

**Intervention on agenda 15.1 Strengthening preparedness and response in health emergencies and 15.2 Standing committee on pandemic and emerge preparedness and response**

Read by Dr. Pisut Chunchongkokul (25/01/2022)

Thank you, Moderator,

Thailand shares the two following comments:

First, the future direction of the WGPR should be **visionary, bold, yet SOFT** (S-O-F-T).

**S- strategic.** The result of the survey should be able to provide direction through prioritization according to the urgency, with a view to proposing evidence-based actions, along with measurable expected outcomes.

**O- operational.** The work of the WGPR should adjust to the ‘real’ needs of Member States, especially when defining the scope of targeted IHR amendments and reviewing lessons learned through the UHPR mechanism.

**F- forward-looking.** The WGPR should drive further discussions on neglected issues in particular the financing of pandemic prevention, post-recovery phase and health systems strengthening, also key aspects that beyond the scope of the IHR to be addressed in a new instrument,

**T- time-efficient.** The WGPR needs to clearly determine, in a consensus-based manner, the agreed timeframe which reflects EFFICIENCY and the process should be expeditious.

Second, on agenda 15.2, Thailand concurs in principle the establishment of the Standing Committee. We suggest that Member States thoroughly discuss to reach consensus beforehand on its structure and functions, in order to ensure that the work of such mechanism is transparent, non-duplicative, results-oriented and acceptable to all.

Thank you.