



Summary Report of the Online Survey on Key Elements to Guide the Development of the Founding Document of the Independent Panel on Evidence for Action against Antimicrobial Resistance

29 August 2025

Background

The Quadripartite Organizations (FAO, UNEP, WHO, WOAH) conducted an online survey as the first step in a global consultative process to inform the establishment of the Independent Panel on Evidence for Action against Antimicrobial Resistance (IPEA). The online survey consisted of 19 questions and was open from 4 July 2025 to 1 August 2025.

The panel aims to strengthen the global AMR response by ensuring it is grounded in independent, multidisciplinary evidence across One health – including human health, animal health, agrifood, and environmental sectors but also ensuring evidence is gathered from other relevant disciplines. The survey sought to capture diverse stakeholder perspectives to help shape the panel's scope, functions, governance, and institutional arrangements, with a particular focus on the balance between political legitimacy and scientific independence and the need to ensure broad One Health perspectives to the AMR evidence. A full copy of the survey questionnaire is provided in Appendix for reference.

Results

Section 1. Respondent Information

Valid responses were received from 386 participants, of which 152 (39%) identified themselves as government stakeholders. Collectively, responses came from 101 UN Member States.¹ Other affiliations covered academia, civil society, industry and private sector, UN agencies, international organizations, development agencies, philanthropic organizations, financial institutions, youth groups, and others. Respondents could select multiple affiliations, sectors, and regions relevant to their work. Respondents' geographical areas of work impacted all UN regions, with Africa (152 [39%]), Asia-Pacific (113 [29%]), Western Europe and other States (85 [22%]), Eastern Europe (47 [12%]), and Latin America and Caribbean (36 [9%]). Sectorally, most engaged in human health (216 [56%]) and animal health (188 [49%]), with significant representation from environmental (126 [33%]) and agrifood sectors (99 [26%]).

¹ Responses came from following UN Member States (in alphabetical order): Albania, Angola, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte D'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia (Republic of The), Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Maldives, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Yemen, Zambia.

Section 2. Scope/objective of the panel

A large majority agreed with having broad overarching objectives for IPEA refined through periodically updated, inclusive work programs (strongly agree or agree: overall 339 [95%], government 140 [98%], non-government 199 [92%]). For integrating a One Health approach, most supported balanced representation of all sectors in both governance and scientific expert bodies (overall 294 [82%], government 115 [80%], non-government 179 [83%]).

Section 3. Functions and outputs of the panel

In terms of IPEA's core functions, evidence synthesis (259 [76%]), knowledge management and identifying research gaps (272 [80%]), and policy support to Member States (237 [69%]) were the most valued, alongside capacity building (217 [63%]) and horizon scanning (175 [51%]). The most desired outputs were regular or specific assessment reports at global level (255 [75%]), regional level (234 [68%]), and country levels (173 [51%]), thematic reports (221 [65%]) and methodological reports (155 [45%]), policy briefs (208 [61%]), and dashboards (172 [50%]). Most respondents saw value in having both sectoral and multi-sectoral outputs.

Section 4. Institutional arrangements for the panel

Governance model

Most respondents emphasized that governments should lead and remain centrally involved in the IPEA's governance to ensure political legitimacy and action. At the same time, there was a strong sense of the need to open the governance space to other stakeholders to ensure transparency, inclusiveness, and diversity of perspectives, considering a hybrid model (overall 260 [83%], government 100 [78%], non-government 160 [86%]). This outcome suggests combining government leadership with structured participation from independent experts and non-state actors to balance political ownership and scientific independence.

Those supporting a hybrid model saw it contributing to effective balance of political legitimacy, scientific independence, and inclusivity. Government respondents highlighted its suitability for multisectoral nature of AMR and its capacity to bridge the science-policy gap while ensuring alignment with national priorities. Non-government stakeholders emphasized the role of diverse perspectives, including those from low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), marginalized communities, and multiple sectors, in enhancing legitimacy and relevance. Many stressed safeguards against conflicts of interest, regional balance, transparent processes, and clear role separation to preserve scientific independence. Across both groups, a hybrid approach was viewed as fostering bi-directional communication, equitable participation, and better uptake of the panel's future recommendations.

Government respondents favoring intergovernmental governance emphasized political legitimacy, arguing that national governments hold the mandate to implement policies, and that decision-making should remain with them, with technical input from experts and non-state actors in subsidiary roles. This group also referenced established intergovernmental science-policy platforms and stressed the importance of political ownership for feasibility and uptake. Similarly, multiple non-government respondents acknowledged the need for governments to set mandates but insisted on a strong separation between governance and scientific work to safeguard credibility. They expressed concern over potential blurring of political and scientific roles and recommended building on existing structures to maintain efficiency.

Institutional Arrangements and Participation

Most respondents preferred two distinct subsidiary bodies—one for administrative/management functions and one for scientific/technical oversight work—supported by a secretariat (overall 175 [56%], government 78 [61%], non-government 97 [52%]). For the scientific work body, a hybrid of standing groups for core functions and ad hoc groups for emerging issues was seen as a preferred option (overall 250 [79%], government 99 [77%], non-government 151 [81%]).

Ensuring inclusive participation of non-state actors was seen as essential. Mechanisms supported included formal membership or representation, observer status, engagement through the AMR Multistakeholder Partnership Platform (MSPP) and other relevant channels. Selection criteria for non-state actors centered on demonstrated AMR relevance, expertise, transparency, sectoral and geographic diversity, and robust conflict of interest safeguards. Respondents highlighted the importance of inclusion for underrepresented and marginalized voices, particularly from LMICs.

Engagement and Science–Policy Interface

Effective two-way communication was seen as critical, with respondents favoring regular consultations, co-creation of key outputs, targeted policy briefs aligned with national decision-making cycles. Some also proposed establishing regional or national contact points to act as formal channels for ongoing dialogue between the panel and stakeholders in different contexts.

Respondents further emphasized the need for effective platforms to connect science and policy. These platforms were seen as essential both for disseminating IPEA’s outputs and for facilitating dialogue that helps translate evidence into policy action. High-level global political forums, sector-specific intergovernmental bodies, regional intergovernmental platforms, MSPP, and digital knowledge platforms were all identified as valuable mechanisms to achieve this.

Way Forward

The survey results provide valuable input for advancing the establishment process of the IPEA. Respondents strongly supported a governance model that balances political legitimacy with scientific independence with the strong need for sectoral One Health representation, geographic balance and gender representativeness, providing a solid basis for advancing the work on the panel’s institutional design, ensuring balanced sectoral and regional representation, gender balance, transparent processes, and robust conflict-of-interest safeguards. The emphasis on both sectoral and multi-sectoral outputs, but also inclusion of other relevant disciplines along with inclusive participation mechanisms, will inform the structure, functions, and deliverables of the panel. Building upon the survey results and other consultations, (e.g., the GLG technical session), including [the upcoming global multi-stakeholder consultations hosted by MSPP](#) (8-9 September 2025) and followed by targeted consultations with UN Member States in October 2025. The draft founding document will be developed and ready by the end of 2025. The process will culminate in the formal launch of the IPEA in December 2025 at a high-level event, marking the beginning of the panel’s work to provide robust, multisectoral and inter-disciplinary evidence grounded in the One Health approach that supports Member States in tackling AMR.

Appendix. Full copy of the online survey questionnaire

Consultation for the establishment of the IPEA

The establishment of the Independent Panel on Evidence for Action Against AMR (IPEA) will mark a critical step toward ensuring that global response to antimicrobial resistance (AMR) is grounded in robust, independent, and multidisciplinary evidence across all One Health sectors: human, animal and plant health and the environment. To support the establishment of IPEA, an inclusive consultative process is being carried out by 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)) to ensure that the Panel is designed to effectively address the complex and cross-sectoral nature of AMR, while being responsive to diverse global and regional needs and priorities.

This survey represents the first step in the consultative process. It aims to gather stakeholders' insights, views, and perspectives on the key elements of the future IPEA, with the goal of supporting Member States in making informed decisions about the panel's design and establishment. These inputs will play a key role in shaping the drafting of the Panel's founding documents, ensuring that its establishment, effectiveness, and impact are grounded in diverse experiences and are aligned with global priorities. The survey will be followed by virtual multi-stakeholder consultations that will aim to present the first draft of the founding documents developed based on the survey insights.

To initiate and guide discussions on the design of the Panel, the Quadripartite organizations have developed a document entitled "[*Establishing an Independent Panel on Evidence for Action against Antimicrobial Resistance \(IPEA\) — Foundational elements for consultation with Member States and other stakeholders*](#)" that outlines key elements to be considered in establishing IPEA (in the following sections, this document is referred to as "the summary document"). This summary document draws on best practices and lessons learned from existing science-policy panels to provide illustrative examples. Its purpose is to support the development of a panel that is scientifically credible, independent, policy-relevant, and politically legitimate.

We strongly encourage you to review [the summary document](#) prior to completing the survey below. We also welcome any additional feedback on the elements outlined in the summary document, including ideas, concerns, or alternative approaches that could help strengthen the panel's design and implementation.

This questionnaire consists of 19 questions and will take approximately 30 minutes to complete. This needs to be submitted within a three-week period.

If you have any questions or need clarification about this questionnaire, please contact the Quadripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR: amr-qjs@who.int

Thank you for your contribution.

The Quadripartite Organizations

Section 1. Respondent Information

1. Are you responding on behalf of a [UN Member State](#)?
 - Yes
 - No

2. (If you are responding on behalf of a Member State) Please select your country from the dropdown list below. (A dropdown list will be displayed on SurveyMonkey)

3. Please indicate your affiliation (select all that apply).
 - ☐ Government
 - ☐ Academia and scientific organization and/or network
 - ☐ Civil society organizations and/or network
 - ☐ Industries and private sector organization and/or network
 - ☐ UN organization, specialized agency or programme
 - ☐ Other international organization and intergovernmental institution
 - ☐ Professional, educational and/or labour organization and/or union
 - ☐ Resource partner, development agency, financial institution, philanthropy
 - ☐ Parliamentarians and their networks
 - ☐ Indigenous peoples, people of African descent, refugees and migrant communities
 - ☐ Youth group
 - ☐ Media and influencers
 - ☐ Responding in individual capacity or no affiliation
 - ☐ Other (please specify)

4. Which [UN region\(s\)](#) does your work primarily impact? (select all that apply)
 - ☐ Africa
 - ☐ Asia-Pacific
 - ☐ Eastern Europe
 - ☐ Latin America and Caribbean
 - ☐ Western Europe and other States
 - ☐ Global (Headquarters settings)

5. Which sector(s) best describe the focus of your work in the context of this survey? (select all that apply).
 - ☐ Human health sector
 - ☐ Animal health sector
 - ☐ Agrifood sector
 - ☐ Environmental sector
 - ☐ Other (please specify)

Section 2. Scope/objective of the panel (see the summary document, section 3.2)

A common way to define the scope of a science-policy panel is by setting its objective. Two key considerations are specificity and flexibility: while specificity offers further clarity on the panel’s mandate and operations, it may limit adaptability—especially important for long-term panels that must respond to emerging, unforeseen issues.

For IPEA, [the 2024 Political Declaration on AMR](#) suggests a model that supports bi-directional communication between science and policy. Drawing from established practices and the language of the Political Declaration, the following broad objective may be appropriate for IPEA: “*The objective of the Independent Panel for Evidence for Action against Antimicrobial Resistance is to facilitate the generation,*

synthesis and use of multisectoral, scientific evidence to support Member States in their efforts to tackle antimicrobial resistance, making use of existing resources and avoiding duplication of ongoing efforts.”

6. Do you agree with the approach of having broad overarching objectives and refining the panel's focus through periodically updated multi-year work programmes that are developed through an open, transparent and inclusive process? (select one answer)
 - ☐ Strongly agree
 - ☐ Agree
 - ☐ Neither agree nor disagree
 - ☐ Disagree
 - ☐ Strongly disagree
 - ☐ I am not sure or cannot assess
7. How can IPEA most effectively reflect the One Health approach, encompassing human, animal, plant, and environmental health, in its scope and/or institutional arrangements? (select all that apply)
 - ☐ Balanced representation of all sectors in the governance structure
 - ☐ Balanced representation of all sectors in the science expert groups/bodies
 - ☐ Balanced representation of all sectors in both governance and scientific expert groups/bodies
 - ☐ Other (please specify)

Section 3. Functions and outputs of the panel (see the summary document, section 3.3)

8. The 2024 Political Declaration on AMR suggests a model that supports bi-directional communication between science and policy. Drawing from established practices and the language of the Political Declaration, what should the primary functions of the IPEA be? (select all that apply)
 - ☐ Assessments / evidence synthesis
 - ☐ Horizon scanning
 - ☐ Knowledge management and identification of data or research gaps
 - ☐ Policy support to Member States
 - ☐ Capacity building to relevant stakeholders for effective participation in the panel's work
 - ☐ Other (please specify)
9. What type of outputs (deliverables) do you think the IPEA should provide after its establishment? (select all that apply)
 - ☐ Regular or specific assessment reports
 - ☐ Global
 - ☐ Regional
 - ☐ Country
 - ☐ Thematic
 - ☐ Methodological
 - ☐ Policy briefs
 - ☐ Dashboards / information clearing house
 - ☐ Other (please specify)

10. Across which dimensions would IPEA outputs (deliverables) be most relevant or needed? (select one answer)
- Sectoral
 - Multi-sectoral
 - Both sectoral and multi-sectoral
 - Other (please specify)

Section 4. Institutional arrangements for the panel (see the summary document, section 3.4)

These arrangements set out the architecture required for a panel to operate and deliver its functions. The independent nature of IPEA mandated by the 2024 Political Declaration on AMR implies that the panel will establish its own institutional arrangements. Despite varying names, the organizational structure of existing science-policy panels typically includes the following components, either permanently or on an *ad hoc* basis:

- A governing body that makes decisions
 - One or more subsidiary or “work” bodies
 - A secretariat
11. What type of governance model is suitable for the IPEA to achieve the right balance between political legitimacy and scientific independence? The definition and example of each model are described in the summary document, section 3.4.2. (select one answer)
- Intergovernmental (government representatives in the governing body only)
 - Hybrid (mix of governments, experts, and non-state actors in the governing body)
 - Other (please specify)
12. Please briefly explain the rationale for your answer to question 11 about the governance model. (open ended question)
13. In your view, how many subsidiary bodies should the IPEA have to effectively support the management of its day-to-day operations? Please see the summary document, section 3.4.1.2. for the details about subsidiary bodies. (select one answer)
- One integrated body combining both administrative and scientific/technical functions, supported by a secretariat
 - Two distinct bodies: one for administrative/management functions and one for scientific/technical functions supported by a secretariat
 - Other (please specify)
14. Regarding the science work body, what type of structure would be best suited to ensure scientific credibility, inclusiveness, and ability to deliver high-quality outputs? (select one answer)
- Standing term-limited Expert Group, whose members are renewed periodically
 - *Ad hoc* expert groups established for specific tasks, topics or mandate
 - Hybrid model combining standing groups for core functions and *ad hoc* groups for emerging issues
 - Other (please specify)

15. What mechanisms should the IPEA adopt to ensure the inclusive participation of non-state actors?
Please note that the foundation documents (e.g., terms of reference of the IPEA) will include detailed guidance on managing conflicts of interest. (select all that apply)
- Formal membership/representation on the Governing Body
 - Observer status and participation in consultations
 - Via existing AMR Multistakeholder Partnership Platform (MSPP)
 - Informal engagement (forums, networks, public consultations)
 - Other (please specify)
16. What criteria should be used to identify and engage non-state actors in IPEA's work? (open ended question)
17. How should the IPEA engage with Member States and non-state actors to ensure effective two-way communication that enables incorporation of stakeholder inputs and policy uptake of its outputs? (select all that apply)
- Regular consultations and dialogue forums
 - Co-creation processes for key outputs
 - Targeted policy briefs and executive summaries aligned with national decision-making cycles
 - Regional or national focal points for continuous engagement
 - Other (please specify)
18. To what extent do you agree that the following platforms, processes or mechanisms would best enable effective science-policy interfacing between the IPEA and Member States, thereby ensuring impactful policy uptake? (Please rate each item from Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, and I am not sure or cannot assess)
- High-level global political forums (e.g., UNGA, Global High-Level Ministerial Conferences on AMR)
 - Sector-specific intergovernmental bodies (e.g., FAO Conference, UNEA, WHA, WOAHA General Session)
 - Regional intergovernmental platforms (e.g., African Union, ASEAN, EU, Regional Economic Communities)
 - AMR Multistakeholder Partnership Platform (MSPP)
 - Digital knowledge platforms and dashboards for dissemination and uptake
19. Would you like to be involved in further consultations related to the establishment of IPEA?
- Yes
 - No