



Final Report
NZRS Customer Satisfaction Survey

25 February 2010

Confidential

Final Report
NZRS Customer Satisfaction Survey

PREPARED FOR Jay Daley
New Zealand Registry Service

PREPARED BY Liam Hickey
Mark Johnson

CONTACT DETAILS Mark Johnson
Research New Zealand
Phone 04 499 3088
www.researchnz.com

PROJECT NUMBER #4002

Contents

Contents	3
Index of tables	4
1.0 Executive Summary	6
2.0 Introduction	11
2.1 Methodology	12
3.0 Main findings	13
3.1 Shared Registry Service System performance and reliability	13
3.1.1 Production SRS response time	13
3.1.2 Production SRS availability	14
3.1.3 Problems experienced and areas to improve with the Production SRS	16
3.1.4 Overall satisfaction with the Production SRS	17
3.2 Shared Registry Service System current features	18
3.2.1 Gap analysis of current features	18
3.2.2 Awareness and usage of current features	19
3.2.3 Satisfaction with current features among users	20
3.2.4 Importance of current features – non-users compared with users	21
3.3 Shared Registry Service System features under development	22
3.3.1 Awareness, usage intentions and importance for features under development	22
3.3.2 Annual project programme	24
3.4 Invoices	25
3.5 Communication and support	26
3.5.1 Information published by NZRS	29
3.5.2 NZ Registry Services Web Site	31
3.5.3 Status updates and website feedback	33
3.6 Overall satisfaction with NZRS and areas to improve	35
3.6.1 Overall satisfaction	35
3.6.2 Areas to improve	37
4.0 Demographics	38

Index of tables

Table 1: Gap Analysis summary table.....	10
Table 2: Margins of Error at the 95 percent confidence level assuming a population of N=200	12
Table 3: Gap Analysis of Production SRS Response Time	13
Table 4: Rating of Production SRS response time.....	14
Table 5: Importance of Production SRS response time.....	14
Table 6: Gap Analysis of Production SRS availability.....	15
Table 7: Rating of Production SRS availability.....	15
Table 8: Importance of Production SRS availability.....	15
Table 9: Frequency experiencing technical problems.....	16
Table 10: Time to resolve problems	16
Table 11: Overall satisfaction with the Production SRS.....	17
Table 12: Gap Analysis of Current SRS features ¹	18
Table 13: Awareness and usage of current features (n=47*)	19
Table 14: Satisfaction with current features among users	20
Table 15: Importance of each feature (users compared with non-users)	21
Table 16: Awareness and usage intentions for features under development (n=47*).....	22
Table 17: Importance of features under development	23
Table 18: Suggestions for additional SRS features	23
Table 19: Awareness of annual project programme	24
Table 20: Preference for finding out about developments	24
Table 21: Accuracy of invoices.....	25
Table 22: Satisfaction with invoice layout.....	25
Table 23: Main method of contacting NZRS	26
Table 24: Satisfaction with the speed of responses back from NZRS.....	27
Table 25: Importance of speed of response from NZRS.....	27
Table 26: Importance of speed of response from NZRS.....	27
Table 27: Overall satisfaction with communications with NZRS	28
Table 28: Uptake of possible services by registrars.....	28
Table 29: Accuracy of information published by NZRS.....	29
Table 30: Monthly .nz newsletter.....	29
Table 31: Informativeness of .nz newsletter.....	30
Table 32: Suggestions for improvements to the .nz newsletter	30
Table 33: Visiting NZRS website.....	31
Table 34: Awareness and usage of website features – excluding those who never visit the website (n=55*)	32
Table 35: Awareness and usage of website features – including those who never visit the website (n=77).....	32
Table 36: Gap analysis of website status updates.....	33
Table 37: Satisfaction with status updates on the website	33
Table 38: Importance of status updates on the website.....	34
Table 39: Feedback on the NZRS Website.....	34

Table 40: Overall satisfaction with NZRS.....	35
Table 41: How NZRS compares with other registries	35
Table 42: Best aspects of NZRS's service	36
Table 43: Areas for NZRS to improve	37
Table 44: Consent to provide answers back to NZRS	38
Table 45: Role of individual	38
Table 46: Main service and other services provided by organisation	39

1.0 Executive Summary

Key findings

This report presents the findings of the fifth monitor of registrars' satisfaction with the service provided by New Zealand Registry Service (NZRS). This executive summary presents key findings from this year's monitor in relation to NZRS's new strategic aims.

NZRS's stated strategic aims are to:

1. To improve communications with registrars.
2. To increase the security reliability and performance of the SRS and DNS.
3. To document SRS better, make it easier to use and inform registrars of its functionality better.
4. To overhaul the SRS to make it easier and faster to implement changes, and to implement EPP, DNSSEC, IDN.

Given that these aims are new, this year's monitor should be viewed as a benchmark or starting point against which to compare future years' results.

Overall, registrars remain very satisfied in their dealings with NZRS (mean overall satisfaction rating of 4.53 out five, compared with 4.61 in 2007 and 4.41 in 2005). Positively, most also think that NZRS is better or much better than other registries they deal with (mean of 4.23 out of five). Evidence to evaluate each strategic aim is presented below.

Aim 1: To improve communications with registrars

- ◆ Almost all respondents remain *satisfied* or *very satisfied* overall with the communication they have with NZRS (mean satisfaction of 4.39 out of five, compared with 4.46 in 2007).
- ◆ Respondents indicated that the *speed of response back from NZRS when they have a query or problem* is one of the most important aspects of service that NZRS provides (mean importance of 4.55 out of five). There is also some small room for improvement, based on the fact that the satisfaction rating for this aspect is slightly lower (mean of 4.49 out of five).
- ◆ Email remains the method of communication preferred by almost all respondents (92 percent use this as the main method).
- ◆ Only small groups of respondents indicated that they would attend events such as a one day conference held in Wellington (31 percent would attend), an informal lunch in their own city (30 percent), or a one day conference in their city (26 percent).

- ◆ Just 30 percent are aware that NZRS has an annual project programme, indicating room for improvement.
 - ◆ Most would prefer to be consulted about the contents of the plan through a survey (47 percent), by commenting on plans published in advance (40 percent), or through the Registrar Advisory Group (also 40 percent). Note that they could select more than one option.
- ◆ Just one respondent said that they found that the information NZRS publishes was not accurate (90 percent said it was accurate, and nine percent said they did not know).
- ◆ The proportion receiving the .nz monthly newsletter has not changed since 2007 (in this year's survey, 57 percent said they received it), though this could be due in part to a wider sampling frame.
 - ◆ Those who receive it generally find it to be *somewhat* or *very informative* (mean score of 4.38 out of five).
- ◆ Very few respondents are making regular visits to the NZRS website, with 45 percent visiting only occasionally, and 27 percent never.

Aim 2: To increase the security, reliability and performance of the SRS and DNS

- ◆ Overall satisfaction with the Production SRS remain very high (mean of 4.70 out of five, compared with 4.80 in 2007).
- ◆ Respondents rated the response time of the SRS as *good* or *very good* (mean of 4.57 out of five).
 - ◆ They also generally said the response time was *important* or *very important* (mean of 4.33 out of five).
- ◆ Respondents rated the system uptime or availability of the Production SRS very highly (mean of 4.65 out of five).
 - ◆ This aspect was also viewed as *important* or *very important* (mean of 4.43 out of five).
- ◆ More than half (55 percent) of respondents say they never experience technical problems with the Production SRS.

Aim 3: To document SRS better, make it easier to use and inform registrars of its functionality better

- ◆ At least two-thirds of respondents are aware of each of the current features of the Production SRS.

- ◆ While usage of some features (such as *IPv6 Glue records* and *IPv6 DNS and WHOIS service*) is currently low, more than half of respondents indicated that they intend to use these features in the future.
- ◆ Where they were currently being used, satisfaction with current features was generally very high (i.e. mean satisfaction at least 4.32 out of five for most features), with the exception of the *SRS Web UI* (mean satisfaction of 3.50 out of five).
- ◆ Only the *Registrar FAQs* are used by more than half of those who visit the website, while other features (such as the *Detailed statistics*, *Transfer activity*, *Lists of domains to be released*, and *Error messages*) are only used by between 33 percent and 44 percent of website visitors (note that this is even less when those who never visit the website are taken into account).
- ◆ However, most website users are *satisfied* or *very satisfied* with status updates provided (mean satisfaction rating of 4.17 out of five).

Aim 4: To overhaul the SRS to make it easier and faster to implement changes & To implement EPP, DNSSEC, IDN

- ◆ Awareness of features under development varied, with 47 percent aware of *EPP*, 62 percent aware of *DNSSEC*, and 74 percent aware of *IDN*.
- ◆ All three of these features are not seen as particularly important at this stage; mean importance ratings for these features sit close to the midpoint (i.e. they are generally seen as *neither important nor unimportant*).
- ◆ Despite this, many respondents are planning to use these features in the future or are already using them with another registry:
 - ◆ EPP – 19 percent planning to use and 21 percent already using with another registry.
 - ◆ DNSSEC – 62 percent planning to use but zero percent currently using with other registries.
 - ◆ IDN – 45 percent planning to use and 15 percent already using with another registry.

Gap analysis summary

Gap analysis results

Table 1 (overleaf) summarises the results for all the gap analyses found in the report. Positively for NZRS, seven out of the nine aspects of service have negative gaps (meaning that satisfaction is rated higher than importance), and should therefore be lower priorities for investment or effort.

Two aspects of service had positive gaps, and these should therefore be the focus for investment and effort:

- ◆ Ranked 1st: *SRS Client (command line tool in the RIK)* (mean satisfaction of 4.32 and mean importance of 4.45).
- ◆ Ranked 2nd: *Speed of response back from NZRS when you contact them* (mean satisfaction of 4.49 and mean importance of 4.58).

Interpreting gap analysis tables

For each feature below, respondents were asked how satisfied they were, and how important the feature was to them or their organisation. Each feature or aspect of service has been ranked, based on the size and direction of the gap between these satisfaction and importance scores.

Those features where importance is rated higher than satisfaction (i.e. a positive gap) are ranked highest; those features where satisfaction is rated higher than importance (i.e. a negative gap) are ranked lowest. Effort/resources/investment should be directed at those aspects with the highest rank.

When making decisions for each aspect, consideration should also be given to the base size (i.e. the number of respondents affected) and the importance/satisfaction scores relative to the other aspects. For example, the *SRS Web UI* is ranked 3rd. However, only six respondents said they used this aspect, and the importance was rated as relatively low by those who used it (mean importance of 3.33 out of five and the next lowest was *Website status updates* with a mean of 3.98).

Table 1: Gap Analysis summary table

		Mean satisfaction/ quality rating	Mean importance	Gap	Priority rank
Response time of the Production SRS	Base =	46*	46*		
	Mean	4.57	4.33	- 0.239	6
	St. Dev.	.620	.668		
System uptime of the Production SRS	Base =	46*	46*		
	Mean	4.65	4.43	- 0.217	5
	St. Dev.	.604	.583		
IPv6 Glue records	Base =	7* **	7*		
	Mean	4.57	4.00	- 0.571	7
	St. Dev.	0.535	0.816		
IPv6 DNS and WHOIS service	Base =	6* **	6*		
	Mean	4.83	4.17	- 0.667	8
	St. Dev.	0.408	0.753		
SRS Web UI	Base =	6* **	6*		
	Mean	3.50	3.33	- 0.167	3
	St. Dev.	1.378	1.211		
SRS Client (command line tool in the RIK)	Base =	22*	22*		
	Mean	4.32	4.45	0.136	1
	St. Dev.	0.894	1.101		
Monthly updates and upgrades	Base =	12*	12*		
	Mean	4.75	3.83	- 0.917	9
	St. Dev.	0.866	1.193		
Speed of response back from NZRS	Base =	72*	72*		
	Mean	4.49	4.58	0.097	2
	St. Dev.	0.731	0.575		
Website status updates	Base =	52*	52*		
	Mean	4.17	3.98	- 0.192	4
	St. Dev.	0.585	0.930		

Note that a positive gap indicates an area in need of improvement. *Sub-samples based on those who provided a one to five rating for both satisfaction and importance scores in each question.

2.0 Introduction

Research New Zealand has been commissioned by the New Zealand Registry Service (NZRS) to conduct a survey to measure satisfaction among its customers. This is the fifth iteration of the survey, with other measures occurring in 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2007.

NZRS is responsible for maintaining the registry of New Zealand Internet domain names, i.e. names that end in '.nz', and authorising other organisations to register these Internet domain names. These organisations are known as Registrars and can be described as comprising NZRS' customer base.

The services NZRS provides allow Registrars to: connect to the Shared Registry System (SRS); test their interaction with the SRS; receive updates, upgrades, and technical help; engage in communications; and pay NZRS for the services it provides.

Against this background, the research objectives of the NZRS customer satisfaction survey are to:

- ◆ Identify the perceptions of NZRS among its customer base.
- ◆ Identify the perceptions of the services it provides to its customer base.
- ◆ Evaluate the on-going success of NZRS in delivery to its customers' service needs.

The information this survey provides will be used by NZRS to assist in measuring how well it is achieving its strategic objectives, namely:

- ◆ To improve communications with registrars.
- ◆ To increase the security, reliability and performance of the SRS and DNS.
- ◆ To document SRS better, make it easier to use, and inform registrars of its functionality better.
- ◆ To overhaul the SRS to make it easier and faster to implement changes, and to implement EPP, DNSSEC, IDN.

2.1 Methodology

As with previous monitors, the survey was undertaken via the Internet.

A total of N=121 contacts from Registrar organisations were initially sent an e-mail from Research New Zealand on 28 October 2009 inviting them to take part in the survey. This e-mail contained unique logins, passwords, a link to the survey web page, and directions on how to complete the survey. For the first time this year, it also asked recipients to forward the email on to other people within their organisation who have regular contact with NZRS.

Email reminders were sent on 4 and 11 November (to those Respondents yet to complete the survey).

To further boost responses, those that completed the survey were eligible to win one of three prizes (an Apple iPhone 32GB, or one of two Apple iPod Touches). The final day of surveying was 13 November 2009.

Respondents and participating registrars

By the close off date, n=77 respondents had completed the survey. This equates to a raw response rate of 64 percent (not taking into account those who were forwarded the email).

The n=77 respondents represent 53 (or 75 percent) of the 71 registrars in the original sample. Table 2, below, shows a range of margins of error for the total sample and the main sub-sample of technical/helpdesk respondents at the 95 percent confidence level.

This means that for example, should 50 percent of respondents to the survey report that the response time of the Production SRS is very important to their company, we are 95 percent confident that the true figure among the total population of N=200 is between 41.2% and 58.8%.

Table 2: Margins of Error at the 95 percent confidence level assuming a population of N=200

Proportional response	Total sample n=77	Technical Support Sub-sample n=47
50%	8.8%	12.5%
60% or 40%	8.6%	12.2%
70% or 30%	8.0%	11.5%
80% or 20%	7.0%	10.0%
90% or 10%	5.3%	7.5%

3.0 Main findings

3.1 Shared Registry Service System performance and reliability

3.1.1 Production SRS response time

Table 3 shows the gap between the importance ratings of the SRS response time and the ratings of its quality¹. The small negative gap (-0.239) indicates that satisfaction is higher than importance, and that therefore, improvement to the response time of the Production SRS is not needed.

Almost all those who work in technical support/helpdesk rate the response time of the Production SRS as good (30 percent) or very good (62 percent) (Table 4). Similarly, most users rate the response time as important (45 percent) or very important (also 45 percent) (Table 5).

The mean rating of the response time is slightly lower than the rating given in 2007 (4.57 compared with 4.72 out of five in 2007), though this difference is not statistically significant (also Table 4).

Table 3: Gap Analysis of Production SRS Response Time

		Mean satisfaction/ quality rating	Mean importance	Gap
Q4/Q5. In the last six months, how would you rate the response time of the Production SRS? And how important to you or your company is the response time of the Production SRS?	Base =	46*	46*	
	Mean	4.57	4.33	-.239
	St. Dev.	.620	.668	

Note that a positive gap indicates an area in need of improvement. *Sub-sample based on those who work in Technical Support or Helpdesk.

¹ Note that a positive gap indicates an area in need of improvement.

Table 4: Rating of Production SRS response time

Q4. In the last six months, how would you rate the response time of the Production SRS?

	Dec 2003 Sub sample Base =	June 2004 Sub sample	April 2005 Sub sample	Nov 2007 Sub sample	Nov 2009 Sub sample
	22* ** %	26* ** %	25* ** %	27* ** %	47* %
Very poor	0	0	0	0	0
Poor	5	0	0	0	0
Fair	18	12	4	0	6
Good	41	31	36	26	30
Very good	23	50	60	67	62
Don't know	14	8	0	7	2
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Mean (out of 5)	3.87	4.42	4.56	4.72	4.57
Std. Deviation	0.915	0.672	0.583	0.458	0.620

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding. *Sub-sample based on those who work in Technical Support or Helpdesk.

**Caution: low base number of respondents – results are indicative only.

Table 5: Importance of Production SRS response time

Q5. And how important to you or your company is the response time of the Production SRS?

	Total 47* %
Neither important nor unimportant	11
Important	45
Very important	45
Total	100
Mean (out of 5)	4.34
Std. Deviation	0.668

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding. *Sub-sample based on those who work in Technical Support or Helpdesk.

3.1.2 Production SRS availability

As was found for the response time, there was a small negative gap between the mean importance rating for the SRS availability and the satisfaction rating (i.e. users gave a quality rating of 4.65 out of five and rated the importance slightly lower at 4.43 out of five). Again, this small negative gap indicates that action is not needed to improve the availability of the Production SRS (Table 6).

Almost all users rated the availability as good (28 percent) or very good (68 percent). Similarly, almost all rated the availability of the Production SRS as important (47 percent) or very important (49 percent) (shown in Table 7 and Table 8).

The availability rating is almost unchanged from 2007 (4.65 compared with 4.68 out of five in 2007).

Table 6: Gap Analysis of Production SRS availability

Q6/Q7. Thinking about these [unscheduled outages] in the past six months, how would you rate the availability or system uptime of the Production SRS? And how important to you or your company is the availability or system uptime of the Production SRS?

	Base =	Mean satisfaction/ quality rating	Mean importance	Gap
Availability or system uptime of the Production SRS	46*	4.65	4.43	-0.217
	St. Dev.	.604	.583	

Note that a positive gap indicates an area in need of improvement. *Sub-sample based on those who work in Technical Support or Helpdesk.

Table 7: Rating of Production SRS availability

Q6. Thinking about these [unscheduled outages] in the past six months, how would you rate the availability or system uptime of the Production SRS?

	Dec 2003 Sub sample	June 2004 Sub sample	April 2005 Sub sample	Nov 2007 Sub sample	Nov 2009 Sub sample
Base =	22* **	26* **	25* **	27* **	47*
	%	%	%	%	%
Very poor	0	0	0	0	0
Poor	10	0	0	0	2
Fair	24	15	4	0	0
Good	24	42	44	30	28
Very good	43	42	48	63	68
Don't know	0	0	4	7	2
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Mean (out of 5)	3.88	4.25	4.46	4.68	4.65
Std. Deviation	1.054	0.732	0.588	0.476	0.604

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding. *Sub-sample based on those who work in Technical Support or Helpdesk.

**Caution: low base number of respondents – results are indicative only.

Table 8: Importance of Production SRS availability

Q7. And how important to you or your company is the availability or system uptime of the Production SRS?

	Base =	Total
		47*
		%
Neither important nor unimportant		4
Important		47
Very important		49
Total		100
Mean (out of 5)		4.45
Std. Deviation		0.583

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding. *Sub-sample based on those who work in Technical Support or Helpdesk.

3.1.3 Problems experienced and areas to improve with the Production SRS

As with 2007, more than half (55 percent) of users said that they never experience technical problems with the Production SRS system. Of the n=21 that said they had experienced a problem at some stage, 12 gave an example of the type of problem they had run into.

For 16 out of these n=21 users, the problem they experienced was resolved as quickly as they would expect (Table 10).

More than half of the users (55 percent) said that no improvements could be made to the Production SRS.

Table 9: Frequency experiencing technical problems

Q8 In the past six months, approximately how often have you experienced technical problems with the Production SRS System?

	Dec 2003 Sub sample Base = 22* ** %	June 2004 Sub sample 26* ** %	April 2005 Sub sample 25* ** %	Nov 2007 Sub sample 27* ** %	Nov 2009 Sub sample 47* %
Never	36	35	44	52	55
Every day	0	0	0	0	0
Every week	0	0	0	0	0
Every two weeks	5	4	0	0	0
Every month	9	4	4	4	2
Less frequently than every month	45	50	52	41	36
Don't know	5	8	0	4	6
Total	100	100	100	100	100

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding. *Sub-sample based on those who work in Technical Support or Helpdesk.

**Caution: low base number of respondents – results are indicative only.

Table 10: Time to resolve problems

Q10. Were these resolved as quickly as you would expect?

	Dec 2003 Sub sample Base = 19* ** %	June 2004 Sub sample 21* ** %	April 2005 Sub sample 14* ** %	Nov 2007 Sub sample 12* ** %	Nov 2009 Sub sample 18* ** %
Yes	56	71	93	92	89
No	17	0	0	0	0
Don't know	28	29	7	8	11
Total	100	100	100	100	100

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding. *Sub-sample based on those who work in Technical Support or Helpdesk and experienced problems with the Production SRS.

**Caution: low base number of respondents – results are indicative only.

3.1.4 Overall satisfaction with the Production SRS

Almost all users were satisfied (21 percent) or very satisfied (74 percent) overall with the Production SRS (Table 11). Note that this year the mean satisfaction was 4.70 (out of five), which is slightly lower than in 2007 (though this difference is not statistically significant).

Table 11: Overall satisfaction with the Production SRS

Q12. And overall, in the past six months, how satisfied are you with the Production SRS?

	Dec 2003	June 2004	April 2005	Nov 2007	Nov 2009
	Sub sample	Sub sample	Sub sample	Sub sample	Sub sample
Base =	22*	26*	25*	27*	47*
	%	%	%	%	%
Very dissatisfied	5	0	0	0	0
Dissatisfied	5	0	0	0	0
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	9	0	0	4	4
Satisfied	41	39	28	12	21
Very satisfied	32	58	72	81	74
Don't know	9	4	0	4	0
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Mean (out of 5)	3.88	4.54	4.72	4.80	4.70
Std. Deviation	1.147	0.505	0.458	0.500	0.548

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding. *Sub-sample based on those who work in Technical Support or Helpdesk.

3.2 Shared Registry Service System current features

3.2.1 Gap analysis of current features

For four out of five current SRS features, there was a negative gap (meaning that satisfaction with the feature was higher than its importance). These four features (ranked 2-5 below) are therefore a low-priority for effort. The exception was the *SRS Client (command line tool in the RIK)*, which had an importance rating of 4.45 (this was the highest importance rating for users of the features), but a satisfaction rating of 4.32 (this was the second lowest satisfaction rating).

Note that the gaps below were analysed using paired samples t-tests, and no significant differences were found at the 95 percent confidence level.

Table 12: Gap Analysis of Current SRS features¹

		Mean satisfaction/ quality rating	Mean importance	Gap	Priority rank
IPv6 Glue records	Base =	7* **	7*		
	Mean	4.57	4.00	-0.571	3
	St. Dev.	0.535	0.816		
IPv6 DNS and WHOIS service	Base =	6* **	6*		
	Mean	4.83	4.17	-0.667	4
	St. Dev.	0.408	0.753		
SRS Web UI	Base =	6* **	6*		
	Mean	3.50	3.33	-0.167	2
	St. Dev.	1.378	1.211		
SRS Client (command line tool in the RIK)	Base =	22*	22*		
	Mean	4.32	4.45	0.136	1
	St. Dev.	0.894	1.101		
Monthly updates and upgrades	Base =	12*	12*		
	Mean	4.75	3.83	-0.917	5
	St. Dev.	0.866	1.193		

Note that a positive gap indicates an area in need of improvement.

*Sub-sample based on those who work in Technical Support or Helpdesk who used each feature.

¹ Note that the importance ratings given in the gap analysis tables are from users of each feature only, and will therefore differ from the importance ratings given by all users and non-users shown in subsequent tables. If a respondent was not a user of the feature, their importance rating did not contribute to the gap analysis.

3.2.2 Awareness and usage of current features

At least two-thirds of users were aware of each current feature, with awareness highest for the SRS Client (83 percent aware), and lowest for the SRS Web UI (66 percent aware). Similarly, usage was highest for the SRS Client (49 percent were currently using), and lowest for the SRS Web UI (13 percent currently using), the IPv6 DNZ and WHOIS service (also 13 percent currently using), and the IPv6 Glue records (15 percent currently using).

However, more than half said they planned to use the IPv6 Glue records (53 percent) or the IPv6 DNS and WHOIS service (55 percent) in the future.

Table 13: Awareness and usage of current features (n=47*)

Q13/14. For the following current features please indicate your awareness and level of use.

	Aware	Not Aware	Total	Not using or planning to use	Planning to use in future	Currently using	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
IPv6 Glue records	77	23	100	32	53	15	100
IPv6 DNS and WHOIS service	72	28	100	32	55	13	100
SRS Web UI	66	34	100	64	23	13	100
SRS Client (command line tool in the RIK)	83	17	100	40	11	49	100
Monthly updates and upgrades	77	23	100	30	43	28	100

*Sub-sample based on those who work in Technical Support or Helpdesk.

3.2.3 Satisfaction with current features among users

Those currently using each service were asked to rate their satisfaction. Table 14 shows that all services are rated highly (i.e. averages of 4.32 out of five or higher), with the exception of the SRS Web UI (mean of 3.50 out of five).

Note that due to small base numbers rating each service, results should be viewed as indicative only.

Table 14: Satisfaction with current features among users

Q15. For each of the services you are currently using, please indicate how satisfied you are.

			Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Don't know	Total
			%	%	%	%	%	%	%
IPv6 Glue records	Base =	7* **							
	Mean	4.57	0	0	0	43	57	0	100
	Std. Dev.	.535							
IPv6 DNS and WHOIS service	Base =	6* **							
	Mean	4.83	0	0	0	17	83	0	100
	Std. Dev.	.408							
SRS Web UI	Base =	6* **							
	Mean	3.50	0	33	17	17	33	0	100
	Std. Dev.	1.378							
SRS Client (command line tool in the RIK)	Base =	22*							
	Mean	4.32	0	4	13	26	52	4	100
	Std. Dev.	.894							
Monthly updates and upgrades	Base =	12*							
	Mean	4.75	0	8	0	0	85	8	100
	Std. Dev.	.866							

*Sub-sample based on those who work in Technical Support or Helpdesk who used each feature, and who gave a rating of between one and five.

**Caution: low base number of respondents – results are indicative only.

3.2.4 Importance of current features – non-users compared with users

Table 15 shows the mean importance rating given to each feature, split by ratings given by users and non-users. In general users gave higher importance ratings for each feature than non-users.

The only significant difference between users and non users was for the SRS Client; users gave a mean importance rating of 4.45 out of five, while non-users only rated it as 1.94 out of five.

Table 15: Importance of each feature (users compared with non-users)

Q16. For each of the features you are aware of, please indicate how important they are to you or your company.

		Total Mean	Users Mean	Non-users Mean	Total						
					Not at all important %	Not important %	Neither %	Important %	Very important %	Don't know %	Total %
IPv6 Glue records	Base = Mean Std. Dev.	32* 3.28 1.442	7* ** 4.00 0.816	25* 3.08 1.525	11	22	11	19	25	11	100
IPv6 DNS and WHOIS service	Base = Mean Std. Dev.	31* 3.45 1.338	6* ** 4.17 0.753	25* 3.28 1.400	6	24	12	24	26	9	100
SRS Web UI	Base = Mean Std. Dev.	29* 2.31 1.137	6* ** 3.33 1.211	23* 2.04 0.976	26	32	19	13	3	6	100
SRS Client (command line tool in the RIK)	Base = Mean Std. Dev.	38* 3.39 1.653	22* 4.45 1.101	16* 1.94 1.063	21	15	8	13	41	3	100
Monthly updates and upgrades	Base = Mean Std. Dev.	33* 3.39 1.171	12* 3.83 1.193	21* 3.14 1.108	6	14	31	22	19	8	100

*Sub-samples based on those who work in Technical Support or Helpdesk who were aware of each feature, and who gave a rating between one and five.

**Caution: low base number of respondents – results are indicative only.

3.3 Shared Registry Service System features under development

3.3.1 Awareness, usage intentions and importance for features under development

Almost three-quarters are aware of Internationalised Domain Names, while 62 percent are aware of DNSSEC and 47 percent are aware of the Extensible Provisioning Protocol (Table 16). One in five were already using Extensible Provisioning Protocol with another registry, and 15 percent were already using Internationalised Domain Names. Sixty-two percent indicated that they would use DNSSEC in the future.

Table 17 (overleaf) shows that respondents gave similar importance ratings for each feature under development, with mean importance ratings sitting close to the midpoint at between 3.07 and 3.18 out of five (i.e. respondents generally perceive the features under development as neither important nor unimportant).

Half said that there were no other features that they thought should be included in the SRS (Table 18, page 23).

Table 16: Awareness and usage intentions for features under development (n=47*)

Q17. For each of the following features under development please indicate your awareness and usage intentions.

	Aware	Not Aware	Total	Not using or planning to use	Planning to use in future	Currently using (with another registry)	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
EPP (Extensible Provisioning Protocol)	47	53	100	60	19	21	100
DNSSEC	62	38	100	38	62	0	100
IDN (Internationalised Domain Names)	74	26	100	40	45	15	100

*Sub-sample based on those who work in Technical Support or Helpdesk

Table 17: Importance of features under development

Q18. For each of the following features under development please indicate how important they are to you or your company.

		Mean (out of 5)	Not at all important %	Not important %	Neither %	Important %	Very important %	Don't know %	Total %
EPP (Extensible Provisioning Protocol)	Base = Mean Std. Dev.	22* 3.14 1.670	32	0	23	14	32	0	100
DNSSEC	Base = Mean Std. Dev.	28* 3.07 1.184	7	28	28	21	14	3	100
IDN (Internationalised Domain Names)	Base = Mean Std. Dev.	34* 3.18 1.359	9	31	14	20	23	3	100

*Sub-sample based on those who work in Technical Support or Helpdesk who were aware of each feature.

**Caution: low base number of respondents – results are indicative only.

Table 18: Suggestions for additional SRS features

Q19. Are there any additional features that you believe should be included in the SRS?

	Total
Base =	47*
	%
At least one suggestion	19
None	49
Don't know	32
Total	100

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding. *Sub-sample based on those who work in Technical Support or Helpdesk.

3.3.2 Annual project programme

Just 30 percent were aware of NZRS’s annual project programme (Table 19). The preferred methods for consulting over what developments go ahead is through a survey (47 percent said this was one of their preferred methods), through plans published in advance with the opportunity to comment (40 percent) and through the Registrar Advisory Group (also 40 percent).

Table 19: Awareness of annual project programme

Q20. Were you aware that NZRS now has an annual project programme that lists all planned developments, which is published in the newsletter?

	Total
Base =	47* %
Yes	30
No	70
Total	100

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding. *Sub-sample based on those who work in Technical Support or Helpdesk.

Table 20: Preference for finding out about developments

Q21. How would you best like to be consulted over what developments should be included in the plan?

	Total
Base =	47* %
Through a survey like this	47
Plans published in advance for me to comment on	40
Through the Registrar Advisory Group	40
I will just email NZRS with my suggestions	28
A group event	13
Just get on with it	11
A visit from NZRS staff to discuss my views	4
I would not like to be consulted	4

Total may exceed 100% because of multiple response. *Sub-sample based on those who work in Technical Support or Helpdesk.

3.4 Invoices

Of those who deal with accounts, 69 percent (or 11 out of 16) found their invoices from NZRS to be accurate. This compares with 55 percent in 2007 and 79 percent in 2005. Satisfaction with the invoice layout continues to be high, with a mean rating of 4.07 out of five (or 'easy to understand').

Table 21: Accuracy of invoices

Q25. When receiving invoices from NZRS, do you find these are accurate?

	Dec 2003	June 2004	April 2005	Nov 2007	Nov 2009
	Sub sample	Sub sample	Sub sample	Sub sample	Sub sample
Base =	12* **	15* **	24* **	20* **	16* **
	%	%	%	%	%
Yes	67	93	79	55	69
No	8	0	4	5	0
Do not check for accuracy [^]	17	7	13	35	-
Don't know	8	0	4	5	31
Total	100	100	100	100	100

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding. *Sub-sample based on those who work in invoicing or billing.

**Caution: low base number of respondents – results are indicative only.

[^]Do not check for accuracy was removed as a category in 2009.

Table 22: Satisfaction with invoice layout

Q26. Would you say the format or 'layout' of the invoices is...

	Dec 2003	June 2004	April 2005	Nov 2007	Nov 2009
	Sub sample	Sub sample	Sub sample	Sub sample	Sub sample
Base =	12* **	15* **	24* **	20* **	16* **
	%	%	%	%	%
Very hard to understand	0	0	0	0	0
Hard to understand	6	7	0	0	0
Neither easy nor hard to understand	13	13	17	15	13
Easy to understand	75	60	63	50	63
Very easy to understand	6	20	21	25	19
Don't know	0	0	0	10	6
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Mean (out of 5)	3.83	3.93	4.04	4.11	4.07
Std. Deviation	0.718	0.799	0.624	0.676	0.594

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding. *Sub-sample based on those who work in invoicing or billing.

**Caution: low base number of respondents – results are indicative only.

3.5 Communication and support

The preferred method of contact from respondents continues to be through email (92 percent), which is slightly higher than the previous two monitors (84 percent preferred email in 2007 and 83 percent in 2005) (Table 23).

The level of satisfaction with the speed of response from NZRS remains high, with an average rating of 4.49 out of five this year, compared with 4.55 in 2007 and 4.35 in 2005 (Table 24). Respondents also rated the speed of response as highly important with a mean importance rating of 4.55 out of five (Table 25).

Table 27 shows that mean overall satisfaction with communication from NZRS is also very high, at 4.39 out of five. This compares with 4.46 in 2007 and 4.38 in 2005.

Respondents were also asked whether they would take up a range of other opportunities to meet or communicate with NZRS, if they were offered (Table 28, page 28). The most popular propositions were:

- ◆ *A one-day registrar conference held in Wellington* (31 percent said they would attend).
- ◆ *An informal registrar lunch held in a city near you* (30 percent said they would attend).
- ◆ *A one-day registrar conference held in a city near you* (26 percent said they would attend).

Table 23: Main method of contacting NZRS

Q22. Which of the following is the main method you use of communicating with NZRS when your organisation has a query or problem?

	Dec 2003	June 2004	April 2005	Nov 2007	Nov 2009
Base =	37	36	41	37	77
	%	%	%	%	%
E-mail	94	86	83	84	92
Telephone	6	14	7	14	5
Don't know	0	0	10	3	3
Total	100	100	100	100	100

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Table 24: Satisfaction with the speed of responses back from NZRS

Q23. How satisfied are you with the speed of responses back from NZRS when you contact them?

	Dec 2003	June 2004	April 2005	Nov 2007	Nov 2009
Base =	37	36	41	37	77
	%	%	%	%	%
Very dissatisfied	0	3	0	0	1
Dissatisfied	3	3	0	0	0
Neither satisfied or dissatisfied	8	6	5	5	5
Satisfied	51	53	49	30	32
Very satisfied	38	36	37	54	55
Don't know	0	0	10	11	6
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Mean (out of 5)	4.11	4.17	4.35	4.55	4.49
Std. Deviation	0.737	0.878	0.588	0.617	0.731

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Table 25: Importance of speed of response from NZRS

Q24. And how important to you or your company is the speed of responses back from NZRS when you contact them?

	Total
Base =	77
	%
Not important	1
Important	42
Very important	57
Total	100
Mean (out of 5)	4.55
Std. Deviation	0.575

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Table 26: Importance of speed of response from NZRS

Q23/Q24. How satisfied are you with the speed of responses back from NZRS when you contact them? And how important to you or your company is the speed of responses back from NZRS when you contact them?

	Mean satisfaction/ quality rating	Mean importance	Gap
Base =	72*	72*	
Speed of response back from NZRS	Mean 4.49	4.58	0.097
	St. Dev. 0.731	0.575	

Note that a positive gap indicates an area in need of improvement.

Table 27: Overall satisfaction with communications with NZRS

Q31. Thinking about all of your communications with NZRS (i.e. when you contact them, the information they release or publish, etc), how satisfied are you overall?

	Dec 2003	June 2004	April 2005	Nov 2007	Nov 2009
Base =	37	36	41	37	77
	%	%	%	%	%
Very Dissatisfied	0	0	0	0	0
Dissatisfied	3	0	0	0	0
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	11	6	5	5	5
Satisfied	47	56	49	41	49
Very satisfied	39	39	41	49	44
Don't know	0	0	5	5	1
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Mean (out of 5)	4.14	4.33	4.38	4.46	4.39
Std. Deviation	0.756	0.586	0.590	0.611	0.591

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Table 28: Uptake of possible services by registrars

Q32. Which of the following services or events would you attend or take up, if NZRS were to offer them to you? Please select all that apply.

	Total
Base =	77
	%
A one-day registrar conference held in Wellington	31
An informal registrar lunch held in a city near you	30
A one-day registrar conference held in a city near you	26
Pre-arranged meetings with CE or CTO at ICANN, APTLD or other international conferences	19
An informal registrar gathering after work held in a city near you	19
An informal registrar lunch held in Wellington	19
An informal registrar gathering after work held in Wellington	16
Regular visits from the Chief Executive (CE) or Chief Technology Officer (CTO) in NZ	13
Any other suggestion? (Specify)	3
None of the above	22
Don't know	9

Total may exceed 100% because of multiple response.

3.5.1 Information published by NZRS

Just one respondent said that they found the information published by NZRS to be inaccurate (Table 29). Note that all respondents were asked this question in 2009, while in previous years it was only asked of those who dealt with the technical interface of the SRS.

The proportion of respondents receiving the .nz newsletter published by the Domain Name Commissioner has not changed from 2007, with this year 57 percent saying they receive it (compared with 59 percent in 2007)². All but two of those who received the newsletter said they found it to be somewhat informative (59 percent) or very informative (36 percent), and the other two individuals said they did not know (Table 31).

Table 29: Accuracy of information published by NZRS

Q27. Thinking about the information NZRS publishes and provides (e.g. notification of scheduled outages, release and upgrade notes, etc.) do you find this information to be accurate?

	Dec 2003 Sub sample	June 2004 Sub sample	April 2005 Sub sample	Nov 2007 Sub sample	Nov 2009 Total
Base =	18* **	25* **	25* **	26* **	77
	%	%	%	%	%
Yes	83	88	100	92	90
No	6	12	0	8	1
Don't know	11	0	0	0	9
Total	100	100	100	100	100

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding. *Sub-samples based on those who deal with the technical interface to the Shared Registry Service (SRS) at NZRS.

Table 30: Monthly .nz newsletter

Q28. Do you receive the monthly .nz newsletter published by NZRS with the Domain Name Commissioner?

	Nov 2007	Nov 2009
Base =	37	77
	%	%
Yes	59	57
No	30	30
Don't know	11	13
Total	100	100

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

² Note that this could be due to the wider sampling frame used in 2009; this year, for the first time, contacts were asked to forward the invitation to take part to other relevant people within their organization.

Table 31: Informativeness of .nz newsletter

Q29. How informative would you say you find the newsletter to be?

	Nov 2009 Sub sample
Base =	44* %
Somewhat informative	59
Very informative	36
Don't know	5
Total	100
Mean (out of 5)	4.38
Std. Deviation	0.492

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding. *Sub-sample based on those who received the .nz newsletter.

Table 32: Suggestions for improvements to the .nz newsletter

Q30. Is there further information that would be useful to include in the newsletter on a regular basis?

	Total
Base =	44* %
At least one suggestion	14
No	45
Don't know	41
Total	100

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding. *Sub-sample based on those who received the .nz newsletter.

3.5.2 NZ Registry Services Web Site

Website usage shows a similar pattern to that observed in 2007 (Table 33). Twenty-seven percent said they never visit the NZRS website (compared with 22 percent in 2007), and just 14 percent said they visited once a week or more (compared with 16 percent in 2007).

Table 34 and Table 35 (overleaf) show awareness and usage of the features on the NZRS website. Table 34 shows the results for those who actually visit the website, while Table 35 takes into account those who never visit the website (i.e. it includes all surveyed respondents). The awareness and usage of the website features can be summarised as follows:

- ◆ *Registrar FAQ*: 76 percent of those who use the website are aware (or 53 percent of all registrars surveyed) and 51 percent are currently using (or 36 percent of all respondents surveyed).
- ◆ *List of domains due to be released*: 76 percent of those who use the website are aware (or 53 percent of all respondents surveyed) and 33 percent are currently using (or 23 percent of all respondents surveyed).
- ◆ *Detailed statistics on your activity*: 68 percent of those who use the website are aware (or 49 percent of all respondents surveyed) and 42 percent are currently using (or 30 percent of all respondents surveyed).
- ◆ *Information on transfer activity*: 67 percent of those who use the website are aware (or 48 percent of all respondents surveyed) and 44 percent are currently using (or 31 percent of all respondents surveyed).
- ◆ *Error messages you have generated*: 53 percent of those who use the website are aware (or 38 percent of all respondents surveyed) and 33 percent are currently using (or 23 percent of all respondents surveyed).

Table 33: Visiting NZRS website

Q33. How often do you use the NZRS web site service?

	Nov2008	Nov 2009
Base =	37	77
	%	%
Daily	8	5
Weekly	8	9
Monthly	5	10
Occasionally (i.e. less frequently than every month)	54	45
Never	22	27
Don't know	3	3
Total	100	100

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Table 34: Awareness and usage of website features – excluding those who never visit the website (n=55*)

Q34/Q35. For the following sections of the Registrar-only area on the web site please indicate your awareness and level of use.

	Aware	Not Aware	Total	Not using or planning to use	Planning to use in future	Currently using	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Detailed statistics on your activity	68	32	100	20	38	42	100
Information on transfer activity	67	33	100	15	42	44	100
Registrar FAQ	76	24	100	22	27	51	100
List of domains due to be released	76	24	100	27	40	33	100
Error messages you have generated	53	47	100	18	49	33	100

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding. *Sub-sample based on those who have visited the NZRS website.

Table 35: Awareness and usage of website features – including those who never visit the website (n=77)

Q34/Q35. For the following sections of the Registrar-only area on the web site please indicate your awareness and level of use.

	Aware	Not Aware	Never visited the website	Total	Not using or planning to use	Planning to use in future	Currently using	Never visited the website	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Detailed statistics on your activity	49	21	30	100	14	26	30	30	100
Information on transfer activity	48	22	30	100	10	29	31	30	100
Registrar FAQ	53	17	30	100	16	18	36	30	100
List of domains due to be released	53	17	30	100	18	29	23	30	100
Error messages you have generated	38	32	30	100	13	34	23	30	100

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding.



3.5.3 Status updates and website feedback

Most of those who visited the website were satisfied (61 percent) or very satisfied (26 percent) with the status updates (Table 37). Similarly, most said that these updates were important (50 percent) or very important (28 percent) (Table 38, overleaf).

Table 36 shows the gap analysis of the website status updates. The analysis showed a small negative gap, meaning that this area is a low priority for improvement.

Table 36: Gap analysis of website status updates

		Mean satisfaction/ quality rating	Mean importance	Gap
website status updates	Base =	52*	52*	
	Mean	4.17	3.98	-0.192
	St. Dev.	0.585	0.930	

Note that a positive gap indicates an area in need of improvement.

*Sub-sample based on those who have visited the NZRS website and who gave a rating between one and five.

Table 37: Satisfaction with status updates on the website

Q36. How satisfied are you with the status updates of the Shared Registry System (SRS) and the Domain Name System (DNS) provided on the web site?

	Base =	Total %
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied		9
Satisfied		61
Very satisfied		26
Don't know		4
Total		100
Mean (out of 5)		4.17
Std. Deviation		0.585

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding. *Sub-sample based on those who have visited the NZRS website.



Table 38: Importance of status updates on the website

Q37. And how important is to you or your company that the SRS and DNS status is available on the website?

	Base =	Total 54* %
Not at all important		4
Not important		2
Neither important nor unimportant		15
Important		50
Very important		28
Don't know		2
Total		100
Mean (out of 5)		3.98
Std. Deviation		0.930

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding. *Sub-sample based on those who have visited the NZRS website.

Table 39: Feedback on the NZRS Website

Q38. Do you have any feedback on the NZRS web site or the Registrar-only area?

	Base =	Total 54* %
Gave feedback		4
No feedback		85
Don't know		11
Total		100

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding. *Sub-sample based on those who have visited the NZRS website.



3.6 Overall satisfaction with NZRS and areas to improve

3.6.1 Overall satisfaction

Overall satisfaction with NZRS in 2009 (mean of 4.53 out of five) is consistent with the level observed in 2007 (mean of 4.61) and 2005 (mean of 4.41) (Table 40).

Table 41 (overleaf) shows that no respondents believe NZRS is worse than other registries; most think that NZRS is better than average (30 percent) or much better than average (38 percent).

Table 40: Overall satisfaction with NZRS

Q39. Taking into account all your dealings with NZRS, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you overall?

	Dec 2003	June 2004	April 2005	Nov 2007	Nov 2009
Base =	37	36	41	37	77
	%	%	%	%	%
Very dissatisfied	0	0	0	0	0
Dissatisfied	3	0	0	0	0
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	5	3	2	3	5
Satisfied	51	58	54	32	36
Very satisfied	41	39	44	62	57
Don't know	0	0	0	3	1
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Mean (out of 5)	4.19	4.36	4.41	4.61	4.53
Std. Deviation	0.736	0.543	0.547	0.549	0.599

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Table 41: How NZRS compares with other registries

Q40. How do you compare NZRS to other registries?

	Total
Base =	77
	%
Neither better nor worse than average	18
Better than average	30
NZRS much better than average	38
Don't know	14
Total	100
Mean (out of 5)	4.23
Std. Deviation	0.780

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding.



Table 42: Best aspects of NZRS's service

Q41. And what aspects of the service that NZRS provides are working best for you?

	Total
Base =	77 %
Gave a suggestion	22
No comments	68
Don't know	10
Total	100

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding.



3.6.2 Areas to improve

Fifteen respondents gave suggestions for how NZRS could improve. Comments were generally varied, however, two comments related to invoicing, and two related to the use of Perl.

Table 43: Areas for NZRS to improve

Q42. What things could NZRS do to improve?

	Total
Base =	77
	%
Gave a suggestion	19
No comments	68
Don't know	13
Total	100

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding.



4.0 Demographics

Table 44 to Table 46, below and overleaf, show the characteristics of the respondents who responded to the survey:

- ◆ Sixty four out of the 77 respondents gave consent for their individual answers to be passed back to NZRS (these individual results are provided as a separate database).
- ◆ The role of the person responding was varied, with 56 percent working in management, 38 percent working in SRS Technical Support, 23 percent working on a help desk, and 21 percent in accounts.
- ◆ 81 percent of respondents' organisations were involved in web hosting, and 75 percent were involved in email hosting.

Table 44: Consent to provide answers back to NZRS

Q43. All individual results are kept confidential as a matter of course and we would only pass them back to NZRS if we had your consent.

	Base =	Total 77 %
Yes		83
No		17
Total		100

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Table 45: Role of individual

Q1. What is your role within your organisation? Please select all that apply.

	Base =	Total 77 %
Invoicing/Billing		21
SRS Technical Support		38
Management		56
Help Desk		23
Other(Specify)		26

Total may exceed 100% because of multiple response.



Table 46: Main service and other services provided by organisation

Q2/Q3. What is the primary service your organisation provides? What other Internet services does your organisation provide? Please select all that apply.

	Main service provided	Other services provided	Main service and others combined
Base =	77	77	77
	%	%	%
.nz registrar	27	-	27
Other ccTLD or gTLD registrations	-	60	60
ISP	23	19	43
Web hosting	26	55	81
Web design	4	27	31
Email hosting	0	75	75
Other application hosting	1	36	38
Domain Name aftermarket services	3	29	31
Other	16	27	36
Don't know	0	0	0
Total	100	-	-

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding.