International Agency for Research on Cancer

World Health Organization

Governing Council **GC/60/Min.4**
Sixtieth Session 18/06/2018

Lyon, 16–18 May 2018
Auditorium

MINUTES OF THE FOURTH MEETING

IARC, Lyon

Friday 18 May 2018, at 08:45

Chairperson: Professor Mads Melbye (Denmark)

Secretary: Dr Christopher P. Wild, Director, IARC

CONTENTS

Participating State Representatives

Professor Mads MELBYE, *Chairperson*	Denmark
Dr Stephen M. ROBBINS, *Vice-Chairperson*	Canada
Ms Lucero HERNANDEZ	
Dr Diane STEBER-BÜCHLI, *Rapporteur*	Switzerland
Professor Brendan MURPHY	Australia
Ms Elisabeth TISCHELMAYER	Austria
Mr Lieven DE RAEDT	Belgium
Dr Ana Cristina PINHO MENDES PEREIRA	Brazil
Dr Livia DE OLIVEIRA PASQUALIN	
Professor Juhani ESKOLA	Finland
Dr Janne PITKÄNIEMI	
Dr Tuula HELANDER	
Professor Norbert IFRAH	France
Dr Jocelyne BÉRILLE	
Mr Thomas DUBOIS	
Ms Barbara LÜBBEN	Germany
Mr Thomas IFLAND	
Dr Prabha ARORA	India
Professor Reza MALEKZADEH	Iran (Islamic Republic of)
Dr Fenton HOWELL	Ireland
Dr Mauro BIFFONI	Italy
Dr Pietro COMBA	
Mr Hiroyuki HORI	Japan
Dr Seiichiro YAMAMOTO	
Dr Latifa BELAKHEL	Morocco
Mr Jeroen HULLEMAN	Netherlands
Professor Pål Richard ROMUNDSTAD	Norway
Dr Al-Hareth M. AL-KHATER	Qatar
Dr Haerae KIM	Republic of Korea
Dr Young Joo WON	
Dr Dmitry KOSTENNIKOV	Russian Federation
Dr Igor KOROBKO *(unable to attend)*	
Dr Eduard SALAKHOV *(unable to attend)*	
Dr Zoya SEREDA *(unable to attend)*	
Dr Alexey NOVOZHILOV	
Dr Sergey IVANOV	

Dr Rafael DE ANDRÉS MEDINA	Spain
Dr Karin SCHMEKEL	Sweden
Dr Sandra KLEINAU	
No Representative	Turkey
Dr Mark PALMER	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Dr Mariana DELFINO-MACHIN	
Dr Douglas LOWY	United States of America
Dr Ann CHAO	
Dr Gabrielle LAMOURELLE *(unable to attend)*	
Dr Rachel OWEN	
Dr Lisa STEVENS	
Dr Sarah LLOYD STEVENSON	

World Health Organization

Dr Svetlana AKSELROD, Assistant Director-General, Noncommunicable Diseases and Mental Health

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

Mr Derek WALTON, WHO Legal Counsel

Observers

Dr JIE He, President, National Cancer Center of China, China

Dr MIN Dai, Director, Department of International Communications, National Cancer Center of China

Dr Julie TORODE, Deputy CEO, Advocacy and Networks Director, Union for International Cancer Control (UICC)

Professor Giske URSIN, Chairperson, Scientific Council

External Audit

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

Secretariat

Dr C.P. WILD, *Secretary*	Ms D. D'AMICO	Dr R. NJIE
Dr T. LANDESZ	Dr P. FERRARI	Ms A. SANTHIPRECHACHIT
	Ms E. FRANÇON	Dr A. SCALBERT
Dr M. ALMONTE	Dr N. GAUDIN	Dr J. SCHÜZ
Dr P. BASU	Dr M. GUNTER	Dr I. SOERJOMATARAM
Ms A. BERGER	Dr Z. HERCEG	Dr K. STRAIF
Dr F. BRAY	Dr R. HERRERO	Dr M. TOMMASINO
Dr P. BRENNAN	Dr B. LAUBY-SECRETAN	Dr J. ZAVADIL
Dr G. CLIFFORD	Dr F. LOZANO	
Dr I. CREE	Dr J. MCKAY	

1. UPDATE ON THE "NOUVEAU CENTRE": Item 17 of the Agenda (Document GC/60/11)

Ms FRANÇON (Administrative Services Officer) recalled that the City of Lyon had hosted IARC since 1967. The tower building, completed in 1972, had been funded by central government, regional authorities and the City of Lyon, with ownership vested in the City of Lyon. A 30-year agreement between the City of Lyon and IARC concerning occupation of the building had been renewed in 2002. Additional buildings had accommodated the increased activities of IARC during the 1980s and 1990s. As outlined in Document GC/60/11, the state of the ageing buildings had become a daily concern and a business continuity plan had been implemented in 2017 in order to mitigate the risks. Local partners had been contacted to ensure potential alternative sites for laboratories in case of major disruption. The Agency and the City of Lyon monitored and anticipated technical issues in the buildings as they arose and agreed on solutions. The cost of evacuating the current site and renting temporary laboratories had been estimated in 2012 at €14 million per year.

The "Nouveau Centre" project, begun in 2011, had progressed rapidly since the financial agreement reached with the French authorities at the end of 2015, the launch of the bid for the design and build in May 2016 and the selection of the best project at the end of 2017. The IARC Secretariat worked closely with the Governing Council Working Group on Infrastructure, the "Métropole de Lyon", the City of Lyon, the French Government and the Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes Region. In 2015, the French financial partners had agreed on a budget of €48 million for the design and build while the land for the new building had been provided by the City of Lyon. In 2016, the design and build cost had been estimated to increase to €49.26 million and the City of Lyon had agreed to donate €1.26 million through the sale of the current buildings. In April 2018, after the signature of the design-build contract, IARC had been informed by the French authorities that the total cost of the project was estimated to be €51.6 million.

A mock-up of the new building had been displayed for participants to view. The project selected by the French authorities, with input from experts and from the Secretariat, was the most compliant with the requirements of IARC and it was considered to be the most modern and innovative. The design and build team was international, with architects from Belgium and France and an engineering company headquartered in Canada; the team was experienced in building complex structures including laboratories. The design and build team had provided a video showing the philosophy behind the building in which IARC would develop over the next 30 to 50 years. The design was formed around a circular, open-air garden. The building was respectful of the environment and reacted naturally to its surroundings while the quality of the internal spaces and the deliberate choice of natural materials were part of the concept inspired by the natural world: biomimetic architecture.

It should be recalled that the French authorities were providing the funds for the building itself, but not for the physical move or for the equipment. It was estimated that the potential extra cost to IARC would be up to €7.78 million, excluding functional and/or security adjustment costs, €1.5 million of which could be found from the overhead accounts instead of being invested in research capacity, with a further €1.24 million expected from the City of Lyon remaining from the sale of the Latarjet and BRC buildings. The real value of the buildings was not secured and would

be assessed six months before the move. There was a balance of funds of €40 000 from the Governing Council Special Fund and additional funds expected from the sale of old furniture and equipment. Some adjustments would be necessary in order to make the project compliant with the requirements of IARC with respect to laboratories and the biobank. The adjustments were those that could normally be expected in any building project. Additional costs linked to security aspects and terrorist threats that had not been included in the original specifications were currently being negotiated with the "Métropole de Lyon". If the additional funds could not be found before 2021 then there might be some delay in implementing the automated biobank and some of the laboratory facilities and the physical move would take longer, leading to major disruption in research activity. The delay in the purchase of new equipment would compromise research capacity, particularly with respect to the P2 and P3 laboratories where it would not be possible to move old and obsolete equipment. The overall figure of €7.78 million had allowed for one third of new equipment and furniture which would allow the physical move of old furniture to be reduced from 12 weeks to six weeks. If the funds could not be mobilized before 2020, it might be possible to take out a loan or use some of IARC's financial reserves. A brochure on the Nouveau Centre had been compiled and a resource mobilization campaign would be launched in September 2018 within the FENSA framework. The French authorities had also undertaken to raise the funding needs of IARC with international partners.

Dr LANDESZ (Director of Administration and Finance) commended Ms Françon and her team for ensuring that it was possible for the Agency's staff to continue to work in the tower. IARC was applying a risk-based approach, which had involved the establishment of a detailed business continuity plan and a disaster recovery plan. The business continuity plan committee continually monitors the state of the tower, which was identified as the Agency's most critical risk. The committee was in charge of mitigating critical risk situations affecting the biobank, data on the servers and access to the tower. Since moving the entire Agency to an alternative site had been estimated at €14 million per year, the opportunity costs of not being able to move to the Nouveau Centre by 2021 were clear.

The Nouveau Centre project was complex, as any large building project would be and, at the current stage, it required intense follow-up with the design and build team and close collaboration with the "Métropole de Lyon", the project manager. Risks had been identified with respect to possible delays or potential surges in costs. Mitigation measures were in place in the form of legal clauses that would protect the Agency from delays.

IARC needed to invest in minimum requirements for the Nouveau Centre project in order to ensure value for money. The opportunity costs of delaying the investments clearly outweighed the investments prior to the move. IARC would engage in resource mobilization in the next two to three years. However, if all of the required funds were not received by 2021, there must be serious consideration of other fallback options, including the possibility of advancing funds from other sources, such as GCSF.

Ms HERNANDEZ (Canada) thanked the Administrative Services Officer and the Director of Administration and Finance for their hard work, noting that they had considerable concerns in keeping the building running and that they were supported by a dedicated team. She was very grateful for the contributions made by the French authorities but was concerned to learn of the

current and potential cost increases and of the uncertainty as to how the funding gaps would be covered. She had heard that the building was the most expensive in the Biopôle area and queried whether a more modest and less expensive building would be possible. While she could agree to authorize the Director to sign an agreement with the City of Lyon for the sale of the current buildings, it was on condition that no new or additional contributions should be requested from Participating States unless they were voluntary and on condition that IARC must be provided with reasonable alternative premises. Since a large part of the budget for the move related to the modernization of the biobank, it could perhaps be postponed, scaled down, accomplished in a step-by-step approach or achieved through partnerships. She asked whether, as discussed in the past, there were still plans to host WHO offices in the new building. She was not able to support using IARC reserves for the budget gaps.

Dr OWEN (United States of America) thanked the City of Lyon and the French Government for their significant financial contributions. However, like the member for Canada, she was concerned about costs and she was not ready to support using IARC reserves. She encouraged the Agency to continue to find other ways of funding the project. It was her understanding that most Participating States would not accept a proposal for mandatory contributions. She looked forward to the conclusion of the project and thanked all those who had contributed to the progress to date.

Ms FRANÇON (Administrative Services Officer), responding to comments, said that in order to consider a less costly building, the Agency would need to start the project from the beginning, necessitating a delay of two or three years, which would not be possible given the current state of the tower. The City of Lyon had invested in refurbishment and repair programmes that were intended to last until 2017 or 2018 and the technical issues suffered by the Agency had risen from weekly occurrences in 2017 to daily occurrences in 2018.

Three different types of agreement were envisaged with the City of Lyon, the first of which concerned the €1.26 million to be derived from the sale of the Latarjet and BRC buildings which would be transferred by the City of Lyon directly to the Métropole de Lyon. The second agreement would be to negotiate the sale of the Latarjet and BRC buildings six months prior to the physical move and the third agreement would be to sign the final “acte de vente” transferring legal ownership of the two buildings from IARC to the City of Lyon. Regarding the funding gap and how to scale down expectations, €5.04 million of the estimated €7.78 million would be the minimum required for IARC to continue operating in the new building. Some purchases could be delayed but that would mean taking some risks: for example, some of the liquid nitrogen tanks in the biobank were very old and they would not be moved because there was too high a risk that they would break. New liquid nitrogen tanks would need to be purchased for the new building. In recent years, the purchase of new scientific equipment, including new freezers and liquid nitrogen tanks, had been delayed in order to ensure that new equipment could be purchased to welcome the new activities. The Agency had explored possible partnerships with local scientific institutes but those institutes would have had to purchase new scientific equipment in order to host the Agency’s activities and therefore the costs would be the same. Regarding the WHO offices, it would not be possible to host them in the new building given the space requirements for IARC.

Dr DE ANDRÉS MEDINA (Spain) echoed the concerns expressed by previous speakers. He wished to know whether the project would pass the due diligence tests necessary in order for the Agency to apply for a loan. He wished to know whether a “Plan C” had been envisaged, enabling a modular solution in the event that IARC could not raise all of the money required.

Professor MURPHY (Australia) said that he was not sure that downscaling the building was a good idea, although some thought should be given to the scientific laboratory equipment which was the major cost in the fit-out. Options had already been explored with respect to outsourcing the biobank or to hosting laboratories at alternate sites but that would be the most practical solution in the short term. There was a significant risk that there could be a further escalation in building costs and he would be interested to learn what contingency had been built into the budget. With respect to resource mobilization, naming rights was an interesting and complex area. In the context of the business continuity plan, he wished to know what would be the proposed action if there was a sudden catastrophic failure in the air-handling plant.

Ms FRANÇON (Administrative Services Officer), responding to the question concerning business continuity, said that in the event of a catastrophic failure of the building ventilation system, the laboratory groups could withstand a period of up to four weeks by using the time to write reports. The Agency was in close contact with the City of Lyon with respect to maintenance of the ventilation system and it would be unlikely for the back-up plant to fail at the same time as the main system. Initiation of the back-up system should allow time for the main system to be repaired. If repairs could not be carried out within four weeks, it was possible that local partners could host laboratory activities although such an event was difficult to plan for: the City and Métropole of Lyon would assist in locating office space.

Dr LANDESZ (Director of Administration and Finance) emphasized that the new building would be owned by the French authorities and occupied by IARC. The French authorities had been extremely supportive in managing and financing the project and they would be bearing all the risks associated with any potential cost escalation. The Agency was managing its own opportunity costs with respect to the move since it was not possible to remain in the current building indefinitely and the state of the building resulted in daily uncertainty. There were cost implications to any temporary move that the Agency was keen to avoid and it was prudent in its management of the approved budget. With respect to the remarks by the member for Canada, indeed the Nouveau Centre was probably the building with the highest financial contribution from the French Government in the Biopôle area, but it was likely that there were many private-sector projects with higher levels of investment in the same area. The building represented one of two international organizations hosted by France; the investment was an important one for the French authorities and he was certain that they would be managing it within the timescale and budget identified. It would be the responsibility of IARC to provide the equipment within the new building. A stepwise approach could be considered to equipping the new building with a biobank, conference room and offices but it would save money over the longer run to invest money at the outset. The question was how to raise the funds within the next three years and the Agency would report back to the Governing Council on how it proposed to close the funding gap.

Dr PALMER (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) thanked the Agency for its work in keeping the organization running. It had been suggested that IARC could delay upgrading and transfer to the new building in a step-by-step process although a lot of the costs of the move related to the biobank which would require a modernized, automated system which could not be done in stages. It was difficult to see what savings could be made with respect to the biobank since the new system would need to be in place at the time of the move. With respect to the use of reserves, he requested clarification of his understanding that the proposal was not to use existing reserves but to use future reserves generated from the sale of equipment.

The SECRETARY said that he wished to make clear that the Agency would not ask for additional mandatory contributions: any contributions from Participating States would be on a voluntary basis. The costs of producing the core building would be borne by the Métropole de Lyon and therefore any unforeseen related inflationary costs would not fall on IARC. The Agency had put forward requirements with respect to the building and it was in the final stages of negotiation on the positions of the partitions for the laboratories and the biobank. IARC would be asked to make a contribution to any adjustments to the project that were deemed to be outside the original remit, including additional security requirements put in place as a result of advice from the United Nations and the local French police. The largest single cost in the planned move was the automated system for the biobank and therefore the fallback solution would be to maintain a manual system and, as far as possible, move across the existing freezers as a first step. There would be challenges in the move due to the fragility of certain items. The Agency was planning the project within the funds it had available.

The CHAIRPERSON, speaking in his capacity as the member for Denmark, said that, ordinarily, the transition to an automated biobank system would take place over a number of years with the old and new systems running alongside each other. Therefore, the Agency would have no choice but to move the current biobank to the new building.

Professor URSIN (Chairperson of the Scientific Council) said that it was a matter of extreme importance to the Scientific Council that there should be no delays that adversely affected the science research carried out at IARC and therefore the biobanks must be preserved. With respect to the funding gap, she believed that there was little experience in Europe in dealing with the issue of naming rights and she sought specific information on any progress made in that area.

The SECRETARY said that, with respect to naming rights, there was some precedent within the present building with the Princess Takamatsu Hall and Sasakawa meeting rooms. The link with Princess Takamatsu was historic in the Agency and therefore, with the agreement of the Governing Council and as requested on several occasions by members for Japan, it would be appropriate to carry the name over to a meeting room in the new building.

Dr LANDESZ (Director of Administration and Finance) said that the Finance team had been conducting research on naming rights and the Agency would be producing guidelines based on best practice in the area of resource mobilization. Experience in European institutions and in United Nations agencies (such as the IAEA Seibersdorf laboratories) indicated that common criteria for naming could be identified, including only using the names of individuals who had made a recognized and substantial contribution in their field. Once drafted, the guidelines would be shared

with the Governing Council Working Group on Infrastructure and with the Governing Council itself if members so wished. To clarify the question on the reserves, raised by the member for the United Kingdom, the Agency would embark on a period of intensive and proactive resource mobilization over the following three years during which it was hoped that the necessary funds would be acquired. If the Agency found itself in the position of having sourced, but not received, the funds that would be necessary for the move, it envisaged making a request to the Governing Council to utilize some funds in advance.

Dr BERILLE (France) said that her country had contributed to the hosting of IARC as a priority and, including the value of the land, it had committed to a significant investment of some €66 million for the Nouveau Centre project. By comparison, the additional amount required for the move and for the biobank, an essential item for which any delay would lead to even greater costs, appeared to be in the order of €5 million. France would be covering any increase in costs arising from the construction of the new building and therefore it strongly encouraged Participating States to make voluntary contributions towards the additional costs of the planned move.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution, entitled "Update on the Nouveau Centre", (GC/60/R10):

> The Governing Council,
>
> Having considered Document GC/60/11 (Update on the "Nouveau Centre"),
>
> 1. EXPRESSES its appreciation to the French national authorities, the Région Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes, the Métropole de Lyon and the City of Lyon for the strong support received, both for the continued efforts to ensure adequate conditions of the current premises and for the progress made on the "Nouveau Centre" project;
>
> 2. RECOGNIZES the remaining unfunded balance of an estimated €5.04 million to be mobilized prior to the planned move to the "Nouveau Centre" in 2021, and ENCOURAGES Participating States to make voluntary contributions towards this target;
>
> 3. ALLOWS, as an exceptional measure, that future miscellaneous revenue originating from the sale of old equipment and furniture during 2018–2021 and credited to the Governing Council Special Fund, be used towards the "Nouveau Centre" project;
>
> 4. AUTHORIZES the Director to sign the agreement(s) with the City of Lyon regarding the sale of Latarjet and the Biological Resources Centre (BRC) buildings; and
>
> 5. 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".

Dr DE ANDRÉS MEDINA (Spain) asked whether a further paragraph could be added to the resolution indicating that the Agency was actively looking for additional sources of funding, so as to make clear that the onus was not on Participating States to provide the funds.

Dr BERILLE (France) asked whether it would be possible to use the word "urges" in place of "encourages" in the second paragraph and to add the word "collective" before "target".

Ms LÜBBEN (Germany) said that she opposed the use of the word “urges” since the Governing Council had been informed from the outset that Participating States would not be urged to provide additional contributions: the word “encourages” was sufficiently strong.

Ms TISCHELMAYER (Austria) said that she was of the same opinion as the member for Germany: the word “urges” was too strong. Dr PINHO MENDES PEREIRA (Brazil) agreed with those remarks.

Mr HULLEMAN (Netherlands) said that the word “invites”, rather than “encourages” would better reflect the invitation from the Secretary for Participating States to make voluntary contributions.

Professor MURPHY (Australia) said that whether “encourages” or “invites” was used, it was clear that the contributions were not mandatory and that the Agency was in need of more money.

The CHAIRPERSON, in his capacity as the member for Denmark, said that he could accept the word “encourages”; he noted that there did not appear to be a strong opposition to its use.

Dr BERILLE (France) said that she did not object to retaining the word “encourages” but she wished to be sure that the capitals of Participating States would be informed that they were invited to make voluntary contributions. She wished to recall her request that the word “collective” should be inserted before “target”.

The CHAIRPERSON drew attention to the second paragraph as amended:

“RECOGNIZES the remaining unfunded balance of an estimated €5.04 million to be mobilized prior to the planned move to the “Nouveau Centre” in 2021, and ENCOURAGES Participating States to make voluntary contributions towards this collective target;”

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

2. PROPOSAL TO UNDERTAKE AN EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF IARC: Item 18 of the Agenda (Document GC/60/12)

The SECRETARY recalled that he had met with the Minister of Social Affairs and Health of Finland following a suggestion received from her Ministry in 2017 that an independent external evaluation of IARC should be conducted. The written proposal from Finland was contained in an annex to Document GC/60/12. Significant checks and balances existed to evaluate the work of IARC and the Agency was already heavily reviewed at different levels: through grant applications for specific projects; through papers submitted to scientific journals; by the Scientific Council; through peer reviews; and through the scrutiny of the Governing Council, particularly with respect to the progress achieved in relation to the Medium-Term Strategy. There was considerable scrutiny of the activities and outcomes of the research of the Agency: as Director, he spent time responding to and contributing to those reviews, as did the scientists of IARC, and it should be borne in mind that there was a time cost to that participation.

Finland had raised the question of an independent review, which he understood to be a broader review of the general scope of the work of the Agency, including how the themes aligned with those of other international organizations and what was the fit with the work of WHO. Such a review on the functions and unique selling points of the Agency might be carried out in tandem with the preparation for setting the Medium-Term Strategy when a wide consultation process was

undertaken with different stakeholders, including those from outside the Agency. A new procedure for setting the Medium-Term Strategy, incorporating the proposal requested by Finland, could be drawn up and proposed to the Governing Council at its next session.

Professor ESKOLA (Finland) said that his understanding of the proposal was very similar to that of the Secretary. The proposal had arisen following discussions at the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health of Finland regarding the growing financial needs of IARC and concerns as to how they could be met, particularly in the light of new opportunities in technology and research. The review should be broad, encompassing the alignment of scientific activities with the mandate of the Agency as well as the balance of priorities and whether they should be changed. It was true that IARC already underwent a number of evaluations, but an external review would give time to more in-depth analysis. The external evaluation could be used as part of the process for setting the Medium-Term Strategy and, as the incoming Director had stated during her interview, it would be useful for her future planning. In its letter of 2017, the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health of Finland had acknowledged that the review would need to be funded from external sources and Finland was ready to contribute its fair share.

Professor MURPHY (Australia) said that he supported the approach outlined by the Secretary to carry out the external review as part of an enhanced preparation for the Medium-Term Strategy. He did not see a need to review the detailed science but there would be value in taking a broader view of the Medium-Term Strategy and the laboratory work that would complement the main mission of the Agency without over-investment in laboratory space. The relationship with WHO must also be evaluated. The reluctance of Participating States to increase their contributions was not a reflection on the quality and direction of the work of the Agency although members had noted that the running costs had risen and there was an insufficient value proposition in terms of new science to match the increases. The number of external members of the review might be increased by one or two in order to respond to the concerns of Finland and others.

Mr DE RAEDT (Belgium) said that he was very supportive of the proposal by Finland. He did not think that the external review should take the form a scientific or financial audit, but that it should be viewed as a tool to engage in strategic action. The Ministry of Health of Belgium had undertaken two reviews recently, on antibiotic policy and on the International Health Regulations (2005), both of which had been extremely helpful in raising issues higher on the political agenda. The review could be funded within the regular budget or through the Governing Council Special Fund rather than through additional external resources.

Dr PALMER (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) said that he had some slight concerns about the criteria to be used in any external review since an evaluation of the quality of the science at IARC was already being adequately managed. If an external review of the strategy were to be held, it could risk the Agency being taken in a different direction from that agreed by the Governing Council. The purpose of the Medium-Term Strategy was to identify the direction and content of the work funded by Participating States. He could accept the approach suggested, whereby the Director would revert to the Governing Council with a proposal and a view could be taken once the criteria had been outlined.

The SECRETARY said that consideration would need to be given to the composition of any external review panel, whether the Scientific Council would be involved, what skillsets would be required and who would select the panel members. The terms of reference of the panel and the processes it would follow would need to be determined and a time frame decided upon.

Ms HERNANDEZ (Canada) said that she supported the proposal by Finland. IARC was established in 1965 and the international arena had changed drastically in that time with new discoveries in science, more demands and greater complexities. There was no doubt concerning the quality of the internal evaluation tools used by IARC, but an external evaluation would provide an overall strategic view, particularly if paired with the development of the Medium-Term Strategy. The evaluation would be an opportunity to examine other issues, such as the relationship with WHO and the Preamble to the Monographs. The Scientific Council should play a central role in the evaluation and, given the interest in improving the relationship with WHO, the Organization could be invited to participate in the process. Safeguards should be put in place to make sure that the evaluation helped Participating States to strengthen the Agency and provide information on which the Governing Council could base its decisions. The external evaluators must have an excellent knowledge of the global environment and the context in which the Agency operated and they must provide a constructive and strategic perspective.

Dr STEVENS (United States of America) said that she supported the suggestion to conduct an external review, including an evaluation of whether the high-tech laboratory structure was essential for success or whether future efforts should be reoriented towards a stronger coordinating role, with more emphasis placed on multicentre collaboration, as in the original mandate. She appreciated the proposed scope of the evaluation which would include: alignment of the activities of IARC with its mandate; collaboration with WHO on cancer control; the importance of operating an international research laboratory, a biobank and a next-generation sequencing platform for the success of the Agency; and the sustainability of operating an international research laboratory and a biobank. As indicated by the member for Canada, the Governing Council would make the final decision on how to utilize the results of the evaluation. She agreed with the member for Belgium that funds from the Governing Council Special Fund could be used to pay for the evaluation.

Dr SCHMEKEL (Sweden) said that she supported the initiative of Finland and highlighted the value of holding external reviews at regular intervals. The evaluation should provide a broad overview and should not focus on the detail of the science. It would be important for the review to look at alignment with other actors, including national and international organizations, examining gaps and overlaps. The aim should be to identify where IARC was unique and had added value. There was a risk that uncomfortable suggestions might arise from the review but the final decision on how to deal with the results would rest with the Agency.

Professor IFRAH (France) agreed with the proposal by Finland since it was part of the culture of research to welcome external evaluation. However, as noted by the member for the United Kingdom, it was the role of the Governing Council to determine both the policy of IARC and the criteria to be used in designing an external evaluation. He was in agreement with using the Governing Council Special Fund to pay for the evaluation.

The CHAIRPERSON, speaking in his capacity as the member for Denmark, said that it was extremely important that the Governing Council should not be seen to be questioning the quality of the work of IARC since it had performed excellently up to the present time. He saw that there was support for the proposal by Finland, although he himself favoured the approach outlined by the members for the United Kingdom and Australia. If the evaluation was to be undertaken, careful thought must be given to how to take it forward in a way that did not involve criticism of IARC and its superb work.

The SECRETARY emphasized that the process for developing the Medium-Term Strategy had been undertaken at the request of the Governing Council and it had included wide consultation on the scope of the work of the Agency, with leading experts in the field of cancer across a broad spectrum. The experts had given advice on the areas in which they believed IARC should or should not engage. WHO had been integrally involved in the joint Governing Council and Scientific Council working group responsible for setting the Medium-Term Strategy and the principle of consulting external experts was already firmly embedded in the process.

Concerning the type of science undertaken, there had never been an indication in the Statute of IARC that laboratory science was not part of the research tools of the Agency. Laboratories had been present in the tower building from the beginning. The laboratory facilities were on a very modest scale and on a par with a small university department: they were not in any way competing with large national centres. There had perhaps been a misperception as to the scale of investment at IARC. With respect to the biobank, it was used predominantly to host specimens from partner countries and IARC did not have its own specimens. The Islamic Republic of Iran had recently requested that IARC should host duplicate specimens from a large collaborative study and the European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition (EPIC) study, which involved 10 countries and 23 centres, was another example of a study for which IARC had been asked to host specimens. He wished to make clear that the biobank was a service to the wider cancer community exactly through the type of cooperative and collaborative studies that were at the heart of the Agency's mandate. He was not in any way arguing against the proposal that had been made but, for new Governing Council members in particular, he wished to put the matter in perspective.

Dr STEBER-BÜCHLI (Switzerland), Rapporteur, echoed the view of the member for Australia that the evaluation could be conducted as part of an enhanced preparation for the Medium-Term Strategy: at a time when a new Director was joining the Agency it would be useful to examine questions concerning the relationship with WHO.

Dr STEVENS (United States of America) agreed with the members for Australia and Switzerland that an external evaluation could be conducted as part of an enhanced approach to the preparation of the Medium-Term Strategy. At a time when IARC had just celebrated its 50th anniversary and with the arrival of a new Director and a planned move to new premises, it would be appropriate to conduct such an evaluation: it should not cause concern in the wider community.

The CHAIRPERSON suggested that the Governing Council should examine the draft resolution.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution, entitled "Proposal to undertake an external evaluation of IARC" (GC/60/R11):

> The Governing Council,
>
> Having considered Document GC/60/12 "Proposal to undertake an external evaluation of IARC",
>
> 1. THANKS Finland for making this proposal;
>
> 2. REQUESTS the Secretariat to prepare a document with a detailed procedure for preparation of the Medium-Term Strategy (MTS) for 2021–2025, including options and a timetable, informed by the outcome of the mid-term review of the MTS 2016–2020 for discussion at its 61st Session in May 2019; and
>
> 3. NOTES that this procedure would draw on the full range of external scientific expertise required, in addition to the Scientific Council members, taking account of the proposal by Finland to [*add here any specific points after discussion by GC*].

The RAPPORTEUR asked participants to provide suggestions for completion of the third paragraph of the draft resolution.

Dr PALMER (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) asked whether the word "external" might be removed from the title and from the preambular part of the resolution; the reference to "external scientific expertise" could be retained in paragraph 3.

Professor ESKOLA (Finland) said that it would be acceptable to remove the word "external" given the concerns raised during the discussions. However, in addition to the "external scientific expertise" referred to in paragraph 3, there should also be a reference to the broader external expertise required to evaluate the alignment of the activities of IARC with its mandate and collaboration with WHO.

Dr STEVENS (United States of America) said that it was not clear from paragraph 2 how the external evaluation and the preparation for the Medium-Term Strategy could be aligned. There had been two proposals on how to fund the external evaluation: she had supported the suggestion by the member for Belgium that it should be funded from the Governing Council Special Fund.

The SECRETARY said that the intent of paragraph 2 had been to suggest that there would be a number of components to the development of the Medium-Term Strategy: the components, which might include a wide consultation with the scientific cancer community as well as an external review, would be set out in a document for consideration and decision by the Governing Council at its sixty-first session. Responding to a question from Dr STEVENS (United States of America), he confirmed that the document to be presented to the Governing Council in 2019 would outline the proposed process and structure, including the expertise required for the external evaluation. The Governing Council would then instruct the new Director as to how to put the process into practice. In making its decision, the Governing Council would also draw on the input received from the Scientific Council following its mid-term review of the Medium-Term Strategy.

Dr SCHMEKEL (Sweden) agreed that the external review could be included in the preparation of the Medium-Term Strategy. She further agreed with the member for Finland that paragraph 3

should contain a reference to the wider expertise required to evaluate the position of IARC in relation to different organizations.

The CHAIRPERSON, speaking in his capacity as the member for Denmark, said that draft resolution could refer simply to “external experts”.

Ms LÜBBEN (Germany) said that the mandate of the external review to draw on expertise would be strengthened if the third paragraph began with the word “requests” in place of “notes”. Paragraph 3 might also mention the terms of reference of an external evaluation panel. The evaluation could be referred to specifically in paragraph 2.

Dr STEVENS (United States of America) supported the remarks by the member for Germany and proposed that the third paragraph should begin with the words “requests that the external evaluation will draw…”. Paragraph 3 could end with the words “the proposal by Finland to consider some of those areas for evaluation and that the process be returned to the Governing Council in May 2019”.

Dr PALMER (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) said that the amendments proposed by the members for Germany and the United States of America could lead to confusion: it was clear from paragraph 2 that the Secretariat was requested to prepare a detailed procedure for submission to the Governing Council. The Governing Council could further instruct the Secretariat once it had received the procedure, but in the meantime it was appropriate to begin the third paragraph with “notes…”. He sought the advice of the WHO Office of the Legal Counsel.

Dr STEVENS (United States of America) said that paragraph 2 made reference to a “detailed procedure” but it did not mention the evaluation.

The SECRETARY said that the “detailed procedure” for preparation of the Medium-Term Strategy would have a number of components, one of which would be the evaluation; more clarity could be added by including the words “including an external evaluation” after “detailed procedure” in paragraph 2. The intent was to provide the Governing Council with a description of a set of steps that would be followed in order to formulate the Medium-Term Strategy. The external evaluation would be one of the steps. The Scientific Council would review the steps proposed before they were submitted to the Governing Council.

In the ensuing discussion, Ms LÜBBEN (Germany) proposed that paragraph 3 should read: “requests the Secretariat to prepare and include an external evaluation, as requested by Finland, into this process” while Professor MURPHY (Australia) felt that an additional amendment was not needed, given that there would be appropriate external involvement in the preparation of the Medium-Term Strategy.

Ms KRANAWETTER (Principal Legal Officer, Office of the WHO Legal Counsel) explained that “a procedure” could be followed as part of “a process”.

Ms HERNANDEZ (Canada), responding to a query from Mr HULLEMAN (Netherlands), suggested that the phrase “full range of external scientific expertise” in paragraph 3 could be replaced by “relevant expertise”. She joined previous speakers in preferring that the draft resolution should make specific mention of the external evaluation so that its relevance within the preparation of the Medium-Term Strategy was not lost.

Dr SCHMEKEL (Sweden) suggested that the draft resolution could refer to an “independent evaluation” rather than an “external evaluation”.

The CHAIRPERSON, speaking in his capacity as the member for Denmark, supported by Professor ROMUNDSTAD (Norway), Professor MURPHY (Australia) and Dr HOWELL (Ireland), proposed that the draft resolution should refer to “an evaluation” and not to “an external evaluation”.

Ms KRANAWETTER (Principal Legal Officer, Office of the WHO Legal Counsel) clarified that IARC was a part of WHO and that organizations belonging to the United Nations common system were not subject to external evaluations but only to evaluations conducted by their governance. Any proposal to conduct an external evaluation would be subject to consideration by the Executive Board of WHO and possibly by the World Health Assembly. A more pragmatic approach would be to request a broader “evaluation” and to specify its components subsequently.

Professor ESKOLA (Finland) asked whether it would be acceptable to replace the phrase “external evaluation” by “independent evaluation”. He was concerned that no reference had been made to the contents of the evaluation and he wished to emphasize that its purpose was not to focus on scientific issues.

Dr STEVENS (United States of America) referring to paragraph 2, requested that members of the Governing Council should be able to participate in the evaluation.

Dr SCHMEKEL (Sweden) supported the remarks of the member for Finland and underlined the importance of clarity in the wording of the resolution so that the perspective of the Governing Council was clearly conveyed to the incoming Director of the Agency.

The CHAIRPERSON said that the draft resolution referred to “the Finnish proposal” and therefore it was very clear what was being asked of the Agency.

PROFESSOR ESKOLA (Finland) requested that the second paragraph be amended to refer to “an evaluation based on the topics raised in the Finnish proposal”.

Mr HULLEMAN (Netherlands) said that seeking opinions from outside of IARC could help the Agency to further identify its unique selling points.

Ms KRANAWETTER (Principal Legal Officer, Office of the WHO Legal Counsel), responding to a comment by Mr DE RAEDT (Belgium) said that the independent evaluation process of WHO had been fully involved in the development of the Medium-Term Strategy.

The CHAIRPERSON said that placing a reference to WHO in the draft resolution could make the text unnecessarily complex.

Professor MURPHY (Australia) said that over-specifying the components of the evaluation could limit the capacity of the executive to draft a full proposal for submission to the Governing Council in 2019. There had been no commitment to a full external evaluation but there had been a commitment to the incorporation of external elements in the evaluation process.

Ms LÜBBEN (Germany) underlined that the evaluation should have a broad scope and that it should not be limited to members of the Scientific Council: members of the Governing Council should also be included.

At the request of the CHAIRPERSON, the RAPPORTEUR read out a revised version of the draft resolution, entitled "Proposal to undertake an evaluation of IARC", (GC/60/R11) which incorporated the amendments proposed:

The Governing Council,

Having considered Document GC/60/12 "Proposal to undertake an external evaluation of IARC",

1. THANKS Finland for making this proposal;

2. REQUESTS that an evaluation on the topics raised in the Finnish proposal be included into the preparation of the IARC Medium-Term Strategy (MTS) for 2021–2025 and be carried out by external experts, Governing Council and Scientific Council members;

3. REQUESTS the Secretariat to prepare a document that describes the scope and terms of reference to be used for this evaluation, to be discussed at the next session of the Scientific Council and be submitted to the Governing Council at its 61st Session in May 2019;

4. REQUESTS the Secretariat to prepare a document with a detailed procedure for preparation of the MTS for 2021–2025, incorporating the evaluation options and a timetable; and

5. DECIDES that Governing Council Special Funds be used for this evaluation.

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

3. BIENNIAL REPORT ON PUBLICATION ACTIVITIES: Item 20 of the Agenda (Document GC/60/9)

Mr GAUDIN (Head, Communications Group) described notable developments in the publications programme over the previous biennium. Readers of IARC publications now had a choice of formats: the traditional hard copy purchased through WHO Press at headquarters, an electronic copy purchased online or a free copy made available through the open access initiative. The *World cancer report 2014* had sold approximately 1000 copies in print when it was first published, but the free version made available later in PDF format had been downloaded 20 000 times. During the previous biennium, eight volumes of the WHO Classification of Tumours series ("Blue Books") had been published, along with seven Monographs, one Handbook and two scientific publications. Sales had increased by 300% compared with the previous biennium, mainly thanks to the perennial demand for the Blue Books series. IARC Technical Publication No. 43, *Planning and developing population-based cancer registration in low- and middle-income settings*, was now available in French, Russian and Spanish. With the generous permission of the Governing Council, 75% of the revenue from publications was retained within the publications programme.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution, entitled "Biennial report on publication activities", (GC/60/R13):

> The Governing Council,
>
> Having reviewed Document GC/60/9 "Biennial report on publication activities", and
>
> Recalling its Resolution GC/58/R6 in which it requested the Director to report on publication activities on a biennial basis,
>
> 1. NOTES the Report with great interest;
>
> 2. NOTES that the net revenue from the sale of IARC publications to the Governing Council Special Fund amounted to €1 450 172 in 2016 and €1 751 567 in 2017, of which 75% was allocated in the following year to the publication programme; and
>
> 3. REQUESTS the Director to continue reporting biennially on publication activities at IARC.

The resolution was **adopted**.

4. REQUESTS FOR SUPPORT FROM THE GOVERNING COUNCIL SPECIAL FUND: Item 23 of the Agenda (Documents GC/60/16 and GC/60/Inf.Doc. No.2)

Dr SCALBERT (Chair, IARC Laboratory Steering Committee) introduced two requests for funding from the Governing Council Special Fund. The first was for three pieces of scientific equipment which would enable much faster processing of biosamples and reduce staff costs: an automated immunostainer, an automated device for nucleic acid quality control and an automated system for plasma phospholipid fatty acid profiling. The second was for the replenishment of serum and plasma samples from cancer cases included in the EPIC biobank. Samples collected during the two decades of the EPIC study had been divided between the study centre that had collected them and the Agency's central biobank: the latter was now greatly depleted, and funding would be used to transfer samples (approximately 22 000 straws) from the local study centres to replenish it. The funds requested from the Governing Council Special Fund amounted to €535 000: the Scientific Council had recommended that the request should be approved and had even suggested an increase in the allocated budget.

Replying to a question from Ms LÜBBEN (Germany), he said that the staff costs listed in the request (see document GC/60/16, para. 2) applied to tasks such as recording the samples and aliquoting.

The SECRETARY said that the staff costs would pay for the time of staff who were normally funded by extrabudgetary resources, i.e. no new staff would be recruited. The replenishment of the biobank, a core resource of the Agency, needed to be financed from the Agency's own funds.

Dr STEVENS (United States of America) asked whether, when the Scientific Council had recommended the proposed expenditure, it had considered the shortfall in funding for the Nouveau Centre, the optimum alignment of IARC's activities with its mandate, and other issues related to the Agency's overall financial situation.

Professor URSIN (Chairperson, Scientific Council) said that the three pieces of scientific equipment had been shown to be necessary for investigating specific research questions under the Medium-Term Strategy. The EPIC biobank was an invaluable resource, and the chance to replenish its stocks from the original samples should not be missed. Members of the Scientific Council had decided that the expenditure was justified and should not be delayed, even in the Agency's current financial situation.

The SECRETARY drew attention to document GC/60/Inf.Doc. No.2, which contained a projection of all existing and expected requests for funding from the Governing Council Special Fund for the period 2018–2021. The Special Fund was one of the few flexible resources available to him, and was thus highly valued. The requested equipment would be used to analyse samples from population-level epidemiological studies, a task which fell squarely within the Agency's mandate and the Medium-Term Strategy.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution, entitled "Request for support from the Governing Council Special Fund" (GC/60/R16):

The Governing Council,

Having reviewed Document GC/60/16 "Request for support from the Governing Council Special Fund" and Document GC/60/Inf.Doc. No.2 "Projection of Governing Council Special Fund Account for 2018–2021",

Noting the strong support from the Scientific Council on the request for support for the purchase of scientific equipment (€285 000) and for the replenishment of the EPIC Biobank (€250 000) (Document GC/60/4 "Report of the Fifty-fourth session of the Scientific Council"),

AUTHORIZES the Director to use up to a maximum of €535 000 from the Governing Council Special Fund, subject to there being sufficient cash balances available in the Fund, for the acquisition of the following scientific equipment and for the replenishment of the EPIC Biobank:

	Approximate price (€)	**Annual maintenance costs (€)**
a) Automated immunostainer	120 000	4000
b) Automated device for nucleic acid quality control	50 000	3000
c) Automated system for plasma phospholipid fatty acid profiling	115 000	Nil
Replenishment of the EPIC biobank		Nil
- Retrieval and shipment from EPIC Centres	130 000	
- Liquid nitrogen tank	30 000	
- Other materials and reagents	30 000	
- Staff costs – Biobank	60 000	
Total	250 000	
Grand total	**535 000**	

The resolution was **adopted**.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE GOVERNING COUNCIL WORKING GROUP ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FRAMEWORK OF ENGAGEMENT WITH NON-STATE ACTORS (FENSA) IN THE CONTEXT OF IARC'S WORK AND RESEARCH PROGRAMME, AND ON IARC RESOURCE MOBILIZATION EFFORTS: Item 24 of the Agenda (Document GC/60/17)

Dr LANDESZ (Director of Administration and Finance) said that, since the adoption in 2016 of World Health Assembly resolution WHA69.10 on the Framework of Engagement with Non-State Actors (FENSA), the Agency had been working on an appropriate procedure for complying formally with FENSA and managing the reputational risk of engagements with non-State actors while maintaining scientific flexibility and the very short time frames involved, particularly in competitive grant applications. The Agency was in daily contact with non-State actors, mainly academic institutions. Two procedures had been developed: the "low-risk simplified procedure" and the "standard procedure". The first was handled locally within the Agency, while the second, including contacts with the private sector, was carried out with input from the Office for Partnerships and Non-State Actors at WHO Headquarters. A clearance procedure had been developed, divided into a due diligence examination (the identification and verification of relevant information about a non-State actor) and a risk assessment (relating to the risks associated with a specific proposed engagement with a defined non-State actor). The Agency did not engage at all with the tobacco or arms industries. A decision matrix had been developed as a pragmatic way to decide which procedure should be applied. The Agency was developing a global engagement management system for declarations of interest by WHO experts and non-State actors.

Technical collaboration between the Agency and private-sector entities would be considered, provided that the activity contributed to the Medium-Term Strategy, that all private-sector actors were given the opportunity to collaborate with IARC in the same way, and that any resulting product was offered to developing countries at a preferential price.

The main challenges ahead were to gain experience in the application of FENSA; to optimize the internal guidelines governing grant applications; to absorb the additional resource demands for the administration of FENSA; to ensure that non-State actors registered under FENSA; and to communicate to IARC scientists the new opportunities for engagement with non-State actors that FENSA made possible. The Governing Council was invited to approve the "IARC-specific guide on engagement with non-State actors" appended to document GC/60/17.

Ms HERNANDEZ (Canada) suggested that a specific reference to FENSA should be included in the title of the guide, for instance "IARC guide to implementing the WHO Framework on Engagement with Non-State Actors". Of course, the Secretariat would report to the Governing Council on the Agency's compliance with FENSA, but she urged the Director to keep WHO fully informed.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution, entitled "Implementation of the Framework of Engagement with Non-State Actors (FENSA) at IARC" (GC/60/R17) and incorporating the Canadian suggestion:

The Governing Council,

Having reviewed Document GC/60/17 "Recommendations from the Governing Council Working Group on the implementation of the Framework of Engagement with Non-State Actors (FENSA)",

1. THANKS the Working Group for its recommendations;

2. NOTES that the "IARC-specific guide on engagement with non-State Actors" (as provided in the appendix to Document GC/60/17) will be used by IARC to implement the FENSA and RECOGNIZES that this is a living document which will be updated regularly; and

3. REQUESTS the Secretariat to report to the Governing Council each year on IARC engagement under FENSA as described in the above Appendix, and as part of the Director's Report.

The draft resolution was **adopted.**

6. REPORT OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE EDUCATION AND TRAINING GROUP (ETR), COVERING THE PERIOD 2015–2017: Item 25 of the Agenda (Documents GC/60/18 and GC/60/18 Corr.1)

Ms BERGER (Head, Education and Training Group) said that the Group, with four staff, worked to further the careers of early-career scientists, advised the research groups on the organization of their own courses, managed the IARC Fellowships and Summer School and developed e-learning resources. An in-depth review of the education and training programme had been conducted over the previous two years.

In the period 2015–2017, the Agency had hosted 346 master's, doctoral and postdoctoral students and visiting scientists. A total of 24 fellowships had been awarded, and five fellows from low- and middle-income countries had received funding for projects in their home countries. One fellowship had been funded under a bilateral agreement with Norway. An impact survey among former fellows had shown that 75% of respondents continued to work in cancer research and 83% worked in public institutions. A total of 62% of respondents considered that that their fellowship had had a "helpful" impact and 31% a "decisive" impact on their career. The Secretariat was currently seeking resources for 15 fellowships, each costing €90 000 over two years.

Over the period 2015–2017, the Agency had organized 92 courses in 39 countries, mainly low- and middle-income countries. The courses had trained a total of 3381 researchers and public health professionals. The relevant scientific group and local partners were responsible for the course design, teaching and administration, with the support of the Education and Training Group.

Two IARC Summer Schools had taken place, in 2015 and 2017: the latter had included a new module on cancer prevention and early detection. In a survey conducted after the 2017 course, the majority of respondents said that they had applied what they had learned during the course,

half of them had used the materials to train others, and half of them had begun collaborations with other participants.

The learning management portal now made available 20 online spaces for courses, with 720 users. So far, it had mostly been used for access to training materials before, during and after face-to-face courses, but in future it would be used for online courses as well. The video management system was used to store, classify and disseminate learning materials, including webinars which could be embedded in web pages. An interactive webinar series in Spanish for Latin America on the tumour/node/metastases (TNM) staging system had attracted almost 100 participants per session.

In future, the Group would continue to contribute to training and management for the scientific research groups, including a new training portal on cancer surveillance. It would continue to identify resources for the Fellowship programme, produce and support generic courses, webinars and e-learning resources and consolidate the e-learning platform.

Professor MURPHY (Australia) commended the Group on its excellent programme and international reach and welcomed its efforts at resource mobilization for the Fellowship programme.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution, entitled "Report of the activities of the Education and Training Group (ETR)" (GC/60/R18):

The Governing Council,

Having considered the Report of the activities of the Education and Training Group (ETR), covering the period 2015–2017, as presented in Document GC/60/18,

1. THANKS the Scientific Council for reviewing the Biennial Report of ETR activities;

2. COMMENDS the Director and his staff on the capacity building in cancer research internationally; and

3. NOTES that future ETR Biennial Reports should be presented to the Scientific Council only.

The resolution was **adopted**.

7. MEMBERSHIP OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE ADMISSION OF NEW PARTICIPATING STATES: Item 27 of the Agenda

The CHAIRPERSON asked for volunteers to serve on the Subcommittee.

Professor MURPHY (Australia), Dr ROBBINS (Canada), Vice-Chairperson, Professor MALEKZADEH (Islamic Republic of Iran), Dr DE ANDRÉS MEDINA (Spain) and Dr PALMER (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) indicated their willingness to serve.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution, entitled "Membership of the Subcommittee on the Admission of New Participating States" (GC/60/R20):

The Governing Council,

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

Recalling its Resolution GC/53/R20 deciding that the number of members and composition of the Subcommittee shall be agreed upon at each regular session of the Governing Council,

DECIDES that this Subcommittee shall be composed of, in addition to the Chairperson of the Governing Council (member ex officio), the representatives of Australia, Canada, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Spain and the United Kingdom who shall hold office until the next regular session of the Council.

The resolution was **adopted**.

The meeting rose at 13:00.