

# Comment to the Quadripartite Joint Secretariat on Antimicrobial Resistance

The Quadripartite recently released a Zero Draft of the Founding Document for the Independent Panel on Evidence for Action (IPEA) on AMR. We express the following primary concerns:

**1. Scientific independence.** The “I” in “IPEA” stands for “independent”, as the invitation from the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) was to establish an independent panel. Yet, the Zero Draft is meant to establish a panel with strong “inter-governmental” features, similar to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES). The UNGA was aware of these panels but chose to invite the establishment of a scientifically “independent” panel instead. The Zero Draft does not fully honor this choice:

- The Plenary and Bureau are chosen by regional groupings of Member States;
- The six scientists leading the work (the “Interdisciplinary Expert Committee”) are nominated by the Quadripartite and elected by the Plenary;
- The Plenary selects the Secretariat, determines the budget, and receives the deliverables; and
- The scientific work programme is first drafted by the Secretariat, then approved by the Plenary.

Altogether, while observers are admitted, the Zero Draft proposes that IPEA decision-makers will be nominated by the Quadripartite or elected by its nominees. We support the objective that the IPEA should be policy relevant with close connections to Member States, but this can be achieved in a more independent manner. Nothing about the structure envisioned in the Zero Draft supports the independence of IPEA’s scientific work. The great bulk of the work of IPEA should be in response to deliverables requested by Member States, but the IPEA should have the ability to initiate reports as well. The cycle of requesting, receiving, discussing, and acting on these deliverables will ensure the work of the IPEA remains policy relevant, supporting the work of Member States in tackling AMR.

**2. Inclusion and representation:** There are only six core experts proposed in the Zero Draft. Sufficient diversity across disciplines (including social science and other areas under-exploited in AMR discourse and inquiry), sectors (all One Health domains), and geographies cannot be met with only six individuals. Attempts to do so will inevitably exclude groups historically under-represented in AMR policy decision-making such as youth and LMIC representatives. Though recognizing that resources will be limited, we suggest expansion of this core, as well as a broad call for nominees.

**3. Duplication and waste.** UNGA insisted IPEA should be “making use of existing resources and avoiding duplication of on-going efforts,” but the Zero Draft features four levels of governance, plus the actual working groups of scientists. No role is found for three other elements of global governance already in existence: (a) the Global Leaders’ Group (GLG) on AMR; (b) the biennial Ministerial on AMR, to be hosted by Nigeria in 2026; and (c) the Multi-Stakeholder Partnership Platform (MSPP) on AMR.

- What is the relationship between the Plenary and the Ministerial? E.g., should the Ministerial be given an additional key role, something along the lines of the COP?
- How will IPEA interact with the GLG and the MSPP? E.g., should the MSPP be used to channel multi-stakeholder input?

**4. Closing evidence gaps:** We welcome that gap identification is one of the functions laid out in the Zero Draft. As the Draft also emphasizes that IPEA will not generate evidence, it is important to consider how the Panel can support and frame priorities for capacity strengthening for evidence-generation. Otherwise, lopsidedness in evidence availability, from resource rich settings versus resource poor ones, will continue.

We further wish to highlight that signatories of this letter convened and attended a global meeting of over 80 stakeholders in Lagos, Nigeria in April 2025: *Lessons Learned for the Independent Panel on Evidence for Action on AMR from Previous International Science Panels*. A short summary of their deliberations, which includes the points we raise above, is available [here](#). The Lagos *Lessons Learned* meeting attendees were briefed by papers we commissioned. Final versions of these papers will be posted at the Centre for Global Development later this week.

Professor Iruka N. Okeke, PhD, University of Ibadan and Fellow, Nigerian Academy of Science<sup>1</sup>

Professor Kevin Outterson, JD, Boston University<sup>1,5</sup>

Javier Guzman MD, MBA<sup>1</sup>

Dr M. Oladoyin Odubanjo, FISC, Executive Secretary, The Nigerian Academy of Science<sup>2</sup>

Robert Leo Skov, MD, ESCMID President<sup>2</sup>

Mathieu JP Poirier, PhD, York University<sup>3,4,5</sup>

Professor Clare Chandler, PhD, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine<sup>2,5,6</sup>

Anthony McDonnell, MS, Centre for Global Development<sup>3</sup>

Ayodele A. Akinyele, PhD, University of Ibadan<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Co-organizers of the Lagos Workshop: “Lessons Learned for the Independent Panel on Evidence for Action on AMR from Previous International Science Panels” and commissioners of the briefing papers.

2 Attendee at the Lagos Workshop.

3 Attendee and co-author of briefing papers for the Lagos Workshop.

4 Director of the Global Strategy Lab at York University & the University of Ottawa.

5 Leaders of the International Network for Antimicrobial Resistance Social Science (INAMRSS)

6 Director of the Antimicrobials in Society (AMIS) project at the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine.