



EDAR8

Environmental Dimensions
of Antimicrobial Resistance
Brisbane, 2-7 August 2026

WORKSHOP OVERVIEW

Workshop Title	Villains or victims? How can we better understand the impact of AMR on wildlife and wildlife on AMR
Facilitators and contributors Details of the individuals leading and contributing to the workshop, including: • Workshop facilitators • Guest speakers or contributors • Their roles in the session	Organiser/facilitator: Dr Bethany Hoye, University of Wollongong Co-organiser/facilitator: Michelle Power, Macquarie University Co-facilitator: Steven Djordjevic, UTS Developed in consultation with: • Clare Death, Wildlife Health Australia • Gabi Tobias, Taronga Zoo • Monique Binet, SAAFE CRC • Kylie Hewson, CSIRO
Background An overview of the context and rationale for the workshop, outlining the key issue, challenge, or opportunity it addresses, and why this topic is timely and relevant.	Wildlife carry antimicrobial resistant bacteria at surprisingly high rates – yet they remain at the margins of AMR research. Whether they amplify and spread resistance, suffer pollution from clinical and agricultural systems, or largely incidental bystanders is complex and critically underexplored. While many sectors operate on assumptions of the importance (or irrelevance) of AMR to wildlife health and wildlife to the AMR crisis, mechanistic research is rare and considerable conjecture fills the void. Despite several reviews on AMR in wildlife in recent years, a horizon scan of the most pressing research needs to substantiate or refute claims is sorely needed. EDAR8 presents a unique opportunity for disparate practitioners and researchers - with interest in AMR, or wildlife, or both – to collaboratively share perspectives and expertise and propose research solutions.
Workshop Aims A description of the purpose of the workshop and its intended focus. This section highlights what participants can expect to explore, learn, or develop during the session.	This workshop aims to lay the foundations for the research required to substantiate claims about the role of AMR in wildlife health and the role of wildlife in the AMR crisis, drawing on the breadth of practitioners and researchers participating in EDAR8. Through structured group discussions, the workshop aims to identify and prioritise evidence needed to better understand the intersection of wildlife and AMR. Specifically, the workshop will: • Elicit and discuss the diversity of stakeholder interpretations of wildlife's role in AMR and/or AMR's impact on wildlife health • Map the evidence needed to test these claims – regardless of what evidence currently exists • Develop a working group of interested participants to formally build a goal-oriented review of wildlife AMR
Participant Takeaways A summary of what participants will gain from attending the workshop. This may include new knowledge, practical skills, tools, frameworks, or shared resources, as well as any tangible outputs (e.g. ideas, draft materials, or collaborative outcomes).	Participants will leave with: • A clearer picture of the diversity of current interpretations of wildlife AMR, and where consensus, disagreement, and untested assumptions exist • A shared understanding of what evidence is needed to resolve the field's biggest unknowns, including the impact of AMR on wildlife, wildlife's role in amplification/spread/novel resistance bridges, and wildlife's role in genomic evolution of resistance • New connections across sectors that rarely share a room (including veterinarians, ecologists, microbiologists, agricultural scientists, land managers, water managers, clinicians, policy makers, wildlife rehabilitators) • Opportunity to contribute to further development of these ideas through a shared review publication

Expected Impact An outline of the broader value of the workshop, including how it may: • Influence research, policy, or practice • Support collaboration and knowledge exchange • Contribute to future work or ongoing initiatives	Wildlife AMR research and policy currently rests on largely untested assumptions about whether wildlife are victims of AMR pollution, amplifiers of resistant bacteria, or contributors to novel resistance evolution. These assumptions are rarely made explicit or tested against each other or the evidence – entrenching dogma and risking misdirected research effort, funding, and policy. This workshop will explicitly elicit cross-sector beliefs, rather than assume shared understanding. Because wildlife AMR has no peak industry body and falls outside traditional research associations, these cross-sector perception gaps have never been systematically surfaced. By identifying where dogma outpaces evidence, and engaging a broad group of practitioners and researchers to define what evidence is needed to resolve the field's biggest unknowns, the workshop will directly inform a research agenda that reflects the full breadth of perspectives and literature relevant to the field, not the assumptions of any single sector. It is anticipated this workshop will draw on expertise from, and contribute to, the following EDAR8 themes: • Animal [wildlife] health, zoonoses, and environmental AMR • Ecology and biology of AMR • AMR omics, informatics and/or AI supported analysis • One Health AMR modelling and risk assessment • AMR biosecurity challenges and agricultural production risks • Environmental AMR and public health • AMR risk management in the water cycle • AMR in a changing environment
Who should attend? Information on the intended audience for the workshop, including: • Relevant backgrounds, sectors, or expertise • The level of participation expected (e.g. discussion, group work, problem-solving)	Any EDAR8 participant would be a valuable addition to this workshop – even if you have never considered wildlife AMR. Ideally 20-50 experts and practitioners spanning the breadth of sectors represented at EDAR8, including but not limited to: wildlife and zoo veterinarians, wildlife rehabilitators, microbiologists/genomicists, zoologists, ecologists and evolutionary biologists, wildlife disease and biosecurity agencies, environmental and water health agencies, agricultural/livestock AMR stakeholders, clinical/public health AMR practitioners, and policy makers. Participants will be involved in active small group discussions throughout the majority of the workshop. They will be seated first with others from their own sector to discuss current perspectives, then in mixed-sector groups for World Café-style discussion. All contributions are made and captured at the group (not individual) level and the focus is on discussing what others present, rather than considering any one input as representative of a sector.
Workshop Schedule and Duration A summary of the structure and flow of the workshop, including: • Key session components • Interactive or breakout activities	3.5 hours (2:00pm–5:30pm). No presentations or panels are used to "set the stage", so as not to anchor participants' thinking before discussion. • 10 min – Welcome and framing of the "villains or victims" question and workshop goals. • 45 min – Round 1 (sector-based tables): "Before coming to EDAR8, what had you considered about the role of wildlife in AMR?" Discussion to span wildlife as potential victims (AMR's impact on wildlife health), wildlife as potential villains (amplification, spread, novel evolutionary bridges) and wildlife as bystanders to the main AMR actors. Discussion functions as icebreaker, with participants introducing themselves and each answering the question, with further discussion from the group. Group-level output captured on butcher's paper – no individual attribution. Facilitators to float through the room. • 30 min – Report-back thoughts captured in round 1 (one participant from each table) • 15 min – break, during which facilitators synthesise Round 1 outputs to identify 3–4 cross-sector dogmas/unsubstantiated unknowns for World Café stations • 45 min — Round 2, World Café (mixed-sector groups – with alternate seats labelled with a colour in round 1 to identify the table to go to for the first station)

in round 2): groups rotate through 3 stations (one for each of the major assumptions/unknowns elicited from round 1) each asking what evidence would we need to test this claim, regardless of whether that evidence currently exists?

- 30 min — Report-back and synthesis of evidence needs identified at each station, shared with the room;, with a focus on how they differ between questions, and thought to who most needs to know (advocating industry).
- 15 min — Wrap-up: next steps, invitation to contribute collectively to continued discussions of the research agenda and development of a review manuscript