

Registries Stakeholder Group Statement

Issue: **Draft PTI and IANA FY20 Operating Plans and Budgets**

Date statement submitted: **12 November 2018**

Reference URL: <https://www.icann.org/public-comments/pti-iana-fy20-2018-09-28-en>

Background¹

- PTI OP & Budget: PTI activities for FY20
The draft FY19 PTI Services Budget is \$10 million, flat to the budget in FY18.
<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/draft-pti-op-budget-fy20-28sep18-en.pdf>
- IANA OP & Budget: IANA services performed by ICANN separate from PTI as IANA Functions Operator (\$0.7 million) and PTI Budget (\$10 million)
The draft FY20 IANA Budget is \$10.7 million, an increase of \$0.2 million from \$10.5 million in FY19.
<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/draft-iana-op-budget-fy20-28sep18-en.pdf>

“The draft FY20 IANA Budget is \$10.7 million, which is an increase of \$0.2 million from the \$10.5 million IANA Budget for FY19. The draft FY20 IANA Budget is comprised of \$10.0 million for PTI Services and \$0.7 million for IANA Services not performed by PTI. The PTI Services remained relatively flat to FY19 with an increase in Professional Services costs of \$0.4M, or 31.1%, for incremental Shared Services resources, most notably Language Services the Office of Technology. Administration, Travel & Meetings, and Capital costs all decreased due to lower rent, less Board meeting support, and fewer Key Management Facility improvements. The IANA Services component increased by \$0.2 million due to the incremental cost of ICANN’s support for the IANA Naming Function review, the Customer Standing Committee (CSC) Effectiveness review, and Root Zone Management caretaker role.”

RySG comment on FY19 budget:

https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/ec8e4c_6ca1c62dba7145088c3c33ec16498b3b.pdf

RySG comments on FY18 budget:

https://docs.wixstatic.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 FY20 Operating Plans and Budgets.

The RySG can support the budgets as proposed. We take note of the USD 0.2 million increase, and trust that PTI and IANA continue to be prudent about the budget evolution.

¹ *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 RySG would like to reiterate its concern about potential scenarios in which PTI would become separated from ICANN. We suggest that such a scenario is thought through as well as the appropriateness of a PTI Reserve Fund providing PTI with sufficient means to continue to perform its key functions independently during a limited time.

With regard to a possible PTI/ICANN Separation Process, the RySG would like to recall that:

*'In the case of a recommendation for any action [by the Separation Cross Community Working Group (SCWG)], ICANN is expected to cover all costs i.e. costs related to the then transition, costs related to the possible selection of a new IFO and the ongoing operating costs of the successor operator. Moreover, in bearing such costs, it is to be required of ICANN that it does not raise fees from TLD operators (registries, registrars and, indirectly, for registrants) in order to do so.'*²

The RySG considers a PTI/ICANN Separation Process to be a Consequential Event for which the ICANN Reserve Fund is expected to provide the appropriate level of support.

² CWG IANA Transition Report, Annex L,
<https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=53779816>)