

Independent Panel on Evidence for Action against Antimicrobial Resistance (IPEA): Reflections on the Foundational Documents *

By Dr. Viviana Munoz Tellez **

ABSTRACT

The United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) invited the Quadripartite Organizations to establish an Independent Panel on Evidence for Action against Antimicrobial Resistance (IPEA) in 2025. The launch of the IPEA is planned for 10 December 2025 during the United Nations Environment Assembly (UNEA). The Quadripartite organizations (the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the World Health Organization (WHO) and the World Organisation for Animal Health (WOAH)) released in November 2025 updated draft documents for the IPEA for additional consultation with Member States and stakeholders. The IPEA will constitute a welcome addition to global Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR) governance, and should be established, starting small and building gradually. Several concerns on the proposed model remain concerning the governance structure, equity in participation, and the independence of the panel. This policy brief provides analysis and recommendations on key issues concerning the draft foundational documents for the IPEA requiring attention.

KEYWORDS: Independent Panel on Evidence for Action against Antimicrobial Resistance (IPEA), Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR), Quadripartite Organizations, Equity

L'Assemblée générale des Nations Unies a invité les organisations quadripartites à créer un groupe indépendant sur les données probantes pour l'action contre la résistance aux antimicrobiens (IPEA) en 2025. Le lancement de l'IPEA est prévu pour le 10 décembre 2025, lors de l'Assemblée des Nations Unies pour l'environnement. Les organisations quadripartites (l'Organisation des Nations unies pour l'alimentation et l'agriculture, le Programme des Nations unies pour l'environnement, l'Organisation mondiale de la santé, et l'Organisation mondiale de la santé animale) ont publié en novembre 2025 des projets de documents actualisés pour l'IPEA afin de mener des consultations supplémentaires avec les États membres et les parties prenantes. L'IPEA constituera un ajout bienvenu à la gouvernance mondiale en matière de résistance aux antimicrobiens et devrait être créé à petite échelle, puis se développer progressivement. Plusieurs préoccupations subsistent concernant le modèle proposé, notamment en ce qui concerne la structure de gouvernance, l'équité de la participation et l'indépendance du panel. Le présent rapport fournit une analyse et des recommandations sur les questions clés relatives aux projets de documents fondateurs de l'IPEA qui méritent une attention particulière.

KEY MESSAGES

- The IPEA should start small and scale up gradually, operating through efficient approaches like hybrid meetings, with flexibility to adjust as it secures sustainable funding.
- The Expert Committee, at the heart of the IPEA, should be composed of interdisciplinary and cross-sectoral experts serving in their independent capacity, with global representation particularly from developing countries that suffer a disproportionate burden of both infectious diseases and AMR.

* This policy brief is based on an unpublished analysis developed exclusively for South Centre Member States to inform their engagement in the IPEA consultation process up to November 2025. This policy brief is also informed by 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](#) (Munoz Tellez and Chiara, July 2025). Research Paper 222 was part of the background documents discussed in a scientific meeting in Lagos in April 2025, co-hosted by the Nigerian Academy of Science and the US National Academy of Medicine, to review lessons from existing international expert panels to inform IPEA's design.

** Dr. Viviana Munoz Tellez is the Coordinator of the Health, Intellectual Property and Biodiversity Programme (HIPB) at the South Centre.

MOTS-CLÉS: Le groupe indépendant sur les données probantes pour l'action contre la résistance aux antimicrobiens (IPEA), La résistance aux antimicrobiens, Les organisations quadripartites, L'équité

La Asamblea General de las Naciones Unidas invitó a las organizaciones cuatripartitas a crear un Grupo Independiente sobre Evidencia para la Acción contra la Resistencia a los Antimicrobianos (IPEA) en 2025. La puesta en marcha del IPEA está prevista para el 10 de diciembre de 2025, durante la Asamblea de las Naciones Unidas para el Medio Ambiente. Las organizaciones cuatripartitas (la Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Alimentación y la Agricultura, el Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Medio Ambiente, la Organización Mundial de la Salud, y la Organización Mundial de Sanidad Animal) publicaron en noviembre de 2025 los borradores actualizados de los documentos del IPEA para someterlos a consulta adicional con los Estados miembros y las partes interesadas. El IPEA constituirá una incorporación muy positiva a la gobernanza mundial de la RAM y debería crearse, comenzando con un tamaño reducido y creciendo gradualmente. Sigue habiendo varias preocupaciones sobre el modelo propuesto en lo que respecta a la estructura de gobernanza, la equidad en la participación y la independencia del panel. Este informe ofrece un análisis y recomendaciones sobre cuestiones clave relativas al borrador de los documentos fundacionales del IPEA que requieren atención.

PALABRAS CLAVES: El Grupo Independiente sobre Evidencia para la Acción contra la Resistencia a los Antimicrobianos (IPEA), La resistencia a los antimicrobianos, Las organizaciones cuatripartitas, La equidad

I. Background

The United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) High Level Political Declaration (HLPD) on Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR) of 2024 invited the Quadripartite organizations “to establish an independent panel for evidence for action against antimicrobial resistance in 2025 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 and avoiding duplication of ongoing efforts, after an open and transparent consultation with all Member States on its composition, mandate, scope and deliverables”.

The Quadripartite has conducted consultations and invited written feedback from Member States and stakeholders on draft papers outlining their proposal for the elements of the IPEA. Based on the feedback received, the Quadripartite has updated the proposed “founding document” for the IPEA and made available additional draft documents on Rules of Procedure, Conflict-of-Interest Policy, and Process for Determining the Work Programme of IPEA.

Member States were invited to submit written comments on the documents in the period of 11-25 November 2025. The Quadripartite noted that the revised versions of the draft documents after the consultations will be forwarded to the Panel for consideration and adoption at its first session.

As detailed in the South Centre Research Paper 222, the mandate of the IPEA serves as the foundational element that will critically shape its composition, scope, deliverables, and governance structure. While establishing the IPEA in 2025 may need to adopt a single proposed model for the IPEA, the consultation process would have benefited from proposals with explanatory notes on why specific choices for the IPEA model were made (i.e., on the role of Member States in the IPEA, on the role of the Quadripartite agencies within the IPEA structure) and discussion of the trade-offs involved in different governance options. The South Centre Research Paper 222 recommends evaluating both the costs and benefits of different operational models, including the trade-offs between establishing an independent Secretariat versus using an IGO-provided Secretariat, and mechanisms to ensure participation of experts from developing countries whose institutions cannot support their involvement.

However, the drafts for the foundational document provide only one suggestion for the elements of the IPEA. It would also have been particularly helpful for Member States and stakeholders to understand why the new foundational document has now omitted an intergovernmental role for decision-making in the IPEA and why the role of the Quadripartite continues to be prominent as ex officio members of the Expert Committee rather than as observers, in addition to acting as a Secretariat, which is a risk to the scientific independence of the IPEA.

II. Analysis of Proposed Elements for the IPEA

The November draft of the foundational document has some

significant differences from the previous Zero draft. In particular, a new governance structure is proposed. These elements are analysed below:

A. Scope

The proposed scope remains unchanged. The founding document adds to the UNGA HLPD on AMR 2024 mandate that the scientific evidence to be generated by the Independent Panel should be policy-relevant, and it adds that it should apply a One Health approach. These elements are important in highlighting that the evidence should serve to inform action, and to advance cross-sectoral collaboration on AMR across human health, animal health and food production and agriculture, and the environment.

As noted in the South Centre Research Paper 222, integration of the One Health Approach remains underexplored in existing AMR bodies. Despite the focus on One Health frameworks, there is still a lack of cohesive research agendas. The IPEA could play a crucial role in creating a unified, cross-sectoral analysis of AMR dynamics and how human mobility, animals, microorganisms, water and pollutants contribute to the emergence and dissemination of AMR.

In addition, it is essential that the IPEA includes interdisciplinary expertise to examine the socioeconomic and behavioural factors behind antimicrobial resistance. These factors are critical to provide guidance on AMR interventions that are cost-effective and with an equity lens.¹

B. Functions

The first function of the IPEA would be:

Assessment—conducting independent, robust and authoritative assessments of current issues and identifying potential evidence-based options to address those issues. It is specified that these options should be targeted “in particular where high impacts from AMR occur”. This language is too vague. There should be some clarification about what the process will be for determining what are high impact areas of AMR, as this will be open for broad interpretation. For example, does it refer to countries, contexts or populations where the AMR burden is highest, or income levels, age-impacts, the use of antimicrobials, and will there be considerations of equity including in access to antimicrobials and the socio-economic factors that lead to misuse and overuse of antimicrobials?

Additional functions include:

Horizon scanning—undertaking “horizon scanning” to identify and prioritize overlooked and emerging trends, risks and impacts of relevance to policymakers and, where possible, proposing evidence-based options to address them.

¹ See K. Davis, R. Limato, M. Monga *et al.*, “Antimicrobial resistance, equity and justice in low- and middle-income countries: an intersectional critical interpretive synthesis”, *Nature Communications*, Vol. 16, No. 9078 (2025). Available from <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-025-64137-z>.

Knowledge management and information sharing—Facilitating the sharing and access to timely and relevant information, identifying and highlighting key gaps in scientific research and evidence base, fostering communication between scientists and policymakers, explaining and disseminating findings for different audiences (e.g., governments, multilateral organizations, other relevant stakeholders), and raising public awareness.

Policy support—Identifying, catalysing the development of, and promoting access to, policy-relevant tools and methodologies to support the translation of knowledge into policy formulation and implementation, such as those arising from assessments.

The South Centre had previously mentioned that IPEA should also serve a role in capacity building for increased equity in the capacity of countries to generate and use evidence for action against AMR. These can include identifying opportunities to build capacity in developing countries for conducting AMR surveillance, research, interpreting AMR data, and translating evidence into policies and interventions. The South Centre Research Paper 222 examines how panels like the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) successfully integrate capacity building as a core pillar of work, that could offer a potential model for the IPEA.

The functions outlined do not introduce a sufficiently clear framework for advancing equity in AMR response. The only aspect of equity that is articulated is in the expert committee function (f) where it is mentioned to “ensure equitable and effective participation of experts in the Panel’s work such as through capacity building”. The proposed financial mechanism does not mention that there will be particular attention to ensuring equitable participation of experts from the Global South.

The South Centre Research Paper 222 identifies several issues that remain underexplored in existing AMR bodies and could be within the scope of the IPEA, including: (1) strategies for AMR mitigation and identifying the most efficient pathways with highest impact relative to cost; (2) developing methodologies to evaluate effectiveness of AMR interventions across different contexts; and (3) accountability for action on AMR, including supporting monitoring and evaluation frameworks for National Action Plans.

C. Organizational and Governance Structure

Consideration of the accountability framework is an element improved in the new foundational document. The functions of the Expert Committee of the IPEA include sharing its outputs with “international policy making bodies” such as the UNGA High-level meetings and the Quadripartite governing bodies. This appears to be aligned with a previous South Centre recommendation made to the IPEA to define which bodies it would be accountable to. In principle, it should be to the UNGA given that it was the body that invited the establishment of the IPEA and is able to oversee the complementary work of the Quadripartite agencies from a One Health approach, and second, to the Quadripartite governing bodies to promote that the Member States of each Quadripartite organization give full attention to

the deliverables that the IPEA produces. The foundation document could make the reporting framework more explicit to the international policy making bodies and show how these can feed back to the work of the IPEA.

No Plenary: Need to Ensure Input of Member States from Developing Countries

One of the main changes in the new foundational document is the deletion of the intergovernmental element for decision-making of the IPEA. The South Centre had suggested that the previously proposed Plenary for the IPEA (in prior draft proposed to be composed of Member States and experts, and open to observers) could be simplified, while ensuring that equity and geographical representation were observed.

The new setup is simplified. However, Member States now only have a role as observers, on par with any other stakeholders. Without any assured financing or modes of operation of the IPEA to ensure equitable participation of developing country stakeholders, there risks being limited interaction of the Expert Committee with Member States, particularly from developing countries, that are unable to finance their attendance to IPEA as observers. This also means that their input into the Work Programme of the IPEA would be more limited compared to Member States that are able to participate in the IPEA meetings. An alternative would be to request that all the IPEA meetings be held in hybrid mode (and not remote for only one of the two meetings planned a year), to enable broader participation of Member States and other observers.

The South Centre Research Paper 222 provides a detailed comparative analysis of three governance models for scientific panels: intergovernmental (like the Independent Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), highly independent (like the Independent Panel for Pandemic Preparedness and Response (IPPPR), and subordinate expert panels to IGOs. Each model presents different trade-offs between political buy-in, independence, and policy influence. The paper emphasizes that regardless of the governance model chosen, robust safeguards are essential, including transparent selection criteria, balanced representation across disciplines and geographies, and mandatory disclosure of conflicts of interest to ensure scientific independence and credibility.

It is essential that a specific mechanism is defined for the IPEA to ensure equitable representation of observers from Member States from developing countries, and possibly also other stakeholders like civil society from developing countries, in order for these to input into the work programme of the Expert Committee and the selection of the topics for the sub-committees.

Expert Committee: Provide Strategic Direction and Oversight

The founding document establishes that the Expert Committee Members would provide scientific and/or policy expertise and strategic guidance to the Panel. It is suggested that the Expert

Committee will be composed of thirty independent experts representing human, animal, and plant health, agrifood, and environmental sectors, and other relevant fields. The increased number of experts as compared to the previous draft is positive. It is also welcome that the main body of the IPEA will be the Expert Committee and the work of sub-committees, to focus the activities of the IPEA on the scientific, evidence-based work. This refocusing on the Expert Committee also serves to differentiate the role of the IPEA from the Global Action Group on AMR, the Multi-Stakeholder Platform, and the global institutions where decision-making lies with Member States.

The Experts who will be Members of the Expert Committee will participate in their individual capacities, and not as representatives of their respective governments, institutions or organizations. They are nominated and selected through an open, transparent, merit-based, and competitive process, based on their expertise and knowledge of the Panel's work. It is noted that the selection process will ensure inclusive participation and will strive for balanced representation across geography, sectors, gender, and disciplines, including representation of Indigenous Peoples, regions severely affected by AMR, and experts in economic, social sciences, and other relevant fields. The details on the terms of service, nomination procedures, and selection criteria and procedures are outlined in the Panel's rules of procedure. The Committee will review its composition and functions no later than two years following its establishment.

For developing country Member States, it will be of high importance to ensure equity in the participation of experts from developing countries. One way to do so is to ensure that there are sufficient nominations of experts from those countries to increase the likelihood of their selection for the Expert Committee and to ensure that there is balance in the geographical representation.

The draft Rules of Procedures document explains the process for selection. There will be a period for nominations, after which the Secretariat will gather and screen the candidates against a set of outlined criteria. In consultation with the Co-Chairs and Vice Co-Chairs of the Expert Committee, a shortlist of nominees for consideration by the Expert Committee will be advanced to the Committee for election at its next ordinary session.

Equitable participation also requires that the selection of the Expert Committee is balanced, from its inception. The Rules of Procedures document suggests that the Secretariat will select the first members of the Expert Committee when the IPEA is set out on 10 December 2025. Whether to give this large discretion to the Secretariat should be carefully considered. An alternative is to request the Secretariat to open the process of nominations from the establishment of the IPEA. The first experts on the Committee will have significant influence in shaping the early development of the IPEA.

Role of the Secretariat in the Expert Committee

The founding document proposes that the Expert Committee

also includes one representative of each of the Quadripartite organizations—Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), World Health Organization (WHO), and World Organisation for Animal Health (WOAH)—as Ex Officio members. What an “ex officio” membership for the Quadripartite means is not sufficiently explained in the founding document. Clarification on whether ex officio members would not have voting rights or decision-making roles would be helpful. As the Secretariat drafts the work programme there could be conflict of interest. Given that each Quadripartite agency has its own technical working groups and expert bodies, it is possible that the Quadripartite agencies may be influential in the selection of the experts for the Expert Committee, and in their work within the Expert Committee in their proposed ex officio role and in managing their relationship with the individual experts that may have served or continue to serve on expert committee of the agencies. Accordingly, it would be preferable to give the Quadripartite an observer role and not an ex officio role in the Expert Committee.

It would be preferable for the Quadripartite agencies to be observers, rather than members of the Expert Committee. The Quadripartite, in a separate role of Secretariat, would help support operations of the IPEA and it would be hosted by UNEP. It will not only act as a Secretariat to the independent panel, but it will be closely influencing the work of the IPEA as an ex officio member, which risks undermining the independence of the IPEA.

D. Topics for Deliverables and Work Programme

The key challenge in the global AMR response is for countries to advance the range of interventions on AMR that are needed, based on the understanding of the AMR problem in different country contexts. The IPEA was conceived with the expectation that as part of the global governance structures on AMR it will help spur that.

A critical aspect of the success of the IPEA is that it contributes to the understanding of the evidence on AMR to translate it to informed policy action, and that it can help identify gaps in evidence and suggest how these can be filled. It will function against the backdrop of several international organizations working in the AMR space: the Quadripartite agencies—that in addition to their technical expertise can set up their own expert and cross-sectoral groups on AMR including the work of the Quadripartite on a One Health Priority Research Agenda on AMR—as well as others such as the World Bank and UNICEF, and many regional and national bodies. Therefore, for the IPEA to function as intended, it will be critical to select experts who can add to the understanding of the complex problem of AMR from a multitude of geographies, and to identify topics for the Work Programme that will add value to what the existing bodies and agencies are already doing.

The South Centre Research Paper 222 emphasizes that the Panel’s mandate should define a unique and complementary role in the AMR evidence landscape, avoiding duplication with existing work of the Quadripartite organizations and other bodies. Cla-

arity is needed on how the IPEA will differentiate itself and add value to the existing AMR governance architecture.

It is positive that the draft document for determining the work programme has a very open process for taking inputs for its elaboration. It suggests that governments, regional economic integration organizations, multilateral agreements, United Nations entities, specialized agencies, and other intergovernmental organizations and AMR governance structures, instruments and bodies may make requests inviting the Panel to work on specific issues. In addition, submissions and inputs can be made by relevant stakeholders—such as academic and research organizations, civil society organizations and networks, Indigenous Peoples, local communities, groups in vulnerable situations, private sector entities, financial institutions and philanthropic organizations. The Secretariat, in consultation with the Co-Chairs of the Expert Committee will then draft the work programme for approval of the Expert Committee based on specific criteria outlined, which will prioritize the requests, submissions and inputs. On what basis this prioritization will be made is uncertain, as the criteria are not yet determined. While the draft document proposes that all submissions are received six months prior to the relevant session of the Expert Committee, it is also unclear how often the work programme would be revised, after the initial programme is adopted.

III. Financing

Financing for the operation of the IPEA is crucial. This element is given due attention in the founding document on the establishment of a financial mechanism and related document on the conflict-of-interest procedures. Importantly, any financing (that can come from any source subject to the conflict-of-interest procedures) cannot be earmarked for specific activities. However, the updated document now considers that earmarking be possible if it is “decided by the Expert Committee in accordance with the financial rules and procedures”. To date the relevant financial rules and procedures have not been made available. It will be important to request further clarification on the matter of potential earmarking of funds. The South Centre Research Paper 222 identifies sustainability as a critical domain for the IPEA design, interrogating whether financial and other resources will be available to ensure that the panel can maintain its credibility, scientific integrity, authority and policy relevance over time.

The issue of partnerships is also left largely to the discretion of the Secretariat. It would be important to highlight that any partnerships should not undermine the independence of the IPEA, and transparency must be ensured by the Secretariat in providing the Expert Committee with information on the partnerships being explored and for what purpose. The need for any partnerships for the IPEA at this early stage of establishment is unclear.

Another related critical consideration for the legitimacy of the IPEA outputs is equity in the participation for experts, Member States and other observers from developing countries and least developed countries if they so wish, to ensure that their

needs and experiences are well understood and taken into consideration. The sessions of the Expert Committee and Ad hoc sub- committees that would be established are proposed to be twice a year with one in person and one online meeting. As mentioned before, it can be suggested that the in-person session could be hybrid instead, allowing for both remote and in-person participation.

Moreover, there should be a specific provision for funding of Expert Committee members, particularly from developing and least developed countries, in accordance with the usual UN processes. Under the proposed document, without any explicit funding allocation for participation, while each member has a vote in the Expert Committee, only a simple majority of members is required to be present for decision-making. This undermines the role of Expert Committee members who may be unable to fund their participation to the in-person meetings, where most of the substantive exchange may occur and key decisions may be taken.

There is also no provision under the financial mechanism to ensure that Member States and other stakeholders from developing, and least developed countries can be observers at the IPEA meetings. Given the resource constraints that the IPEA is likely to operate under, this is another reason for calling for the IPEA sessions to allow for virtual participation of observers to the Expert Committee meetings and any ad hoc committees and bodies that may be established. This is also very important to ensure that the different Ministries can participate so that the IPEA can have a truly One Health approach to its work. Otherwise, in the case of only in-person Expert Committee or Ad Hoc Group meetings, the participation of observers will be slanted towards the Member States that can pay and the specific Ministries and institutions whose oversight for their work is more closely related to the meeting location, be it Geneva, New York, Nairobi or other.

Another element of the proposal to consider is that the official working language for the meetings is English, without mention of translation services, and documents will be provided only in English.

IV. Summary of Key Recommendations

The IPEA model should start small and build up gradually, with flexibility to revise its scope of work and procedures as it gains ground, as was done in the case of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). However, from the get-go, it should not compromise on scientific rigour and on equity. The South Centre Research Paper 222 proposes that equity should be established as a foundational principle for the IPEA design, requiring recognition of existing imbalances among countries in their production and international dissemination of scientific evidence on AMR. This means designing the IPEA not merely to ensure developing countries' participation, but to actively redress imbalances and support analysis of cross-sectoral evidence on AMR across diverse geographical, economic and cultural contexts.

Governance and Independence

- The Quadripartite agencies should serve as observers, rather than ex officio members of the Expert Committee, to preserve the scientific independence of the IPEA, and request clarification on what "ex officio" membership would mean for the Quadripartite, specifically whether these members have voting rights or decision-making roles.
- Define in writing the The IPEA model should start small and build up gradually, with flexibility to revise its scope of work and procedures as it gains ground.

Expert Committee Selection and Composition

- Open the process of nominations for the Expert Committee from the establishment of the IPEA, rather than allowing the Secretariat to select the first members with broad discretion.
- Ensure sufficient nominations of experts from developing and least developed countries to increase the likelihood of their selection and ensure balanced geographical representation.
- Ensure that the selection process results in equitable representation across geography, sectors, gender, disciplines, and includes representation from Indigenous Peoples and regions severely affected by AMR.

Member State Participation and Equity

- Establish a specific mechanism to ensure equitable representation of observers from Member States from developing and least developed countries and from other stakeholders from those countries, enabling them to input to the work programme
- Hold all IPEA meetings in hybrid mode (not only one of the two annual meetings remotely), to enable broader participation of Member States and other observers, particularly from developing and least developed countries.
- Provide specific provisions for funding Expert Committee members, particularly from developing and least developed countries, in accordance with usual UN processes.
- Ensure that Member States and other stakeholders from developing and least developed countries can observe the IPEA, including through virtual participation mechanisms.

Functions and Scope

- Clarify the process for determining "high impact areas" of AMR, including whether this refers to countries, contexts, populations, income levels, or other considerations, and ensure equity considerations including access to antimicrobials and socio-economic factors.

- Include capacity building as an explicit function of the IPEA to increase equity in the capacity of countries to generate and use evidence for action against AMR, particularly for developing countries.
- Introduce a clear framework for advancing equity in AMR response within the functions of the IPEA.

Financial Mechanism and Transparency

- Request clarification on the financial rules and procedures related to potential earmarking of funds by the Expert Committee.
- Ensure transparency in any partnerships explored by the Secretariat and clarify that partnerships should not undermine the independence of the IPEA.
- Ensure the financial mechanism includes provisions for equitable participation of experts and observers from developing and least developed countries.

Operational Matters

- Provide translation services and make documents available in multiple languages, not only English, to ensure inclusive participation.
- Clarify how often the work programme would be revised after the initial work programme is adopted.

Equity as a Foundational Principle

Drawing from the South Centre Research Paper 222, the following recommendations can ensure equity is established as a foundational principle for IPEA design:

- **Developing country Leadership in IPEA Governance:** Secure equitable representation of developing country experts within the IPEA and empowering them to help define IPEA priorities for scientific evidence synthesis and assessment.
- **Link to Policy Actions with Priority on Sustainable Financing.** IPEA work should support translating scientific evidence into practical, implementable policies for developing countries, including case studies of evidence of impactful AMR interventions in developing countries, and mechanisms for sustainable financing that ensure AMR funding focus areas in developing countries are not determined disproportionately by high-income countries or global funder priorities.
- **Strengthen Capacities for AMR Monitoring and Accountability in developing countries:** IPEA can support the development of monitoring and accountability mechanisms specifically designed for developing country contexts and priorities.

References

Munoz Tellez, Viviana and Francesca Chiara (2025). *Designing an Independent Panel on Evidence for Action on Antimicrobial Resistance: Lessons from Selected Bodies in Global Health, Climate Change and Biodiversity*, Research Paper, No. 222. Geneva: South Centre. Available from <https://www.southcentre.int/research-paper-222-16-july-2025/>.

PREVIOUS SOUTH CENTRE POLICY BRIEFS

No. 130, 21 May 2024

Unpacking the WTO MC13 Decision on the Work Programme on Electronic Commerce by Vahini Naidu

No. 131, 3 July 2024

Understanding the New WIPO Treaty on Intellectual Property, Genetic Resources and Associated Traditional Knowledge by Nirmalya Syam and Carlos M. Correa

No. 132, 8 November 2024

Towards a Balanced WIPO Design Law Treaty (DLT) for Developing Countries by Nirmalya Syam

No. 133, 2 December 2024

South Centre Inputs to FfD4 Elements Paper – Debt Sustainability, Business and Finance, Taxation by Yuefen Li, Danish, Abdul Muheet Chowdhary

No. 134, 28 January 2025

The WIPO Development Agenda: Progress and Challenges in 2025 by Nirmalya Syam

No. 135, 20 February 2025

The Riyadh Design Law Treaty: Harmonizing Global Design Procedures with Mixed Implications by Nirmalya Syam

No. 136, 25 February 2025

Lessons from COVID-19: Strengthening Antimicrobial Stewardship Prior and During Pandemics by Dr Rasha Abdelsalam Elshenawy

No. 137, 14 March 2025

Leveraging the Antimicrobial Resistance Declarations of 2024 to Reduce the Burden of Drug-Resistant Infections by Afreenish Amir & Viviana Munoz Tellez

No. 138, 27 March 2025

Will the Global Digital Compact ensure an equitable future for Developing Countries? by Daniel Uribe

No. 139, 23 April 2025

Advancing Women's, Children's and Adolescents' Health and Inequalities in Sexual, Reproductive, Maternal, Newborn, Child and Adolescent Health: Highlights from the 156th Meeting of the World Health Organization's Executive Board by Bianca Carvalho, Viviana Munoz Tellez

No. 140, 30 April 2025

Global Digital Compact: Charting a New Era in Digital Governance? by Aishwarya Narayanan

No. 141, 15 May 2025

Scaling Up the Health Response to Climate Change: Highlights from the World Health Organization Executive Board's 156th Meeting on the Global Action Plan on Climate Change and Health by Bianca Carvalho

No. 142, 22 May 2025

Education & Learning and the Global Digital Compact by Kishore Singh

No. 143, 28 May 2025

Impact of Global Trade Tensions on Developing Countries: How to respond to a reset of the global economic system by Yuefen Li

No. 144, 18 June 2025

Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights in the Context of International Human Rights by Carlos Correa and Daniel Uribe

No. 145, 5 September 2025

History of the Negotiations of the TRIPS Agreement by Carlos Correa

No. 146, 29 September 2025

Taking Forward Digital Public Infrastructure for the Global South by Danish

No. 147, 24 October 2025

Reeling Towards Termination: Assessing the WTO Agreement on Fisheries Subsidies and the Future of Fisheries Disciplines by Vahini Naidu

No. 148, 17 November 2025

From Fragmentation to Impact: Strengthening Southern Agency in Global AI Governance by Vahini Naidu and Danish

The South Centre is the intergovernmental organization of developing countries that helps developing countries to combine their efforts and expertise to promote their common interests in the international arena. The South Centre was established by an Intergovernmental Agreement which came into force on 31 July 1995. Its headquarters is in Geneva, Switzerland.

Readers may reproduce the contents of this policy brief for their own use, but are requested to grant due acknowledgement to the South Centre. The views contained in this brief 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. For comments on this publication, please contact:



The South Centre
International Environment House 2
Chemin de Balexert 7-9
1219 Geneva
Switzerland
Tel.: +41 22 791 8050
south@southcentre.int
<https://www.southcentre.int>

Front cover photo credit: Monstera Production from Pexels