TAP Network Steering Committee - 2020-2021 Steering Committee

Meeting Decisions

19 March 2020

Present:	**Mr. Peter van Sluijs, CSPPS**
	Ms. Judith Kaulem, Poverty Reduction Forum Trust
	Ms. Florence Syevuo, SDG Kenya Forum
	Ms. Jean Scrimgeour, Accountability Lab
	Mr. Hideki Wakabayashi, ADA
	Mr. John Romano, TAP Secretariat
	Ms. Elle Sweeney, TAP Secretariat
Absent:	**Ms. Jyotsna Mohan Singh**
Next meeting:	20 March 2020
Chairing Meeting:	**Ms. Judith Kaulem, Poverty Reduction Forum Trust**

DECISIONS TAKEN FROM CONFERENCE CALL IN GREEN; FOLLOW-UP ITEMS IN BLUE

Agenda Items:

1. **Background and Overview and Review of Objectives for meeting**

    a. **Overview of agenda and expected outcomes from the meeting and each day**

Discussion: Judith welcomed the group and kicked off the meeting with an overview of its agenda, background materials, and expected outcomes.

2. **Discussion on TAP Network Strategic Plan**

    a. **Review and adoption of TAP Network 2020-2023 Strategic Plan**

Discussion: John reviewed the 2020-2023 Strategic Plan and the updates that were made to this document since it was last reviewed with the Steering Committee during on 6 March 2020. He also discussed the feedback that was received from the Steering Committee prior to today's meeting. All edits and feedback are included in detail the attached google document.

Overall it was noted that the strategic plan is very dense and detailed. There is a some need to rethink the structure of the document in terms of how the content is ordered. There is also a need to simplify the language overall and ensure that it is consistent throughout. Finally, it was recommended that the document include more visuals where possible and link out to other TAP communications materials as a way to decrease the amount of content.

Accountability Lab noted that the content of the plan is good overall but also had a number of helpful changes. There is potentially a way to add an executive summary at the beginning of the document that provides an overview of everything included. As noted previously, there are some inconsistencies in the language throughout the document that need to be addressed. In terms of the structure, there needs to be some reformatting and reordering for logic purposes. There is also an opportunity to be a bit more creative with this document by using other types of media. This way, we will not need to include so much content in the strategic plan itself. For examples, TAP could create regular blog posts that help define the contextual challenge our work is addressing that could be linked in the document. There is also a need to for better visuals throughout. The theory of change could be snappier. At the end of the document, there should be a link with some sort of network mapping of organizations and our initiatives. Finally, Accountability Lab noted that they have a preference to make this strategic plan a three year document rather than a four or five year.

CSPPS agreed that the document is very dense. There is a need to think about the purpose of the document overall and whether something like an execute summary would help outside audiences better digest the content. CSPPS also agrees that the sequence of the content within the plan is not entirely logical. Also, there needs to be better connections made between the various sections. Given that the global situation is rapidly changing (especially with the situation around the current global pandemic), there is a need for this strategic plan to be able to adjust to the current and future changes around the world. This may relate to the duration of the strategic plan i.e. a longer plan that runs for four or five years may become irrelevant to TAP's work if the context of the world continues to evolve at the pace it is today. CSPPS agrees that there is a need for more visuals, too, including a mapping of the network with entry points.

PRFT noted that there is a need to make sure that we have a shared sense I the document of how we want to engage and work with the membership i.e. the "call" of the network. This will help us better design the strategic plan.

John agreed with the above point by PRTF and noted that the strategic plan neglects to outline the value of the membership. The plan notes how we work as a network, i.e. the things that we do, but not how we do these things with our members and the value-add the members have to the network.

In terms of how we engage with the network, John noted that this is a continuous challenge for TAP. There is a need to perhaps directly mention how we work with our members, as there is a balance that needs to be struck in terms of the Secretariat leading work and TAP's members and partners itself taking more charge of TAP's overall work. For example, TAP's Regional Focal Point structure has been an imperfect model but something that should be reviewed and revamped. There is also a need to think about how we engage with the membership, but there are major capacity issues for the Secretariat that limits its ability to do this while also juggle the Network's substantive work.

PRFT agreed with the above and noted that we should focus on what we can control in terms of our engagement with the Network, so the capacity limitations of the Secretariat should be kept font of mind.

SDG Kenya Forum reminded the group that we should balance both focusing on what TAP does well with introducing new and innovative ideas to enrich the document.

ADA noted that there is a need to better define what TAP's role is in the world, i.e. a catalyzer behind the scenes, etc. Identifying "what the TAP Network is" will help guide the creation of this document. ADA also posed a question to the Secretariat about how the developments around the global pandemic will impact the nature of TAP's work.

John agreed that there is a need to utilize other means to get TAP's message across. In no way should this strategic plan be seen as the only means of getting TAP's message across and the steering committee in talking about the next steps should brainstorm ways and tools to make sure the Network's message is being communicated, i.e. blogs, a webpage, etc.

John noted that the pandemic will likely not impact the development of TAP's strategic plan too much, given that it is a three- to four-year plan. There is an opportunity with this current challenge to think about the opportunity to build out our engagement with our membership via digital platforms and technological mechanisms. CSPPS noted, however, that the challenges of this global pandemic might really impact TAP's work in terms of building out the work of the Network in countries.

i. Review of 2018-2019 Steering Committee analysis

Discussion: John briefly went through the reflections and analysis of the strategic plan from the previous Steering Committee. This feedback largely aligned with the feedback we received from the Network's members and partners via the recent survey.

This feedback noted that there is a need to focus on capacity building, specifically the creation of more resources and tools like the Goal 16 Toolkit. There is also a need to find a way for members to contribute to the development of these resources more directly, and thus also be able to showcase the work our membership is doing themselves.

The previous Steering Committee also noted that there is a need to establish new mechanisms to engage with our Network, including via the Regional Focal Points structure and other mechanisms. One suggestion is through reporting on commitments.

Finally, there is an urgent need to focus on fundraising and capitalize on the momentum we have built over the last couple of years.

ii. Review of draft of Strategic Plan and edits/comments by Steering Committee members

Discussion: The group then dived into a thorough review of the draft Strategic Plan. The full commentary is outlined in the attached google document. Below are some of the additional comments:

ADA noted that this paper should be self-explanatory in terms of what TAP is doing, what SDG16+ is, and how we plan to accelerate progress on this.

Overall, the strategic objectives might need to be simplified and harmonized the language.

SDG Kenya asked where the Network is in terms of membership numbers, who they are, etc. It was suggested that TAP create a ToR for its members and partners. John noted that TAP has already created a document similar to this through the member engagement structure document and on the website that we could link out to.

It was decided and agreed that we need to simplify the "How We Work" section.

The following reordering was suggested:
- Executive Summary
- About the TAP (And the language made snappier)
- Contextual Analysis (i.e. what we respond to)
- How we do our work

It was suggested that this strategic plan should refer to the previous strategic plan. It was suggested that this be limited to a couple sentences or one paragraph and then link out to the document itself.

The density of this document continues to be an issue for this document and must be lessened

b. Timeline, next steps and outreach related to finalization of Strategic Plan

Discussion: In terms of duration of the strategic plan, it was suggested by Accountability Lab that it may be better to stick to a three-year plan, as opposed to a four- to five-year plan, especially given the current global context. This would also allow future steering committees to engage in the creation of a new strategic plan.

3. **AOB**

Discussion: It was suggested that during tomorrow's discussion the group should plan to have a conversation about planning another in-person meeting for later in the year.

Follow-up:

- The TAP Secretariat to turn-around a new draft for tomorrow's meeting with the new structure and added/removed content.
- Tomorrow, the Steering Committee to review and potentially adopt the plan.