UNITED NATIONS FOUNDATION

Lessons from International Science Panels for the IPEA's Structure and Governance

Dr. Cecilia Mundaca Shah, Vice-President, Global Health Strategy, UN Foundation

What can we learn from other panels?

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)

Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES)

One Health High-Level Expert Panel (OHHLEP)

International Panel on the Information Environment (IPIE)

The Independent Science Panel on AI

Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA)

Key Lessons from International Science Panels:
Core Elements to Consider

Governance	• Governance must balance independence and political relevance
Institutional Processes	• Process—strong review mechanisms and engagement strategies build credibility and drive action
Funding	• Funding must be stable and free from undue influence
Membership and Inclusion	• Representation must be globally equitable

There is no one-size-fits-all model: design choices reflect trade-offs and priorities. IPEA should draw from these experiences, but adapt to its context.

Governance: Balancing Independence and Influence

- **Science panels need credibility and political connection for real-world impact.**
  - IPCC and IPBES ensure political relevance but may face negotiation delays.
  - OHHLEP operates independently, providing agility in expert leadership.
  - UN AI Panel is a hybrid model with both expert-led and multilateral features.
- **IPEA should maintain scientific independence while being politically salient.**

Institutional Processes: Ensuring Credibility & Policy Impact

- **Panel operations shape credibility and relevance.**
  - IPCC: Peer review, government co-developed summaries, UNF strategic communications.
  - IPBES: Embeds Indigenous/local knowledge, regional dialogues.
  - OHHLEP: Agile consensus statements, cross-sector consultations.
  - IPIE: Living panel model, modular outputs, iterative engagement.
  - JECFA: Peer-reviewed methods informing global standards.
- **For IPEA: Transparent topic selection, fit-for-purpose outputs, embedded communications, and ongoing engagement with governments**.

Funding: Sustainable and Independent Financing

- **Panels need stable, predictable, and independent funding**
  - IPCC: Voluntary gov't contributions
  - IPBES: Mixed model incl. philanthropy
  - IPIE: Philanthropic support
  - OHHLEP: Funded through UN agencies
  - JECFA: Funded via FAO/WHO core budgets
- **IPEA needs a hybrid model with safeguards against influence**
- **GLG support for resource mobilization is critical**

Representation and Inclusion: Ensuring Global Relevance

- **IPEA must reflect the diversity of those most affected by AMR—including LMIC voices and expertise across human, animal, and environmental health sectors**
  - IPCC: Funds LMIC participation, but leadership gaps persist.
  - IPBES: Formalized stakeholder inclusion and regional platforms.
  - OHHLEP: Cross-sectoral but limited regional/community agenda-setting.
  - IPIE: Broad, multi-stakeholder engagement model.
  - JECFA: Structured multisectoral expert input.

- **Ensure transparent, balanced expert selection, with LMIC inclusion and full One Health sectoral representation built into the structure.**

- **Prioritize meaningful participation—through regional working groups, incentives for LMIC experts, and engagement across disciplines and sectors.**

Summary

- There is no perfect model—but across science panels, we see consistent tensions that IPEA will need to navigate:
  - Independence vs. policy uptake
  - Rigor vs. responsiveness
  - Sustainability vs. autonomy
  - Representation vs. decision-making complexity
- A unique opportunity to learn from these experiences—and chart a path that is both credible and catalytic.

Science panels are only effective if they are structured for impact

Thank You