

Draft paper: Evaluating existing Independent and Intergovernmental Panels in Animal Health

[Document subtitle]



APRIL 16, 2025 OLAFUR VALSSON

Contents

Introduction3
Objectives:
Methodology/Framework3
Framework for the evaluation4
Outcome:4
Individual Panel evaluation5
OFFLU5
The Panel on Animal Health and Welfare (AHAW)(15–19)6
WOAH Aquatic Animal Health Standards Commission (20–22)7
Global Preparedness Monitoring Board (GBMP) (24–27)7
The Global Framework for the Progressive Control of Transboundary Animal Diseases (GF-TADs) (28,29)
The One Health High-Level Expert Panel (OHHLEP)(30–34)
Codex Alimentarius (CODEX)(35–39)10
Comparison of panels11
Common Strengths Across Panels11
Common Weaknesses Across Panels11
Summary Comparison Matrix (High-Level)12
Discussion12
Conclusion:12
References
Annex 1: Evaluation in table format18
OFFLU (9)(10–14)
The Panel on Animal Health and Welfare (AHAW)(15–19)
WOAH Aquatic Animal Health Standards Commission (20–22)
Global Preparedness Monitoring Board(24–27)20

Т	he Global Framework for the Progressive Control of Transboundary Animal Diseases	
(GF-TADs) (28,29)	.20
T	he One Health High-Level Expert Panel (OHHLEP)(30–33)	.21
C	Codex Alimentarius (CODEX)(35–39)	.21
Anı	nex 2: List of identified panels	. 22

Introduction

With growing concerns over the rise of antimicrobial resistance (AMR), the Interagency Coordination Group on AMR (IACG) made governance recommendations in 2016. The first two were implemented through establishing a quadripartite collaboration, the creation of the Global Leaders Group (GLG) and within that recommendation, establishing the Multi-Stakeholder Partnership Platform. The 2024 United Nations High-Level Meeting on AMR mandated establishing an Independent Panel on Evidence for Action (IPEA).

In late April 2025, a scientific meeting co-sponsored by the Nigerian Academy of Science and the US National Academy of Medicine will occur in Lagos, Nigeria to explore lessons learned from prior international science panels that may be relevant to creation of IPEA. An early draft of this paper will be used as a pre-read to stimulate discussion at the conference. This paper will be finalized based on the feedback taken in Lagos.

Objectives:

The objective was to write a policy paper to describe and analyse the performance of a selection of independent panels across various animal health contexts. The aim was to provide actionable insights on how the emerging IPEA on AMR can be effectively structured for success while avoiding common pitfalls encountered by previous panels.

Methodology/Framework

The approach chosen was to first identify international or intergovernmental panels covering various aspects of animal health. This was done through an open search and by personal consultations with recognised international experts on animal health. Following the initial screening a shortlist of panels was created based on criteria identified and agreed with CGDE in the process. The main criteria for the selection were: 1. The panel is internationally recognised; 2. With a mandate in animal health or food safety 3. Providing international standards, recommendations or policy reviews on animal health or food safety; 4. Publishing reports or papers on the outcome of the work of the panel.

The selected panels were evaluated against specific criteria considered as key structural elements related to their function. The parameters assessed for each selected panel were

- clarity of mandate and membership processes,
- independence and autonomy,
- accountability and transparency,
- diversity and inclusivity,
- responsiveness and effectiveness,
- evidence-assessment frameworks and processes.

• multidisciplinary expert composition

Framework for the evaluation

To evaluate the selected international intergovernmental advisory panels in animal health, a structured evidence-assessment framework can help measure their impact, effectiveness, and reliability(1) (2). The approach selected was to use a combination of frameworks from the international organisations; UNEG (United Nations Evaluation Group), OECD and World Bank (WB)/United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The frameworks used were the OECDs Principles on Integrity and Accountability, UNEG's Norms and Standards(3) and, Good Governance Principles from WB(4) and UNDP(5). The aim of using these evaluation frameworks was to provide sufficient information provide a preliminary qualitative evaluation of the above mentioned with certain strength, Independence and Autonomy, Accountability and Transparency, Diversity and Inclusivity, Clarity of Mandate and Membership and Responsiveness and Effectiveness (6–8).

Given the time allocated to assessment a qualitative approach was chosen, as quantitative analysis would require substantial time and multi-facetted approach. A qualitative approach gives an idea of what has been successful and where there are gaps in the structure of the panels evaluated. The outcomes should however be seen as preliminary as it would require substantial more in-depth analysis to analyse the performance of the panels to its full extent.

Outcome:

Out of thirty-three identified and screened candidates for panels/committees (See Annex 2), seven panels were selected for further evaluation.

Panels selected

OFFLU; is a network of expertise on animal influenza.

The Panel on Animal Health and Welfare (AHAW); provides scientific advice on all aspects of animal diseases and animal welfare.

WOAH Aquatic Animal Health Standards Commission; is an expert panel responsible for ensuring that the Aquatic Animal Health Code (the Aquatic Code) and Manual of Diagnostic Tests for Aquatic Animals (the Aquatic Manual) reflect current scientific information

Global Preparedness Monitoring Board; provides an independent and comprehensive appraisal for policy makers and the world about progress towards increased preparedness and response capacity.

The Global Framework for the Progressive Control of Transboundary Animal Diseases (GF-TADs) provides recommendations on prevention, detection and control of transboundary animal diseases (TADs)

The One Health High-Level Expert Panel (OHHLEP): OHHLEP is an interdisciplinary initiative created by the Quadripartite to improve our understanding of how diseases with the potential to trigger pandemics behave.

Codex alimentarius (CODEX) (various committees): CODEX's General subject committees develop General Standards, Guidelines and Codes of Practice which are applied transversely to all products and product categories. emerge and spread.

Individual Panel evaluation

OFFLU (9)(10-14)

The assessment draws on OFFLU's strategic documents, annual reports, protocols, and public communications. (More detailed analysis is provided in Annex 1)

Summary of the assessment

OFFLU plays a critical global role in coordinating influenza expertise for animal health. It demonstrates strong alignment with key governance principles in terms of technical responsiveness, scientific integrity, and collaboration with global institutions such as WHO. Its ability to rapidly respond to emerging influenza threats, support vaccine strain selection, and disseminate diagnostic protocols showcases high operational value.

The network is transparent about its technical work notably through its annual reports. However, as far as it was possible to assess, it operates without a formal legal identity or institutional autonomy, as it remains nested within FAO and WOAH frameworks. The absence of clear governance structures, publicly defined membership processes, and financial reporting weakens its alignment with best practices in accountability and institutional independence.

While OFFLU engages a technically diverse network of veterinary and laboratory professionals across regions, it has yet to institutionalize a commitment to gender equity, LMIC leadership, or interdisciplinary One Health participation, particularly in fields like environmental science, social science, or public health policy.

OFFLU is a technically strong and globally influential network with demonstrable impact in animal influenza control. The preliminary assessment indicates it could benefit from formalizing its governance framework and broadening its inclusivity and disciplinary scope to fully meet international standards of transparency, autonomy, and equity.

The Panel on Animal Health and Welfare (AHAW)(15–19)

The assessment of the panel draws on publicly available information from EFSA, including panel mandates, reports, protocols, and operational procedures.

Summary of the assessment

The Panel of Animal Health and Welfare, operating under the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA), exhibits strong alignment with core governance principles, particularly in areas of scientific rigor, transparency, and responsiveness. The panel benefits from a clearly defined mandate, well-established procedures, and public access to its scientific opinions and activities, supporting high levels of accountability and operational transparency.

AHAW demonstrates geographic diversity among its panel members and draws from a strong base of technical expertise in animal health, disease risk assessment, and welfare science. It applies robust evidence-assessment frameworks in accordance with EFSA's established methodologies, ensuring scientific consistency and credibility in its outputs.

However, the panel's autonomy is framed within EFSA's broader institutional structure, and its governance independence is not explicitly safeguarded. Additionally, while there is strong disciplinary representation in veterinary science and related fields, the panel shows limited inclusion of experts from social sciences, economics, or environmental health, constraining its alignment with a broader One Health perspective.

In summary, AHAW is a highly credible scientific body with strong procedural integrity and responsiveness. The assessment indicates it could further enhance its governance alignment by expanding interdisciplinary participation and making its expert composition and influence pathways more visible.

WOAH Aquatic Animal Health Standards Commission (20-22)

The preliminary assessment of the Commission draws on publicly available documents, including WOAH standards, commission structure, terms of reference, and confidentiality procedures(20–23).

Summary of the assessment

The WOAH Aquatic Animal Health Standards Commission demonstrates strong alignment with international governance principles in terms of its clarity of mandate, scientific rigor, and standard-setting authority. It plays a central role in shaping global aquatic animal health regulations, with well-defined responsibilities and a structured process for reviewing and updating international standards.

The Commission benefits from high technical credibility, and its work is publicly accessible through reports and standards. It engages with global stakeholders and offers opportunities for public comment, reinforcing its transparency and inclusiveness at the consultation level. The confidentiality declarations signed by members further support ethical governance and scientific independence.

However, the Commission operates within the framework of WOAH and does not possess formal institutional autonomy. Transparency of internal deliberations, such as dissenting views, individual contributions, or stakeholder influence is limited due to confidentiality rules. While its membership is geographically diverse and technically expert, there is limited evidence of systematic efforts to broaden participation from underrepresented disciplines or integrate One Health principles.

In sum, the Commission is a high-functioning standard-setting body with strong technical and procedural integrity, but it would benefit from enhanced visibility of its internal governance processes and a more structured approach to interdisciplinary representation. Impact of the work of the panel is substantial when the standards they propose are adopted by the General assembly of WOAH they become applicable to WOAH Members across the globe. WOAH standards are the standards the World Trade Organization (WTO) applies to international trade in live animals and animal products.

Global Preparedness Monitoring Board (GBMP) (24-27)

The evaluation draws on publicly available documents, including GPMB reports, monitoring frameworks, board membership information, and organizational history.

Summary of the assessment

The Global Preparedness Monitoring Board demonstrates strong alignment across all core governance and accountability criteria. Co-convened by the WHO and the World Bank, it operates with a well-defined mandate to monitor global health preparedness and advocate for sustained investment in pandemic prevention and response. GPMB is highly transparent, publishing annual reports, assessments, and strategic recommendations that are grounded in evidence-based monitoring frameworks. Its outputs are designed for public, policy, and institutional audiences, reinforcing its accountability and influence on global health governance.

The Board's composition is diverse and multidisciplinary, with members selected to reflect geographic, sectoral, and gender diversity, including expertise in human health, veterinary epidemiology, economics, law, environment, and social policy. This structure supports a strong One Health orientation and enhances the credibility of its assessments.

While its formal independence is slightly constrained by its origins within two major institutions (WHO and the World Bank), its operations, publications, and membership processes are managed in a way that safeguards operational autonomy and scientific impartiality.

In summary, GPMB exemplifies a high-performing global governance body—strategically positioned, methodologically sound, and diverse in expertise. It serves as a model for transparency, accountability, and cross-sectoral collaboration in the global health security architecture.

The Global Framework for the Progressive Control of Transboundary Animal Diseases (GF-TADs) (28,29)

The evaluation focused on its global and regional governance groups. It drew on publicly available documents including strategic frameworks, governance descriptions, and operational plans.

Summary of the assessment

The global and regional governance groups are governance panels of GF-TADs, a joint initiative of FAO and WOAH, with the expected participation of WHO for the zoonoses, to achieve the prevention, detection and control of transboundary animal diseases (TADs) and in particular to address their original and global dimensions. The initiative combines the strengths of both international organizations to achieve agreed common objectives. The general advisory role of the Global Steering Committee includes institutional, strategic, technical (initiating, monitoring, and evaluation), communication, coordination, lobbying, and financial issues. This broad task is reflected in the composition of the GSC. The Committee, co-chaired by WOAH and FAO, brings together representatives and observers of major development partners, donors, regional organisations, and stakeholders, as well as the chairpersons of the RSCs and a representative of the World Health Organisation (WHO) in view of the zoonotic aspects of TADs and emerging diseases.

It provides a structured and regionally inclusive mechanism for coordinating the global response to priority animal diseases. Its governance model includes a Global Steering Committee, Management Committee, Regional Steering Committees, and Secretariats, which together support vertical and horizontal coordination. GF-TADs exhibits strong mandate clarity, with roles and responsibilities clearly outlined at both global and regional levels. The initiative promotes regional ownership, stakeholder consultation, and alignment of disease control efforts through shared strategies and regional roadmaps.

Its transparency in general terms strong with publicly available strategy documents, although there could be room for improvement on more detailed information on decision-making processes, performance metrics, and financial flows. Similarly, while GF-TADs engages a range of technical stakeholders and regional actors, its governance structure could benefit from a formal mechanism for broader stakeholder accountability.

The framework's evidence use is embedded in technical planning and priority setting. Formal Monitoring Evaluation and Learning (MEL) systems and methodological guidance are being developed. It draws heavily on veterinary and policy expertise, but interdisciplinary integration from social, economic, or environmental fields remains limited.

In summary, GF-TADs is a robust, regionally grounded coordination platform for transboundary animal disease control. It is institutionally sound, inclusive in its structure, and evolving in its strategic direction, but it would benefit from enhanced transparency, independent evaluation mechanisms, and greater interdisciplinary engagement to fully meet good governance standards.

The One Health High-Level Expert Panel (OHHLEP)(30-34)

An interdisciplinary initiative created by the Quadripartite (FAO, UNEP, WHO, WOAH) to provide scientific advice and strategic guidance on emerging health threats at the human–animal– environment interface.

The preliminary assessment draws on publicly available documents related to the panel's mandate, structure, transparency, diversity, responsiveness, evidence frameworks, and multidisciplinary engagement.

Summary of the assessment

OHHLEP demonstrates strong alignment with key governance principles. Its mandate is clearly defined, and the panel's multidisciplinary membership includes internationally recognized experts from diverse regions and disciplines such as public health, veterinary sciences, environmental science, law, and social science. The group is gender-balanced and geographically inclusive, supporting equity and legitimacy.

The panel shows high responsiveness, contributing expert guidance to major strategic frameworks like the One Health Joint Plan of Action and the One Health Theory of Change. It also supports the integration of One Health thinking into pandemic prevention and global health security mechanisms.

Although the panel operates with declared independence, it is institutionally hosted by the Quadripartite organizations, and is an advisory panel for the quadripartite, which impacts its autonomy. OHHLEP publishes reports and strategic documents, but transparency regarding

internal deliberations and evidence assessment methodologies was not readily apparent in the documents assessed.

In summary, OHHLEP is a multidisciplinary scientific body that is aimed at advancing the global One Health agenda. To further strengthen its governance alignment, it could enhance procedural transparency and formalize its operational independence from its convening organizations.

Codex Alimentarius (CODEX)(35-39)

The evaluation drew on publicly available information on the Commission's structure, mandate, transparency, inclusivity, scientific rigor, and responsiveness in the context of international food safety governance.

Summary of the assessment

The Codex Alimentarius Commission is a well-established global standard-setting body that demonstrates strong alignment with international governance and accountability principles. Jointly established by FAO and WHO in 1963, its mandate to develop international food standards that protect consumer health and ensure fair trade is clearly defined and widely respected.

CODEX exhibits high levels of transparency, with open access to meeting reports, procedural manuals, draft standards, and final decisions. Its decision-making processes are participatory, and membership is nearly universal, including 188 countries and one regional organization (the European Union). CODEX also allows for extensive engagement by non-governmental and intergovernmental observer organizations, reinforcing its inclusive and participatory model.

The Commission's standards are grounded in scientific evidence, supported by expert input from FAO/WHO scientific advisory bodies such as the *Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives* (JECFA), Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR), and the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Meetings on Microbiological Risk Assessment (JEMRA). CODEX procedures reflect formal risk analysis frameworks and evidence-based methodologies, ensuring scientific rigor and global relevance.

Although CODEX operates under FAO and WHO, it maintains a high level of procedural and operational autonomy. Its multidisciplinary approach incorporates expertise from food safety, nutrition, toxicology, economics, and law, which strengthens its legitimacy and capacity to respond to emerging global food system challenges.

In summary, CODEX is a mature, transparent, and technically robust institution that exemplifies best practices in global food governance. It serves as a global model for intergovernmental collaboration, scientific standard-setting, and inclusive governance in the public interest. Its standards on food safety are directly applicable so the impact it has on global food safety is substantial.

Comparison of panels

Looking at strengths and gaps of the seven panels evaluated the following tables give an idea of where common areas of strength and possible areas which could be improved.

This document summarizes common governance strengths and weaknesses across several global expert panels and institutional bodies, evaluated using a shared governance and accountability framework. The analysis is based on evaluations of OFFLU, AHAW, WOAH Aquatic Commission, GPMB, GF-TADs, OHHLEP, and CODEX.

Common Strengths Across Panels

Governance Area	Shared Strengths
Clarity of Mandate	All entities have clearly defined mandates with
	sector-specific focus areas.
Scientific Rigor	Most panels rely on evidence-based processes and
	established scientific frameworks.
Responsiveness	Panels like OFFLU, GPMB, and CODEX have
	demonstrated timely response to emerging risks.
Multidisciplinary Composition	Most panels include technical diversity; GPMB and
	OHHLEP are notable for true One Health
	interdisciplinarity.
Diversity (Geographic & Gender)	Panels like GPMB, CODEX, and OHHLEP show strong
	regional and gender inclusion.

Common Weaknesses Across Panels

Governance Area	Shared Weaknesses / Gaps
Independence and Autonomy	Most panels operate under parent organizations
	without full structural autonomy. Membership in the
	scientific panels and selection of topics are in most
	cases controlled by the parent organization, often in
	a non-transparent process without accountability
Transparency of Internal Processes	Deliberations, dissent, and stakeholder influence
	pathways are often not disclosed.
Inclusivity (LMIC & non-technical)	Inconsistent inclusion of LMIC experts or non-
	technical disciplines.
Formal Accountability Mechanisms	Few panels have MEL systems or systematic
	performance tracking.
Gender Policy / Equity Reporting	Most lack gender-specific policies or disaggregated
	reporting.

Summary Comparison Matrix (High-Level)

Panel / Body	Clear Mandate	Autonomy	Transparency	Diversity	Responsiveness	Evidence- Based	Multidisciplinary
OFFLU	А	С	В	С	В	А	В
AHAW	А	В	А	В	А	А	В
WOAH	А	В	В	С	В	А	В
Aquatic							
GPMB	А	В	А	А	А	А	А
GF-TADs	А	С	С	В	В	В	В
OHHLEP	А	В	В	А	В	В	А
CODEX	А	A	А	А	А	A	A

A = Strongly aligned | B = Moderately or partially aligned | C = Weak or absent alignment

Discussion

Some of the differences between the bodies here described can be because of their specific functions and identified gaps might be intentional as potential tensions and unintended consequences may arise when addressing governance gaps in global expert panels and intergovernmental bodies. As example, while increasing transparency is crucial, disclosing internal deliberations is in some instances considered against the functioning of the panel. To preserve independence, transparency reforms could focus on procedural visibility rather than individual contributions and clearly established processes for choosing panel members, topics to investigate and clear structures streams of funding the panels. Likewise, introducing formal MEL processes can help track performance, but may reduce the agility of technical bodies that must respond quickly to emergencies. In contexts like outbreak response (OFFLU, GF-TADs), rigid MEL structures might delay critical action. MEL tools need therefore to be adaptive.

Improving governance requires a balance between structure and adaptability. The goal should not be to apply uniform reforms, but to design changes that protect institutional strengths while closing priority gaps. By managing trade-offs consciously, panels can evolve into more inclusive, effective, and resilient institutions without undermining what already works.

Conclusion:

The assessment of seven global expert panels reveals that while each institution brings strong sectoral expertise, clear mandates, and demonstrated responsiveness to its mission, common governance gaps persist. Most panels excel in scientific rigor and stakeholder engagement, but struggle with institutional autonomy, procedural transparency, and inclusive representation, particularly from LMICs and non-technical disciplines. Despite these challenges, the diversity of models, ranging from the technically robust CODEX and OFFLU to the strategically integrated OHHLEP and GPMB, offers valuable lessons. Strengthening governance frameworks in a balanced

way could enhance their legitimacy, equity, and impact without compromising core strengths such as agility and scientific independence.

The importance of securing diversified, sustainable funding sources to reduce dependency on host institutions or donors was highlighted. Dedicated financial structures and support can for instance be essential for enabling LMIC participation, and is essential for ensuring operational continuity, and preserving scientific autonomy.

The CODEX and GPMB emerge as the most consistently well-aligned with governance best practices. OFFLU, WOAH Aquatic Commission, and GF-TADs show strong technical merit but might lack a bit in institutional autonomy and procedural transparency. OHHLEP and GPMB offer models of interdisciplinary, One Health-aligned governance, though both are institutionally embedded in larger organizations. Across the board, accountability mechanisms, inclusivity frameworks, and transparency of internal decisions are the most common gaps.

Panels that demonstrate the greatest real-world impact consistently exhibit several key characteristics: a clear and specific mandate, strong structural autonomy, high levels of transparency and openness, multidisciplinary and diverse expertise, a responsive and adaptable working model, and a firm grounding in evidence-based decision-making. These features enable panels not only to maintain technical credibility and stakeholder trust but also to remain agile and relevant in a rapidly evolving global landscape. In contrast, panels lacking in these areas often face challenges in influence, effectiveness, and legitimacy.

Several critical design questions should be further discussed. Achieving the appropriate degree of diversity is particularly important in One Health, but not always easily balanced, so considerations on whether minimal cross-sector inclusion is sufficient or whether broader, more integrated representation is necessary. Similarly, the need for responsiveness should be considered. How important is it in the context of the panel to have formal rapid response capacities or is does it better fit to have the structure to function through periodic, structured deliberations. Another question is where IPEA will sit and how does it link to the other structures already established on AMR, the Quadripartite Joint Secretariat on AMR, the Global Leaders Group and the Multistakeholder Partnership Platform. Finally, determining the right panel size involves balancing the need for wide multidisciplinary input with the practical need for efficiency and agility. These considerations highlight that in addition to strong foundational principles, context-specific adaptations should be further discussed when establishing an Independent scientific panel on a One health issue as AMR.

References

- Guthrie S, Wamae W, Diepeveen S, Wooding S, Grant J. Measuring research: A guide to research evaluation frameworks and tools [Internet]. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation; 2013. Available from: https://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/MG1217.html
- Pyone T, Smith H, van den Broek N. Frameworks to assess health systems governance: a systematic review. Health Policy Plan [Internet]. 2017 Jun 1;32(5):710– 22. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/czx007
- United Nations Evaluation Group. UNEG. 2016 [cited 2025 Apr 5]. Norms and Standards for Evaluation. Available from: https://www.unevaluation.org/uneg_publications/uneg-norms-and-standardsevaluation-un-system
- World Bank. World Bank Governance and Development [Internet]. 1992 [cited 2025 Apr 5]. Available from: https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/604951468739447676/pdf/multipage.pdf
- 5. UNDP. UNDP Governance for Sustainable Human Development: A UNDP Policy Document [Internet]. 1994 [cited 2025 Apr 5]. Available from: https://www.undpaciac.org/publications/other/undp/governance/undppolicydoc97-e.pdf
- 6. Mathot A, Giannini F. Evaluation Framework and Practices: A comparative analysis of five OECD countries. OECD Journal on Budgeting. 2022 Sep 17;22.
- 7. Liverani A, Lundgren H. Evaluation Systems in Development Aid AgenciesAn Analysis of DAC Peer Reviews 1996—2004. Evaluation. 2007 Apr 1;13:241–56.
- Luoto J, Maglione MA, Johnsen B, Chang C, S. Higgs E, Perry T, et al. A Comparison of Frameworks Evaluating Evidence for Global Health Interventions. PLoS Med [Internet]. 2013 Jul 9;10(7):e1001469-. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1001469
- 9. OFFLU. OFFLU Website [Internet]. [cited 2025 Apr 6]. Available from: https://www.offlu.org/
- 10. OFFLU. OFFLU Strategy 2030 [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2025 Apr 5]. Available from: https://www.offlu.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/OFFLUsurveillance.pdf

- 11. OFFLU. OFFLU Annual Report 2022 [Internet]. World Organisation for Animal Health (WOAH); 2023. Available from: https://www.woah.org/app/uploads/2023/05/offluannual-report-2022.pdf
- 12. OFFLU. OFFLU Annual Report 2023 [Internet]. World Organisation for Animal Health (WOAH); 2024. Available from: https://www.offlu.org/wpcontent/uploads/2024/02/OFFLU_Annual_Report_2023.pdf
- FAO, WHO, WOAH. Taking a Multisectoral, One Health Approach: A Tripartite Guide to Addressing Zoonotic Diseases in Countries [Internet]. FAO, WHO, WOAH; 2018. Available from: https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241514934
- 14. FAO, WHO, WOAH. Tripartite Zoonoses Guide: A Framework for One Health Coordination [Internet]. Tripartite Collaboration on Zoonotic Diseases; 2019. Available from: https://www.fao.org/3/ca2942en/ca2942en.pdf
- Committee ES. Overview of EFSA's scientific risk assessment procedures. EFSA Journal [Internet]. 2018;16(S1):e5343. Available from: https://efsa.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.2903/j.efsa.2018.5343
- Committee ES. Guidance on the use of EFSA's Weight of Evidence approach in scientific assessments. EFSA Journal [Internet]. 2017;15(8):e4971. Available from: https://efsa.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.2903/j.efsa.2017.4971
- 17. (EFSA) EFSA. AHAW Annual Report 2022 [Internet]. 2023. Available from: https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/supporting/pub/en-8475
- (EFSA) EFSA. EFSA Panel on Animal Health and Welfare (AHAW) [Internet]. 2024. Available from: https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/science/scientific-committee-andpanels/ahaw
- 19. (EFSA) EFSA. AHAW Panel Members and Network [Internet]. 2023. Available from: https://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/assets/ahawnetwork.pdf
- 20. (WOAH) WO for AH. WOAH Aquatic Code [Internet]. 2023. Available from: https://www.aphis.usda.gov/international-standards/woah/aquatic-code
- 21. (WOAH) WO for AH. Aquatic Animals Commission [Internet]. 2024. Available from: https://www.woah.org/en/what-we-do/standards/standard-setting-process/aquaticanimals-commission/
- 22. (WOAH) WO for AH. WOAH Specialist Commissions Overview [Internet]. 2024. Available from: https://www.woah.org/en/who-we-are/structure/framework/basic-texts/specialist-commissions/

- (WOAH) WO for AH. Declaration of Interests and Confidentiality Undertaking for WOAH Experts [Internet]. 2024. Available from: https://www.woah.org/en/document/declaration-of-interests-and-confidentialityundertaking/
- 24. GPMB. About the Global Preparedness Monitoring Board (GPMB) [Internet]. 2024. Available from: https://www.gpmb.org/about-us
- 25. GPMB. GPMB Annual Reports [Internet]. Available from: https://www.gpmb.org/reports
- 26. GPMB. GPMB Monitoring Framework [Internet]. 2022. Available from: https://www.gpmb.org/monitoring-framework
- 27. GPMB. GPMB Announces New Board Membership [Internet]. 2022. Available from: https://gpmb.org/news/news/item/30-09-2022-global-preparedness-monitoringboard-announces-new-board-membership-bringing-diverse-expertise-toindependent-monitoring
- FAO, WOAH. GF-TADs Strategy 2021–2025 [Internet]. 2021. Available from: https://openknowledge.fao.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/f0e24084-346f-4371-94db-4bae1700962b/content
- 29. FAO, WOAH. GF-TADs Governance Overview [Internet]. 2023. Available from: https://www.gf-tads.org/about/governance/en/
- WHO, FAO, UNEP, WOAH. The Quadripartite Organizations Announce the Second Term Members of OHHLEP. 2024; Available from: https://www.who.int/news/item/17-04-2024-the-quadripartite-organizationsannounce-the-second-term-members-of-its-one-health-high-level-expert-panel-(ohhlep)
- 31. OHHLEP. OHHLEP One Health Theory of Change [Internet]. 2022. Available from: https://cdn.who.int/media/docs/default-source/one-health/ohhlep/ohhlep--onehealth-theory-of-chance.pdf
- 32. OHHLEP. One Health High-Level Expert Panel Annual Report 2021 [Internet]. 2021. Available from: https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/one-health-high-levelexpert-panel-annual-report-2021
- 33. WHO, FAO, UNEP, WOAH. Terms of Reference: One Health High-Level Expert Panel (OHHLEP) [Internet]. 2023. Available from: https://cdn.who.int/media/docs/defaultsource/one-health/ohhlep/ohhlep-tor2023_oct2.pdf

- WHO, FAO, UNEP, WOAH. Operationalizing One Health: A Policy Framework to Combat Health Threats at the Human-Animal-Environment Interface [Internet].
 2022. Available from: https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240059139
- 35. Commission CA. Codex Membership [Internet]. 2024. Available from: https://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/about-codex/members/en/
- 36. contributors W. Codex Alimentarius. In 2024. Available from: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Codex_Alimentarius
- 37. Commission CA. Codex Procedural Manual (28th Edition) [Internet]. 2024. Available from: https://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/publications/procedural-manual/en/
- 38. FAO, WHO. Codex Alimentarius: About [Internet]. 2024. Available from: https://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius
- FAO, WHO. Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme: FAO/WHO Codex Trust
 Fund [Internet]. 2023. Available from: https://openknowledge.fao.org/handle/20.500.14283/cb9269en
- 40. FAO, WOAH. Collaborative Efforts on Animal Influenza: OFFLU Annual Overview. Rome & Paris: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and World Organisation for Animal Health; 2022.
- 41. FAO, WOAH. Collaborative Efforts on Animal Influenza: OFFLU Annual Overview. Rome & Paris: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and World Organisation for Animal Health; 2022.

Annex 1: Evaluation in table format

OFFLU (9)(10–14)

Evaluation area	Preliminary assessment summary
Clarity of Mandate and Membership	Partially aligned. OFFLU's mandate is operationally clear through strategic documents. However, governance details (legal status, decision-making structures, membership processes) were not as easily accessible.
Independence and Autonomy	Moderately aligned. Scientific independence is evident through peer networks and outputs. However, institutional autonomy is less clearly documented. Safeguards protecting agenda-setting from FAO/WOAH influence are not clearly documented.
Accountability and Transparency	Moderately aligned . Annual reports document technical activities (2022, 2023)(11,12), improving transparency. However, governance, financial disclosure, and performance metrics remain missing.
Diversity and Inclusivity(40)	Technically inclusive, but less clearly equitable. There is clear geographic and institutional diversity in laboratory participation. However, gender policy, and equity indicators are less visible,
Responsiveness and Effectiveness(41)	Strongly aligned. OFFLU shows timely, coordinated response to outbreaks (HPAI), provides vaccine guidance, and supports surveillance globally. Regular collaboration with WHO and national partners reflects effectiveness.
Evidence-Assessment Frameworks and Processes	Robust, but not fully transparent. Surveillance, vaccine matching (e.g., AIM), and risk assessment frameworks are in use. However, internal methodologies for weighing and validating evidence are less transparent.
Multidisciplinary Expert Composition	Moderately aligned. OFFLU includes a range of technical veterinary disciplines. However, it lacks structured engagement from social sciences, environmental health, behavioural science, or cross-sectoral One Health governance roles.

The Panel on Animal Health and Welfare (AHAW)(15–19)

Evaluation area	Preliminary assessment summary
Clarity of Mandate and Membership	Strongly aligned. AHAW operates under EFSA with a
	clearly defined mandate to provide scientific advice on
	animal health and welfare. Membership includes
	European scientific experts in relevant fields.
Independence and Autonomy	Moderately aligned. AHAW maintains scientific
	independence in its assessments, though its autonomy is
	framed by EFSA's broader operational and regulatory
	mandates.
	AHAW is funded through the EU's general budget as part
	of EFSA, ensuring public-sector support. Additional co-
	financed grants, such as Horizon Europe projects,

	supplement its scientific work. This structure supports
	scientific independence while providing transparency
	through EU financial governance.
Accountability and Transparency	Strongly aligned. Reports, activities, and methodologies
	are made publicly available through EFSA's platform,
	promoting transparency and accountability.
Diversity and Inclusivity	Moderately aligned. Geographic diversity is present
	among panel members, but gender and interdisciplinary
	inclusion is less apparent.
Responsiveness and Effectiveness	Strongly aligned. AHAW responds promptly to emerging
	animal health and welfare issues, providing guidance that
	supports EU-level policy and legislation.
Evidence-Assessment Frameworks and	Strongly aligned. AHAW uses standardized EFSA
Processes	methodologies for risk assessment and evaluation,
	ensuring scientific rigor.
Multidisciplinary Expert Composition	Moderately aligned. The panel comprises diverse
	veterinary-related experts but could consider broader
	representation from social sciences, economics, or
	environmental health.

WOAH Aquatic Animal Health Standards Commission (20–22)

Evaluation Area	Assessment Summary
Clarity of Mandate and Membership	Strongly aligned. The Commission's role in proposing
	aquatic animal health standards is clearly defined under
	WOAH. Members are elected for fixed terms and serve in
	their individual capacity, as defined in WOAH's rules and
	confidentiality declarations.
Independence and Autonomy	Moderately aligned. The Commission operates under
	WOAH's organizational oversight, but confidentiality
	declarations and conflict-of-interest policies help
	safeguard scientific independence.
Accountability and Transparency	Moderately to strongly aligned. The Commission
	publishes meeting reports, which enhance transparency
	by summarizing agenda items, stakeholder input, and
	decisions. However, these reports do not disclose the
	details of internal deliberations, individual expert views, or
	how stakeholder comments influence decisions. As a
	result, while external visibility is supported, internal
	process transparency remains partial.
Diversity and Inclusivity	Moderately aligned. Geographic diversity is supported
	through elections, but gender, interdisciplinary, and LMIC
	inclusion are not formally tracked or promoted.
Responsiveness and Effectiveness	Strongly aligned. The Commission regularly updates
	standards and responds to emerging aquatic animal
	health threats, fulfilling its technical mission effectively.
Evidence-Assessment Frameworks and	Strongly aligned. Uses science-based methodologies for
Processes	standard setting, informed by expert consensus and
	stakeholder comments.
Multidisciplinary Expert Composition	Moderately aligned. Experts are drawn from aquatic
	animal health fields, but structured inclusion of

professionals from social sciences, environmental
sciences, or economics is not readily evident.

Global Preparedness Monitoring Board (24–27)

Evaluation area	Preliminary assessment summary
Clarity of Mandate and Membership	Strongly aligned. GPMB's mandate is clearly defined—to
	monitor global preparedness for health emergencies. Its
	membership is composed of internationally recognized
	experts from diverse disciplines and regions.
Independence and Autonomy	Moderately aligned. While co-convened by WHO and the
	World Bank, the Board operates independently and
	publishes assessments without institutional approval,
	though some influence may persist.
Accountability and Transparency	Strongly aligned. Annual public reports and a dedicated
	monitoring framework provide clear insights into global
	preparedness, contributing to institutional accountability.
Diversity and Inclusivity	Strongly aligned. Board members represent a broad
	geographic, gender, and sectoral diversity, reinforcing
	inclusivity and legitimacy.
Responsiveness and Effectiveness	Strongly aligned. GPMB has issued timely, forward-looking
	reports, including warnings prior to COVID-19, and
	continuously advocates for preparedness investments.
Evidence-Assessment Frameworks and	Strongly aligned. The GPMB Monitoring Framework
Processes	enables structured, evidence-based assessments of
	preparedness and response capacity.
Multidisciplinary Expert Composition	Strongly aligned. The Board includes experts from public
	health, human rights, law, economics, veterinary
	medicine, and gender equity, reflecting broad disciplinary
	integration.

The Global Framework for the Progressive Control of Transboundary Animal Diseases (GF-TADs) (28,29)

Evaluation area	Preliminary assessment summary
Clarity of Mandate and Membership	Strongly aligned. GF-TADs has a clearly defined mandate
	and governance structure. It includes the Management
	Committee, Global Steering Committee, Regional Steering
	Committees, and corresponding Secretariats, ensuring
	alignment between global and regional action.
Independence and Autonomy	Moderately aligned. While hosted by FAO and WOAH, GF-
	TADs maintains its own governance mechanisms.
	However, decision-making is still influenced by its parent
	organizations.
Accountability and Transparency	Moderately aligned. Strategic documents and governance
	frameworks are available. However, detailed records of
	internal decision-making, evaluations, and operational
	reporting are limited.

Diversity and Inclusivity	Strongly aligned. The global and regional governance bodies include representatives from across regions and
	organizations, supporting broad stakeholder inclusion.
Responsiveness and Effectiveness	Moderately aligned. Strategies are in place and tailored at
	regional levels for priority diseases. Implementation
	effectiveness varies by context and region.
Evidence-Assessment Frameworks and	Moderately aligned. GF-TADs uses evidence to shape its
Processes	action plans and priorities, but detailed methodological
	guidance is not readily available in public documents.
Multidisciplinary Expert Composition	Moderately aligned. Experts in veterinary and animal
	health domains are central, but integration of broader
	disciplines (e.g., social sciences, economics,
	environment) appears limited.

The One Health High-Level Expert Panel (OHHLEP)(30–33)

Evaluation Area	Assessment Summary
Clarity of Mandate and Membership	Strongly aligned. OHHLEP has a clear mandate from the
	Quadripartite (FAO, UNEP, WHO, WOAH) to advise on One
	Health policy. Members are appointed via an open
	process and serve in their personal capacities.
Independence and Autonomy	Moderately aligned. OHHLEP is formally independent but
	operates under the auspices of the Quadripartite, which
	may influence priorities. Members' personal-capacity
	roles help support autonomy.
Accountability and Transparency	Moderately aligned. OHHLEP publishes reports, but
	detailed deliberations and decision-making records are
	not fully disclosed.
Diversity and Inclusivity	Strongly aligned. The panel is gender-balanced and
	geographically diverse, with interdisciplinary
	representation.
Responsiveness and Effectiveness	Strongly aligned. The panel provides timely strategic input
	and has guided the One Health Joint Plan of Action and
	related frameworks.
Evidence-Assessment Frameworks and	Moderately aligned. Frameworks like the One Health
Processes	Theory of Change guide work, but specific methodologies
	for evidence assessment are not fully transparent.
Multidisciplinary Expert Composition	Strongly aligned. Members span disciplines including
	health, environment, biodiversity, economics, and social
	science, reflecting a comprehensive One Health
	perspective.

Codex Alimentarius (CODEX)(35–39)

Evaluation Area	Assessment Summary
Clarity of Mandate and Membership	Strongly aligned. CODEX has a clear mandate to develop
	international food standards. Membership includes nearly
	all FAO and WHO member countries and one organization
	(EU).

Independence and Autonomy	Moderately aligned. While CODEX is institutionally linked to FAO and WHO, it has its own procedures and decision-making structures.
Accountability and Transparency	Strongly aligned. Meetings, decisions, and procedural guidance are public. Reports and standards are accessible online.
Diversity and Inclusivity	Strongly aligned. CODEX involves a highly diverse membership base and includes observer organizations from around the world.
Responsiveness and Effectiveness	Strongly aligned. The Commission updates standards regularly to address emerging food safety risks and evolving science.
Evidence-Assessment Frameworks and Processes	Strongly aligned. CODEX bases its decisions on input from expert scientific bodies like JECFA and follows formal risk analysis protocols.
Multidisciplinary Expert Composition	Strongly aligned. CODEX integrates expertise from toxicology, food science, nutrition, economics, and public health.

Annex 2: List of identified panels.