Dear APNIC Members and friends,

In August 2006 the APNIC Executive Council commissioned the fourth formal survey of APNIC Members and Stakeholders, from international consulting firm KPMG. The survey results were received in February 2007, and presented to the APNIC Annual Members Meeting in Bali on 2 March. The formal survey reports were also made available on the APNIC website.

The APNIC EC has now had time to consider the results of the latest Survey, and wishes to thank Dr John Earls of KPMG for his work on this important project. It was particularly good to see the large turnout for the survey (316 responses from 34 economies), and the wide range of comments and suggestions submitted. Again, the anonymity ensured by the survey method seemed to promote frank and genuine feedback, of both the positive and negative kinds.

An important step prior to this survey was to review the results of the past 3 surveys. Dr Earls undertook this review in 2006, and concluded that 90% of all items from those surveys have been actioned by the APNIC Secretariat. That figure included 39% described as "actioned and completed", and 51% involving ongoing work. The EC is satisfied with this assessment and provides this response to the latest survey in the confidence that actions required will be undertaken by the APNIC Secretariat.

The fourth survey was again composed of several parts: assessment of APNIC services and activities; allocation of APNIC resources to future activities; registration of interest in future, more detailed surveys; and general comments. The report from KPMG provides a very comprehensive description of the survey response, including summary and detailed statistical information, and additional comments received. These documents are recommended reading for anyone with an interest in APNIC.

In reviewing the survey results, the APNIC EC notes a number of issues of importance which are regarded as needing improvement, or as priorities for resource allocation. These issues include the ongoing streamlining of administrative and request processes within APNIC, the clarity and accessibility of procedures and policies, and accessibility of APNIC meetings and training. The EC will work with the Secretariat to ensure that these issues are prioritized in future planning.

In reviewing the additional analysis provided by KPMG, the EC also notes some interesting trends in the survey results according to membership category, duration and economy. From those breakdowns, it is clear that general satisfaction with APNIC increases for larger members and those with a longer membership relationship; which would seem to indicate that smaller members, and those in developing countries, should be given more attention in terms of membership induction, training and support services. Also, it seems that in areas related to cost of membership and participation, larger members have a markedly more positive view, and smaller members a more negative view. This trend in particular should inform the current process of revising the APNIC fee structure.

Considered in whole, the survey result reveals a range of issues and concerns which are clearly important to APNIC members and stakeholders. While some can be addressed reasonably easily, others are more complex and require further consideration before deciding on the best approach, let alone implementing it. In any case, the APNIC EC will refer to these results often in future discussions and decisions, as will the APNIC Secretariat. We hope that APNIC member and others with an interest in APNIC will do the same.