

# Registries Stakeholder Group Statement



## Issue: **DRAFT PTI and IANA FY21 Operating Plan and Budgets**

Date statement submitted: **26 November 2019**

Reference url: <https://www.icann.org/public-comments/draft-pti-iana-fy21-op-budget-2019-10-14-en>

### Background<sup>1</sup>

The ICANN Community is invited to provide comments on the Draft FY21 Public Technical Identifiers (PTI) Operating Plan and Budget and the DRAFT FY21 IANA Operating Plan and Budget.

1) The **Draft FY21 PTI Services budget is \$10.0M**, which is an increase of \$0.1M to the FY20 Forecast.

<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/draft-pti-op-budget-fy21-14oct19-en.pdf>

2) The **Draft FY21 IANA Budget is \$10.6M, of which \$10.0M is for PTI Services and \$0.6M is for IANA Services** (not performed by PTI).

<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/draft-iana-op-budget-fy21-28sep18-en.pdf>

Previous RySG Comments on the PTI / IANA OPs and Budgets:

FY20 : [https://84e2b371-5c03-4c5c-8c68-63869282fa23.filesusr.com/ugd/ec8e4c\\_10289a4064aa43639b27e66b76dbbe2a.pdf](https://84e2b371-5c03-4c5c-8c68-63869282fa23.filesusr.com/ugd/ec8e4c_10289a4064aa43639b27e66b76dbbe2a.pdf)

FY19 : [https://84e2b371-5c03-4c5c-8c68-63869282fa23.filesusr.com/ugd/ec8e4c\\_6ca1c62dba7145088c3c33ec16498b3b.pdf](https://84e2b371-5c03-4c5c-8c68-63869282fa23.filesusr.com/ugd/ec8e4c_6ca1c62dba7145088c3c33ec16498b3b.pdf)

FY18 : [https://84e2b371-5c03-4c5c-8c68-63869282fa23.filesusr.com/ugd/ec8e4c\\_280f548e4a474bb88d45de8899f47202.pdf](https://84e2b371-5c03-4c5c-8c68-63869282fa23.filesusr.com/ugd/ec8e4c_280f548e4a474bb88d45de8899f47202.pdf)

---

### Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG) comment:

The Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG) welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Public Technical Identifiers (PTI) and IANA draft FY21 Operating Plans and Budgets.

#### Overarching Points

- The FY21 budget is fiscally prudent in that it is forecast to only marginally exceed the FY20 forecast. This is welcomed by the RySG.
- The budget as presented is lacking in underlying detail and any apparent linkage to a strategic plan and this makes it difficult to comment in substantial detail on any of the key areas of expenditure.
- The format is a statement of the budget as planned. Community input and comment may be better facilitated by the authors providing specific questions around key expenditure for community input and comment.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Background*: intended to give a brief context for the comment and to highlight what is most relevant for RO's in the subject document – it is not a summary of the subject document.

The FY21 budget as presented represents (US\$10.6m) a marginal increase on FY20 and therefore appears to be fiscally prudent; this is generally welcomed by the RySG. That said, the FY20 forecast of US\$10.5m represents a significant uplift on the FY19 actuals (US\$7.9m) so the apparent prudence of FY21 needs to be seen in that context. Further detailed explanation on the underspend in 2019 and why this cannot be retained would be helpful.

Review of the budget as presented presents a challenge to a third party seeking to comment. For example, Section 4 provides clear and useful descriptions of the activities carried out in various areas of work. But there are no questions posed to anyone commenting or indications of the choices or compromises being made. Absent such information, it is challenging for a commenter to provide substantial or material input. While the RySG is not be asked to approve the budget as such, if we were being asked to do so, we would find that difficult to do with this limited level of detail. The RySG appreciates that the PTI budget process necessitates that this budget is for a reasonably long time ahead and therefore it is challenging to provide some of the details. But, recognising the obvious constraints, alternatives to the current presentation should be considered. The development and socialisation of a longer term view - a strategic plan for the IANA services - and the linkage of such a plan to the budgets may help here.

Fiscal prudence is only one parameter and, should the IANA services require investment, the RySG would welcome the opportunity to understand and comment on what investment may be required. To this extent, the RySG welcomes interaction with the IANA staff and, potentially, a more interactive style of budget. For example, the budget as presented could offer more than one option for investment. Such an approach could offer two or even three options along the lines of a base budget, a development budget and an investment budget that the community could comment on. We anticipate that users of the IANA services may find such an approach particularly helpful in facilitating more detailed and interactive community comment and input.