

**TAP Network Statement to informal consultations on HLPF follow-up and review “revised” draft – 25 May, 2016**

Thank you co-chairs for the opportunity to intervene in these very important discussions.

Two HLPFs in 2019 and every four years after. We frequently talk about the “strain” of an overloaded HLPF agenda and not having enough time to undertake national reviews, thematic reviews, review outcomes of conferences, and so much more – so taking a full ECOSOC HLPF session out of the mix will only add further strain to the agenda of the HLPF going forward, and will indeed weaken the HLPF on the whole. We would agree though that only one negotiated outcome is adopted in 2019 and in subsequent years.

We are a bit discouraged that the language from Paragraph 8 of the zero draft encouraging Member States to report twice to the HLPF has been removed. We support the call from many Member States to bring this language back, and to include “at least” two reviews. If the HLPF is meant to provide a robust platform for partnerships as stated in 67/290, reporting as frequently as possible should be encouraged.

We strongly support the language in paragraph 12 on innovative arrangements for engaging with stakeholders – however we note that any language around “stakeholders” or “MGoS” is missing here, so the paragraph as it stands is not explicit enough. We also note that the language extracted from the first half of this paragraph has been removed in this draft, and we’d ask for it to be re-included here, including the full text from paragraph 14 of 67/290 which this language was based on, which makes reference to the HLPF’s role to “promote transparency and enhance the participation of MGoS”. This commitment to “enhance” participation of MGoS has been referenced in the Rio+20 outcome document, 67/290 and now 70/1, and including this language will ensure that Member States are still striving to enhance participation yet again. We understand the request of some Member States to be more “specific” around what these “innovative” arrangements might entail – however, we prefer to keep this language flexible as it is, as surely what we consider “innovative” 3-4-5 years down the road will hopefully be far different than what we consider it to be now, particularly given the commitment to “enhance” stakeholder participation.

We have concrete language recommendations for all of these positions and others, and we look forward to working with you all on this going forward.