



Lyon and web conference, 10–12¹ May 2023

MINUTES OF THE THIRD MEETING

IARC, Lyon and web conference

Thursday 11 May 2023, at 14:00 Central European Summer Time (CEST)

Chairperson: Professor Norbert IFRAH (France)

Secretary: Dr Elisabete WEIDERPASS, Director, IARC

CONTENTS

	Page
1. Proposed Programme and Budget (2024–2025)	4
2. Appointment of new members of the Scientific Council (<i>closed session</i>)	13
3. Membership of the Subcommittee on the admission of new Participating States	14
4. Any other business	14
5. Election of Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson for next session	14
6. Date of next session	15
7. Closure of formal session	15

¹ No summary record was prepared for the session on Friday 12 May 2023, the inauguration ceremony for the Nouveau Centre.

Participating State Representatives

Professor Norbert IFRAH, Chairperson Dr Thomas DUBOIS Ms Christine BERLING Dr Nicolas ALBIN	France
Dr Mara BURR, Vice-Chairperson Ms Christina TAYLOR Dr Maya LEVINE <i>[unable to attend]</i> Dr Tracy CARSON <i>[remotely]</i> Dr Satish GOPAL Ms Adriana GONZALEZ	United States of America
Professor Dorothy KEEFE Ms Sarah McNEILL, Rapporteur	Australia
Ms Elisabeth TISCHELMAYER	Austria
Dr Marc VAN DEN BULCKE Ms Anne SWALUË <i>[remotely]</i> Ms Eloïse DELFORGE	Belgium
Dr João Paulo DE BIASO VIOLA Dr Luis Felipe RIBEIRO PINTO <i>[unable to attend]</i>	Brazil
Dr Fei-Fei LIU Ms Jennifer IZAGUIRRE	Canada
Professor Jie HE Ms Qi SHI Ms Xin HUANG Dr Wenqiang WEI Mr Wanqing CHEN Ms Ni LI Ms Jing WU	China
Dr Morten FRISCH	Denmark
Dr Markku TERVAHAUTA Ms Tuula HELANDER	Finland
Mr Thomas IFLAND	Germany
Professor Péter NAGY	Hungary
<i>[No Representative]</i>	India
Dr Yunes PANAHI Dr Sajad SAHAB NEGAH	Iran (Islamic Republic of)
Mr Eoin DORNAN <i>[unable to attend]</i> Mr Andrew KELLY	Ireland
Dr Mauro BIFFONI	Italy
Dr Hitoshi NAKAGAMA Dr Takashi SUZUKI Dr Kanami KOBAYASHI Ms Kay OHARA	Japan
Dr Latifa BELAKHEL Dr Youssef CHAMI KHAZRAJI	Morocco
Ms Susan POTTING Mr Pim TEN BROEKE	Netherlands

Professor Pål Richard ROMUNDSTAD Dr Karianne SOLAAS [<i>remotely</i>]	Norway
Dr Al-Hareth M. AL-KHATER Mr Abdullatif Ali AL-ABDULLA [<i>unable to attend</i>]	Qatar
Dr Min Won LEE Dr Hyeon Gyu PARK Mr Yeol KIM	Republic of Korea
Dr Eduard SALAKHOV Mr Ivan TARUTIN Dr Anton BARCHUK [<i>unable to attend</i>]	Russian Federation
[<i>No Representative</i>]	Spain
Professor Madeleine DURBEEJ HJALT Dr Karin SCHMEKEL	Sweden
Mr Florian DOLDER	Switzerland
Dr Mark PALMER Dr Isobel ATKIN	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

World Health Organization

Dr Bente MIKKELSEN	Director, Noncommunicable Diseases, WHO headquarters
Ms Sigrid KRANAWETTER	Principal Legal Officer, WHO headquarters

Observers

Scientific Council

Dr Manami INOUE	Chairperson
-----------------	-------------

IARC Ethics Committee

Dr Samar AL-HOMOUD	Chairperson
--------------------	-------------

Union for International Cancer Control (UICC)

Dr Cary ADAMS	Chief Executive Officer
---------------	-------------------------

External Audit

Ms Ritu DHILLON [<i>remotely</i>]	Director of External Audit (WHO), Office of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India
-------------------------------------	--

Secretariat

Dr E. WEIDERPASS, <i>Secretary</i> Dr T. LANDESZ	Mr O. EXERTIER Dr P. FERRARI Ms E. FRANÇON Dr Z. HERCEG Dr M. JENAB Mr D. KAVANAGH Dr Z. KOZLAKIDIS Dr B. LAUBY-SECRETAN Ms T. LEE Mr F. LOZANO Dr F. MADIA Dr V. MCCORMACK	Dr J. MCKAY Ms C. MEHTA Ms A. MENEGHEL Dr S. RINALDI Ms C. SALIGNAT Dr M. SCHUBAUER-BERIGAN Dr J. SCHÜZ Dr I. SOERJOMATARAM Dr S. VIRANI Ms V. VOCANSON Dr J. ZAVADIL
---	--	---

1. PROPOSED PROGRAMME AND BUDGET (2024–2025): Item 17 of the Agenda ([Document GC/65/9](#))

Ms MEHTA (Administration and Finance Officer), introducing the item and illustrating her remarks with slides, said that she would present the scientific direction that provided the framework for the proposed Programme and Budget 2024–2025, including budget planning scenarios, a summary of the proposed Programme and Budget, an overview of extrabudgetary resources and a note on IARC's Core Voluntary Contribution Account.

The proposed Programme and Budget 2024–2025 was the second biennial programme and budget prepared for implementation of IARC's Medium-Term Strategy (MTS) 2021–2025. The MTS provided guidance on priorities with a view to ensuring that the Agency's activities had a significant impact on the global burden of cancer. The document presented was the result of a close collaboration between IARC's governing bodies and the Secretariat.

The Agency's two interlinked categories of fundamental and emerging priorities had been identified after extensive consultations with IARC staff, key experts, WHO counterparts and IARC's governing bodies. IARC would continue to address its four fundamental priorities: Data for action; Understanding the causes of cancer; From understanding to prevention; and Knowledge mobilization. Those priorities reflected the long-term nature of much of the research conducted at IARC. In addition, the Agency had identified three emerging priorities for the advancement of cancer prevention research: E01 – Evolving cancer risk factors and populations in transition; E02 – Implementation research; and E03 – Economic and societal impacts of cancer.

The IARC Project Tree ensured a continued link between the Agency's scientific programme, resource allocation and the overall strategy as proposed in the MTS. It provided a structure of objectives and activities over three levels. The preparation of the proposed Programme and Budget started from the detailed level of Project and Budget Proposals prepared by the Branches and mapped to the Level 3 objectives of the Project Tree. Activities and related resource allocation were then summarized at the different levels of the Tree. The summary of the proposed programme and budget was prepared at Level 2 of the Project Tree, comprising six main objectives: Objectives 1 to 4 captured IARC's scientific programme; Objective 5 was for leadership, governance, strategic engagement and advocacy; and Objective 6 was for enabling functions.

There had been a flat increase of the budget for the 2020–2021 and 2022–2023 biennia. An increase of €1.2 million from one new Participating State (Hungary) had not been sufficient to cover inflationary and statutory cost increases.

The Agency had faced difficulties in maintaining its core capacity for cancer prevention research owing to a prevailing Zero Nominal Growth policy in Participating State capitals for the previous 14 years. In order to deliver the ambitious goals of the MTS 2021–2025, IARC proposed a budget for the final two years of the current Strategy with a 5% increase in assessed contributions from the existing Participating States in addition to the contribution of China. The proposal had not received clear support from Participating States during the financing dialogue meetings and therefore a revised budget incorporating zero nominal growth plus China's contribution had also been prepared.

The revised budget would represent a reduction of €2.4 million from the original proposal, leading to the scaling down of the initial proposed scientific programmes and activities.

The initial total budget proposal of €51.12 million was distributed over six main objectives with 55.36% allocated to the scientific programme, 10.67% to leadership, governance, strategic engagement and advocacy and the remaining sum allocated directly to scientific outcomes and administrative support. The reduced budget scenario would also have a similar distribution between objectives.

The Agency used all available resources to finance its activities, proposing for the 2024–2025 biennium to combine €51.12 million from the regular budget with €23.3 million from extrabudgetary resources. As discussed during follow-up meetings of the financing dialogue, the Secretariat would also like to request Participating States to make a contribution to IARC's Core Voluntary Contribution Account. The additional contributions would fill the funding gap for the programmatic aspirations of the Agency in order to fully achieve its objectives in a zero nominal growth environment.

The Governing Council was invited to acknowledge that the proposed programme was consistent with IARC's MTS; approve the 2024–2025 budget at the level of €51 118 011; and approve the financing of the biennium budget exclusively from assessments on Participating States.

Dr LANDESZ (Director, Administration and Finance) thanked Governing Council members who had helped IARC to prepare for the present session by participating in the financing dialogue. The current proposed budget represented the final two years of the five-year 2021–2025 MTS, which was probably the most innovative and progressive medium-term strategy that the Agency had ever implemented. The MTS mandated the Agency to enter the 21st century in terms of its physical move to the new building as well as scientifically and programmatically. Efficiency savings included a reduction in administrative costs, which stood at around 20%, while maintaining the employment of the excellent staff working in Services to Science and Research by repurposing their roles. The Nouveau Centre was architecturally designed to save costs: it was 20% larger than the previous premises with a capacity for 500 staff and contained 350 at present, although it used 15% less energy. There was close collaboration with WHO and with the administration of the new WHO Academy, which was being built some 200 metres from the Nouveau Centre, in particular with regard to exploration of synergies and the possibility of joint procurement tenders and shared services. Flexible working, introduced during the restrictions accompanying the pandemic of coronavirus disease (COVID-19), had also helped to reduce costs.

The IARC Scientific IT Platform had helped to modernize IARC's science, enabling it to share data with partners in some 160 countries and providing a secure digital space for efficient collaboration. A detailed report on the Platform was scheduled for delivery in 2024. Savings on communication costs had been made through a move to a cloud-based system which facilitated collaboration and teleworking. By joining with WHO, IARC had been able to adopt a new automated Business Management System (Workday) at reduced cost. Travel had been significantly reduced as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and its reintroduction had been accompanied by a revised travel policy which went beyond WHO's travel policy in authorizing economy-class-only travel whatever the duration. Travel by train was encouraged wherever possible to reduce the carbon footprint and associated costs. Ways in which to reduce costs further were constantly under review.

Dr PALMER (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) said that it was clear that the proposed programme did indeed deliver the 2021–2025 MTS which had been approved by the Governing Council. It was important that the Governing Council should not only set IARC's strategy but also support its delivery. It was disappointing that there had not been an increase in assessed contributions since 2009, with the resulting impact on the research programme, as well as on staff morale, recruitment and retention. Many agencies had faced funding restraints over the previous decade, but the Agency was engaged in research which was expensive and which was subject to inflationary costs. For those reasons, the Governing Council should support the budget as proposed. While the admission of China as a Participating State was to be welcomed, it should be emphasized that additional membership alone could not sustain the Agency and it should not form part of a strategy that the Governing Council relied upon in order to deliver the expanding scientific programme which was of benefit to the global population. One in six deaths worldwide were caused by cancer and the role of the Governing Council was critical in supporting IARC's vision. Efficiencies alone would not drive the activities of the organization. The proposed increase had been made after careful consideration: it was pragmatic and modest when compared with the lack of investment in previous years.

Professor ROMUNDSTAD (Norway) agreed with the position put forward by the United Kingdom: IARC was doing a tremendously important and efficient job to combat cancer in a complex world. After a decade of zero nominal growth policies and the recent increase in inflationary costs, Norway supported the proposal for a modest increase as recommended by the Scientific Council. The increase would enable IARC to keep up its good work and reach the important goals of the MTS.

Mr IFLAND (Germany) said that Germany had already shared its concerns about the envisaged increase in assessed contributions before the present meeting. In the current biennium, IARC had recorded an increase in revenue of €1.2 million following the admission of Hungary as a Participating State, representing an increase of 2.77%. In the draft budget of 2024–2025, the admission of China would lead to a budget increase of nearly €3.5 million, representing a further increase of 7.67%. Overall, that combined increase of some 10% would be one of which most international organizations would be envious. In addition, extrabudgetary resources had increased by €8.7 million. The situation of IARC was therefore quite comfortable, especially compared with other international organizations: he therefore saw no need for an additional increase of 5%, in particular given that the special contribution calculation would pose an additional burden on Participating States. Further, Germany could not accept the cross-subsidization from assessed contributions of personnel costs arising out of grants for projects; grants for new projects must also cover the corresponding personnel costs rather than placing a burden on the core budget of IARC. In future, it should be ensured that all extrabudgetary contributions included sufficient funds for personnel and programme support costs.

Dr DUBOIS (France) said that France supported the arguments put forward by the United Kingdom and was in favour of the 5% budget increase as proposed. The support was in the context of the need for cooperation in the field of scientific research on cancer and the important and positive contribution made by IARC to world health in terms of cancer prevention, which translated into lives saved and the advancement of sustainable health systems. Reducing the burden of cancer was a strategic goal embraced by all Participating States and it was the most rational from an epidemiological, ethical and economic point of view. It was for that reason, over and above the practical need for a new building

and new equipment, that France had invested in the construction of the Nouveau Centre: to invest in and improve the capacity of IARC for cancer research and prevention under the leadership of its Director, Dr Elisabete Weiderpass. It should be further recalled that the proposed Programme and Budget had received the approval of the Scientific Council. France accepted the reasons for the increase as proposed and recalled the capacity of IARC over a number of years to modify its strategic direction, modernize its organization and ensure sound management during difficult times.

Mr TARUTIN (Russian Federation) said that the opportunity to participate in the financing dialogue ahead of the Governing Council had been appreciated and he hoped it would be offered in future years. He would have liked to see some adjustments to the budget format with more information provided on the extent to which current goals had been met and what action would be taken to achieve goals in the future. In accordance with best practice, he would have liked to know how progress was measured. He understood that IARC did not use results-based management but certain aspects could be applied to the Agency's working methods: by way of example, the information provided, in the table in Annex 1 of ILO's Programme and Budget Proposal listed "impact indicators" and showed the "means of verification" used to measure how far targets had been met. He would like to see similar methods of evaluation used at IARC. In the interests of transparency, more information could be provided on staffing grades and post levels as well as on inflationary indicators. The sources of data might be further highlighted. With respect to the current proposed increase, given the high burden on national budgets, he would prefer to maintain zero nominal growth. In his experience, the admission of new Participating States should lead to a reduced financial burden for existing members.

Dr BIFFONI (Italy) agreed with the views put forward by Germany. The problem for Italy was one of allocation of available resources and the need for consistency with previous budget decisions made in similar situations. The view was not a reflection on the quality of the programme and budget put forward by the Agency, but Italy was not in favour of an increase in the assessed contributions of Participating States.

Dr BELAKHEL (Morocco) congratulated IARC for its many achievements in cancer research. Morocco supported the scientific focus of the Agency in its fight against cancer and endorsed the MTS. Morocco had been assessed in the same group as Finland, Hungary and the Islamic Republic of Iran and it had paid €603 442 in the financial year 2022. The proposed budget would lead to a significant increase in assessed contributions for Morocco and therefore it supported the view put forward by Germany that the budget should remain stable without any additional increase in contributions from Participating States. She recommended that further synergies and cost savings should be found within the Agency with the use of extrabudgetary resources should crucial needs arise.

Dr NAKAGAMA (Japan) expressed appreciation for the early provision of budget information to Participating States and the possibility to take part in the pre-session financing dialogues. Japan supported the proposed Programme and Budget and hoped that IARC would continue to distribute its resources in the most efficient way to accomplish its mission. The Government of Japan appreciated IARC's endeavours to include new Participating States as a way of securing more income and identifying the contacts who could take the initiative in leading States in the journey towards joining IARC while developing investment cases tailored to each candidate country's interests. Given that the

window for funding opportunities for cancer research was becoming narrower, it was commendable that IARC monitored funding opportunities very closely with a high number of grant applications.

Ms GONZALEZ (United States of America) thanked IARC for its efficiency and transparency in developing the proposed budget 2024–2025 and for its outstanding fundraising activities, with extrabudgetary resources expected to grow even more in 2024 and 2025. IARC's continued progress on its top four fundamental priorities was valued and she commended the research priorities. She acknowledged that energy and statutory costs had risen significantly for IARC and was glad to see that all three proposed budget scenarios would cover those additional costs. The United States preferred the scenario of zero nominal growth as it would still allow the Agency to cover its costs.

Professor KEEFE (Australia) welcomed the provision of alternate budget scenarios following pre-session discussions on the proposed Programme and Budget 2024–2025. A zero nominal growth scenario was consistent with the challenging budget situation that many countries faced as they emerged from the COVID-19 pandemic, with slower than expected economic growth and strong pressure on government budgets. Australia supported the use of China's contributions to meet the priorities outlined in the MTS and address the critical needs of the Agency. The Agency might not always be able to rely on contributions from new Participating States but, while it was able to do so, Australia did not see the need for an additional budget increase.

Ms TISCHELMAYER (Austria) said that Austria understood IARC's need to request a budget increase in the light of inflation, higher energy costs and the costs of moving to the new building. However, a budget increase of more than 12% could not be justified. Austria's position with respect to all international research organizations was to adopt zero nominal growth. For the upcoming biennium, there would be a substantial increase in the Agency's income as a result of the admission of China as a new Participating State and therefore Austria could not support a 5% increase in the assessed contributions of Participating States.

Mr TEN BROEKE (Netherlands) said that his country understood the difficulties faced by IARC as a result of the cost increases due to high inflation and it complimented the Agency on the great work it had accomplished. However, in his country, the Government was engaged in budget cuts and, as in many countries, huge amounts had been spent on the COVID-19 crisis and therefore there was no opportunity for his country to commit to a structural budget increase of 5%. The Netherlands agreed with the views of Germany on that issue. However, considering the importance of IARC's cancer research, it would be willing to make a contribution to the Agency's research on childhood oncology.

Dr VAN DEN BULCKE (Belgium) expressed support for IARC's work and highlighted the importance of cancer research. While Belgium could not commit to a full 5% increase and recognized the contribution of new Participating States, there should be a balanced view of the Agency's needs, bearing in mind that a zero nominal growth budget represented a decreased budget over time. Although Belgium also faced budget challenges, it would be willing to consider a small increase in IARC's budget.

Dr VIOLA (Brazil) said that, while Brazil fully supported IARC for its commendable work on cancer research, it could not commit to a budget increase at that time. If the economic situation in Brazil changed in the future, it might be possible to discuss further support.

Dr TERVAHAUTA (Finland) acknowledged warmly the previous results of IARC and the importance of its future role in cancer research. The Agency's reasons for requesting a budget increase were understandable and, although the proposed increase was quite high, Finland was willing to support it.

Dr LEE (Republic of Korea) said that she recognized that the role and function of IARC was becoming increasingly important and that more resources were needed to support its work. Economic difficulties and uncertainties were affecting many countries, including her own. Therefore, the Republic of Korea proposed an increase of 2% in assessed contributions, instead of 5%.

Mr DOLDER (Switzerland) congratulated the Director on her re-election and leadership of the Agency to date. The discussion of the proposed budget in pre-session meetings had provided the opportunity to gain a more detailed understanding and it appeared that several aspects referred to extraordinary costs which, hopefully, would not be present in the medium to long term. Under current circumstances, it was difficult for Switzerland to argue for a 12% increase and the zero nominal growth scenario was preferred.

Dr LANDESZ (Director, Administration and Finance) said that there appeared to be a split between Participating States that could accept a 5% increase and those that could not. He recalled that, in its review of the proposed Programme and Budget, the Scientific Council had expressed deep concern about IARC's financial situation and the constraints it faced, including an existential threat to the world-leading and high-quality research conducted by the Agency. The current proposed budget would allow the Agency to continue to accelerate its scientific discovery with the aim of reducing cancer incidence and preventing all types of cancer worldwide. He understood that many countries faced constraints, a situation that had prevailed for the previous 14 years. The amount being asked of each Participating State was not substantial compared with other United Nations agencies, but the support would come at a critical time and go a long way towards helping the Agency to achieve its mission.

In response to the comment by Germany, he confirmed that projects funded by extrabudgetary resources were not cross-subsidized from the regular budget: there was a strong core of scientific researchers at IARC who acted as principal investigators and who were highly successful in applying for grants. IARC was possibly the only purely scientific United Nations agency and its work was very different from the normative work carried out by WHO. In response to the Russian Federation, he said that the Agency would examine how to improve the format in which the budget was presented. Participating States would be consulted on how to draft the next MTS and how the current Strategy should be evaluated, including through key performance indicators.

The Agency stood ready to fulfil the wishes of Participating States to present the figures for alternative budget scenarios although a decision not to apply a 5% budget increase would have an impact on the work of the Agency.

The CHAIRPERSON said that it was the custom of the Agency to adopt decisions by consensus. Discussions thus far had shown that there was a real understanding of the importance of the research conducted by IARC as well as practical difficulties in agreeing to an increase of 5%. By the same token, it was understood that a zero nominal growth approach over 14 years amounted to a very significant decrease in the budget and collective thought should be given to the effects of that approach over time.

IARC's great efforts to increase the number of Participating States had been accompanied by an increase in the budget but the two concepts of "revenue" and "profit" should not be confused. At the time that new Participating States joined the Agency, they brought with them both their contributions and their own expectations as to how the money should be spent, leading to a corresponding widening in the scope of research projects.

Consideration should also be given to the savings that would be made by national health budgets as a result of IARC's work, such as the recently-published research on the efficacy of the single-dose HPV vaccine: the proposed budget increase would be more than compensated for by those savings. He requested that representatives should put forward such arguments to their capitals in future years.

Dr LANDESZ (Director, Administration and Finance) said that the increase in the number of Participating States and the corresponding increase in the budget had been a lifeline for the Agency in recent years. If the contributions from all of the new Participating States since 2008 were removed, IARC would have 30-40% fewer staff at the present time with a consequent impact on the work of a small research organization that already punched above its weight. In the MTS, the Director was mandated to actively seek new Participating States and the Agency's efforts in that regard had been commended.

The Governing Council had before it a number of budget scenarios, including a 5% increase, a zero nominal growth budget with a contribution from China and a 2% increase. There was also a proposal to use the Core Voluntary Contribution Account (CVCA), a funding mechanism that WHO had used for some decades and which would allow Participating States to consider making a voluntary contribution even if they were unable to agree to an increase in assessed contributions. Several countries had supported IARC's work through the CVCA in recent years.

The CHAIRPERSON said that it was his impression that the majority of representatives did not have the authorization of their capitals to agree to an increase of 2% in assessed contributions. He believed that a scenario in which no Participating State would see an increase or decrease in its assessed contribution would nevertheless be acceptable. He would prefer to agree a scenario in which all could support the Agency through a decision based on consensus.

Ms MEHTA (Administration and Finance Officer), presenting a slide showing the contributions that would be due under an adjusted zero nominal growth scenario, explained that according to the WHO scale of assessment which had been changed by decision of the World Health Assembly in May 2022, Participating States in Groups 5, 4 and 3 had minor increases, with an exception of the Russian Federation who moved from Group 3 to Group 4 thus receiving a reduction in their contribution as a result of the aforementioned change in scale of assessment. Countries in Groups 2 and 1 had a reduction. She mentioned that if the Participating States receiving a reduction could contribute to the level of their present (2022–2023) contribution, this would result in an overall increase of about €400 000. She presented the scenario to the Governing Council for consideration, and for recording this additional contribution under the CVCA.

Ms GONZALEZ (United States of America) expressed appreciation for the efforts made to reach consensus and for the proposal put forward which the United States could support. However, she wished to emphasize that, as currently set out, she could not agree to the corresponding wording of

the proposed resolution, since the United States could not agree to make a contribution of a specific amount of voluntary funds.

Mr IFLAND (Germany) and Dr TARUTIN (Russian Federation) echoed the statement made on behalf of the United States. It would not be possible to provide a guarantee to make voluntary contributions.

The CHAIRPERSON, responding to a question from Dr BELAKHEL (Morocco), confirmed that the Participating States in Groups 4, 2 and 1 with figures displayed in red would be requested to make voluntary contributions.

Dr LANDESZ (Director, Administration and Finance) explained that, in the draft resolution, the wording would reflect the actual assessed contributions of each Participating State with additional wording adopted to reflect the concerns of those countries with corresponding figures recorded in red. There was no obligation to contribute to the CVCA mechanism.

The CHAIRPERSON suggested that Participating States affected by the numbers in red in Groups 4, 2 and 1 should meet informally to agree on appropriate wording for the draft resolution.

Following those informal discussions, the RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution, entitled “Proposed Programme and Budget 2024–2025” (GC/65/R10):

The Governing Council,

Having reviewed the Agency’s Proposed Programme and Budget for the biennium 2024–2025, as contained in [Document GC/65/9](#), and [summary tables Revision 1](#),

1. APPROVES the budget for the biennium 2024–2025 at the level of €48 683 313;
2. ACKNOWLEDGES that the presentation and priorities of the proposed budget for 2024–2025 are aligned with the IARC Medium-Term Strategy for 2021–2025 (Document GC/63/6A);
3. DECIDES that the budget shall be financed solely by annual assessments on Participating States as follows:
 - (1) €24 323 172 shall be assessed on Participating States on 1 January 2024,
 - (2) €24 360 141 shall be assessed on Participating States on 1 January 2025,
4. RESOLVES to appropriate an amount of €48 683 313 to the six main Level 2 objectives of the IARC Project Tree (Document GC/63/6A Annex 2) for the biennium 2024–2025 as follows:

Section	IARC Project Tree – Level 2 Objectives	Amount (€)
1.	Describing the occurrence of cancer	4 068 890
2.	Understanding the causes of cancer	9 814 842
3.	Evaluating cancer prevention interventions	5 987 604
4.	Synthesizing and mobilizing knowledge and strengthening global capacities in cancer science	6 628 336
5.	Strengthening the Agency's leadership, governance, strategic engagement, and advocacy	5 401 722
6.	Strengthening the efficiency and effectiveness of the Agency's research and collaboration	16 781 919
	Total	48 683 313

5. DECIDES that the Director shall have authority under Financial Regulations Article III, Paragraph 3.3 to transfer credits between sections of the budget, provided that such transfers do not exceed 15% of the section from which the credit is transferred. Transfers in excess of 15% of the section from which the credit is transferred may be made with the prior written concurrence of the majority of the Members of the Governing Council;
6. DECIDES to grant authority to the Director to use a maximum of €500 000 in the biennium 2024–2025 from the Governing Council Special Fund to cover unforeseen budgetary costs due to currency realignments, subject to availability of cash balances in the Fund, noting the base rate of exchange for 2024–2025 is €0.907/US\$;
7. REQUESTS the Director to report on the use of the Fund for this purpose in future financial reports;
8. ENCOURAGES Participating States to contribute to the Core Voluntary Contribution Account to supplement the regular budget; and
9. REQUESTS the Secretariat to continue dialogue with Participating States who are amenable to providing a voluntary contribution and report back at the next Governing Council on total voluntary contributions received.

The CHAIRPERSON invited comments on the draft resolution which had been drafted to reflect as closely as possible all comments made during the informal discussions.

Professor KEEFE (Australia) commended the work done to reach a consensus text.

Ms GONZALEZ (United States of America), referring to paragraph 9, asked whether there should be a reference to those Participating States who were amenable to providing voluntary contributions since they might not wish to be specifically identified. She asked that the paragraph be reworded to refer to "...dialogue with Participating States about providing voluntary contributions...".

The VICE-CHAIRPERSON suggested that the paragraph might be split into two sentences to read as follows: "REQUESTS the Secretariat to continue dialogue with Participating States who are amenable to providing a voluntary contribution. The Secretariat shall report back at the next Governing Council on total voluntary contributions received".

Ms GONZALEZ (United States of America) agreed with the suggestion by the Vice-Chairperson since it removed the possibility that the Governing Council would report on the specific voluntary contributions made by individual Participating States.

Ms MEHTA (Administration and Finance Officer), responding to a question from Dr TARUTIN (Russian Federation) as to the origin of the figures set out in paragraph 6, said that the figure of €500 000 was based on past trends, giving authority for some €250 000 per year to be transferred from the Governing Council Special Fund with cover for inflationary changes in the future. The figure of €0.907/US\$ represented an average of the exchange rate used by the United Nations in the first five months of 2022 and was the exchange rate used as in the past for preparation of the budget

exercise for the following biennium which had begun in June 2022. The Agency did not purchase currency in advance.

Dr ALBIN (France) said that France had invested an enormous amount in the new building because funding cancer prevention was an investment in the future and it was more important to invest in prevention than to treat an established illness. It was the view of France that a 5% increase in the budget would save much more than 5% in the cost of treating illnesses at a later stage. The cost of treating cancer had risen significantly over the previous five years, including chemotherapy, new immunotherapies, more staff and the treatment of patients over longer periods of time. The 5% increase requested of France represented €45 000 per year, which was the cost of treating one melanoma over a period of one year against a risk of recurrence of 10% meaning that, for every 100 patients, only 10 would benefit from the treatment. The same sum could treat one triple-negative breast cancer over a period of nine months. Investment in prevention would protect health systems from inevitable questions in the future on the continuing affordability of treatment.

The CHAIRPERSON agreed with the representative of France that future generations might call their countries to account for the lack of investment in research given that treatment might no longer be financially sustainable even for the wealthiest of countries.

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

2. APPOINTMENT OF NEW MEMBERS OF THE SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL (closed session): Item 18 of the Agenda ([Document GC/65/12 Rev.1](#))

The Governing Council met in closed session. On the resumption of the public session, the RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution, adopted during the closed session and entitled "Appointment of new members of the Scientific Council" (GC/65/R13):

The Governing Council,

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

1. APPOINTS

Professor André Karch, Germany)	
Dr István Kenessey, Hungary)	
Dr Prashant Mathur, India)	
Professor Orla Sheils, Ireland)	
Dr Roberta De Angelis, Italy)	to serve for four years on the Scientific Council
Dr Mohamed Berraho, Morocco)	
Professor Pål Richard Romundstad, Norway)	
Professor Young-Woo Kim, Republic of Korea)	
Dr Valeriy V. Breder, Russian Federation)	
Professor David Gisselsson Nord, Sweden)	

2. THANKS the outgoing members of the Scientific Council, Drs Karima Bendahhou (Morocco), Tone Bjørge (Norway), Gunilla Enblad (Sweden), William Gallagher (Ireland), Ulrike Haug (Germany), Sergey Ivanov (Russian Federation), Ravi Mehrotra (India), Péter Nagy (Hungary), Jong Bae Park (Republic of Korea) and Pietro Pichierri (Italy) for their valuable work in the Scientific Council and for the contribution which they have made to the research activities of the Agency.

**3. MEMBERSHIP OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE ADMISSION OF NEW PARTICIPATING STATES:
Item 19 of the Agenda**

The CHAIRPERSON asked for volunteers to serve on the Subcommittee. He recalled that the current membership of the Subcommittee comprised Brazil, Japan, Qatar, the United Kingdom and the United States of America, in addition to the Chairperson of the Governing Council as an ex officio member.

Dr VIOLA (Brazil), Dr NAKAGAMA (Japan), Dr AL-KHATER (Qatar), Dr PALMER (United Kingdom) and Ms GONZALEZ (United States of America) indicated their willingness to serve on the Subcommittee for a further year.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution, entitled “Membership of the Subcommittee on the Admission of new Participating States” (GC/65/R14):

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 Governing 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 the Chairperson of the Governing Council (member ex officio), and representatives of Brazil, Japan, Qatar, the United Kingdom and the United States of America, who shall hold office until the next regular session of the Council.

The resolution was **adopted**.

4. ANY OTHER BUSINESS: Item 20 of the Agenda

There was no other business.

Dr BURR (Vice-Chairperson) took the Chair.

5. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON AND VICE-CHAIRPERSON FOR NEXT SESSION: Agenda Item 21

On the proposal of Dr NAKAGAMA (Japan), Professor Ifrah (France) was re-elected as Chairperson, the proposal being seconded by Dr BELAKHEL (Morocco).

Professor IFRAH (France) resumed the Chair.

On the proposal of Dr LIU (Canada), Dr Burr (United States of America) was re-elected as Vice-Chairperson, the proposal being seconded by Dr BELAKHEL (Morocco) and Professor KEEFE (Australia).

The VICE-CHAIRPERSON thanked the Governing Council for the renewed confidence it had placed in her.

6. DATE OF NEXT SESSION: Item 22 of the Agenda

The CHAIRPERSON suggested that the Governing Council should hold its next session in Lyon shortly before the Seventy-seventh World Health Assembly in May 2024.

It was so agreed.

The RAPPORTEUR read out the following draft resolution, entitled “Date of the Sixty-sixth session of the Governing Council” (GC/65/R15):

The Governing Council,

1. DECIDES to hold its next regular session in Lyon, France, within the two weeks preceding the opening of the World Health Assembly in the year 2024; and
2. REQUESTS the Director to inform members of the Council as soon as these dates are known.

The resolution was **adopted**.

7. CLOSURE OF THE FORMAL SESSION: Item 25 of the Agenda

The CHAIRPERSON noted that, although the formal session of the Governing Council would shortly be concluded, the official inauguration of the Nouveau Centre building would take place the following morning, Friday 12 May.

Mr CHAUVET (Strategic Engagement and External Relations Officer) gave details of the inauguration ceremony, to be attended by the French Minister of Health. It would include speeches and a round table discussion, the unveiling of a ceremonial plaque and the display of a time capsule, to which Governing Council members were invited to contribute their thoughts on the future of IARC and cancer research in general. The new official name of the building would be announced in due course.

In closing, the CHAIRPERSON expressed his thanks to the Vice-Chairperson, the Director and her staff and the Principal Legal Officer.

The SECRETARY likewise expressed her thanks to all Governing Council members and commended the unwavering dedication of her staff. In particular, she paid tribute to Ms Agnès Meneghel, from the Director of Administration and Finance Office, who would shortly retire from the Agency after 37 years, many of them as the staff member chiefly responsible for coordinating the Scientific and Governing Council sessions.

The members of the Governing Council stood and applauded in tribute to Ms Meneghel's long years of dedicated service to the Agency.

The CHAIRPERSON declared the session closed.

The meeting rose at 17:45.