

**Designing an Independent Panel on Evidence for  
Action on Antimicrobial Resistance:  
Lessons from Selected Bodies in Global Health,  
Climate Change and Biodiversity**

Viviana Munoz Tellez and  
Francesca Chiara

 **SOUTH  
CENTRE**





# **RESEARCH PAPER**

**222**

## **DESIGNING AN INDEPENDENT PANEL ON EVIDENCE FOR ACTION ON ANTIMICROBIAL RESISTANCE: LESSONS FROM SELECTED BODIES IN GLOBAL HEALTH, CLIMATE CHANGE AND BIODIVERSITY**

**Viviana Munoz Tellez<sup>1</sup> and Francesca Chiara<sup>2</sup>**

**SOUTH CENTRE**

**16 JULY 2025**

---

<sup>1</sup> Programme Coordinator, Health, Intellectual Property and Biodiversity Programme (HIPB), South Centre, [munoz@southcentre.int](mailto:munoz@southcentre.int).

<sup>2</sup> Former Consultant on Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR), South Centre.



## **SOUTH CENTRE**

In August 1995, the South Centre was established as a permanent intergovernmental organization. It is composed of and accountable to developing country Member States. It conducts policy-oriented research on key policy development issues and supports developing countries to effectively participate in international negotiating processes that are relevant to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The Centre also provides technical assistance and capacity building in areas covered by its work program. On the understanding that achieving the SDGs, particularly poverty eradication, requires national policies and an international regime that supports and does not undermine development efforts, the Centre promotes the unity of the South while recognizing the diversity of national interests and priorities.

## **NOTE**

The views contained in this paper are attributable to the author/s and do not represent the institutional views of the South Centre or its Member States. Any mistake or omission in this study is the sole responsibility of the author/s.

Any comments on this paper or the content of this paper will be highly appreciated. Please contact:

South Centre  
International Environment House 2  
Chemin de Balexert 7–9  
1219 Geneva  
Switzerland  
Tel. (41) 022 791 80 50  
[south@southcentre.int](mailto:south@southcentre.int)  
[www.southcentre.int](http://www.southcentre.int)

## ABSTRACT

This paper proposes a framework for designing an Independent Panel on Evidence for Action on Antimicrobial Resistance (IPEA), responding to the 2025 United Nations General Assembly mandate. Through a comparative analysis of selected international scientific advisory bodies, we identify the panel's mandate as the foundational element that will critically shape its composition, scope, deliverables, and governance structure. Our framework addresses key domains of credibility, scientific integrity, authority, policy relevance, and sustainability while establishing equity as a fundamental design principle—not merely ensuring low and middle-income country (LMIC) participation but designing the IPEA to address existing imbalances in antimicrobial resistance (AMR) evidence production and dissemination. We analyse potential mandate options, from evidence synthesis to policy recommendations, highlighting the importance of defining a unique and complementary role for IPEA within the existing AMR governance landscape to avoid duplication and maximize impact on global AMR response.

*Este documento propone un marco para el diseño de un Panel Independiente sobre Evidencia para la Acción contra la Resistencia a los Antimicrobianos (IPEA), en respuesta al mandato de la Asamblea General de las Naciones Unidas para 2025. A través de un análisis comparativo de determinados órganos consultivos científicos internacionales, identificamos el mandato del panel como el elemento fundamental que determinará de manera decisiva su composición, alcance, resultados y estructura de gobernanza. Nuestro marco aborda ámbitos clave como la credibilidad, la integridad científica, la autoridad, la pertinencia de las políticas y la sostenibilidad, al tiempo que establece la equidad como principio fundamental de diseño, no solo garantizando la participación de los países de ingresos bajos y medios (PIBM), sino diseñando el IPEA para abordar los desequilibrios existentes en la producción y difusión de pruebas sobre la resistencia a los antimicrobianos (RTA). Analizamos las posibles opciones de mandato, desde la síntesis de pruebas hasta las recomendaciones políticas, destacando la importancia de definir una función única y complementaria para el IPEA dentro del panorama actual de gobernanza de la RAM, a fin de evitar duplicaciones y maximizar el impacto en la respuesta mundial a la RAM.*

*Ce document propose un cadre pour la conception d'un groupe d'experts indépendant sur les données factuelles pour l'action contre la résistance aux antimicrobiens (IPEA), en réponse au mandat de l'Assemblée générale des Nations unies pour 2025. Au moyen d'une analyse comparative de certains organismes consultatifs scientifiques internationaux, nous identifions le mandat du groupe d'experts comme l'élément fondamental qui déterminera de manière décisive sa composition, son champ d'action, les résultats attendus et sa structure de gouvernance. Notre cadre aborde les domaines clés que sont la crédibilité, l'intégrité scientifique, l'autorité, la pertinence politique et la durabilité, tout en établissant l'équité comme principe fondamental de conception. Il ne s'agit pas seulement de garantir la participation des pays à revenu faible et intermédiaire (PRFI), mais aussi de concevoir l'IPEA de manière à remédier aux déséquilibres existants dans la production et la diffusion des données sur la résistance aux antimicrobiens (RAM). Nous analysons les options possibles pour le mandat, de la synthèse des données à la formulation de recommandations politiques, en soulignant l'importance de définir un rôle unique et complémentaire pour l'IPEA dans le paysage actuel de la gouvernance de la RAM afin d'éviter les doubles emplois et de maximiser l'impact sur la réponse mondiale à la RAM.*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	7
II.	BACKGROUND.....	9
III.	MANDATE OF THE INDEPENDENT PANEL.....	10
IV.	AN INDEPENDENT PANEL.....	12
V.	CONCLUSIONS: CRITICAL QUESTIONS TO RESOLVE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE PANEL.....	15
	REFERENCES.....	17
	ANNEX: ANALYSIS OF RELEVANT BODIES TO INFORM THE DESIGN OF THE IPEA .....	19



## I. INTRODUCTION

The United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) invited the Quadripartite organizations, namely the UN World Health Organization (WHO), the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the UN Environment Programme (UNEP), and the World Animal Health Organization (WOAH), to establish an Independent Panel on Evidence for Action on Antimicrobial Resistance (IPEA) in 2025.

This paper advances a framework for thinking through how to design an IPEA, informed by a review of selected bodies that operate at the interface of science and policy in the areas of human health, climate change, environment, and biodiversity. The aim of the review is to draw lessons and insights from the operation of these bodies to help inform the design and operation of the emerging Independent Panel on Evidence for Action (IPEA) on antimicrobial resistance (AMR).

Purposely excluded from the scope of this review are all international scientific advisory bodies established as part of a legally binding international instrument, with legal standing, irrespective of their degree of independence in their operation and scientific assessments. Unlike those bodies, the mandate for establishing the IPEA comes directly from a UNGA recommendation, which designates the Quadripartite organizations as executing agencies. Moreover, at present the IPEA cannot establish linkages with any international legally binding instrument specifically focused on AMR, as none currently exists. Accordingly, the authors consider that bodies that stem from legally binding international instruments hold limited relevance for the IPEA. Examples of these bodies include the Scientific Assessment Panel under the Montreal Protocol, the Scientific Advisory Committee of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, the Scientific and Technical Body (STB) under the Biodiversity Beyond National Jurisdiction (BBNJ) Treaty, the Emergency Committee and IHR Review Committee under the International Health Regulations, and the scientific expert groups established under the WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC).

The authors also excluded from the review, drawing on the UNGA mandate for the IPEA, international independent scientific organizations established independently of governments or IGOs, such as the International Science Council (ISC) and the World Climate Research Programme (WCRP) and Cochrane. Finally, we also exclude any intergovernmental scientific and technical policy body whose outputs do not include independent scientific syntheses or assessments, and is composed of government representatives, such as the FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (CGRFA).

This review includes selected international scientific and technical advisory bodies that aim at ensuring scientific independence in their work. Those included are the following:

1. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)
2. Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES)
3. Independent Panel for Pandemic Preparedness and Response (IPPPR)
4. Independent Monitoring Board (IMB) for Polio Eradication
5. **Expert scientific, technical and advisory panels of the Quadripartite organizations, such as the WHO Strategic and Technical Advisory Group for Antimicrobial resistance (STAG-AMR), the WOAH Working Group on AMR and the and the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Meetings on Microbiological Risk Assessment (JEMRA).**

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) is included in the review, despite its formal connection to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), a legally binding international instrument. The rationale for this inclusion is twofold: first, the establishment of IPCC predates the negotiation and adoption of the UNFCCC; and second, the UNFCCC explicit referencing of the IPCC and assignment of specific roles to it demonstrates the Panel's substantial policy influence. This relationship offers valuable insights relevant to the design of the IPEA.

## **II. BACKGROUND**

The Interagency Coordination Group on AMR (IACG) in its report of 2019 to the UN Secretary General recommended the establishment of an Independent Panel for Antimicrobial Resistance (IPEA), emphasizing the need for independent scientific evidence to guide global AMR responses (1). A consultation process was advanced by the WHO in 2020 on proposed terms of reference for the IPEA (2) but this process failed to reach any agreement and was abandoned. The UNGA political declaration resolution on AMR of September 2024 (4) inviting the Quadripartite organizations to establish the IPEA, also reaffirmed by the 4th AMR Ministerial Meeting in October 2024 (5) now provides a fresh opportunity to advance the IPEA, while incorporating lessons from the earlier attempt. The UNGA recommends the establishment of the panel to facilitate the generation and use of multisectoral, scientific evidence to support Member States in efforts to tackle antimicrobial resistance, making use of existing resources (which can be interpreted as prioritizing and efficiently utilizing resources that are already available while new resources may be necessary) and avoiding duplication of on-going efforts. It is explicitly mandated that the panel is established after an open and transparent consultation with all Member States on its composition, mandate, scope, and deliverables.

In March 2025, the Quadripartite organizations presented the draft roadmap of the process to create the panel (27). The first step will be a landscape analysis from January to April 2025 to assess existing AMR research and knowledge gaps based on the work delivered by other existing scientific panels on AMR. At the same time, a stakeholder engagement and consultation process will take place on first draft of documents for consultations, to involve diverse stakeholders including from low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) in shaping the panel. Between February and August 2025, written inputs will be sought from stakeholders. From May to September 2025, the focus will be on developing guidance and operational documents, establishing procedures, and defining methodological and policy recommendation frameworks. Between May and September 2025, there will also be final consultations, culminating with the launch of the panel and the first meeting of the governing body. Resource mobilization efforts will begin in July and continue until December 2025 to ensure sustainable funding for the panel.

The requirement of “open and transparent consultation with all Member States” suggests that all the Quadripartite organizations should involve their Member States in the process, although there is no specification regarding how formal this process should be. The inputs from Member States into the consultation process now organized by the Quadripartite will provide more information on their expectations. It appears from the roadmap plan and timeline that the draft documents for the proposed panel would not be submitted to the Assemblies of the Quadripartite organizations for their information or for their approval, prior to the establishment of the panel. The UNGA call for the establishment of the panel in 2025 creates a time constraint for formal review of the proposal by each of the assemblies of the Quadripartite organizations, which are scheduled to meet in May (WHO and WOH), June (FAO) and December (UNEP).

Clarifying how Member States of the Quadripartite organizations, and potentially other stakeholders, will be consulted to guide the panel's establishment is essential to uphold the integrity of the science-policy interface on AMR that the UNGA wants the panel to strengthen. As an example, in the context of UNEP, the assembly decision to establish a science-policy panel to contribute further to the sound management of chemicals and waste and prevent pollution was followed with a process of convening an ad hoc open-ended working group of governments for two years (still ongoing) to prepare proposals for the science-policy panel, to be followed by the convening of an intergovernmental meeting for the purpose of considering the establishment of a science-policy panel (28, 29).

### III. MANDATE OF THE INDEPENDENT PANEL

The intended aim of the panel was clearly defined by the UNGA: to facilitate the generation and use of multisectoral, scientific evidence to support Member States in efforts to tackle antimicrobial resistance. How the panel will do this, strengthening the science-policy interface on AMR, will be defined by the mandate, scope and deliverables that are agreed for the panel.

The mandate for the panel will serve as the foundational element that will be critical for defining the details of its composition, scope, deliverables, governance structure, independence, operational procedures, and financial or other resource requirements.

The Interagency Coordination Group on AMR (IACG) envisioned an IPEA panel in a One Health context that would be convened by the UN Secretary-General, in close collaboration with FAO, WHO, WOA, UNEP and other international organizations, to monitor and provide Member States with regular reports on the science and evidence related to AMR, its impacts and future risks, and recommend options for adaptation and mitigation (1). The UNGA offers less guidance for the mandate and deliverables.

The mandate for the panel should articulate precisely how it will support strengthening evidence-based decision-making. The panel may focus on compiling, assessing, and synthesizing scientific evidence, as is the focus of the IPCC. For AMR, it is essential that the panel works across different sectors (such as healthcare, veterinary care, agriculture, and environment) and preferably is informed by various disciplines (i.e., microbiology, epidemiology, economics and other social sciences) and methodologies. This mandate would already be extensive and potentially requiring significant resources for implementation.

That said, the panel could additionally include a more directly policy-relevant mandate. This could include recommendations for policy action on AMR based on the assessed evidence-base that may be context specific, helping policy makers to identify and understand potential trade-offs (such as economic impacts versus public health and animal health benefits) and to leverage co-benefits of policy interventions (such as prevention measures, immunization, water/sanitation/hygiene, waste-water management). However, this work risks overlapping with the mandate of the Quadripartite organizations and other IGOs and entities working on AMR, potentially duplicating existing work. Similarly, the panel could support capacity building, as in the case of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), which includes capacity building as one of the key pillars of its work.

Another approach would be to define a specific, focused mandate for the panel for a limited time period. This initial mandate could be reviewed and expanded in the future. For example, the initial proposed terms of reference for the IPEA in 2020 suggested that the mandate be reviewed every 5 years (2). As opportunities arise, Member States and the Quadripartite organizations could suggest ways to further leverage the panel.

The Panel's mandate should also define a unique and complementary role it can play in the AMR evidence landscape, given the existing work and guidance of the Quadripartite organizations and other IGOs and their expert advisory bodies, and regional/national bodies. A description of some of these bodies is provided in the annex.

Some issues that remain underexplored in the work of existing bodies on science-policy interface on AMR and could be part of the scope of the panel at the interface of science and policy include:

1. Integration of One Health Approach:
  - Despite the focus of AMR stakeholders on the One Health framework, there is still a lack of cohesive research agendas (6). Two separate AMR research agendas, in human health and One Health, were published by the Quadripartite in 2023 (7,8), which raises concerns on coherence in implementation and whether there may be more competition than collaboration including to attract research funding. Developing integrated strategies is essential to address AMR effectively across all sectors and IPEA could have a role in finally creating a unified, cross-sectoral analysis in particular of AMR dynamics and how human mobility, animals, microorganisms, water and pollutants contribute to the emergence and dissemination of AMR.
2. Strategies for AMR Mitigation:
  - There is a need for clarity on the most efficient pathways to address AMR. Identifying and prioritizing interventions and outcomes that provide the highest impact relative to their cost and resources available can guide policymakers in allocating limited resources effectively (9). Negative and positive outcomes are still not systematically captured, and the panel include developing methodologies to evaluate the effectiveness of various AMR interventions across different contexts, evaluating what has worked, for whom, and under which conditions. This approach could help in adapting successful strategies to diverse settings and communities.
3. Accountability for action on AMR:
  - Tracking global progress in combating AMR against agreed international targets is an area that needs strengthening. There could be a role for the panel in this regard. Increasingly, National Action Plans on AMR are including monitoring and evaluation frameworks (M&A). Moreover, the WHO European regional office is developing a monitoring, evaluation, and accountability framework, the AMR accountability index (10). The panel could have a role in supporting the M&A of NAPs, and the framework for a global AMR accountability index based on country/region specific targets.

## IV. AN INDEPENDENT PANEL

Another crucial design element requiring definition is the nature of the panel's "independence", which is highlighted in its proposed title: "Independent Panel on Evidence for Action". While there can be different interpretations of the independence requirement, at minimum it should ensure the scientific objectivity of the panel's work through freedom from undue influence such as political pressure, lobbying from special interest groups, or financial conflicts of interest.

An analysis of models of panels has also been conducted that classifies these by their degree of relationship to government involvement, in particular in the panels' governance structure, as presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1

**Comparisons of Models for Independent Assessments**

STRUCTURE	GOVERNANCE	PROS	CONS
<b>Inter-governmental</b>  <b>IPCC</b> <b>IPBES</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Operates independently from the organization establishing it.</li> <li>Governments are part of the governing body of the panel, and approve outputs such as reports.</li> <li>Governments, IGOs can nominate experts for the panel and are involved in the selection (IPCC). In addition stakeholders can nominate experts (IPBES).</li> <li>IGOs and governments may provide some level of administrative and budgetary support for the operation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Political Buy-In:</b> Participation by Member States can foster global consensus.</li> <li><b>Resource Mobilization:</b> Governments are more likely to allocate resources.</li> <li><b>Policy Integration:</b> Recommendations are more likely to influence national policies and treaties.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Slow Decision Making:</b> Longer processes for consensus building, delay due to national priorities overriding global priorities.</li> <li><b>Limited independence:</b> to dissent from governments or international bodies if outputs require review or approval.</li> </ul>
<b>Highly Independent</b>  <b>IPPPR</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Operates independently from the organization establishing it</li> <li>Governments are not part of the governing body.</li> <li>WHO Director General appointed co-chairs, co-chairs selected other members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Neutral:</b> providing unbiased evaluations and recommendations that can openly critique governments and organizations when warranted by evidence</li> <li><b>Broad Stakeholder Engagement:</b> integrates diverse perspectives, including academia, civil society, and the private sector</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Limited Influence:</b> Without official governmental backing, recommendations may be ignored by policymakers.</li> <li><b>Funding Challenges:</b> May struggle to secure sustainable financing without formal governmental</li> </ul>

STRUCTURE	GOVERNANCE	PROS	CONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Set out own work plan and procedures</li> <li>Separate Secretariat, not provided by an IGO</li> <li>Budgetary support from IGO</li> </ul>		or organizational support.
<b>Subordinate</b>  <b>Expert, advisory, technical panels to IGO</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May be a subsidiary body of an IGO, temporary or permanent</li> <li>May or not operate independently from the IGO</li> <li>establishing it</li> <li>IGOs may provide budgetary support for the operation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Policy relevance: can be quickly adopted in internal IGO programs and as guidance to Member States</b></li> <li><b>Timing – quick response: aligned to identified time-sensitive need</b></li> <li><b>Secured funding: resources are provided by the IGO though participation in such panels is usually not remunerated</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Potential bias: favouring alignment to the institutional approach and potential for Member State influence</b></li> <li><b>Limited transparency: IGO may choose whether to filter reports, adopt the advice or recommendations and whether to disseminate in the form provided.</b></li> </ul>

While insights for the panel can be drawn from this analysis, the fundamental question of independence is first and foremost of ensuring scientific independence and impartiality of the work of the panel for its credibility, while the relationship to governments as to other stakeholders is most relevant for linking the science to policy interface.

Experts (scientists and specialists) must serve in their personal capacities rather than representing their governments or organizations. While it is a choice to define whether governments, IGOs, and diverse stakeholders may or not participate in the nomination and appointment process, what is essential is to set robust safeguards—including transparent selection criteria, balanced representation across disciplines, geographies, and mandatory disclosure of potential conflicts of interest. These measures help ensure scientific independence and credibility of the evidence assessment.

An important factor of accountability is the involvement of the actor—government, IGO, other stakeholders—in the review or approval of the panel outputs. Review and or approval requirements by governments or IGOs can condition the outputs of the panel, while these can also render the outputs more influential on the governments or IGOs. This is a fine balance that the existing models have tried to address, offering important learning to inform the design of the IPEA panel. The IPCC requires that the summary of the reports that are aimed to inform policy makers are reviewed line by line by the governing body (plenary) in which governments sit. The IPBES, taking lessons from IPCC but also considering the specific needs for informing the scientific-policy interface for biodiversity, maintained the intergovernmental nature of the plenary, but with more flexibility to include other stakeholder inputs and a less strict approval process.

Another important question is to which body the Panel ultimately formally presents its deliverables for the policy influence of the Panel and its accountability. As the mandate of the establishment of the Panel is with the Quadripartite Organizations, the Panel reports should

go to the governing bodies of each of the Quadripartite Organizations for consideration (as there is no single body for the Quadripartite), and could be forwarded by the Quadripartite to relevant fora for information purposes, such as the Ministerial Conferences on AMR.

The initial proposed terms of reference for the IPEA in 2020 suggested that the panel should be accountable to the UN Secretary General, considering that this level of accountability would reflect the urgency as well as the complex nature of AMR that reaches beyond the mandate of any one agency of the UN or other international organizations. While it may be the case that if the IPEA would be tasked to present its deliverables to the UN Secretary General, this as a result may have a higher level of visibility and dissemination among multiple IGOs, governments and stakeholders; a separate question is whether a governing body for the IPEA should sit with the UN Secretary General's office. There may be limited feasibility of this proposal since the Quadripartite organizations are tasked with establishing the IPEA, but it is worth further considering the merits of the proposal.

It is ultimately up to the Member States in different fora to decide whether to update the recommendations of the Panel, regardless of whether the governance form. For example, in the case of the "highly independent" governance of the IPPPR established by the WHO Director General to evaluate the preparedness and response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the IPPPR presented its report formally to the WHO Member States through the Director General, though the members of the panel disseminated more widely and transparently its findings. Nonetheless, the report of the IPPPR had significant direct policy influence on the WHO intergovernmental working group that was established to negotiate amendments to the International Health Regulations and the Pandemic Agreement. The Member States Working Group on Strengthening WHO Preparedness and Response to Health Emergencies (WGPR) was established with a mandate derived from resolution WHA74.7 (2021), which requested the WGPR, among other things, "to consider the findings and recommendations of the Independent Panel for Pandemic Preparedness and Response" (32). This working group was the basis for the negotiation and conclusion of a WHO Pandemic Agreement.



## **V. CONCLUSIONS: CRITICAL QUESTIONS TO RESOLVE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE PANEL**

Informed by the experiences of other panels and relevant bodies explored in the annex, the following is a suggested framework for defining critical elements of the IPEA.

<b>DOMAIN</b>	<b>Questions</b>
<b>Credibility</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the mandate of the panel clearly defined?</li> <li>• Have the expected panel deliverables been identified?</li> <li>• What criteria should guide the appointment of panel members? Scientific excellence, multi-sectoral, multi-disciplinary, wide geographical representation for inclusiveness</li> <li>• Can the panel maintain objectivity in its work, free from undue influence by governments, IGOs, or special interests?</li> <li>• What are the basic operating procedures of the panel? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Process for consensus-building among panel members on their findings (review/syntheses/assessments of scientific evidence)</li> <li>○ Process for consensus-building among panel members on developing recommendations (if the panel mandate includes recommendations)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• What will be the level of governmental, IGO or stakeholder involvement in reviewing or evaluating the panel's deliverables?</li> <li>• Are the outputs of the panel – syntheses, evidence reviews – freely and publicly available?</li> <li>• Does the panel serve to strengthen capacity in low and middle income countries (LMICs) to develop and use relevant scientific evidence and data on AMR?</li> <li>• Are the deliverables of the panel widely disseminated?</li> </ul>
<b>Scientific Integrity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do panel members have appropriate scientific expertise?</li> <li>• Are the codes of conduct and ethics to follow, i.e., data management, attribution?</li> <li>• Will agreements/disagreements among the panel in evaluating and synthesizing evidence be documented?</li> <li>• Are panel members required to disclose potential conflict of interests and are there other mechanisms to mitigate potential bias?</li> </ul>
<b>Authority / efficiency</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the panel provide unique deliverables, as compared to outputs produced by existing bodies and processes, and is not duplicative of other efforts?</li> <li>• To whom is the panel accountable for its outputs? whether the panel reports to its own independent governing body, the IGO(s) establishing the panel, to</li> </ul>

	<p>Member States via the IGO(s) or as part of its governing body</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there demand/interest for the panels' work from the scientific and policy community, IGOs, governments and stakeholders?</li> <li>• To what extent can the panel's findings influence behavioural change? What is the panels' communications strategy?</li> </ul>
<b>Policy Relevance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How can the panel's deliverables support the mandates of the Global Leaders Group on AMR and the Multistakeholder Platform on AMR?</li> <li>• Is the scope of the panel's deliverables limited to reviews, syntheses, and assessments of scientific evidence, or will it also develop specific policy recommendations?</li> <li>• Can the panel undertake policy advocacy based on its recommendations?</li> </ul>
<b>Sustainability</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the financial and other resources available to ensure that the panel can follow the structure and processes proposed to attest its credibility, scientific integrity, authority and policy relevance of its deliverables, and sustain its operations in time?</li> <li>• Have both costs and benefits been evaluated for different operational models? For example: (1) establishing an independent Secretariat versus using an IGO-provided Secretariat, and (2) funding mechanisms to ensure participation of experts from LMICs whose institutions cannot support their involvement.</li> </ul>

Finally, we advance that **equity** should be established as a foundational principle for the IPEA design. This requires recognition of the existing imbalances among countries in their production and international dissemination of scientific evidence on AMR, a commitment to IPEA design that helps to redress these imbalances and ensure that the IPEA supports the analysis of cross-sectoral evidence on AMR across diverse geographical, economic and cultural contexts. Such an approach will also facilitate identification of gaps in AMR evidence to support policy action. We offer the following final recommendations to ensure equity in the participation of LMICs in the IPEA:

**1. LMIC leadership in IPEA governance** Ensure LMICs serve not merely as participants but as decision makers in IPEA governance. This includes: 1) securing equitable representation of LMIC experts within the IPEA, and 2) empowering LMICs to help define IPEA priorities for scientific evidence synthesis and assessment.

**2. Link to policy actions with priority of sustainable financing for AMR response in LMICs** IPEA's work should support translating scientific evidence into practical, implementable policies for LMICs, including case studies of evidence of impactful AMR interventions in LMICs, and mechanisms for sustainable financing of AMR interventions in LMICs. This includes ensuring that AMR funding focus areas in LMICs is not determined disproportionately by HIC or global funder priorities.

**3. Strengthen capacities for AMR monitoring and accountability in LMICs** IPEA can support the development of monitoring and accountability mechanisms specifically designed for LMIC contexts and priorities.

## REFERENCES

1. Interagency Coordination Group on Antimicrobial Resistance (IACG). No time to wait: securing the future from drug resistant infections. 2019. Retrieved from: [https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/documents/no-time-to-wait-securing-the-future-from-drug-resistant-infections-en.pdf?sfvrsn=5b424d7\\_6](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/documents/no-time-to-wait-securing-the-future-from-drug-resistant-infections-en.pdf?sfvrsn=5b424d7_6). Accessed March 14, 2025.
2. World Health Organization (WHO). Terms of Reference for the Independent Panel 2020. Retrieved from <https://global1hn.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/Evidence-panel-Action-against-AMR.pdf> Accessed March 14, 2025.
3. Interagency Coordination Group on Antimicrobial Resistance (IACG). Discussion Paper: Future Governance of Antimicrobial Resistance. 2018. Retrieved from <https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/antimicrobial-resistance/amr-gcp-tjs/iacg-future-global-governance-for-amr-120718.pdf> Accessed March 14, 2025.
4. United Nations. Political declaration of the high-level meeting on antimicrobial resistance. New York: United Nations; 2024. Retrieved from [https://documents.un.org/doc/undoc/ltd/n24/278/35/pdf/n2427835.pdf?\\_gl=1\\*1ujft9b\\*\\_ga\\*\\_MTqzOTA2MzAzMy4xNzQxOTUxMTU5\\*\\_ga\\_TK9BQL5X7Z\\*\\_MTc0MTk1MTE1OC4xLjAuMTc0MTk1MTE1OC4wLjAuMA](https://documents.un.org/doc/undoc/ltd/n24/278/35/pdf/n2427835.pdf?_gl=1*1ujft9b*_ga*_MTqzOTA2MzAzMy4xNzQxOTUxMTU5*_ga_TK9BQL5X7Z*_MTc0MTk1MTE1OC4xLjAuMTc0MTk1MTE1OC4wLjAuMA) Accessed March 14, 2025.
5. Ruckert A, Hoffman SJ, Bishop et al. Intergovernmental or fully independent? Designing a scientific panel on evidence for action against antimicrobial resistance. PLOS Glob Public Health. 2025 Jan 3;5(1):e0004039.
6. Fieldman T, Mossialos E, Anderson M. Enhancing global insight into AMR spread and generation: prospects and limitations of the WHO and quadripartite research agendas. J Antimicrob Chemother. 2024;79(2):207-210.
7. World Health Organisation (WHO). Global research agenda for antimicrobial resistance in human health. 2023. Retrieved from <https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/global-research-agenda-for-antimicrobial-resistance-in-human-health> Accessed March 27, 2025
8. World Health Organisation (WHO). A one health priority research agenda for antimicrobial resistance. 2023. Retrieved from <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240075924> Accessed March 27, 2025
9. Wernli D, Jørgensen PS, Parmley EJ, et al. Evidence for action: a One Health learning platform on interventions to tackle antimicrobial resistance. Lancet Infect Dis. 2020;20(12):e307-e311. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30392-3
10. Anderson M, Kluge HHP, Lo Fo Wong D, Butler R, Mossialos E. Promoting sustainable national action to tackle antimicrobial resistance: a proposal to develop an antimicrobial resistance accountability index. Lancet Microbe. 2024;5(11):100997.
11. Global Leaders Group (GLG). Information session on establishment of the Independent Panel on Evidence for Action (IPEA) Against AMR. Summary Note, 2025.
12. World Health Organisation (WHO). Models to Inform the Development of Terms of Reference for the Independent Panel on Evidence for Action Against AMR. 2020. Retrieved from <https://cdn.who.int/media/docs/default-source/antimicrobial-resistance/introduction-ag-background-paper-26-02-20.pdf> Accessed March 14, 2025.
13. World Health Organisation (WHO). Public discussion - draft terms of reference of the independent panel on evidence for action against antimicrobial resistance. 2020. Retrieved from <https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/public-discussion-draft-terms-of-reference-independent-panel-on-evidence-amr>
14. ReAct. Comments on Terms of Reference for the Independent Panel. 2020. Retrieved from <https://www.reactgroup.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/ReAct-Feedback-ToR-of-the-Independent-Panel-on-Evidence-submitted.pdf>
15. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, History. Retrieved from <https://www.ipcc.ch/about/history/> Accessed March 14, 2025.

16. United Nations Climate Change. The Paris Agreement. Retrieved from <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement> Accessed March 14, 2025.
17. Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), About. Retrieved from <https://www.ipbes.net/history-establishment> Accessed March 14, 2025.
18. Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. Global assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. E.
19. S. Brondizio, J. Settele, S. Díaz, and H. T. Ngo (editors). IPBES secretariat, Bonn, Germany. 1148 pages.
20. Independent Panel for Pandemic Preparedness and Response (IPPPR), About. Retrieved from <https://theindependentpanel.org/about-the-independent-panel/> Accessed March 14, 2025.
21. Independent Monitoring Board (IMB) for Polio Eradication, Our Strategy. Retrieved from <https://polioeradication.org/who-we-are/our-strategy/> Accessed March 14, 2025.
22. Strategic and Technical Advisory Group on Antimicrobial Resistance (STAG-AMR). Terms of Reference. Retrieved from [https://cdn.who.int/media/docs/default-source/antimicrobial-resistance/amr-stag/stag-amr-terms-of-reference.pdf?sfvrsn=1aac0e06\\_5&Status=Master](https://cdn.who.int/media/docs/default-source/antimicrobial-resistance/amr-stag/stag-amr-terms-of-reference.pdf?sfvrsn=1aac0e06_5&Status=Master) Accessed March 14, 2025.
23. Global Tuberculosis Programme's Strategic and Technical Advisory Group (STAG-TB). Terms of Reference. Retrieved from [https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/terms-of-reference-for-the-strategic-and-technical-advisory-group-for-tuberculosis-\(stag-tb\)](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/terms-of-reference-for-the-strategic-and-technical-advisory-group-for-tuberculosis-(stag-tb)) Accessed March 14, 2025.
24. Immunization and Vaccines-related Implementation Research Advisory Committee (IVIR-AC). Terms of Reference. Retrieved from [https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/terms-of-reference-for-the-immunization-and-vaccines-related-implementation-research-advisory-committee-\(ivir-ac\)](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/terms-of-reference-for-the-immunization-and-vaccines-related-implementation-research-advisory-committee-(ivir-ac)) Accessed March 14, 2025.
25. Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA), About. Retrieved from [https://www.who.int/groups/joint-fao-who-expert-committee-on-food-additives-\(jecfa\)/about](https://www.who.int/groups/joint-fao-who-expert-committee-on-food-additives-(jecfa)/about) Accessed March 14, 2025.
26. Joint FAO/WHO Expert Meetings on Microbiological Risk Assessment (JEMRA), About. Retrieved from [https://www.who.int/groups/joint-fao-who-expert-meetings-on-microbiological-risk-assessment-\(jemra\)/about](https://www.who.int/groups/joint-fao-who-expert-meetings-on-microbiological-risk-assessment-(jemra)/about) Accessed March 14, 2025.
27. WHO Advisory Group on Integrated Surveillance of Antimicrobial Resistance (AGISAR) Integrated surveillance of antimicrobial resistance: guidance from a WHO Advisory Group. World Health Organization 2013, Geneva, Switzerland. Retrieved from [https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/91778/9789241506311\\_eng.pdf?sequence=1](https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/91778/9789241506311_eng.pdf?sequence=1) Accessed March 14, 2025.
28. Roadmap for Establishing an Independent Panel for Evidence for Action against Antimicrobial Resistance (IPEA), Quatripartite Organizations, updated as of 14 March 2025, [Roadmap](#).
29. United Nations Environment Assembly, Resolution 5/8, 2 March 2022, [Information on reports and updates by the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel](#)
30. UNEP Ad hoc open-ended working group on a science-policy panel to contribute further to the sound management of chemicals and waste and to prevent pollution, Report of the first part of the third session, 17-21 June 2024, [k2401592.pdf](#)
31. One Health High-Level Expert Panel (OHHLEP) Retrieved from <https://www.who.int/groups/one-health-high-level-expert-panel/ohhlepterm-2>. Accessed April 30, 2024.
32. WHO Resolution WHA74.7 (2021), Strengthening WHO preparedness for and response to health emergencies, [Strengthening WHO preparedness for and response to health emergencies](#)

## **ANNEX: ANALYSIS OF RELEVANT BODIES TO INFORM THE DESIGN OF THE IPEA**

### **1. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)**

#### **Background**

The IPCC was established in 1988 by the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) as a United Nations body. Its mission is to provide policymakers with scientific assessments on climate change and strategies for adaptation (14).

The IPCC's organizational framework includes:

- **Plenary:** With representatives from 195 member states that work program and budget.
- **Bureau:** Elected by the Plenary to oversee activities
- **Working Groups and a Task Force**
- **Secretariat:** Located in Geneva to support operations.

It does not conduct original research but synthesizes findings from scientific studies. Experts volunteer their time to review and assess literature and publish reports.

#### **Achievements**

- **Reports:** Six assessment reports published.
- **Policy Influencing:** Findings have informed the Paris Agreement and national policies such as Nationally Determined Contributions. The 1.5°C target adopted in the Paris Agreement is largely based on IPCC scientific evidence (15).

#### **Challenges**

- **Objectivity and Inclusiveness:** Questions have arisen about potential biases in report content and methodology. Ensuring representation from developing countries remains an issue.
- **Operational Challenges:** Recommendations have been slow to translate into action.
- **Lack of accountability:** There is no mechanism to enforce or track the implementation.
- **Political resistance:** Economic interests, particularly in fossil fuel-reliant countries, have undermined implementation of recommendations.

#### **Relevance for Establishing an Independent AMR Panel**

- **Scientific and Policy Integration:** The IPCC demonstrates how multidisciplinary panels can produce evidence-based reports to guide global policy.
- **Global and National Impact:** The IPCC's reports influence both international agreements and national-level actions.

### **2. Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES)**

#### **Establishment and scope**

The IPBES was founded in 2012 to bridge the gap between science and policy on biodiversity and ecosystem. IPBES aims to address the global biodiversity crisis by guiding actions to mitigate biodiversity loss and its impacts on ecosystems and societies (17).

IPBES operates through:

- **Plenary:** with representatives from 140+ member states, which approve assessments, work programs, and budgets, elects the Bureau and establishes subsidiary bodies.
- **Bureau:** Oversees administrative functions and ensures equitable geographic representation. It comprises a Chair, four Vice-Chairs, and five additional members.
- **Multidisciplinary Expert Panel (MEP):** Provides scientific and technical oversight of assessments.

- **Secretariat:** based in Bonn, Germany, it manages daily operations, communication, and logistical support for the Plenary, Bureau, and MEP.

It achieves its mission through four core functions: producing comprehensive reports on biodiversity, ecosystems, and their links to human well-being like the *Global Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (2019)*, developing tools and methodologies for integrating biodiversity considerations into policies and programs, identifying research gaps and providing training to enhance participation, particularly from developing countries (18).

### Achievements

- **Global Influence:** Findings have informed negotiations under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), including the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (2022).
- **Policy Impact:** Contributed tools and methodologies adopted in global and national biodiversity policies.
- **Public Awareness:** Raised awareness of the critical links between biodiversity, human well-being, and sustainable development.

### Challenges

- **Political Resistance:** Some member states hesitate to adopt recommendations that conflict with national priorities.
- **Funding Constraints:** Securing adequate funding remains a persistent issue.
- **Complexity of Biodiversity Issues:** An interdisciplinary collaboration adopting a One Health approach has been challenging to achieve in practice.

### Relevance for Establishing an Independent AMR Panel

- **Science-Policy Integration:** IPBES demonstrates the value of bridging scientific evidence with actionable policy, which could be adapted to AMR.
- **Inclusiveness:** Its model of integrating diverse knowledge systems, including local and indigenous perspectives, highlights the importance of equitable representation.
- **Operational Independence:** Despite challenges, its interdisciplinary and collaborative structure offers valuable lessons for designing an AMR focused panel.

## 3. Independent Panel for Pandemic Preparedness and Response (IPPPR)

### Establishment and Scope

The IPPPR was established by the Director General of the WHO in response to the mandate given by the World Health Assembly (WHA) in May 2020 through Resolution WHA73.1 to initiate a stepwise process of impartial, independent and comprehensive evaluation to review experience gained and lessons learned from the WHO coordinated international health response to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Its mandate was to evaluate the pandemic response and recommend strategies to strengthen preparedness, prevention, and response mechanisms for future health emergencies (19). It emphasized the importance of cross-sectoral interventions, aligning with the One Health approach relevant to AMR.

The IPPPR included:

- 2 Co-Chairs plus 13 global experts in public health, economics, international law, and governance, ensuring diverse regional and sectoral representation. The panelists drew from their expertise and experience and did not represent their institutions or governments.
- **An independent Secretariat that** coordinated operations.
- **Financing from WHO's assessed contributions. It did not accept additional contributions in cash or kind. Panel members made their contributions on a voluntary and non-remunerated basis.**

### Achievements

- **Key Report:** “COVID-19: Make it the Last Pandemic” in May 2021, a review of systemic failures and actionable reforms.
- **Influence on Policy:** With the creation of the Pandemic Fund in 2022, the negotiation of a new internationally legally binding pandemic agreement.
- **Global Coordination:** Emphasized multisectoral approaches, integrating health, economic, and social policies to strengthen pandemic resilience.
- **Awareness and Advocacy:** Elevated the importance of equity and accountability in pandemic preparedness, response mechanisms and access to vaccines.

### Challenges

- **Limited implementation:** Many recommendations remain unfulfilled by WHO member States and other stakeholders.
- **Time limited mandate:** The panel had a mandate that was limited to making an assessment and on that basis, advancing recommendations. In time, the relevance of the panel becomes questionable.

### Relevance for Establishing an AMR Independent Panel

- **Credibility:** An IPEA can draw from the IPPPR framework to ensure that it produces work that is considered as unbiased, transparent, and evidence based.
- **Interdisciplinary Focus:** The IPPPR ability to integrate sectors echoes the need for a multisectoral approach to AMR.
- **Equity and Access:** Recommendations on advancing equity including equitable vaccine distribution for future pandemics can guide strategies to ensure equity for addressing AMR, including ensuring equitable access to antimicrobials.
- **Objective scientific analysis:** The IPPPR governance model ensuring the panel members participated independently and carried out rigorous scientific assessment, and supported by an independent Secretariat, may be a blueprint for the IPEA.
- **Funding:** The dedicated financing mechanism for IPPPR from WHO assessed contributions may be a model for ensuring the sustainability of the IPEA.

## 4. Independent Monitoring Board (IMB) for Polio Eradication

### Establishment and Purpose

The IMB was created by the Global Polio Eradication Initiative (GPEI) to independently, from countries and agencies, assess GPEI performance and provide strategic recommendations. Its primary role is to monitor progress toward eradicating polio and identify barriers impeding success (20). It comprises a small team of experts in epidemiology and policy. The IMB’s recommendations focus on overcoming challenges specific to each region with country-specific assessments.

### Achievements

- **Progress in Eradication and Addressing Barriers:** The IMB typically publishes a yearly report to highlight gaps in vaccine coverage, surveillance, and country’s operational efficiency in preventing and controlling polio cases. It also provides in its reports tailored recommendations to countries, agencies (such as WHO) and other interested stakeholders (such as Gavi).

### Challenges

- **Sustainability:** Ensuring sustained funding and political commitment is critical.

### Relevance for Establishing an AMR Independent Panel

- **Independent Oversight to GPEI’s work:** The IMB is a model of an impartial body to monitor progress, identify challenges, and recommend strategic solutions.

- **Data-Driven Decision-Making:** IPEA could adopt the IMB's emphasis on evidence-based evaluations and country-specific recommendations.

## 5. Scientific and Technical Advisory Panels to IGOs

There are various scientific, technical and advisory panels established by the IGOs that form the Quadripartite organizations (WHO, FAO, UNEP and WOA) to provide expert knowledge and analysis to the agency. Through their assessments they can inform the development of their technical guidance to member states, policies, regulatory frameworks, and intervention strategies. The nature of their reports and recommendations are advisory to the agency and operate without direct involvement or oversight from member States. These scientific, technical advisory panels are usually composed of scientists and experts participating in their independent capacity (not representing the institution or government by which they are employed).

Within WHO, some of these include the Strategic and Technical Advisory Group on Antimicrobial Resistance (STAG-AMR) to provide strategic and technical advice with experts serving in their personal capacities (21). While the STAG-AMR provides essential guidance to WHO on AMR, its mandate is limited to advising WHO programs and initiatives. Other examples are the Quadripartite Technical Group on Economics for AMR (QTG-EA), the Strategic and Technical Advisory Group of the Global Tuberculosis Programme (STAG-TB) (22), the Immunization and Vaccines-related Implementation Research Advisory Committee (IVIR-AC) (23), and the WHO Advisory Group on Integrated Surveillance of Antimicrobial Resistance (AGISAR) to support WHO in its effort to minimize the public health impact of AMR associated with the use of antimicrobials in food animals, now dissolved (26). Of relevance, it is worth mentioning the One Health High-Level Expert Panel (OHHLEP), a multidisciplinary advisory body established by the Quadripartite, established in 2023. Its primary role is to provide scientific, policy and strategic guidance on the implementation of the One Health approach, which recognizes the interconnectedness of human, animal, and environmental health. The relevance of OHHLEP to IPEA lies in its role in fostering interdisciplinary collaboration and providing evidence-based recommendations (30).

Within WOA, a working group on AMR (AMR WG) composed of specialists provides support and advice to the agency on its work on AMR regarding animal health and the interface with human health, food production and the environment.

Examples of expert Committees established to provide scientific advice also include the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA) (24) and the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Meetings on Microbiological Risk Assessment (JEMRA) (25), that advise the Codex Alimentarius Commission and its Ad hoc Codex Intergovernmental Task Force on AMR (TFAMR), now dissolved.



## RECENT SOUTH CENTRE RESEARCH PAPERS

No.	Date	Title	Authors
142	4 January 2022	Competition Law and Access to Medicines: Lessons from Brazilian Regulation and Practice	Matheus Z. Falcão, Mariana Gondo and Ana Carolina Navarrete
143	11 January 2022	Direito Brasileiro da Concorrência e Acesso à Saúde no Brasil: Preços Exploratórios no Setor de Medicamentos	Bruno Braz de Castro
144	27 January 2022	A TRIPS-COVID Waiver and Overlapping Commitments to Protect Intellectual Property Rights Under International IP and Investment Agreements	Henning Grosse Ruse-Khan and Federica Paddeu
145	9 February 2022	The Right to Health in Pharmaceutical Patent Disputes	Emmanuel Kolawole Oke
146	16 February 2022	A Review of WTO Disputes on TRIPS: Implications for Use of Flexibilities for Public Health	Nirmalya Syam
147	28 February 2022	Can Negotiations at the World Health Organization Lead to a Just Framework for the Prevention, Preparedness and Response to Pandemics as Global Public Goods?	Viviana Muñoz Tellez
148	7 March 2022	Marine Genetic Resources Beyond National Jurisdictions: Negotiating Options on Intellectual Property	Siva Thambisetty
149	8 March 2022	The International Discourse on the Right to Development and the Need to Reinvigorate its Implementation	Yuefen Li, Daniel Uribe and Danish
150	21 March 2022	The Liability of Internet Service Providers for Copyright Infringement in Sri Lanka: A Comparative Analysis	By Ruwan Fernando
147	28 February 2022	Les négociations au sein de l'Organisation mondiale de la santé peuvent-elles aboutir à un cadre juste pour la prévention, la préparation et la riposte aux pandémies en tant que bien public mondial?	Viviana Muñoz Tellez
147	28 February 2022	¿Podrán las negociaciones en la organización mundial de la salud resultar en un marco justo para la prevención, la preparación y la respuesta ante pandemias como bienes públicos globales?	Viviana Muñoz Tellez

151	19 April 2022	Escaping the Fragility/Conflict Poverty Trap: How the interaction between service delivery, capacity development and institutional transformation drives the process of transition out of fragility	Mamadou Dia
152	21 April 2022	An Examination of Selected Public Health Exceptions in Asian Patent Laws	Kiyoshi Adachi
153	26 April 2022	Patent Analysis for Medicines and Biotherapeutics in Trials to Treat COVID-19	Srividya Ravi
154	9 May 2022	COVID-19 Vaccines as Global Public Goods: between life and profit	Katuska King Mantilla and César Carranza Barona
155	27 May 2022	Manufacturing for Export: A TRIPS-Consistent Pro-Competitive Exception	by Carlos M. Correa and Juan I. Correa
156	1 June 2022	A Tough Call? Comparing Tax Revenues to Be Raised by Developing Countries from the Amount A and the UN Model Treaty Article 12B Regimes	Vladimir Starkov and Alexis Jin
157	3 June 2022	WTO Moratorium on Customs Duties on Electronic Transmissions: How much tariff revenue have developing countries lost?	Rashmi Banga
158	15 June 2022	Twenty Years After Doha: An Analysis of the Use of the TRIPS Agreement's Public Health Flexibilities in India	Muhammad Zaheer Abbas, PhD
156	1 June 2022	Un choix cornélien ? Comparaison des recettes fiscales à engranger par les pays en développement au titre des régimes du Montant A et de l'Article 12B du Modèle de convention des Nations Unies	Vladimir Starkov et Alexis Jin
159	15 July 2022	Reaping the Fruits of Research on Microorganisms: Prospects and Challenges for R&D and Industry in Sri Lanka	Ruwan Fernando
160	21 July 2022	Movement Forward on ABS for the Convention on Biological Diversity: Bounded Openness Over Natural Information	Joseph Henry Vogel, Manuel Ruiz Muller, Klaus Angerer, and Christopher May
161	26 July 2022	Two Pillar Solution for Taxing the Digitalized Economy: Policy Implications and Guidance for the Global South	Irene Ovonji-Odida, Veronica Grondona, Abdul Muheet Chowdhary

162	11 August 2022	The Proposed Standing Multilateral Mechanism and Its Potential Relationship with the Existing Universe of Investor – State Dispute Settlement	Danish and Daniel Uribe
163	19 August 2022	The Human Right to Science: From Fragmentation to Comprehensive Implementation?	Peter Bille Larsen and Marjorie Pamintuan
156	1 June 2022	¿Una elección difícil? Comparación de los ingresos fiscales que recaudarán los países en vías de desarrollo a partir de los regímenes del Monto A y del Artículo 12B de la Convención Modelo de las Naciones Unidas	Vladimir Starkov y Alexis Jin
143	11 January 2022	Brazilian Competition Law and Access to Health in Brazil: Exploitative Pricing in the Pharmaceutical Sector	Bruno Braz de Castro
164	23 September 2022	Impact of a Minimum Tax Rate under the Pillar Two Solution on Small Island Developing States	Kuldeep Sharma
165	4 October 2022	Evaluating the Impact of Pillars One and Two	Suranjali Tandon and Chetan Rao
166	6 October 2022	Lessons From India's Implementation of Doha Declaration on TRIPS and Public Health	Nanditta Batra
167	27 October 2022	Analysing Intersections between Climate Change and Human Rights	Daniel Uribe Teran and Luis Fernando Rosales
168	28 October 2022	TRIPS Flexibilities and Access to Medicines: An Evaluation of Barriers to Employing Compulsory Licenses for Patented Pharmaceuticals at the WTO	Anna S.Y. Wong, Clarke B. Cole, Jillian C. Kohler
169	8 November 2022	The WTO TRIPS Decision on COVID-19 Vaccines: What is Needed to Implement it?	Carlos M. Correa and Nirmalya Syam
170	17 November 2022	Left on Our Own: COVID-19, TRIPS-Plus Free Trade Agreements, and the Doha Declaration on TRIPS and Public Health	Melissa Omino and Joanna Kahumbu
171	29 November 2022	Pautas para el Examen de Solicitudes de Patentes Relacionadas con Productos Farmacéuticos	Carlos M Correa

162	11 August 2022	El mecanismo multilateral permanente propuesto y su posible relación con el universo existente de solución de controversias entre inversionistas y estados	Danish y Daniel Uribe
162	11 August 2022	Le mécanisme multilatéral permanent proposé et sa relation potentielle avec l'univers existant du règlement des différends entre investisseurs et États	Danish y Daniel Uribe
172	1 December 2022	Illicit Financial Flows and Stolen Asset Recovery: The Global North Must Act	Abdul Muheet Chowdhary and Sebastien Babou Diasso
171	31 January 2022	Directives pour l'examen des demandes de brevet relatives aux produits pharmaceutiques	Carlos M Correa
173	7 February 2023	Analysis of COVID-Related Patents for Antibodies and Vaccines	Kausalya Santhanam
174	13 February 2023	Leading and Coordinating Global Health: Strengthening the World Health Organization	Nirmalya Syam
138	October 2021	Más allá de la responsabilidad social de las empresas: reforzar la diligencia debida en materia de derechos humanos mediante el Instrumento jurídicamente vinculante sobre empresas y derechos humanos	Daniel Uribe Terán
138	October 2021	Au-delà de la responsabilité sociale de l'entreprise : Renforcer le devoir de diligence en matière de droits de l'homme au moyen de l'instrument juridiquement contraignant relatif aux entreprises et aux droits de l'homme	Daniel Uribe Terán
167	27 October 2022	Analyse des Intersections entre le Changement Climatique et les Droits de l'Homme	Daniel Uribe Teran y Luis Fernando Rosales
167	27 October 2022	Análisis de las intersecciones entre cambio climático y derechos humanos	Daniel Uribe Teran y Luis Fernando Rosales
175	22 March 2023	Experiencias internacionales sobre la concesión de licencias obligatorias por razones de salud pública	Catalina de la Puente, Gastón Palopoli, Constanza Silvestrini, Juan Correa
176	29 March 2023	De dónde viene y a dónde va el financiamiento para la salud mundial	Germán Velásquez

177	18 May 2023	Policy Dilemmas for ASEAN Developing Countries Arising from the Tariff Moratorium on Electronically Transmitted Goods	Manuel F. Montes and Peter Lunenborg
178	22 May 2023	A Response to COVID-19 and Beyond: Expanding African Capacity in Vaccine Production	Carlos M. Correa
179	14 July 2023	Reinvigorating the Non-Aligned Movement for the Post-COVID-19 Era	Yuefen Li, Daniel Uribe and Danish
180	9 August 2023	Neglected Dimension of the Inventive Step as Applied to Pharmaceutical and Biotechnological Products: The case of Sri Lanka's patent law	Ruwan Fernando
181	14 August 2023	Trends, Reasons and Prospects of De-dollarization	Yuefen Li
182	7 September 2023	Multistakeholderism: Is it good for developing countries?	Harris Gleckman
183	15 September 2023	Least Developed Countries and Their Progress on the Sustainable Development Goals	Peter Lunenborg
184	15 September 2023	Promoting Jordan's Use of Compulsory Licensing During the Pandemic	Laila Barqawi
185	13 October 2023	Foreign Investment Flows in a Shifting Geoeconomic Landscape	Danish
182	7 September 2023	Multistakeholderismo: ¿Es bueno para los países en desarrollo?	Harris Gleckman
182	7 September 2023	Multipartisme: est-ce bon pour les pays en développement?	Harris Gleckman
186	14 November 2023	Patentamiento de anticuerpos monoclonales. El caso de Argentina	Juan Correa, Catalina de la Puente, Ramiro Picasso y Constanza Silvestrini
187	4 December 2023	The Global Digital Compact: opportunities and challenges for developing countries in a fragmented digital space	Carlos Correa, Danish, Vitor Ido, Jacqueline Mwangi and Daniel Uribe
188	7 December 2023	The Intersection Between Intellectual Property, Public Health and Access to Climate-Related Technologies	Livia Regina Batista
189	21 December 2023	Status of Permanent Establishments under GloBE Rules	Kuldeep Sharma

190	24 January 2024	Implementing the Doha Declaration in OAPI Legislation: Do Transition Periods Matter?	Patrick Juvet Lowé Gnintedem
191	25 January 2024	TRIPS Waiver Decision for Equitable Access to Medical Countermeasures in the Pandemic: COVID-19 Diagnostics and Therapeutics	Nirmalya Syam and Muhammad Zaheer Abbas, PhD
192	30 January 2024	Pautas para el examen de patentes sobre anticuerpos monoclonales	Juan Correa, Catalina de la Puente, Ramiro Picasso y Constanza Silvestrini
193	2 February 2024	Desafíos actuales y posibles escenarios futuros de la salud mundial	Germán Velásquez
194	15 February 2024	Implementation of TRIPS Flexibilities and Injunctions: A Case Study of India	Shirin Syed
195	6 March 2024	Régimen de licencias obligatorias y uso público no comercial en Argentina	Juan Ignacio Correa
196	19 April 2024	Licencias obligatorias para exportación: operacionalización en el orden jurídico argentino	Valentina Delich
197	28 May 2024	Compulsory Licensing as a Remedy Against Excessive Pricing of Life-Saving Medicines	Behrang Kianzad
198	31 May 2024	What Can Cambodia Learn from Thailand and India as It Prepares to Graduate from Least Developed Country Status?	Brigitte Tenni, Deborah Gleeson, Joel Lexchin, Phin Sovath, and Chalernsak Kittitrakul
199	10 June 2024	A Toss Up? Comparing Tax Revenues from the Amount A and Digital Service Tax Regimes for Developing Countries	Vladimir Starkov and Alexis Jin
200	26 June 2024	Transforming the Non-Military Structures of Global Governance Assessing Priorities for Chapter 5 of the Pact for the Future	Harris Gleckman
201	27 June 2024	Antimicrobial Resistance: Optimizing Antimicrobial Use in Food-Producing Animals	Viviana Munoz Tellez
202	28 June 2024	Constraints to and Prospects for Sustainable Livestock Sector Practices in Argentina with Emphasis on Antimicrobial Usage	David Oseguera Montiel
203	11 July 2024	The Vaccine Industry After the COVID-19 Pandemic: An International Perspective	Felix Lobo

204	24 July 2024	Negotiating Health and Autonomy: Data Exclusivity, Healthcare Policies and Access to Pharmaceutical Innovations	Henrique Zeferino De Menezes, Julia Paranhos, Ricardo Lobato Torres, Luciana Correia Borges, Daniela De Santana Falcão and Gustavo Soares Felix Lima
205	30 July 2024	Foreign Direct Investment Screening for 'National Security' or Sustainable Development: a blessing in disguise?	Daniel Uribe Teran
206	28 August 2024	Equity and Pandemic Preparedness: Navigating the 2024 Amendments to the International Health Regulations	Nirmalya Syam
207	29 August 2024	Discussions on Draft Provisions on Damages in the Investor-State Dispute Settlement System in UNCITRAL Working Group III	José Manuel Alvarez Zárate
208	10 September 2024	Catalyzing Policy Action to Address Antimicrobial Resistance: Next Steps for Global Governance	Anthony D. So
209	25 September 2024	AMR in Aquaculture: Enhancing Indian Shrimp Exports through Sustainable Practices and Reduced Antimicrobial Usage	Robin Paul
210	30 September 2024	Decision 15/9 and the Nagoya Protocol: Who should get what in the Multilateral Benefit-Sharing Mechanism?	Joseph Henry Vogel, Natasha C. Jiménez-Revelles, Xavier A. Maldonado-Ramírez de Arellano
211	14 October 2024	The Implications of Treaty Restrictions of Taxing Rights on Services, Especially for Developing Countries	Faith Amaro, Veronica Grondona, Sol Picciotto
212	15 November 2024	Régulation internationale des dessins et modèles industriels : l'Accord sur les ADPIC à l'aune du droit de l'Union européenne	Adèle Sicot
213	13 December 2024	Navigating the WTO's Working Group on Trade and Transfer of Technology: A Critical Analysis from the Perspective of Developing Countries	Nirmalya Syam
212	9 January 2025	International Regulation of Industrial Designs: The TRIPS Agreement in the Light of European Union Law	Adèle Sicot
214	15 January 2025	Application of the Bolar Exception: Different Approaches in the EU	Dmytro Doubinsky

215	23 January 2025	Assessing Five Years of the African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA): Proposals on Potential Amendments	Kiiza Africa
216	27 February 2025	Will the Pact for the Future Advance a Common Global Agenda on the Challenges Facing Humanity?	Viviana Munoz Tellez, Danish, Abdul Muheet Chowdhary, Nirmalya Syam, Daniel Uribe
214	20 March 2025	Application de l'Exception Bolar: Différentes approches dans le droit de l'UE	Dmytro Doubinsky
217	20 May 2025	Cross-Border Enforcement of Copyright: A Special Emphasis on Court Decisions and Arbitral Awards	Hany Salem
218	12 June 2025	Winds of Change: The BRICS Club of Nations Chipping Away at Western Dominance - The Dawn of the New South	Len Ishmael, PhD
219	16 June 2025	Reducing the Cost of Remittances – A Priority for the Global South	Danish
220	25 June 2025	Harnessing Open Account Trade — A Major Enabler for Illicit Financial Flows from Developing Countries	Yuefen Li
221	15 July 2025	The AI Race: A Tightrope Walk Between Innovation, Inclusivity and Prosperity for All	Daniel Uribe Terán







International Environment House 2  
Chemin de Ballexert 7-9  
1219 Geneva  
Switzerland

Telephone: (41) 022 791 8050  
E-mail: [south@southcentre.int](mailto:south@southcentre.int)

Website:  
<http://www.southcentre.int>

ISSN 1819-6926