

Summary report of the United Nations Member States consultation on the Establishment of an Independent Panel on Evidence for Action against Antimicrobial Resistance (IPEA)

3 March 2026

Background

The Quadripartite organizations (FAO, UNEP, WHO, and WOA) conducted a written consultation with United Nations (UN) Member States on the first draft of the *Founding Document* of the Independent Panel on Evidence for Action against Antimicrobial Resistance (IPEA), together with drafts of a complementary set of documents related to its operationalization.

This consultation was held from 11 November to 1 December 2025 and provided an opportunity for UN Member States to provide their feedback on the proposed governance and operational framework for the IPEA, as detailed in the shared drafts of the *Founding Document*, *Rules of Procedure for the IPEA*, *Conflict-of-Interest Policy*, and the *Process for Determining the Work Programme of IPEA*. To ensure multisectoral participation across One Health sectors, communications with UN Member States was channeled through existing official mechanisms of the Quadripartite organizations. UN Member States were invited to submit contributions reflecting a whole-of-government One Health approach, emphasizing coordination across the agrifood, environmental, human health and animal health sectors. Where feasible, they were encouraged to provide consolidated, multisectoral submissions to ensure comprehensive representation of national efforts. This consultation was conducted in English, and the survey form is provided as an Appendix.

This consultation followed a series of previous consultations with UN Member States and stakeholders including an [online survey](#) on key elements to guide the development of the *Founding Document* of the IPEA, held from 4 July to 1 August 2025, as well as four sessions of [multi-stakeholder consultations](#) convened through the AMR Multi-Stakeholder Partnership Platform (MSPP) from 8–9 September 2025.

Results

A total of 139 submissions were received from 72 UN Member States.¹ Of these, 61 submissions provided comments and suggestions for consideration informing further development of the *Founding Document* and the abovementioned complementary documents

¹ Responses came from following UN Member States (in alphabetical order): Angola, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Egypt, Eswatini, Ethiopia, France, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Morocco, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

related to IPEA operationalization. The remaining 78 submissions indicated that they had no comments to provide.

There was clear support for ensuring inclusivity, transparency, neutrality, and accountability in the IPEA's governance and operations. Submissions underscored the need for a clearly defined role for UN Member States, particularly in the nomination of experts and the development of the work programme. Meaningful UN Member State engagement was viewed as instrumental in strengthening policy ownership of the IPEA's outputs and enhancing its impact.

Achieving an appropriate geographical and maintaining the efficient functioning of the Expert Committee emerged as a key theme. Emphasis was placed on equitable regional and sectoral representation, gender balance, and the participation of experts from countries with a high burden of AMR.

Sustainable and predictable financing to support the IPEA's long-term viability was also highlighted. The consultation highlighted the need to establish safeguards to prevent undue influence from both public and private donors, thereby reinforcing the integrity and independence of the IPEA's scientific work. There was support for developing a robust and transparent framework to assess conflicts of interest, alongside calls for clearly defined accountability mechanisms, independent periodic reviews, performance indicators, and transparent reporting to UN Member States.

The draft *Rules of Procedure for the IPEA* were identified as requiring further clarification. Comments received addressed the nomination and selection of experts, decision-making processes, establishment of *ad hoc* expert groups, observer participation, and the respective roles of the Quadripartite organizations.

With respect to the *Process for Determining the Work Programme of IPEA*, submissions highlighted the need for procedures that are transparent, inclusive, and responsive to UN Member State priorities. Suggestions included the development of prioritization criteria, such as potential impact, urgency, and equity considerations, as well as the introduction of public consultations on draft work programmes and flexible submission modalities to facilitate participation by low- and middle-income countries. There was an emphasis on the need to clarify the IPEA's key deliverables, including the integration of periodic global assessment reports and ensuring that evidence synthesis remains actionable and policy relevant. Such assessment and reporting mechanisms were viewed as instrumental in strengthening accountability, measuring the impact of the IPEA's work, and informing its continued relevance and potential evolution over time. Some UN Member States proposed the establishment of a periodic evaluation mechanism with a clearly defined mandate.

The consultation raised the need for further clarification regarding key aspects of the Secretariat, including its location, organizational structure and chain of command, staffing and selection process, and financing mechanism. Concern was expressed regarding the Quadripartite organizations holding dual roles, both as members of the Expert Committee as

well as facilitating the Secretariat, with more consideration needed regarding the impact on the IPEA's independence.

Way Forward

In summary, UN Member States have underscored the importance of accountability, inclusivity, transparency, and alignment with national priorities in both the establishment and operation of the IPEA. These guiding principles remain central to the process and will continue to inform the refinement of the IPEA's foundational and operational framework.

At present, the revisions to the draft Founding Document and the accompanying documents are underway, taking into careful consideration the feedback received during this consultation. The accompanying roadmap is also being updated to reflect the time required for consolidation, while recognizing the urgency and scale of the AMR burden and the need to rapidly launch the IPEA in 2026 as a critical component of the global multisectoral response. UN Member States and other stakeholders will be kept informed through online information sessions. These will provide opportunities to clarify further revisions to the documents and address any other questions or concerns, thereby facilitating continued and informed engagement throughout the process.

Appendix. Full copy of the survey form used in the UN Member States consultation on the IPEA

Call for written comments on the Establishment of an Independent Panel on Evidence for Action against AMR (IPEA)

Period: 11 November – 1 December 2025

As part of its establishment, we invite Member States to submit written comments on the draft documents for the establishment and operationalization of the Independent Panel on Evidence for Action against Antimicrobial Resistance (IPEA). Your contributions are essential to ensuring that the IPEA is bold, effective, and capable of accelerating global action against AMR.

Name, Surname: _____

E-mail address: _____

Member State: _____

Sector (*please select all that apply*):

Human health

Animal health

Food and agriculture

Environment

Other: _____

Constituency Type (*please select one that applies*)

Multisectoral on behalf of the Government

Sectoral on behalf of your institution

Please provide your written comments for the *Founding Document (Draft 1)* of the IPEA.

I. Scope, objective and functions of the IPEA

Do you have any comments? Yes/No

If yes, please provide your comments (no more than 100 words)

II. Institutional arrangements for the IPEA

A. Expert Committee

Do you have any comments? Yes/No

If yes, please provide your comments (no more than 100 words)

B. Subsidiary groups

Do you have any comments? Yes/No

If yes, please provide your comments (no more than 100 words)

C. Secretariat

Do you have any comments? Yes/No

If yes, please provide your comments (no more than 100 words)

III. Financial Arrangements

Do you have any comments? Yes/No

If yes, please provide your comments (no more than 100 words)

IV. Partnerships

Do you have any comments? Yes/No

If yes, please provide your comments (no more than 100 words)

V. Evaluation of the effectiveness of the IPEA

Do you have any comments? Yes/No

If yes, please provide your comments (no more than 100 words)

Please provide your written comments on the complementary set of documents

1. Rules of procedure **for the IPEA**

Do you have any comments? Yes/No

If yes, please provide your comments (no more than 500 words)

2. Conflict-of-Interest policy

Do you have any comments? Yes/No

If yes, please provide your comments (no more than 500 words)

3. Process for Determining the Work Programme of the IPEA

Do you have any comments? Yes/No

If yes, please provide your comments (no more than 500 words)