

Improving EURALO's engagement with ALS'es and independents

1) A couple years ago, EURALO started to implement a recommendation of ATLAS II (London, June 2014) on mapping the expertise available (but hidden) at the ALS's and harnessing it to the policy work of EURALO/ALAC. Each was approached individually, with personalized messages from Olivier, asking for names and contact information of people who were experts on any topics within ICANN's remit. Some ALS'es had to be reminded several times, but finally we had a fairly complete list.

The EURALO Independent's Association is in the process of a mapping expertise of its members.

Here's the link to the current version of the list:

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1QjrOsGLQCCuMYJhVaLIVtYw-ifDSeNX2BXGUtyayZNA/edit?ts=58a1d594#gid=809962045>

The list was updated last year, and it should now be to updated again. in fact, it should be updated on an annual basis.

The list has been useful on a number of occasions, when EURALO has contributed to public comments and other statements. Valuable grassroots inputs have been received from ALS experts. EURALO members should be aware of the list, keep it in mind and ask for contributions "from the field" when public comments/statements are being prepared.

In view of the GDPR, **the list is not public**. It is accessible only to EURALO members after log-in to the wiki.

EURLO has presented the mapping exercise as a good practice to other RALO's, and I think NARALO has followed our path.

2) The core interests of EURALO ALS's (and Independents) are diverse, and the scope of their Internet-related interests and activities is usually wider than the narrow remit defined by ICANN's mission. But this should not lead to dismissing them for being "out of scope". As pre-existing, established organizations, incorporated/registered according to

applicable local rules, they can be valuable elements in the multi-stakeholder structures on national/local level, eg. as co-organizers of national IGF's. In that role, they also carry the ICANN flag, and can benefit ICANN by spreading information about it to their local partners. We should encourage ALS'es to do that, and find out how we could help them. EURALO should ask for their regular feedback in order to understand, how ALS's tie their ICANN- and non-ICANN related interests together, what gaps we can fix, what information is missing, and what are the obstacles for the getting involved in the work. We also have to remember that EURALO ALS's exist in countries with different political systems, some of which are present a more difficult environment for their work than others.

3)) At the joint ALAC/GAC meeting in Montreal, under the AOB, there was an excellent suggestion from Ricardo that we should deepen the ALAC/GAC contacts and cooperation from global (and sometimes regional) level to national level. In some countries such contacts (eg., cooperation in preparing for important meetings) already exist, in some countries there may be high barriers to such interaction. Ricardo's suggestion was favorably received by Manal. Perhaps the first step before Cancun could be finding out, in which countries such interaction actually exists, what kind of forms it takes, and if not, what would be the main obstacles and how to overcome them. Here again, as in the case of mapping expertise at ALS'es, EURALO could take the lead and ask its ALS'es and independents for reports on the present state of national multistakeholder interaction and on its difficulties, as well as for suggestions on how to improve it.

In this context, we should keep in mind and leverage the work done by Dev in putting together the Stakeholder Analysis Tool so that other stakeholders, such as country code managers, will be included in the contacts and cooperation on the national level.