

TAP Network 2016 HLPF Debriefing Call

Meeting Minutes

July 27, 2016

Present:

- Ms. Stacey Cram, Namati
- Mr. Bonian Golmohammadi, WFUNA
- Mr. Ryan Kaminski, UNA-USA
- Ms. Dylan Hunzeker, TAP Network Program Assistant
- Mr. John Romano, TAP Network Coordinator
- Mr. Johannes Tonn, Global Integrity
- Ms. Omoyemen Lucia, Centre for Human Rights and Climate Change
- Mr. Jordan Street, WFUNA
- Ms. Meerah Shah, Center for Reproductive Rights
- Mr. Rukshana Nanayakkara, Transparency International
- Ms. Marianne Beisheim, Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik
- Ms. Catherine Woodin, Save the Children
- Mr. Jeffrey Huffines, CIVICUS
- Mr. Mwangi Waituru, VSO International
- Mr. Savio Carvalho, Amnesty International
- Ms. Nathalie Risse, IISD
- Ms. Quinn McKew, Article 19
- Mr. Tola Winjobi, Campaign2015+
- Mr. Tom Orrell, Publish What You Fund
- Mr. David Kirshbaum, Nonviolence International
- Ms. Arellys Bellorini, World Vision
- Ms. Jennifer Tsai, ABA Rule of Law Initiative
- Ms. Shruti Chopra, Nonviolence International
- Mr. Gwilym Roberts-Harry, Nonviolence International

Follow-Up Actions:

- TAP Secretariat to gather intel on next steps for Follow-up and Review negotiations, and coordinate with TAP Members on advocacy going forward.
- TAP Secretariat to compile and disseminate a list of resources with information and follow-up from 2016 HLPF.

MEETING MINUTES

1.1. TAP Activity and Overview of 2016 HLPF

- John Romano, TAP Coordinator:
 - TAP Hosted 7 events during the course of the 8 days, 1 lunch meeting of TAP Members.
 - Most notably, [TAP hosted workshop around the Goal 16 Advocacy Toolkit](#) with the Open Government Partnership, and stated that this was an encouraging workshop as there were not many familiar faces in the room and many CSO representatives working at the national level.
 - Launched [SDG16 Data Initiative](#), well-received, first step of work around data initiative
 - TAP also hosted a lunch meeting for organizations in New York for the HLPF, specifically to discuss the strategic direction for TAP going forward. TAP will host a consultation Webinar for this purpose on Friday, July 29th, 2016, for Members who were not in New York for the HLPF to also discuss TAP's future.
 - TAP Blog regarding HLPF from the perspective of TAP Secretariat to be sent out soon.
 - Newsletter outlining TAP events during HLPF to be sent out soon.
 - Stated that the TAP Secretariat had mixed reviews of the HLPF overall. With high expectations, since this was the first HLPF after the adoption of the 2030 Agenda, many people attended this year's HLPF, particularly from civil society.
 - Stated that the 2016 HLPF was very similar to previous HLPF sessions in structure and format, particularly in the first week. First week was a series of round table panels with no concrete outcomes, second week was important with 22 national voluntary reviews spanning over two days.
 - Regarding the [national reviews](#), there were time restraints and groups of Member States did joint reviews in some cases. This meant that there was not a whole lot of time for an interactive discussion. Most states were essentially reflecting their reports, with very structured interactive dialogue, and only one representative from civil society having the chance to intervene.
 - Stated that the ministerial declaration was held up by one country who broke silence procedure on the resolution's adoption. The Declaration was eventually taken to an unprecedented "vote", which highlighted the confusion about how ECOSOC and the HLPF are related. Leading up to the HLPF, Member States have been adamant that the HLPF was not a decision making body and does not have the capacity to take a vote or decision. This was unprecedented, and although the resolution passed this vote overwhelmingly, this voting procedure has implications for future HLPFs where might signal to the HLPF being a decision making or voting body, or have other implications beyond this.

- Stated that this year the HLPF was only limited to participation by ECOSOC accredited NGOs, where we were only notified on the Friday before HLPF began. This was a huge challenge, as we had to scramble to get accreditation for TAP colleagues who did not already have passes. This limitation of participation to only ECOSOC accredited NGOs was severely disappointing, since ECOSOC accreditation process was very politicized and limited in scope. We must push Member States to expand this process going forward.
- Quinn McKew, Article 19 stated that ECOSOC accreditation is something that TAP can work on going forward, but the issues are much broader than the HLPF and speaks to the engagement of the entire United Nations and is a very politicized conversation.
- John Romano, TAP agreed with Quinn, and explained that there is precedent for expanding scope of NGOs accredited to participate in the HLPF: During the first and second HLPF sessions in 2013 and 2014, registration open not just to ECOSOC accreditation but also under previous Sustainable Development conferences (i.e. World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) and Rio+20)
- Tom Orrell, Publish What You Fund had a few questions
 - Which state held up approval of the Ministerial Declaration?
 - Was there any progress made on SDG indicators discussions?
- With regard to Tom's first question, John Romano, TAP stated that it was held up by Nicaragua, who rejected to language about the Paris Climate Agreement and the way that it was referenced in the Ministerial Declaration, but there were also objections to foreign occupation language as well.
- With regard to Tom's second question, John Romano, TAP stated that the indicators have gone through ECOSOC already (not just HLPF but weeks previous have shown us this), next steps mean it has to go through the GA, but we have no intel as to how member states may perceive it in the GA. Some Member States believe it to be a procedural matter, while others think it is still a politicized issue and may be held up.
- Jeffrey Huffines, CIVICUS stated that there was a [sign-on letter](#) produced by civil society at the HLPF, which was endorsed by 240 CSOs, which advocated for the National Voluntary Reviews (NVRs) to begin the HLPF next year next year to place the NVRs at the beginning of the HLPF and utilize the five days for this, as opposed to the limited timeframe provided in the 2 days of the ministerial segment. Stated that in the years ahead we should be consistent on our messaging in this area. Secondly, regarding ECOSOC only NGOs, this decision was made at the last minute because of security concerns, and that these issues go beyond the HLPF.
- John Romano, TAP stated that TAP will send around resources on the back end of this call, including the NGO letter.
- Savio Carvalho, Amnesty International stated that the letter itself, to turn the HLPF upside down, when he had proposed it I thought it was a grand idea and is something that the UN has actually thought about before, but realized that ministers want to come in at the far end. Stated that we need to fight for it and keep

demanding it. Second comment was what was our role as civil society? Stated that he did not think that many civil society interventions throughout the HLPF used the space we were given wisely, not asking the right questions. We need to ask the right questions about what is coming out in the field and at the national level.

- Arelys Bellorini, World Vision stated that regarding the Ministerial Declaration, although there was a lot of conversation with co-facilitators, she feels that not much of what civil society had proposed was captured into the Ministerial Declaration. Stated that on one hand we are able to speak but on the other hand what we were proposing was barely captured. Stated that when we talk about engagement and participation, message should also be that our input needs to be taken onboard. Another aspect of the ministerial declaration was capture portions of what was in the Agenda 2030 that were cherry picked, with only paragraphs included in the Declaration, we should guard the entirety of the agenda, so that it's not diluted over different ministerial declarations.
- Arelys Bellorini, World Vision also stated that regarding the inputs, specific paragraph in Agenda 2030 about how the HLPF is building on existing platforms and processes. If we review inputs, 45 of them submitted by inter-governmental processes, it is possible to see how they are done selectively, but they need to be comprehensive. Significant content issues that we need to be mindful of.
- Arelys Bellorini, World Vision also noted that regarding our participation, we need to constantly communicate with the ECOSOC president. Next precedent is Zimbabwe, so we need to be careful because perhaps countries may not be as open to our participation.
- John Romano, TAP stated that he agrees that the Ministerial Declaration was very weak, it is important to think about the implications this weakness has for us and our advocacy, and whether or not it is useful to keep putting time and resources towards Ministerial Declaration or towards others, like the Follow Up and Review Negotiations which had stalled months ago and will resume soon. Perhaps we should look towards that process as a concrete opportunity to push the needle a little bit.
- Stacy Cram, Namati asked, how useful was the national voluntary review process for countries and for national level organizations?
- John Romano, TAP responded that regarding the national voluntary review process for countries it was an awkward year as we are only several months into the implementation of the 2030 agenda, so there was not much to report on their end. Stated that regarding civil society, many of the countries said that they had consulted CSOs in the drafting, but some civil society groups concluded that they had not – apparently only two of those countries had a genuine consultation with civil society.
- Marianne Beisheim, SWP responds that she thought the take home message for some countries was about how to prepare for the institutional set-up, how to do a multi-stakeholder process that was inclusive. Heard that DESA planning on sending out a questionnaire for 22 countries, feedback and format on the sessions. The

Germans are offering to host “Partners for Review”, bringing together 22 countries for this round and discuss how to do this and prepare it at the national level, the presentations and a written report (not standard yet, China did not hand in a written report, only a summary), and part of this P4R initiative is to discuss lessons for a national level, to reflect among the 22 what should be the take-home messages.

- John Romano, TAP stated that he would also like to add a perspective, particularly for some of the developed countries, heard that they had stated that they had already achieved certain SDGs and certain targets, which is concerning as they did cherry pick some of the issues in their presentations; the agenda is universal and we should be conscious of developed countries using this tactic/approach going forward.
- Omoyemen Lucia, CHRCCS stated that there is a gap between the level of engagement for CSOs on the global level between the national level, and the knowledge gap in the national voluntary reviews; not only did not a lot of countries consult civil society during their reviews, but even the few countries that consulted civil society did not do so thoroughly or in any meaningful way.
- John Romano, TAP agreed that it is necessary to do a better job of communicating all of these processes of the HLPF at the national level, so that national level organizations are able to participate in those consultation processes when they happen, which is part of what the Goal 16 Toolkit is meant to do. We agree that national level advocacy is still a big issue.
- Ryan Kaminski, UNA-USA stated that while he could not attend the HLPF, he attended the simultaneous Global LGBTI Human Rights Conference in Uruguay. There was a lot of interest in “leaving no-one behind” and connecting the current SDGs to LGBTI and human rights issues, yet there was a gap in understanding about what the HLPF was. Relatively few advocates knew when or where it was happening, and one of the speakers asked the audience if they had been tracking the indicator process and making sure sexual gender and orientation were included, only three people raised their hands (out of a room of 150). There is the issue of making sure they know what the HLPF is and the follow up processes, but also translating the goals and the process to other communities, especially the most vulnerable around the world.

Next Steps and Future TAP Work

- John stated that the follow-up and review negotiations are very important to us, we should be able to build on the work that we have already done but we would need to do a lot of advocacy at least a few weeks before the GA, hit the ground running. Stated that we will send a bunch of resources to the entire network and we will get them to the landscape. We are in a better position than we were in May and June previously. Understands that August is a difficult time to engage. Secondly, there was a fair amount of discussion about the gap between the global level of discussion for the HLPF and the knowledge gap between organizations that engage with the HLPF quite intimately and

those that don't, that work at the national level. Good opportunity for us to take advantage of as well.

- Natalie Risse, IISD highlighted that the President of the General Assembly has [issued a letter](#) saying that the negotiations should be concluded by Friday, the 2nd of September. Don't know how those consultations will be carried out in August, but that the timeline might be shorter than we had anticipated.

