

# Registries Stakeholder Group Statement



## Public Comment: **DRAFT PTI and IANA FY22 Operating Plan and Budgets**

Date statement submitted: **30 November 2020**

Reference url:

<https://www.icann.org/public-comments/draft-pti-iana-fy22-budgets-2020-10-08-en>

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

Documents:

- **Draft PTI FY22 Operating Plan and Budget**  
<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/draft-pti-op-budget-fy22-08oct20-en.pdf>
- **Draft FY22 IANA Operating Plan and Budget (“IANA Budget”)**  
<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/draft-iana-op-budget-fy22-07oct20-en.pdf>

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

[FY21](#) , [FY20](#) , [FY19](#) , [FY18](#) .

---

## Registries Stakeholder Group comment

The Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG) welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Public Technical Identifiers (PTI) and IANA draft FY22 Operating Plans and Budgets. Since there is substantial overlap between the two documents, we have elected to make a single integrated comment.

### Overarching Points

- The FY22 budget is fiscally prudent in that it is forecast to be in line with the prior year (FY21) forecast. This prudence is welcomed by the RySG.
- The PTI budget as presented improves on the prior year by providing additional narrative detail and linkage to the strategic plan
- The format is a statement of the budget as planned and proposed. Community input and comment may be better facilitated or complemented 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.*

We note that this PTI Operating Plan and Budget is published following the September 2020 publication of the first ever PTI Strategic Plan. We welcomed the prior production of the PTI Strategic Plan and are pleased to review the PTI Operating Plan and Budget in this context.

The FY22 budget as presented represents a (US\$0.3m) small decrease on FY21 forecast and therefore appears to be fiscally prudent; this is generally welcomed by the RySG. That said, the FY21 IANA forecast of US\$10.6m represents a significant uplift on the FY20 actuals (US\$8.0m) so the apparent prudence of FY21 and 22 needs to be seen in that context. Further detailed explanation on the underspend in 2020 and why this will not follow through would be helpful. The major items are clearly staff and travel. In the light of the COVID-19 situation, the FY20 Actual underspend on travel is self-explanatory but the underspend on hiring is less obvious. The frame of reference for FY22 is almost entirely the FY21 forecast, whereas it would be useful to reference equally the “reality” of FY20 actuals, and therefore to ground the FY22 budget in both the FY21 forecast and the FY20 actuals.

The document as prepared provides helpful narrative context regarding the Operational Activities and System Enhancements and this is appreciated. But, as we indicated in our prior year comment, we would find it useful to have specific questions posed for our commentary response. Questions could be posed to anyone commenting or, at least, indications of the choices or compromises being made. As commenters, we are not familiar with the detail choices or compromises being made. Therefore, absent such information, it is challenging for a commenter to provide substantial or material input. We welcome the development of the previously published Strategic Plan and the opportunity we had to comment<sup>2</sup> on it at the time. More comprehensive, explicit linkage of the Operating Plan and Budget to the Strategic Plan will be a welcome development.

Fiscal prudence is only one key parameter and, should the IANA services require investment or critical investment decisions, 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.

Finally, given the overarching COVID-19 situation at present, a statement specifically dealing with this would be welcome. This could cover any additional risks or issues arising from the COVID-19 pandemic and the prospective variations in the budget arising from the pandemic. For example, what is the range of scenarios for the travel budget and is there adequate practical and financial coverage for key-signing activities?

---

*Registry Stakeholder Group (RySG) Comment - In the interest of time, we did not conduct a vote on these comments. We did discuss them on our mailing list and during a biweekly conference call, and no member opposed their submission.*

---

<sup>2</sup> RySG Comment on the Draft PTI FY21-24 Strategic Plan, 1 June 2020, [https://84e2b371-5c03-4c5c-8c68-63869282fa23.filesusr.com/ugd/ec8e4c\\_164c899843eb425e83f18ae3d6967214.pdf](https://84e2b371-5c03-4c5c-8c68-63869282fa23.filesusr.com/ugd/ec8e4c_164c899843eb425e83f18ae3d6967214.pdf)