed Al-Zahrani (Kingdom of Saudi Arabia), María José Sánchez Pérez (Spain) and Richard Sullivan (United Kingdom).
2. He also welcomed Professor Norbert Ifrah (Chairperson, Governing Council (GC), France), Professor Dorothy Keefe (Vice-Chairperson, GC, Australia), Dr Guy Fones (WHO/HQ Representative), Dr Sonali Johnson (UICC, Observer) Professor Samar Alhomoud (Chair of the IARC Ethics Committee, Observer), and Professor Béatrice Fervers (Centre Léon Bérard, Observer)¹.
3. Apologies for absence were received from Dr Satish Gopal (USA) for the entire session, and Professor Prashant Mathur (India) for Friday 14 February.
4. For ease of reference a list of acronyms of IARC Pillars and Branches can be found in [Annex 1](#) at the end of this Report.
5. Due to the remote nature of the session, some presentations were made available in advance of the meeting to devote web conference time to discussion and finalization of the Scientific Council Report.

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

6. Declarations of interests were summarized by the Secretariat and available for consultation by SC members. Please refer to [Annex 2](#) at the end of this Report.

ELECTION OF RAPPORTEUR

7. Dr Ben Spycher (Switzerland) was elected Rapporteur.

¹ Photographs: participants were not asked to sign a consent form. The Secretariat read a statement, at the opening of the session, informing participants of the Group photograph, consisting of several screen shots to be taken during the first break. Participants with their cameras switched on will be taken as equivalent to their consent to have their picture displayed on the Governance website and kept in the IARC archives for future use. This also covers consent for screen shots taken during the meeting. Participants were asked to let the Secretariat know formally if they wished not to have their picture published by IARC, at the time of the meeting or in future.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA ([Document SC/61/1](#))

8. The agenda was **adopted**.

SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL FEEDBACK ON FLASH TALKS

9. Due to the remote format of this Session, short videos presentations of the IARC scientists' flash talks were made available on a protected shared drive, protecting unpublished scientific data.
10. All Branch Head, Deputy Branch Heads, and scientists thanked the SC for comments/recommendations, which were duly noted and appreciated.

Overall comments and overview:

- Excellent overviews of the scientific activities and structure of the Branches
 - Excellent to outstanding presentations from scientific staff
 - High scientific quality of studies
 - High public health impact
 - Innovative work/pioneering projects
 - Alignment with the IARC Medium-Term Strategy very high
 - Strong collaboration with international partners and key stakeholders
 - Diversity of backgrounds highly appreciated
 - Gender balance
11. The Scientific Council made the following comments:
- The Secretariat is requested to provide the SC members with a standardized template for homogenised evaluation of the flash talks to be held in-person in 2026.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT INCLUDING:

MAJOR SCIENTIFIC HIGHLIGHTS

12. The Director's presentation is available from the event management platform ([here](#)) and a list of publication of Agency staff is available from https://www.iarc.who.int/cards_page/iarc-publications/ (*click on card IARC STAFF JOURNAL ARTICLES*).
13. In addition, the Director delivered a short presentation.
14. Dr Guy Fones, on behalf of WHO Director-General, thanked the Director, highlighted the alarming cancer statistics and projections, as well as the growing need for the IARC and WHO to work together. He also mentioned the recent inauguration of the WHO Academy, which will further strengthen the ties between IARC and WHO.

15. A summary of discussions and questions raised by the SC at the meeting and answers given by the Director and IARC staff is given below:
- The SC questioned how IARC's evidence could drive action and emphasized the importance of IARC's independent research in evaluating the impact of ultra-processed foods (UPFs) on non-communicable diseases (NCDs), including cancer risk. They stressed that IARC's research must remain free from industry influence, as its independent role is critical in uncovering such associations. The IARC *Monographs* program assesses potential environmental carcinogens, including UPFs, and recently classified aspartame as a Group B carcinogen. Several food ingredients have been prioritized for evaluation in the 2025–2029 period. Further research is needed to better understand the association between UPFs and various cancer types, as well as the underlying mechanisms.
 - The SC expressed serious concerns that funding for the *Monographs* program may be at risk.
 - The SC also questioned the strategic link between IARC's research on the early onset of colorectal cancer and the *Monographs* program. IARC's findings indicate that the colibactin signature is more prevalent in tumours from younger patients, suggesting a potential role in the rising incidence of colorectal cancer among younger individuals. However, additional research is required before this topic can be considered for evaluation within the *Monographs* program.
16. The Scientific Council congratulated the Director and her staff on the scientific highlights.

BIENNIAL REPORT OF THE IARC ETHICS COMMITTEE (IEC), 2023–2024 ([Document SC/61/2](#))

17. The IEC Chair, Professor Samar Alhomoud, attended the virtual session, as an Observer.
18. The SC noted the Report with satisfaction.

DISCUSSION WITH THE DIRECTOR, THE DIRECTOR OF ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE AND THE SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL ONLY

19. Discussion was held in closed session.

EVALUATION REPORT OF THE IARC MEDIUM-TERM STRATEGY (MTS) 2021–2025 ([Document SC/61/3](#))

20. Mr Olivier Exertier and Dr Anna Schmütz, Consultants, Director's Office, presented this item.
21. The SC noted that the implementation of the MTS 2021–2025 according to four fundamental priorities is a relevant model corresponding to the value chain of cancer research and prevention continuum.
22. The SC reaffirmed IARC's strong scientific and operational performance, as well as its impactful research worldwide, paving the way for the development of the MTS 2026–2030 this year.
23. The Scientific Council commended IARC personnel for their outstanding work and made the following comments:
- Health economics is a crucial research area for IARC, and the SC recommends that IARC seek alternative funding sources to strengthen this program, as well as alternative global collaborations with centres that have the micro- and macroeconomic expertise. The SC suggests the creation of a working group of interested SC members and IARC personnel to develop and advance efficient models of capacity building capitalizing on international partnerships and collaborations.

- The SC enquired about the collaboration between IARC and the WHO Academy. IARC is currently migrating its learning programs to the WHO Academy while maintaining its leadership in these initiatives. This collaboration is expected to grow, enhancing the outreach and dissemination of IARC's research.
- The SC emphasized the importance of implementation research, particularly in areas such as HPV vaccination and screening strategies, and recommended that it be further strengthened and consolidated in the next MTS.
- The SC inquired about potential new research areas to be included in the next MTS. The potential inclusion of new research programs will be guided by the evaluation of the current MTS and the recommendations derived from the reviews of various IARC Branches during its implementation.
- The SC noted significant variation in the h-index across Branches. The Secretariat recommends complementing the h-index with more relevant metrics, as Branches focus on different research areas and have varying public health impacts. Therefore, the h-index should not be used to compare Branches directly.

REQUEST FOR SUPPORT FROM THE GOVERNING COUNCIL SPECIAL FUND. COMPUTING INFRASTRUCTURE FOR THE IARC SCIENTIFIC IT PLATFORM (DOCUMENT SC/61/4)

24. The SC considered the Director's proposal to request an allocation of €250 000 from the GC Special Fund (GCSF) to purchase new computing servers, including some with high-performance graphics processing unit (GPU) designed for artificial intelligence analyses, as well as general infrastructure (network, power supply, cables) and maintenance of the servers for a period of five years.
25. The SC notes that a cost-recovery system is being developed to support the operational cost and the long-term sustainability of the SIT platform.
26. The SC notes that this investment will secure the SIT platform's capacity to meet the current and future computational demands of IARC's scientific projects while supporting its open-science mandate.
27. The SC recommended that GC approve the allocation of €250 000 from the GCSF in support of the Director's requests and made the following comments:
 - The SC noted that the SIT platform is open to external collaborators while keeping the data safe in line with data protection requirements and the Open Science strategy.
 - The SC noted that the SIT platform is part of IARC's overall information strategy planning, to be implemented considering the French and European computing infrastructures and initiatives that will shape IARC's Open Science and data-sharing strategies in the future.

DIRECTOR'S RESPONSE TO THE EVIDENCE SYNTHESIS AND CLASSIFICATION (ESC) BRANCH REVIEW, HELD REMOTELY IN JANUARY 2024

28. The details of action taken following the Evidence Synthesis and Classification (ESC) Branch review were discussed.
29. The SC noted the Director's response to the ESC Review and made the following observations:
 - The SC recognizes and appreciates the substantial contribution the United States of America has made for the last 43 years to the *Monographs* programme,
 - The SC is concerned about the funding of the *Monographs* programme, which relies on a US grant (60% of its total budget) that is now in jeopardy given the uncertainty of future US funding,
 - The SC alerted the Secretariat to the unsustainability of the *Monographs* funding scheme, further exacerbated by the freezing of NIH grants in the US and urged its members to reach out to their Governing Council representatives to explore sustainable and multi-annual funding solutions.
 - The SC further noted that direct contributions from other funders, would not provide a stable, long-term funding solution and may be challenging as per the ongoing discussions with the European Union to secure some funding for the *Monographs*.
 - The SC noted that the Secretariat is working on developing targeted funding packages for potential donors more inclined to support specific thematic areas and emphasized that by far the best and preferred option remains regular contributions from multiple Participating States increasing IARC Regular Budget, ensuring independence and preventing conflicts of interest.
 - The SC notes that utilizing the Core Voluntary Contribution (CVC) mechanism as a complementary option would allow Participating States to provide voluntary contributions.

REGULAR UPDATE ON IARC INITIATIVE FOR RESILIENCE IN CANCER CONTROL (IRCC) (FORMERLY IARC-C19) ([Document SC/61/5](#))

30. Dr Isabelle Soerjomataram, CSU Deputy Branch Head, presented the update on IARC IRCC which was launched in 2020 to support IARC in investigating the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on cancer services, including health system disruptions and mitigation strategies.
31. The SC noted that in order to capture crises at larger sense, activities planned within the IARC-C19 have been expanded to include natural and human-made disasters. The updated major aims of the initiative cover three overarching workstreams:
 - i. Conduct in depth monitoring of key indicators of cancer incidence, survival, and mortality during and after a crisis such as the COVID-19 pandemic, encompassing collection of data, impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on cancer diagnosis and stage, survival from cancer before and during the COVID-19 pandemic, and Global impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on cancer mortality.
 - ii. Explore reasons for disruptions to cancer services and mitigation strategies employed, encompassing the global impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on delays and disruptions in cancer services, the global impact of COVID-19 mitigation strategies on disruptions in cancer services, the Health System Responses and Stakeholder Experiences Amidst the COVID-19 Pandemic, and the

Health systems resilience in coordinating cancer control during crises in selected low- and middle-income countries.

- iii. Provide a tool to model the short-, medium and long-term impact of disruptions on cancer outcomes to improve resilience in cancer control. Current developments encompass a tool 'The Cervical Cancer Elimination Planning Tool (EPT)' as an expansion of the EPT, will be designed around the four functions within the WHO's framework for health system performance assessment: governance, financing, resource generation, and service delivery.

30. The SC made the following observations:

- The SC suggested to expand these efforts to countries with limited data on cancer mortality.
- The SC queried how IARC plans to respond in the event of another pandemic or crisis. The Secretariat indicated that IARC will collaborate with WHO Headquarters and Regional Offices to develop a framework of recommendations tailored to local needs.
- The SC queried about IARC's strategic focus for the coming years. The Secretariat indicated that IARC has prioritized cervical cancer prevention, screening, and treatment and aims to expand its efforts to breast cancer.

UPDATE – IARC@60 ANNIVERSARY ([Document SC/61/6](#))

31. Mr Clément Chauvet presented the year-long anniversary campaign of IARC 60th anniversary, starting in May 2025, as an opportunity to highlight the importance of cancer research on prevention and strengthen collective prevention efforts.
32. The SC noted that local and international events will be organized, involving international stakeholders. A visibility campaign will also be launched, running from 2025 to 2026 to raise awareness of IARC's core mission, and a large-scale scientific conference will close the one-year campaign.
33. The SC notes the invitation to provide feedback and suggestions to support the Secretariat in making this celebration a success.

IARC SCIENTIFIC PROGRAMMES : PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

34. The SC noted with great interest the presentation of the IARC-led programme [Oesophageal cancer, a long-neglected killer] presented by Drs Behnoush Abedi-Ardekani, Valerie McCormack and Joachim Schüz.
35. The SC suggested that IARC collaborate on developing a grant proposal focused on different subtypes of oesophageal cancer in the Netherlands.
36. The SC noted that the implementation of these projects would require a budget of €700 000 to be sought from IARC Participating States interested in investing in the oesophageal cancer prevention program.

SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP OF THE REVIEW PANEL IN 2026

37. In 2026, the Genomic Epidemiology (GEM) Branch, Head: Dr Paul Brennan will be reviewed.
38. Drs André KARCH, Pål Richard ROMUNDSTAD and Orla SHEILS will participate in the GEM Review Panel. It was agreed that Dr André KARCH would Chair the GEM Review Panel.
39. The external members will be chosen by the Secretariat in consultation with the Chair of the Review Panel and the SC Chair.
40. The SC notes that the review will be fully remote, over five half days on 12–16 January 2026.

PROPOSED PROGRAMME AND BUDGET (2026–2027) ([Document SC/61/7](#) and [Annexes](#))

41. The SC provided the following comments:
42. The SC noted with satisfaction the new presentation of the Proposed Programme and Budget based on Results Based Budgeting principles and with a focus on IARC's core programme and flagships.
43. The SC noted that the core programme of IARC as well as the 10 Flagships as proposed in the Programme and Budget 2026–2027 are vital for global cancer research, and ultimately for global health, due to their unique value proposition.
44. The SC acknowledged that the requested increase in the Assessed Contribution of a total of €1.9 million for the biennium 2026–2027 is fully justified to partially cover the statutory staff cost increase, while observing with concern the proposed cut of €1.5 million in the Activity budget for the biennium.
45. The SC inquired about the potential impact on IARC if the proposed budget increase is not approved by the Governing Council. In response, the Secretariat stated that it would be forced to cut some programmes. The SC is seriously concerned with this potential consequence, in case the budget proposal is not supported by the Governing Council.
46. The SC expressed concerns that one of the core programmes of IARC, i.e. "Pillar 1-Data for Action", appears to be underbudgeted. The Secretariat agreed and highlighted that within the current budget envelope, additional regular budget resources cannot be diverted to Pilar 1 without impacting the other areas of IARC research. The Secretariat also explained the difficulty of this particular pillar in attracting competitive grant funding, as their deliverables and results are seen as "global public goods", thus rarely fitting into the requirements of any external grant calls. The Secretariat looks forward to collaborating further with the SC to seek guidance on how to address such challenges.
47. The SC invited willing Participating States to provide additional voluntary contributions through the Core Voluntary Contributions Account (CVCA), specifically devised for IARC Participating States.
48. The SC noted that a request for allocation of funds from the Governing Council Special Fund of approximately €1.5 million to cover the shortfall in the staff budget for the biennium 2024–2025 will be submitted to the forthcoming Governing Council.
49. The SC noted that the Secretariat is working on an ERP implementation plan for which a request for additional allocation of funds from the Governing Council Special Fund will be submitted to the forthcoming Governing Council. The amount is currently unknown as this requires further working by the Secretariat.

50. The SC recommended that the Governing Council approves the proposed budget (2026–2027), including the regular budget or assessed contribution of €53.5 million, as it is vital for the successful implementation of the core programme as well as the 10 Flagships as indicated in the Proposed Programme and Budget.

SCIENTIFIC REPORT OF THE EPIGENOMICS AND MECHANISMS (EGM) BRANCH REVIEW AND DISCUSSION (Document SC/61/WP3)

51. The Scientific Report of the EGM Review was presented by Drs Walter Berger and David Gisselsson Nord, Co-Chairs of the Review Panel (RP).
52. The external experts and SC members of the RP were thanked for their valuable contributions.
53. The RP noted the following concerning the EGM Branch:
- a. **Assessment of EGM's scientific quality (using the six-point scale below)¹**
 - EGM's past performance: Outstanding
 - EGM's future plans: Outstanding/Forefront

 - b. **Assessment of the relevance of EGM's work to the mission of IARC²**
 - EGM's past performance: Perfect Fit
 - EGM's future plans: Perfect Fit

Overall recommendations for EGM

- The EGM Branch is mission-critical to IARC. It significantly contributes to the Agency's overarching mission of cancer prevention by enhancing the understanding of cancer causes, mechanisms, and the identification of biomarkers. EGM has built an impressive interdisciplinary ecosystem of researchers, uniting the key areas of environmental exposures, infectious agents, internal factors, epigenetic cancer pathogenesis and biomarker discovery. EGM comprises a highly impressive global, collaborative network, including a unique access to large population cohorts in low- and middle-income countries.

¹ The following classification will be used:

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.

² The following classification will be used:

- 1: **Perfect fit:** This type of work is ideally suited to the mission of IARC.
- 2: **Good fit:** This type of work is suited to the mission of the Agency.
- 3: **Questionable fit:** Uncertain.
- 4: **Poor fit:** Work which should not continue.

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

- The future strategy could benefit by better aligning resources with more focused goals to allow adaptation to an uncertain future. There is an imminent need for a clarity of direction from IARC leadership regarding the upcoming Branch leadership transition. Efforts should also be made to further empower mid-level leadership to safeguard the unique EGM Branch research environment through future organizational restructuring.
 - The EGM Branch has a unique interdisciplinary function within the IARC ecosystem, most prominently by offering synergising research on the microbiome, epigenome and environmental exposures across a wide range of malignancies. This scientific environment should be safeguarded during upcoming transitions.
 - Tangible assets to be preserved include in particular: the access to global cohorts and other types of data from low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) as well as methodology and laboratory resources that allows actionable mechanistic understanding of a broad set of cancer risk factor; another asset is the well-functioning system for training junior scientists from LMICs who later become international collaborators to the Branch.
 - For the future plan, the EGM Branch needs to have a full-scale prioritization of their strategic goals, i.e. they need to specify what will be continued and what must be cut in a less well-funded future, based on mission priorities. Clear prioritization will allow Branch leadership to feel more ownership of their direction and improve competitiveness for external funding opportunities.
54. The overall recommendations for the EGM Branch were discussed and approved.
55. In response, the Director:
- Thanked the RP for their in-depth Review, and commended Branch Head and Deputy Branch Head for their work.
 - Informed the SC that the positive aspects and critical issues highlighted by the Review Panel will be addressed in the new MTS 2026–2030, with careful consideration of the worrisome financial situation.
56. The Branch and Deputy Head thanked the RP for their input.
57. The Epigenomics and Mechanisms (EGM) Branch Review Panel Report was formally accepted by the Scientific Council.

SCIENTIFIC REPORT OF THE EARLY DETECTION, PREVENTION AND INFECTIONS (EPR) BRANCH REVIEW AND DISCUSSION (DOCUMENT SC/61/WP4)

58. The Scientific Report of the EPR Review was presented by Dr Sirpa Heinävaara, on behalf of Dr Satish Gopal, Chair of the Review Panel (RP).
59. The external experts and SC members of the RP were thanked for their valuable contributions.
60. The RP noted the following concerning the EPR Branch:
- a. **Assessment of EPR's scientific quality (using the six-point scale below)¹**
 - EPR's past performance: Outstanding
 - EPR's future plans: Outstanding
 - b. **Assessment of the relevance of EPR's work to the mission of IARC2**
 - EPR's past performance: Perfect Fit
 - EPR's future plans: Perfect Fit

Overall recommendations for EPR

The RP suggested the following scientific portfolio recommendations for EPR and IARC consideration:

- Achieve greater strategy, cohesion, prioritization, and balance across the EPR portfolio.
- Continue to support and more strongly integrate the EPR portfolio focused on prevention of infection-related cancers, including gastric cancer, with other workstreams.
- Increase efforts to build institutional research capacity within LMIC partners.
- Continue to expand the implementation research portfolio and continue to engage external expertise as required (e.g. behavioural science, health economics) to support this work.
- Develop a strategic framework for pursuing EPR research opportunities incorporating new tools and technologies (e.g. artificial intelligence, large language models, multicancer early detection).
- Pursue more community-engaged and citizen science opportunities with integration of patient and community perspectives at all stages of research.
- Continue to strengthen the essential support IARC provides to key WHO cancer initiatives.
- Consider expanding CanScreen5 and provide permanent funding for it.

¹ The following classification will be used:

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.

² The following classification will be used:

- 1: **Perfect fit:** This type of work is ideally suited to the mission of IARC.
- 2: **Good fit:** This type of work is suited to the mission of the Agency.
- 3: **Questionable fit:** Uncertain.
- 4: **Poor fit:** Work which should not continue.

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

61. The overall recommendations for the EPR Branch were discussed and approved.
62. In response, the Director:
 - Thanked the RP for their tremendous Review, and commended Branch Head and Deputy Branch Heads for their outstanding work.
63. The Branch and Deputy Head thanked the RP for their input.
64. The Early Detection, Prevention and Infections (EPR) Branch Review Panel Report was formally accepted by the Scientific Council.

ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON AND VICE-CHAIRPERSON FOR THE 62nd SESSION OF THE SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL IN 2026

65. Dr Sirpa Heinävaara was elected Chairperson.
66. Dr Young-Woo Kim was elected Vice-Chairperson.

DATE OF NEXT SESSION

67. The 62nd SC will take place on Wednesday 11, Thursday 12 and Friday 13 February 2026 in Lyon.
68. The GEM Review Panel will take place (remotely) over five half days from Monday 12 to Friday 16 January 2026.

ADOPTION OF THE SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL REPORT (Document SC/61/8)

69. The report of the Sixty-first Session of the Scientific Council was **adopted**.

CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

70. The customary expressions of thanks were exchanged.
71. Dr Weiderpass thanked the outgoing members of the Scientific Council, Drs Einas Abdulaziz Eid Al Kuwari (Qatar), Walter Berger (Austria), Jie He (China), Marie-Elise Parent (Canada), Luis Felipe Ribeiro Pinto (Brazil), and Mathilde Touvier (France).

ANNEX 1 – LIST OF ACRONYMS OF IARC PILLARS AND BRANCHES

ACRONYM	PILLAR / BRANCH
	Pillar I: DATA FOR ACTION
CSU	Cancer Surveillance Branch
	Pillar II: UNDERSTANDING THE CAUSES
GEM	Genomic Epidemiology Branch
NME	Nutrition and Metabolism Branch
	Pillar III: FROM UNDERSTANDING TO PREVENTION
ENV	Environment and Lifestyle Epidemiology Branch
EGM	Epigenomics and Mechanisms Branch
EPR	Early Detection, Prevention and Infections Branch
	Pillar IV: KNOWLEDGE MOBILIZATION
ESC	Evidence Synthesis and Classification Branch
LCB	Learning and Capacity Building Branch
LSB	Laboratory Support, Biobanking and Services
	DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
SSR	SERVICES TO SCIENCE AND RESEARCH

ANNEX 2 – DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Declarations of interest were provided by all Scientific Council members.

Interests were declared by a minority of Scientific Council members and include:

- ✓ Research support from the private sector; and
- ✓ Investment interests in the private sector.

Upon review by the Secretariat none of the declared interests were considered to represent a potential or significant conflict of interest with respect to the content of the meeting.

The individuals reporting interests were asked to check the contents of the table below, which they all subsequently approved.

Scientific Council member	Disclosure statement
Einaz Abdulaziz Eid Al-Kuwari	No relevant interest declared
Walter Berger	No relevant interest declared
Mohamed Berraho	No relevant interest declared
Valeriy V. Breder	No relevant interest declared
Roberta de Angelis	No relevant interest declared
Hesham Ahmed Gaballah Elghazaly	No relevant interest declared
Adam Elshaug	No relevant interest declared
David Gisselsson Nord	No relevant interest declared
Satish Gopal	No relevant interest declared
Jie He	No relevant interest declared
Sirpa Heinävaara	No relevant interest declared
André Karch	No relevant interest declared
István Kenessey	No relevant interest declared
Young-Woo Kim	No relevant interest declared
Valery Lemmens	No relevant interest declared
Prashant Mathur	No relevant interest declared
Marie-Elise Parent	No relevant interest declared
Luis Felipe Ribeiro Pinto	No relevant interest declared
Pål R Romundstad	No relevant interest declared
Maria José Sánchez Pérez	No relevant interest declared
Orla Sheils	No relevant interest declared
Tatsuhiko Shibata	No relevant interest declared
Ben Spycher	No relevant interest declared
Richard Sullivan	No relevant interest declared
Mathilde Touvier	No relevant interest declared
Eric Van Cutsem	No relevant interest declared

ANNEX – STATEMENT FOR THE DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Declarations of interest were provided by all Review Panel members.

Upon review by the Secretariat none of the declared interests were considered to represent a potential or significant conflict of interest with respect to the content of the meeting, and no direct or substantial involvement in IARC Programmes currently being reviewed were reported.

The individuals reporting interests were asked to check the contents of the tables below, which they all subsequently approved.

EGM Panel Member	Involvement in IARC Programme currently being reviewed*	Disclosure statement*
Robert Eferl	None	No relevant interest declared
Carmen J. Marsit	None	No relevant interest declared
Maria Sibilía	None	No relevant interest declared
Toshikazu Ushijima	None	No relevant interest declared

EPR Panel Member	Involvement in IARC Programme currently being reviewed*	Disclosure statement*
Julia Bohlius	None	No relevant interest declared
Eduardo Franco	None	Reports that his unit at McGill University benefits from research funding from Merck Group, and holding patent 20220073994 on "DNA methylation biomarkers for early detection of cervical cancer"
Sirpa Heinävaara**	Collaboration with IARC/EPR on CanScreen-ECIS project (WP leader up to February 2024) and Joint Action EUCanScreen (current task leader)	No relevant interest declared
Mari Kiens Nygård	None	Reports that his unit at Cancer Registry of Norway benefits from research funding from Merck Group to assess the long-term effectiveness and safety of HPV vaccines