

Registries Stakeholder Group Statement

Issue: **Draft PTI and IANA FY19 Operating Plans and Budgets**

Date statement submitted: **26 November , 2017**

Reference URL: <https://www.icann.org/public-comments/draft-pti-iana-fy19-2017-10-09-en>

Background

The PTI FY19 OP and Budget is published as a separate document to the IANA Budget.

- PTI OP & Budget: PTI activities for FY19
The draft FY19 PTI Services Budget is \$10.4 million, an increase of \$0.8 million from 9.6 million in FY18.
<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/draft-pti-fy19-op-budget-09oct17-en.pdf>
- IANA OP & Budget: IANA services performed by ICANN separate from PTI as IANA Functions Operator (\$0.5 million) and PTI Budget (\$10.4 million)
The draft FY19 IANA Budget is \$10.9 million, an increase of \$0.9 million from \$10.0 million in FY18.
<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/draft-fy19-iana-op-budget-09oct17-en.pdf>

RySG comment on the FY18 PTI 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 FY19 Operating Plans and Budgets.

The publication of the PTI and IANA Budgets as two separate documents is an improvement. The documents are more clear and transparent and richer in background information. We note that the PTI Budget is now situated within ICANN's strategic objectives, goals and portfolios, and that the document includes definitions of 'support functions' and 'direct costs' as well as the associated formula to calculate the PTI support function costs as was suggested by the RySG in its comment on the FY18 Budget.

The RySG can support the budgets as proposed. We take note of the USD 900 million increase, due to an incremental increase of existing costs, and trust that PTI and IANA continue to be prudent about the budget evolution.

There exists some concern within the RySG 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.'*

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