



## TAP Network HLPF Strategy Meeting – Friday, 29 July 2016

### **Organizations present:**

Article 19  
Asia Development Alliance  
Global Integrity  
Human Rights First Rwanda Association  
KOFID  
World Federation of United Nations Associations  
World Vision International

### **Chaired by:**

Mr. John Romano, TAP Network Coordinator

### **Provide your inputs for the TAP Network Questionnaire:**

**English:** <http://bit.ly/TAPQuestionnaire>

**Spanish:** <http://bit.ly/29PtUFX>

**French:** <http://bit.ly/29D47RI>

**Deadline for inputs: Friday, 5 August 2016**

### **Timeline and Next Steps for TAP Consultation on Strategic Direction:**

**Friday, 29 July:** Consultation Webinar on TAP Network Strategic Direction for 2017 and Beyond

**Friday, 5 August:** Deadline for TAP Questionnaire Inputs

**Mid-August:** TAP Secretariat to circulate summary of questionnaire inputs to TAP Network

**Week of Friday, 29 August:** Webinar on Questionnaire summary for TAP Network Members

**August/September:** TAP Network Steering Committee to draft and finalize Strategic Plan and funding proposal

# Meeting Summary

## Agenda:

- 1) Introduction
- 2) Discussion on TAP Strategic Direction Part 1: Scope of Work
- 3) Discussion on TAP Strategic Direction Part 2: TAP Activities and Positioning
- 4) Discussion on TAP Strategic Direction Part 3: Structure, Membership, and Governance

## 1) Discussion on TAP Strategic Direction – Scope

The discussion largely focused on some of the broader issues that TAP should cover from the perspective of webinar participants. Some suggested that TAP should focus on specific TAP issues *within Goal 16*, even though participation as an issue underpins everything else. It was noted that there were already quite a number of initiatives around Goal 16 issues, and that in order for TAP to stick out it needs to differentiate itself by being specific. Likewise, it was highlighted that the “governance” space has been very active and crowded in many cases as well. It was suggested that if the Network limited itself to covering “TAP” issues within Goal 16, it would be much easier to pin down what the value added was for TAP on the whole. However, others highlighted that if we were to focus on “TAP” issues, it might *broaden* the scope of our work, not limit it, as we’d then need to be very clear about what our focus of “accountability” is towardst. It was also suggested from others that working on Goal 16 is incredibly important for our work if we are to continue working around the SDGs and the 2030 Agenda. However, most agreed that a stakeholder mapping exercise for the Network would be very useful, to understand how to best answer these questions.

On the various “levels” that TAP could potentially work on, it was highlighted that the global, regional, and national levels are not necessarily mutually exclusive; it is possible to focus on a certain part like the global discussions, for instance, if the global-level work benefits the national level and vice-versa, if the national-level work then feeds up to the global-level. It was highlighted that defining mechanisms for how we would engage at all of these levels to provide added value would also important, but again, in order to do this a stakeholder mapping may be necessary to ensure that we’re avoiding duplication.

## 2) Discussion on TAP Strategic Direction – TAP Activities and Positioning

One of the largest value adds that the TAP Network brings is the intel and updates from the TAP secretariat on follow-up and review processes, as well as information from the Goal 16 Toolkit for national-level advocacy and regional coverage – particularly for those that are not able to follow these processes in New York. It was suggested that the intel and updates should be the most prioritized out of all activities, and that it was very useful for TAP organizations to have a dedicated secretariat/advocate in New York to engage in the global-level discussions. In regards to operating at the global level, the question was raised around what value we saw in engaging in the HLPF going forward, and if we might need to also consider engaging in other non-SDG related processes to really maximize TAP’s impact. This might require global-level coordination, but could also benefit from national-level engagement of TAP members.

It was noted that the activities for TAP should be driven by demand, at the global level need to gather intel but at the national level should help organizations make decisions on how they approach their work at the national

level. It was also suggested that existing regional networks would not be difficult to harness, and that the current regional coordination mechanisms could facilitate engagement between global and national levels.

### 3) Discussion on TAP Strategic Direction – Structure, Membership and Governance

Building upon the previous discussions in the webinar, it was noted that it will be necessary for TAP to continue to build upon existing platforms at the regional and national levels, and that stakeholder mapping might particularly be needed for TAP to provide added value and avoid overlap with other mechanisms. It was also decided that it would be important that TAP be enablers for more active members by collecting intel as to each organization's preferred language of working, to see if language barriers for participation are present. It is also necessary to map timezones to make sure the meetings are timed in order to be accessible for most.