

APNIC 2022 Survey Appendix B

Survey Data Tables & Segmentation by Region & Classification of Economies

Overview

This Appendix B provides the full results for all questions asked in the 2022 APNIC Survey.

These are presented as full frequency and / or mean scores. When analysing the survey data, please note that the results have been cross tabulated by respondents' relationship with APNIC (Member or Stakeholder), APNIC sub-region (East Asia, Oceania, South East Asia and South Asia) and Classification of Economies (Least Developed Economies (LDEs) or Other (Developed or Developing)).

Questions marked with an asterix (*) were asked only of APNIC Members. Individual responses from economies associated with non-APNIC regions were excluded.

Q2. What type of organization do you work for?

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Sample Size	1,622	1,061	561	269	275	454	486	395	1089
Internet Service Provider (ISP)	28%	37%	13%	22%	23%	31%	36%	41%	26%
Academic/Educational/Research	17%	12%	24%	17%	13%	17%	17%	12%	18%
Telecommunications/Mobile operator	11%	12%	9%	19%	10%	9%	10%	9%	12%
Government/Regulator/Municipality	7%	6%	10%	4%	10%	9%	6%	10%	6%
Hosting/Data centre	6%	7%	3%	12%	7%	5%	3%	3%	7%
Banking/Financial	5%	5%	5%	3%	4%	6%	6%	9%	4%
Enterprise/Manufacturing/Retail	5%	4%	5%	4%	7%	4%	3%	3%	5%
Software vendor	4%	3%	6%	2%	3%	4%	5%	3%	4%
Non-profit/NGO/Internet community	4%	2%	7%	3%	4%	3%	4%	4%	3%
Domain name registry/Registrar	1%	1%	2%	5%	1%	1%	0%	0%	2%
NREN/Research network	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Hardware vendor	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%
Infrastructure (transport/hospital)	1%	1%	2%	0%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Industrial (construction, mining, oil)	1%	1%	1%	0%	2%	0%	0%	1%	1%
Internet Exchange Point (IXP)	1%	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Media/Entertainment	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%
Other	7%	6%	10%	5%	12%	6%	6%	4%	8%

Q3. What is your role within the organisation?

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Sample Size	1,622	1,061	561	269	275	454	486	395	1089
Network/Systems Operations Engineer/Manager	35%	36%	31%	40%	40%	31%	34%	33%	36%
Network/Systems Planning Engineer/Manager	28%	31%	22%	33%	28%	28%	24%	23%	30%
IT Support	19%	18%	20%	14%	20%	20%	19%	20%	18%
Manager	14%	16%	11%	17%	10%	16%	16%	15%	15%
Academic/Research	10%	6%	19%	13%	6%	11%	10%	7%	11%
CEO/COO/CFO	9%	11%	7%	7%	12%	7%	11%	11%	9%
CTO/CIO	8%	10%	5%	6%	12%	6%	9%	9%	8%
Product/Peering/Interconnect Engineer/Manager	8%	8%	6%	10%	8%	7%	5%	4%	9%
Project Manager	6%	5%	7%	7%	4%	6%	6%	4%	7%
Trainer	5%	3%	9%	2%	3%	7%	6%	4%	5%
Software Engineer	4%	3%	4%	2%	7%	3%	3%	2%	4%
Sales / Marketing	3%	3%	3%	4%	1%	2%	2%	2%	3%
Student	3%	3%	3%	1%	1%	2%	5%	4%	3%
Applications Developer	2%	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%
Other	7%	5%	9%	5%	5%	9%	8%	9%	6%

Q4. Approximately how many employees are in your organization?

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Sample Size	1,622	1,061	561	269	275	454	486	395	1,089
1-10	13%	14%	12%	12%	25%	10%	10%	11%	14%
11-50	18%	20%	14%	17%	21%	18%	18%	23%	17%
51-100	11%	12%	10%	13%	8%	9%	14%	15%	10%
101-500	19%	17%	23%	23%	20%	20%	17%	21%	19%
501-1,000	10%	10%	11%	9%	8%	10%	14%	13%	10%
1,000-10,000	18%	17%	18%	17%	12%	20%	18%	13%	19%
10,000+	9%	9%	9%	7%	5%	11%	8%	3%	10%
Don't know	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%

Q5. What is your organisation's relationship with APNIC?

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Sample Size	1,622	1,061	561	269	275	454	486	395	1,089
APNIC Member/Account Holder	65%	100%	-	62%	75%	63%	69%	76%	64%
Member of an NIR in APNIC Region	15%	-	44%	22%	8%	18%	14%	11%	17%
Other Stakeholder	19%	-	56%	15%	17%	19%	18%	13%	19%

Q6. How many times have you used an APNIC service, contacted or interacted with APNIC in the past two (2) years?

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Sample Size	1,622	1,061	561	269	275	454	486	395	1,089
None	14%	8%	25%	19%	8%	13%	13%	12%	14%
1-5 times	41%	46%	33%	42%	49%	41%	37%	39%	43%
More than 5 times	30%	34%	22%	32%	32%	28%	29%	27%	31%
Don't know/I can't remember	15%	13%	20%	7%	10%	17%	22%	23%	13%

Q7.* Over the past two years, which of the following APNIC products, services or initiatives have you used or participated in?



	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Sample Size	1,403	980	423	216	276	365	461	393	986
* MyAPNIC	61%	61%	-	59%	73%	55%	62%	61%	63%
APNIC website	52%	52%	52%	53%	55%	46%	58%	53%	53%
APNIC Whois Database	47%	49%	43%	55%	57%	40%	45%	40%	51%
APNIC training (face-to-face or online)	43%	38%	54%	26%	42%	49%	47%	43%	43%
* APNIC Helpdesk	34%	34%	-	34%	37%	28%	42%	38%	34%
* IP address / AS number resource application	34%	34%	-	32%	35%	28%	43%	41%	33%
APNIC Blog	29%	27%	32%	26%	30%	21%	35%	27%	29%
* Routing security (ROA publication)	24%	24%	-	24%	29%	16%	30%	27%	24%
* Resource certification (RPKI)	23%	23%	-	18%	29%	16%	28%	25%	22%
APNIC conference, APRICOT /other event	23%	20%	29%	28%	25%	20%	23%	21%	24%
* New membership account	21%	21%	-	19%	22%	19%	24%	26%	19%
*APNIC EC Election	16%	16%	-	14%	7%	8%	30%	29%	11%
* IPv4 address transfer	15%	15%	-	19%	18%	11%	17%	14%	17%
* APNIC reverse DNS	15%	15%	-	19%	19%	8%	17%	14%	16%
Online presentation by APNIC	12%	11%	14%	6%	17%	9%	14%	11%	12%
APNIC Labs reports/measurement statistics	12%	10%	15%	14%	9%	10%	11%	10%	11%
** Contacted APNIC with a query	10%	-	10%	7%	11%	8%	13%	3%	12%
Online meeting with APNIC representative	10%	8%	15%	11%	11%	9%	11%	7%	12%
Special Interest Group (SIGs)	7%	5%	12%	8%	9%	4%	9%	5%	8%
*APNIC Annual Report	7%	7%	-	10%	6%	3%	8%	8%	6%
DASH (Dashboard for AS Health)	6%	8%	3%	4%	8%	7%	8%	7%	6%
APNIC Policy Development Process	6%	4%	9%	7%	4%	4%	8%	6%	6%
APNIC NetOX	6%	6%	4%	5%	5%	5%	7%	5%	5%
PING Podcast	4%	3%	5%	5%	4%	1%	5%	3%	3%
*APNIC RDAP service	4%	4%	-	5%	3%	2%	3%	1%	4%
REx (Resource Explorer)	2%	2%	1%	0%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%
None of these	4%	3%	5%	4%	2%	5%	3%	4%	3%

Q8. *Thinking about the APNIC products, services or initiatives have you used or participated in, how would you rate your experience?

(Only the specific services selected at Q5 presented to each respondent – n=various)

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
MyAPNIC*									
Very Poor	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2	0%	0%	-	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3	1%	1%	-	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Neutral	7%	7%	-	10%	8%	9%	2%	4%	8%
5	9%	9%	-	19%	9%	9%	3%	4%	10%
6	44%	44%	-	42%	49%	45%	40%	42%	45%
Excellent	40%	40%	-	28%	31%	38%	55%	50%	36%
Top 3	93%	93%	-	89%	90%	91%	98%	96%	91%
Mean	6.15	6.15	-	5.84	5.99	6.11	6.48	6.38	6.07
Std. Dev.	0.90	0.90	-	1.02	0.97	0.90	0.66	0.75	0.94

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
APNIC website									
Very Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%
2	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%
3	1%	1%	1%	3%	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%
Neutral	6%	7%	5%	10%	9%	7%	3%	8%	6%
5	12%	12%	11%	13%	16%	11%	8%	8%	12%
6	44%	45%	41%	43%	41%	49%	44%	42%	46%
Excellent	36%	35%	41%	31%	34%	33%	44%	40%	35%
Top 3	93%	92%	94%	88%	91%	93%	96%	91%	93%
Mean	6.08	6.05	6.15	5.91	5.99	6.08	6.24	6.10	6.09
Std. Dev.	0.93	0.93	0.94	1.03	0.96	0.84	0.90	1.03	0.89

* Option not offered to Stakeholder respondents

** Option not offered to Member respondents

Q8. *Thinking about the APNIC products, services or initiatives have you used or participated in, how would you rate your experience?

(Only the specific services selected at Q5 presented to each respondent – n=various)

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Whois database									
Very Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3	1%	1%	0%	2%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Neutral	6%	6%	6%	14%	8%	5%	1%	1%	7%
5	10%	10%	12%	12%	10%	9%	7%	11%	9%
6	40%	40%	43%	38%	43%	42%	36%	42%	40%
Excellent	42%	44%	38%	32%	39%	44%	56%	46%	43%
Top 3	93%	93%	93%	83%	92%	95%	99%	99%	92%
Mean	6.17	6.19	6.12	5.81	6.12	6.25	6.48	6.32	6.16
Std. Dev.	0.91	0.91	0.91	1.16	0.92	0.82	0.66	0.72	0.95

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
APNIC Academy training									
Very Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%
3	0%	1%	0%	2%	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%
Neutral	3%	2%	4%	0%	4%	4%	1%	1%	3%
5	6%	6%	5%	13%	8%	6%	3%	4%	6%
6	38%	38%	39%	32%	34%	43%	37%	42%	37%
Excellent	53%	53%	53%	54%	55%	47%	57%	52%	53%
Top 3	97%	97%	96%	98%	96%	96%	98%	98%	96%
Mean	6.40	6.39	6.41	6.36	6.40	6.34	6.47	6.42	6.39
Std. Dev.	0.77	0.79	0.74	0.84	0.79	0.76	0.78	0.76	0.77

* Option not offered to Stakeholder respondents

** Option not offered to Member respondents

Q8. *Thinking about the APNIC products, services or initiatives have you used or participated in, how would you rate your experience?

(Only the specific services selected at Q5 presented to each respondent – n=various)

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
APNIC Helpdesk*									
Very Poor	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2	1%	1%	-	0%	3%	1%	0%	0%	1%
3	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%
Neutral	6%	6%	-	8%	5%	7%	5%	4%	7%
5	10%	10%	-	18%	14%	7%	6%	8%	11%
6	38%	38%	-	31%	40%	42%	38%	38%	39%
Excellent	45%	45%	-	43%	38%	42%	51%	51%	42%
Top 3	93%	93%	-	92%	90%	91%	95%	96%	91%
Mean	6.18	6.18	-	6.10	60.3	6.12	6.35	6.36	6.10
Std. Dev.	0.96	0.96	-	0.96	1.09	1.05	0.80	0.78	1.03

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
IP address or AS number resource application*									
Very Poor	0%	0%	-	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2	1%	1%	-	2%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%
3	2%	2%	-	0%	7%	0%	0%	0%	2%
Neutral	8%	8%	-	13%	12%	12%	3%	8%	9%
5	7%	7%	-	17%	9%	4%	3%	4%	8%
6	42%	42%	-	44%	31%	45%	44%	43%	40%
Excellent	40%	40%	-	25%	40%	38%	49%	44%	39%
Top 3	89%	89%	-	85%	79%	86%	96%	91%	88%
Mean	6.07	6.07	-	5.75	5.78	6.04	6.35	6.21	6.00
Std. Dev.	1.08	1.08	-	1.10	1.40	1.07	0.80	0.95	1.14

* Option not offered to Stakeholder respondents

** Option not offered to Member respondents

Q8. *Thinking about the APNIC products, services or initiatives have you used or participated in, how would you rate your experience?

(Only the specific services selected at Q5 presented to each respondent – n=various)

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
APNIC Blog									
Very Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	2%	0%
Neutral	5%	4%	7%	5%	7%	6%	5%	6%	5%
5	9%	10%	7%	7%	7%	12%	9%	12%	8%
6	48%	49%	46%	50%	41%	47%	50%	49%	47%
Excellent	37%	36%	40%	38%	46%	35%	35%	31%	40%
Top 3	94%	95%	93%	95%	93%	94%	94%	91%	95%
Mean	6.16	6.15	6.18	6.20	6.26	6.11	6.12	6.00	6.21
Std. Dev.	0.85	0.84	0.88	0.80	0.85	0.84	0.86	0.94	0.80

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Routing security (ROA publication)*									
Very Poor	0%	0%	-	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
2	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Neutral	4%	4%	-	8%	5%	2%	3%	4%	5%
5	8%	8%	-	14%	5%	14%	3%	4%	9%
6	36%	35%	-	36%	38%	36%	35%	36%	36%
Excellent	51%	51%	-	39%	52%	48%	58%	55%	50%
Top 3	95%	95%	-	89%	95%	98%	97%	96%	95%
Mean	6.32	6.32	-	5.94	6.36	6.30	6.48	6.43	6.28
Std. Dev.	0.87	0.87	-	1.26	0.82	0.79	0.72	0.76	0.92

* Option not offered to Stakeholder respondents

** Option not offered to Member respondents

Q8. *Thinking about the APNIC products, services or initiatives have you used or participated in, how would you rate your experience?

(Only the specific services selected at Q5 presented to each respondent – n=various)

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia [#]	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Resource certification (RPKI)*									
Very Poor	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Neutral	4%	4%	-	11%	7%	2%	1%	1%	6%
5	7%	7%	-	14%	5%	9%	4%	4%	8%
6	44%	44%	-	50%	41%	42%	44%	44%	43%
Excellent	44%	44%	-	25%	46%	47%	51%	50%	43%
Top 3	96%	96%	-	89%	93%	98%	99%	99%	94%
Mean	6.28	6.28	-	5.89	6.27	6.33	6.44	6.43	6.24
Std. Dev.	0.79	0.79	-	0.92	0.86	0.75	0.64	0.65	0.83

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
APNIC conferences, APRICOT & Events									
Very Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2	0%	0%	1%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	3%	0%
Neutral	4%	5%	4%	8%	5%	1%	4%	3%	5%
5	7%	8%	5%	7%	11%	8%	4%	5%	7%
6	40%	40%	40%	41%	27%	45%	42%	51%	36%
Excellent	48%	46%	50%	43%	58%	46%	47%	38%	52%
Top 3	95%	94%	95%	90%	95%	99%	94%	95%	95%
Mean	6.29	6.26	6.34	6.13	6.38	6.36	6.29	6.19	6.33
Std. Dev.	0.86	0.87	0.86	1.04	0.86	0.68	0.89	0.88	0.86

* Option not offered to Stakeholder respondents

** Option not offered to Member respondents

Small sample size

Q8. *Thinking about the APNIC products, services or initiatives have you used or participated in, how would you rate your experience?

(Only the specific services selected at Q5 presented to each respondent – n=various)

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia [#]	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
New membership application*									
Very Poor	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2	0%	0%	-	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	1%
3	2%	2%	-	3%	5%	2%	0%	0%	3%
Neutral	11%	11%	-	17%	17%	8%	7%	5%	14%
5	9%	9%	-	17%	5%	8%	4%	4%	9%
6	38%	38%	-	24%	40%	58%	28%	36%	39%
Excellent	40%	40%	-	38%	31%	24%	61%	55%	34%
Top 3	87%	87%	-	79%	76%	90%	93%	95%	82%
Mean	6.02	6.02	-	5.76	5.69	5.94	6.43	6.40	5.84
Std. Dev.	1.08	1.08	-	1.24	1.33	0.91	0.86	0.81	1.18

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia [#]	Oceania [#]	SE Asia [#]	South Asia	LDEs	Other
APNIC's EC election*									
Very Poor	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3	1%	1%	-	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%
Neutral	8%	8%	-	14%	31%	0%	6%	6%	12%
5	11%	11%	-	18%	15%	5%	8%	5%	15%
6	36%	36%	-	32%	23%	38%	40%	40%	34%
Excellent	44%	44%	-	36%	31%	57%	45%	49%	38%
Top 3	91%	91%	-	86%	69%	100%	92%	94%	87%
Mean	6.14	6.14	-	5.91	5.54	6.52	6.22	6.32	5.96
Std. Dev.	0.96	0.96	-	1.06	1.27	0.60	0.92	0.83	1.07

* Option not offered to Stakeholder respondents

** Option not offered to Member respondents

Small sample size

Q8. *Thinking about the APNIC products, services or initiatives have you used or participated in, how would you rate your experience?

(Only the specific services selected at Q5 presented to each respondent – n=various)

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia#	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
IPv4 address transfer*									
Very Poor	1%	1%	-	0%	3%	0%	0%	0%	1%
2	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3	1%	1%	-	0%	3%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Neutral	11%	11%	-	7%	25%	10%	4%	8%	12%
5	12%	12%	-	10%	11%	17%	8%	8%	12%
6	45%	45%	-	59%	22%	57%	45%	47%	44%
Excellent	31%	31%	-	24%	36%	17%	43%	37%	31%
Top 3	88%	88%	-	93%	69%	90%	95%	92%	86%
Mean	5.93	5.93	-	6.00	5.53	5.80	6.27	6.13	5.87
Std. Dev.	1.04	1.04	-	0.80	1.50	0.85	0.78	0.88	1.10

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia#	Oceania	SE Asia#	South Asia	LDEs	Other
APNICreverse DNS*									
Very Poor	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3	1%	1%	-	0%	3%	0%	2%	3%	1%
Neutral	12%	12%	-	17%	13%	14%	4%	8%	12%
5	7%	7%	-	14%	13%	5%	0%	0%	10%
6	37%	37%	-	31%	24%	45%	47%	47%	34%
Excellent	43%	43%	-	38%	47%	36%	47%	42%	44%
Top 3	87%	87%	-	83%	84%	86%	94%	89%	88%
Mean	6.09	6.09	-	5.90	6.00	6.05	6.34	6.18	6.09
Std. Dev.	1.05	1.05	-	1.11	1.19	1.00	0.83	0.98	1.04

* Option not offered to Stakeholder respondents

** Option not offered to Member respondents

Small sample size

Q8. *Thinking about the APNIC products, services or initiatives have you used or participated in, how would you rate your experience?

(Only the specific services selected at Q5 presented to each respondent – n=various)

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia [#]	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Online APNIC presentation									
Very Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Neutral	5%	5%	5%	8%	5%	0%	3%	5%	3%
5	7%	6%	7%	0%	7%	6%	5%	10%	4%
6	43%	47%	35%	46%	31%	54%	47%	46%	43%
Excellent	46%	42%	53%	46%	57%	40%	45%	38%	50%
Top 3	95%	95%	95%	92%	95%	100%	97%	95%	97%
Mean	6.30	6.27	6.37	6.31	6.40	6.34	6.33	6.18	6.41
Std. Dev.	0.79	0.78	0.82	0.85	0.83	0.59	0.73	0.82	0.69

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania [#]	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
APNIC Labs reports and/or measurement statistics									
Very Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2	1%	0%	2%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
3	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	3%	0%
Neutral	5%	2%	10%	3%	5%	5%	8%	9%	5%
5	11%	11%	11%	3%	9%	15%	15%	18%	9%
6	44%	50%	34%	40%	27%	48%	50%	44%	43%
Excellent	39%	37%	44%	50%	59%	33%	25%	26%	42%
Top 3	94%	97%	89%	93%	95%	95%	90%	88%	94%
Mean	6.15	6.19	6.06	6.27	6.41	6.08	5.88	5.82	6.19
Std. Dev.	0.91	0.78	1.10	1.08	0.85	0.83	0.96	1.03	0.91

* Option not offered to Stakeholder respondents

** Option not offered to Member respondents

Small sample size

Q8. *Thinking about the APNIC products, services or initiatives have you used or participated in, how would you rate your experience?

(Only the specific services selected at Q5 presented to each respondent – n=various)

	Total#	Members	Stakeholders#	East Asia#	Oceania#	SE Asia#	South Asia#	LDEs#	Other#
Contact with APNIC**									
Very Poor	0%	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2	0%	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3	4%	-	4%	0%	0%	0%	13%	0%	6%
Neutral	13%	-	13%	0%	25%	0%	25%	100%	11%
5	0%	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
6	43%	-	43%	50%	25%	80%	13%	0%	44%
Excellent	39%	-	39%	50%	50%	20%	50%	0%	39%
Top 3	83%	-	83%	100%	75%	100%	63%	0%	83%
Mean	6.00	-	6.00	6.50	6.00	6.20	5.63	4.00	6.00
Std. Dev.	1.17	-	1.17	0.71	1.41	0.45	1.69	-	1.19

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia#	Oceania#	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs#	Other
Online meeting with an APNIC representative									
Very Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3	1%	1%	2%	0%	0%	0%	2%	4%	0%
Neutral	5%	5%	5%	8%	7%	3%	4%	4%	5%
5	11%	13%	8%	8%	14%	11%	9%	13%	10%
6	34%	33%	35%	32%	25%	39%	36%	33%	34%
Excellent	49%	48%	51%	52%	54%	47%	49%	46%	51%
Top 3	94%	94%	94%	92%	93%	97%	93%	92%	95%
Mean	6.25	6.22	6.29	6.28	6.25	6.31	6.24	6.13	6.30
Std. Dev.	0.93	0.94	0.92	0.94	0.97	0.79	0.96	1.08	0.86

* Option not offered to Stakeholder respondents

** Option not offered to Member respondents

Small sample size

Q8. *Thinking about the APNIC products, services or initiatives have you used or participated in, how would you rate your experience?

(Only the specific services selected at Q5 presented to each respondent – n=various)

	Total	Members	Stakeholders [#]	East Asia [#]	Oceania [#]	SE Asia [#]	South Asia	LDEs [#]	Other
Special Interest Group (SIG)									
Very Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2	2%	2%	2%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
3	3%	6%	0%	6%	4%	0%	3%	6%	3%
Neutral	7%	6%	8%	6%	17%	0%	3%	6%	6%
5	7%	8%	6%	0%	9%	13%	5%	0%	8%
6	45%	45%	44%	47%	26%	44%	55%	61%	41%
Excellent	37%	34%	40%	35%	43%	44%	35%	28%	41%
Top 3	88%	87%	90%	82%	78%	100%	95%	89%	90%
Mean	6.00	5.91	6.00	5.82	5.87	6.31	6.18	6.00	6.08
Std. Dev.	1.14	1.21	0.86	1.47	1.29	0.70	0.84	1.03	1.09

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia [#]	Oceania [#]	SE Asia [#]	South Asia [#]	LDEs [#]	Other
APNIC Annual Report*									
Very Poor	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Neutral	14%	14%	-	0%	17%	14%	9%	14%	6%
5	19%	19%	-	40%	17%	14%	9%	10%	25%
6	36%	36%	-	13%	50%	43%	52%	43%	31%
Excellent	31%	31%	-	47%	17%	29%	30%	33%	39%
Top 3	86%	86%	-	100%	83%	86%	91%	86%	94%
Mean	5.84	5.84	-	6.07	5.67	5.86	6.04	5.95	5.94
Std. Dev.	1.03	1.03	-	0.96	0.98	1.07	0.88	1.02	0.89

* Option not offered to Stakeholder respondents

** Option not offered to Member respondents

Small sample size

Q8. *Thinking about the APNIC products, services or initiatives have you used or participated in, how would you rate your experience?

(Only the specific services selected at Q5 presented to each respondent – n=various)

	Total	Members	Stakeholders [#]	East Asia [#]	Oceania [#]	SE Asia [#]	South Asia	LDEs [#]	Other
DASH (Dashboard for AS Health)									
Very Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%	4%	0%
Neutral	4%	5%	0%	0%	0%	7%	3%	4%	3%
5	14%	15%	9%	0%	26%	7%	13%	12%	13%
6	36%	35%	36%	25%	32%	41%	38%	35%	37%
Excellent	44%	43%	55%	75%	42%	44%	44%	46%	47%
Top 3	94%	94%	100%	100%	100%	93%	94%	92%	97%
Mean	6.18	6.14	6.45	6.75	6.16	6.22	6.16	6.15	6.27
Std. Dev.	0.92	0.94	0.69	0.46	0.83	0.89	0.99	1.05	0.82

	Total	Members	Stakeholders [#]	East Asia [#]	Oceania [#]	SE Asia [#]	South Asia	LDEs [#]	Other
APNIC Policy Development Process									
Very Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3	1%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%	5%	0%
Neutral	5%	5%	5%	0%	9%	7%	3%	10%	2%
5	6%	7%	5%	7%	0%	14%	6%	5%	8%
6	51%	48%	54%	60%	45%	36%	56%	25%	62%
Excellent	37%	38%	35%	33%	45%	43%	31%	55%	29%
Top 3	94%	93%	95%	100%	91%	93%	94%	85%	98%
Mean	6.16	6.14	6.19	6.27	6.27	6.14	6.09	6.15	6.17
Std. Dev.	0.85	0.93	0.78	0.59	0.90	0.95	0.89	1.23	0.65

* Option not offered to Stakeholder respondents

** Option not offered to Member respondents

Small sample size

Q8. *Thinking about the APNIC products, services or initiatives have you used or participated in, how would you rate your experience?

(Only the specific services selected at Q5 presented to each respondent – n=various)

	Total	Members	Stakeholders#	East Asia#	Oceania#	SE Asia#	South Asia#	LDEs#	Other
NetOX									
Very Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2	1%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Neutral	10%	10%	11%	9%	8%	0%	17%	16%	8%
5	11%	13%	5%	9%	8%	17%	3%	0%	12%
6	34%	33%	37%	45%	25%	33%	34%	37%	33%
Excellent	43%	42%	47%	36%	58%	50%	45%	47%	47%
Top 3	89%	88%	89%	91%	92%	100%	83%	84%	92%
Mean	6.06	6.02	6.21	6.09	6.33	6.33	6.07	6.16	6.20
Std. Dev.	1.08	1.11	0.98	0.94	0.98	0.77	1.10	1.07	0.94

	Total	Members	Stakeholders#	East Asia#	Oceania#	SE Asia#	South Asia#	LDEs#	Other
PING Podcast									
Very Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Neutral	6%	3%	9%	10%	0%	0%	10%	8%	6%
5	12%	17%	5%	0%	22%	0%	5%	0%	9%
6	44%	37%	55%	50%	33%	80%	45%	42%	50%
Excellent	38%	43%	32%	40%	44%	20%	40%	50%	34%
Top 3	94%	97%	91%	90%	100%	100%	90%	92%	94%
Mean	6.15	6.20	6.09	6.20	6.22	6.20	6.15	6.33	6.13
Std. Dev.	0.85	0.85	0.87	0.92	0.83	0.45	0.93	0.89	0.83

* Option not offered to Stakeholder respondents
 ** Option not offered to Member respondents
 # Small sample size

Q8. *Thinking about the APNIC products, services or initiatives have you used or participated in, how would you rate your experience?

(Only the specific services selected at Q5 presented to each respondent – n=various)

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia#	Oceania#	SE Asia#	South Asia#	LDEs#	Other#
APNIC RDAP service*									
Very Poor	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3	3%	3%	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Neutral	11%	11%	-	0%	17%	0%	30%	75%	4%
5	25%	25%	-	29%	33%	0%	20%	25%	20%
6	31%	31%	-	29%	17%	33%	30%	0%	32%
Excellent	31%	31%	-	43%	33%	67%	20%	0%	44%
Top 3	86%	86%	-	100%	72%	100%	70%	25%	96%
Mean	5.75	5.75	-	6.14	5.67	6.67	5.40	4.25	6.16
Std. Dev.	1.11	1.11	-	0.90	1.21	0.52	1.17	0.50	0.90

	Total#	Members#	Stakeholders#	East Asia#	Oceania#	SE Asia#	South Asia#	LDEs#	Other#
REx (Resource Explorer)									
Very Poor	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3	8%	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%	13%	14%	0%
Neutral	16%	20%	0%	0%	0%	25%	0%	29%	0%
5	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
6	36%	30%	60%	100%	50%	38%	25%	29%	43%
Excellent	40%	40%	40%	0%	50%	38%	63%	29%	57%
Top 3	76%	70%	100%	100%	100%	75%	88%	57%	100%
Mean	5.84	5.7	6.40	6.00	6.50	5.88	6.25	5.29	6.57
Std. Dev.	1.34	1.45	0.55	-	0.58	1.25	1.39	1.60	0.51

* Option not offered to Stakeholder respondents

** Option not offered to Member respondents

Small sample size

Q11. *Thinking about APNIC overall, how would you rate:

(Only asked if used APNIC service, contacted or interacted with APNIC in the past two years)

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
The quality of APNIC products and services									
Very Poor	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2	0%	0%	-	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3	0%	0%	-	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Neutral	5%	5%	-	5%	7%	7%	2%	6%	5%
5	6%	6%	-	11%	5%	5%	2%	3%	6%
6	34%	34%	-	40%	32%	38%	32%	35%	35%
Excellent	54%	54%	-	42%	54%	50%	64%	57%	53%
Top 3	94%	94%	-	93%	92%	93%	98%	94%	94%
Mean	6.36	6.36	-	6.16	6.30	6.31	6.57	6.43	6.34
Std. Dev.	0.87	0.87	-	0.92	0.98	0.85	0.66	0.81	0.87

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
The value of APNIC products and services									
Very Poor	0%	0%	-	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2	0%	0%	-	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3	1%	1%	-	3%	2%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Neutral	5%	5%	-	6%	10%	6%	2%	4%	6%
5	7%	7%	-	14%	7%	7%	3%	4%	8%
6	33%	33%	-	34%	32%	37%	28%	33%	32%
Excellent	54%	54%	-	43%	49%	50%	67%	59%	53%
Top 3	94%	94%	-	91%	88%	94%	98%	96%	93%
Mean	6.32	6.32	-	6.08	6.13	6.32	6.60	6.46	6.28
Std. Dev.	0.92	0.92	-	1.03	1.14	0.84	0.66	0.77	0.97

Q11. *Thinking about APNIC overall, how would you rate:

(Only asked if used APNIC service, contacted or interacted with APNIC in the past two years)

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
The value of APNIC membership									
Very Poor	0%	0%	-	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3	1%	1%	-	2%	2%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Neutral	7%	7%	-	9%	14%	7%	2%	4%	8%
5	6%	6%	-	11%	6%	7%	2%	3%	7%
6	34%	34%	-	38%	32%	35%	32%	34%	34%
Excellent	51%	51%	-	40%	45%	51%	64%	58%	50%
Top 3	92%	92%	-	89%	83%	93%	97%	95%	90%
Mean	6.27	6.27	-	6.05	6.01	6.31	6.55	6.45	6.21
Std. Dev.	0.97	0.97	-	1.03	1.22	0.87	0.72	0.81	1.01

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Your experience dealing with APNIC									
Very Poor	0%	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2	1%	-	1%	3%	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%
3	0%	-	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Neutral	10%	-	10%	12%	16%	11%	6%	13%	10%
5	5%	-	5%	10%	4%	4%	3%	9%	4%
6	34%	-	34%	34%	28%	43%	26%	36%	33%
Excellent	50%	-	50%	39%	53%	42%	65%	40%	53%
Top 3	89%	-	89%	83%	84%	88%	94%	85%	89%
Mean	6.22	-	6.22	5.86	6.18	6.13	6.50	5.99	6.26
Std. Dev.	1.02	-	1.02	1.29	1.09	1.01	0.83	1.13	1.02

12. When travel restrictions across the region are eased and travel becomes more common, do you think you or your organization will attend face-to-face events as you did before the COVID-19 pandemic?

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Sample Size	1622	1061	561	269	275	454	486	395	1089
We will attend more face-to-face events	39%	39%	39%	31%	30%	37%	51%	54%	34%
We will attend the same number of face-to-face events	13%	14%	12%	17%	14%	11%	12%	10%	14%
We will still attend face-to-face events, but not as many	23%	23%	23%	31%	21%	28%	16%	15%	26%
We will attend few or no face-to-face events in future	12%	13%	12%	12%	15%	12%	11%	10%	13%
Don't know	13%	12%	14%	9%	20%	12%	10%	10%	13%

13. What do you think are the MAIN benefits of attending APNIC events in-person?

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Sample Size	1622	1061	561	269	275	454	486	395	1089
Networking with other attendees	75%	76%	73%	70%	73%	75%	80%	79%	74%
Meeting new people	56%	56%	57%	56%	46%	60%	59%	61%	55%
Easier to participate in discussions or sessions	49%	49%	48%	48%	48%	49%	51%	50%	49%
I can concentrate on the sessions with less interruption	34%	32%	37%	30%	38%	32%	35%	31%	35%
The social activities organized	27%	27%	28%	25%	22%	28%	30%	27%	27%
I see no benefits over online participation / I prefer online participation	5%	5%	4%	5%	8%	5%	3%	3%	6%
Other	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%	1%	2%	1%

15. During COVID-19, what were the impacts on demand for your services?

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Sample Size	1621	1060	561	269	275	454	485	394	1089
Demand decreased significantly	12%	11%	14%	6%	11%	13%	14%	17%	9%
Demand decreased somewhat	18%	18%	17%	24%	12%	23%	12%	13%	19%
Demand stayed the same	17%	16%	18%	24%	15%	19%	12%	13%	18%
Demand increased somewhat	23%	23%	21%	30%	27%	19%	21%	20%	24%
Demand increased significantly	26%	27%	23%	14%	31%	19%	37%	28%	25%
Don't know	6%	5%	8%	3%	5%	7%	5%	8%	5%

16. Thinking again about the issues and impacts of COVID-19, which of the following had the MOST impact on you or your organization?

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Sample Size	1622	1061	561	269	275	454	486	395	1089
Inability to travel, to attend meetings, conferences, training and so forth	48%	45%	54%	54%	46%	54%	41%	42%	51%
Managing people working from home	47%	46%	47%	35%	38%	51%	55%	55%	44%
Supply chain disruptions (inability to acquire supplies or equipment)	43%	48%	35%	44%	62%	34%	41%	40%	44%
Increased costs to provide services	32%	33%	30%	34%	29%	28%	38%	39%	30%
Managing customer expectations	31%	30%	31%	25%	31%	34%	32%	30%	31%
Attracting or retaining suitably qualified technical employees	22%	23%	18%	19%	26%	22%	20%	20%	22%
Increased pressure from market competitors	12%	13%	10%	11%	7%	15%	11%	12%	11%
Other	2%	2%	3%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%

17. Thinking about business continuity and growth of your organization in the next two years, how confident are you about the future?



	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Sample Size	1622	1061	561	269	275	454	486	395	1089
Not at all confident	2%	2%	2%	3%	1%	2%	2%	3%	1%
Low confidence	8%	8%	8%	13%	5%	8%	6%	9%	7%
Somewhat confident	39%	40%	36%	47%	39%	41%	31%	32%	41%
Very confident	47%	47%	46%	30%	51%	43%	57%	49%	46%
Don't know	5%	4%	7%	7%	4%	6%	5%	7%	5%

Q20. *Thinking about Internet-related services, products or activities, what are the MAIN STRATEGIC challenges facing your organisation? Please rank these in order of priority, where 1 is the greatest challenge. Top Rank

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Sample Size	291	219	72	45	64	66	90	72	193
Hiring and/or keeping skilled employees	15%	17%	10%	11%	27%	20%	9%	13%	18%
Internet security risks	12%	12%	13%	7%	13%	14%	14%	8%	14%
Policymakers and regulators' understanding of the Internet	10%	8%	18%	9%	8%	11%	12%	13%	9%
Managing the unintended consequences of government regulations	9%	11%	6%	13%	8%	6%	13%	17%	8%
Cost control of hardware, software, and network investments	9%	11%	6%	7%	8%	8%	14%	14%	8%
Scaling capacity to meet market demand	9%	11%	4%	11%	14%	8%	4%	4%	10%
Introduction of new products and services to improve our business and stay competitive	8%	6%	14%	18%	5%	6%	4%	4%	8%
Costs of Internet security	8%	8%	7%	9%	5%	9%	8%	11%	6%
Compliance with regulatory requirements	7%	6%	7%	4%	5%	6%	10%	10%	6%
Keeping pace with new technologies	5%	5%	7%	9%	2%	8%	1%	3%	5%
Adapting business model to meet market changes	5%	5%	3%	2%	5%	2%	8%	4%	5%
Adapting our organization to meet environmental sustainability goals	2%	1%	7%	0%	3%	5%	1%	0%	3%

Q21. *Thinking again about your Internet-related services, products or activities, what are the MAIN operational challenges facing your organisation? (Top Rank)

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Sample Size	1,300	1,052	248	223	228	366	399	340	876
Internet security	30%	29%	37%	31%	29%	31%	28%	29%	30%
Managing cost of systems, network operations, and security	14%	15%	12%	10%	15%	15%	16%	17%	13%
Skills shortages / lack of suitably qualified technical people	12%	12%	10%	11%	17%	11%	10%	9%	13%
Management of Internet traffic, transit and peering, and network capacity	10%	11%	6%	13%	12%	8%	8%	10%	10%
Automation of network and systems operations	9%	10%	6%	5%	12%	10%	8%	9%	9%
IPv4 scarcity	7%	7%	9%	9%	4%	8%	7%	6%	8%
Managing the impact of new Internet technologies (for example 5G, Internet of Things (IoT)) on existing infrastructure	5%	5%	6%	6%	4%	5%	6%	4%	5%
Deployment of IPv6 in our network	5%	4%	7%	4%	1%	4%	8%	6%	4%
Keeping up with the pace of technology changes (for example, SDN, NFV, blockchain)	4%	4%	4%	4%	3%	5%	3%	3%	4%
Content providers are not IPv6 ready	3%	3%	2%	3%	1%	3%	4%	4%	2%
Other suppliers of Internet services are not IPv6 ready	2%	2%	1%	3%	1%	1%	3%	3%	1%

Q23. *Thinking about Internet security, what are the MAIN challenges facing your organisation?

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Sample Size	1,310	1,061	249	228	228	370	400	345	881
DDoS attacks	42%	44%	33%	49%	32%	37%	50%	47%	40%
Phishing, spam, malware, ransomware	42%	43%	38%	43%	46%	38%	45%	37%	45%
Staff lack awareness of security issues	22%	22%	23%	18%	26%	24%	21%	20%	23%
Blacklisting of our IP addresses	20%	22%	16%	13%	15%	24%	26%	26%	19%
Lack of expertise in implementing enterprise-wide security programs	20%	18%	26%	17%	20%	25%	17%	20%	20%
Intrusion and other breaches	18%	18%	20%	21%	25%	17%	15%	11%	22%
Routing security	16%	17%	15%	19%	14%	17%	14%	18%	15%
Compliance with national security regulations/requirements	16%	16%	16%	18%	20%	16%	13%	15%	16%
Lack of clear directives/policies from relevant government authorities	14%	14%	15%	11%	10%	17%	17%	22%	11%
Lack of security for IoT devices/applications	13%	13%	15%	12%	12%	11%	15%	12%	13%
Inadequate security policies	13%	12%	17%	16%	15%	11%	12%	14%	12%
Lack of application security	13%	12%	14%	10%	11%	13%	15%	15%	12%
Handling abuse and incident reports	11%	11%	10%	11%	9%	15%	8%	9%	12%
Lack of clear directives/policies from management	11%	10%	12%	9%	14%	10%	11%	13%	10%
Other	2%	2%	2%	2%	4%	1%	1%	1%	2%

Q24. *How could APNIC assist with these Internet security challenges?

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Sample Size	1,310	1,061	249	228	228	370	400	345	881
Increase security-focused training courses (DDoS prevention, and so forth)	30%	30%	30%	29%	24%	26%	35%	35%	27%
Collaboration with others to share information and best practice	28%	28%	26%	29%	27%	30%	27%	30%	28%
Maintain a security threat intelligence sharing service	21%	21%	20%	27%	20%	19%	19%	16%	23%
Sharing of security insights on the APNIC Blog / website	19%	20%	14%	18%	19%	19%	18%	18%	19%
Engagement with governments in the region about the issues of cybersecurity	18%	18%	20%	19%	18%	14%	22%	22%	17%
Enhance security content in APNIC conferences	17%	17%	18%	17%	11%	17%	20%	20%	16%
Encourage CERT development, information sharing between CERTs & APNIC community	16%	14%	23%	14%	17%	19%	14%	12%	18%
Provide a general security advice service	12%	12%	10%	11%	10%	14%	11%	10%	12%
Briefings/security training for senior management	11%	11%	15%	9%	12%	13%	13%	13%	11%
APNIC is already doing all it can to assist with these challenges	6%	7%	4%	6%	8%	7%	6%	6%	7%
None of these	3%	3%	2%	1%	7%	2%	2%	1%	3%
Other	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%

Q26. How much do you agree that historical addresses should be subject to the same fees as current resources (i.e. those resources allocated by APNIC)?

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Sample Size	1,060	1,060		168	206	287	334	302	693
Strongly disagree	6%	6%	-	2%	6%	5%	7%	8%	5%
Disagree	4%	4%	-	8%	2%	4%	4%	4%	4%
Somewhat disagree	6%	6%	-	8%	4%	6%	6%	5%	6%
I have no opinion	28%	28%	-	33%	22%	29%	28%	29%	27%
Somewhat agree	14%	14%	-	12%	12%	16%	14%	12%	15%
Agree	21%	21%	-	20%	22%	22%	19%	22%	20%
Strongly agree	13%	13%	-	8%	23%	10%	13%	13%	13%
Don't know	8%	8%	-	9%	9%	7%	8%	7%	9%

Q27.*Thinking about the availability of IPv4 addresses, what are the MAIN challenges facing your organisation?



	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Sample Size	1,061	1,061		168	206	287	334	302	693
The cost of buying IPv4 addresses	30%	30%	-	32%	22%	31%	33%	33%	29%
Finding available IPv4 addresses	27%	27%	-	22%	18%	30%	31%	30%	25%
Deploying IPv6	26%	26%	-	23%	19%	31%	26%	29%	24%
It is not an issue for my organization	22%	22%	-	18%	38%	18%	16%	16%	24%
Cost and complexity of NATs	16%	16%	-	18%	13%	14%	16%	15%	15%
IPv4 address transfer policies	14%	14%	-	17%	6%	15%	14%	18%	12%
“Health” of IPv4 addresses being transferred	13%	13%	-	13%	12%	13%	16%	13%	14%
Don’t know	6%	6%	-	7%	7%	6%	5%	6%	6%

Q29. Thinking about IPv6, in your opinion, what are the main issues preventing IPv6 deployment across the region?

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Sample Size	1,060	1,060		168	206	287	334	302	693
Lack of knowledge and expertise on IPv6	45%	45%	-	32%	43%	43%	54%	56%	39%
Lack of demand for IPv6 from customers	35%	35%	-	33%	36%	39%	31%	33%	35%
Lack of business/technical advantages or reasons to adopt IPv6	26%	26%	-	33%	37%	26%	17%	17%	30%
Lack of IPv6 support in network management/security systems	18%	18%	-	20%	17%	16%	21%	22%	18%
Lack of CPE (customer equipment) that supports IPv6	18%	18%	-	17%	14%	14%	25%	22%	16%
Lack of support for IPv6 among content providers	14%	14%	-	20%	16%	14%	11%	12%	15%
Content providers do not offer any/enough content on IPv6 in our economy	14%	14%	-	19%	4%	12%	19%	15%	14%
None of the above	5%	5%	-	2%	5%	7%	4%	3%	6%
Other	3%	3%	-	2%	5%	6%	2%	2%	4%

Q30. *Which of the following APNIC activities do you believe are the most important to encouraging IPv6 adoption in the APNIC region?

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Sample Size	1,060	1,060		168	206	287	334	302	693
Providing basic and advanced training on IPv6	29%	29%	-	21%	31%	32%	31%	32%	28%
Sharing deployment case studies and best current practices about IPv6	28%	28%	-	34%	22%	28%	28%	24%	29%
Providing technical assistance on IPv6 deployment	26%	26%	-	26%	25%	28%	27%	29%	26%
Promoting IPv6 to hardware, software and/or content providers	26%	26%	-	24%	24%	23%	30%	30%	24%
Promoting IPv6 to government and related organizations	20%	20%	-	30%	20%	17%	19%	19%	21%
Promoting IPv6 to customers (business and retail)	20%	20%	-	21%	19%	20%	20%	17%	21%
Promoting IPv6 to management and/or decision makers	19%	19%	-	15%	17%	21%	19%	20%	18%
Facilitating knowledge sharing between Member organizations on IPv6 deployment experiences	13%	13%	-	12%	14%	15%	12%	19%	11%
APNIC should take no action to promote or assist with the deployment of IPv6	2%	2%	-	2%	3%	1%	2%	1%	3%

31. Has your organization already deployed or are you ready for deployment of RPKI or ROV?

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Sample Size	1,310	1,061	249	228	228	370	400	345	881
We have deployed RPKI and ROV	23%	23%	25%	23%	16%	22%	29%	27%	22%
We are using RPKI but are not yet performing ROV	17%	17%	15%	19%	21%	14%	15%	14%	17%
We have an RPKI/ROV deployment plan	20%	20%	20%	21%	16%	17%	23%	24%	18%
We do not have any RPKI/ROV deployment plans	40%	40%	40%	37%	48%	46%	33%	36%	43%

32. What is preventing your organization from deploying RPKI/ROV?

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Sample Size	1,009	821	188	176	192	288	289	256	689
We do not have the knowledge and expertise	38%	36%	44%	34%	32%	41%	43%	45%	36%
Don't know	21%	22%	18%	21%	22%	20%	21%	23%	20%
We are not aware of other networks deploying RPKI/ROV	18%	18%	20%	11%	12%	23%	23%	23%	17%
We do not have the time to deploy and maintain it	16%	17%	13%	17%	23%	17%	9%	10%	18%
The cost of deployment and management of RPKI	16%	15%	22%	22%	7%	18%	15%	14%	16%
We are concerned about losing legitimate traffic by using RPKI/ROV	14%	14%	14%	15%	7%	13%	16%	17%	12%
We do not see the need to adopt RPKI/ROV	14%	13%	15%	13%	14%	12%	15%	10%	15%
Other	5%	5%	2%	4%	12%	3%	2%	2%	6%

33. *Earlier, you indicated you had not attended any APNIC training in the past two years. Can you tell us why you haven't attended any training?

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Sample Size	646	493	88	137	117	165	180	163	436
I didn't know about the training	29%	28%	30%	30%	21%	33%	32%	31%	29%
I don't have time	26%	26%	26%	36%	33%	26%	12%	15%	30%
I prefer face-to-face training	24%	25%	23%	15%	19%	19%	39%	40%	18%
The courses are not suited to my role/job	15%	14%	18%	18%	17%	15%	9%	7%	17%
Not offered in my local language	14%	16%	15%	26%	1%	12%	19%	22%	13%
I couldn't get management approval	10%	10%	13%	7%	8%	15%	9%	11%	10%
APNIC Academy training courses are not certified	7%	7%	9%	4%	4%	8%	7%	9%	6%
The topics are too basic	4%	5%	2%	5%	6%	4%	4%	6%	4%
Other	7%	8%	2%	3%	12%	8%	7%	6%	8%

35. Through the APNIC Foundation, APNIC has been able to expand Internet development activities in the region. In the next two years, what would you say is the MOST important area for APNIC to focus its development activities? Please rank these in order of importance where 1 is the MOST important?

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Sample Size	1,623	1,061	312	269	275	454	486	395	1,089
Infrastructure investment (e.g., IXPs, peering, route servers etc.)	35%	35%	29%	38%	36%	35%	33%	34%	36%
Human resource capacity building (For example, educating the next generation of Internet engineers)	34%	34%	37%	29%	33%	35%	37%	36%	33%
Relationship development (For example, governments, regulators, stakeholders)	17%	17%	19%	15%	18%	19%	15%	17%	17%
Community development (For example, NOGs, NREs etc.)	14%	14%	15%	17%	13%	11%	15%	13%	14%

35a. You ranked infrastructure development as an important area for Internet development. What aspects of infrastructure development support should be the main priority?

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Sample Size	939	637	302	161	156	267	280	230	634
Backbone networks – undersea and/or satellite	46%	44%	50%	42%	48%	50%	40%	42%	46%
Peering	43%	45%	40%	47%	41%	50%	39%	43%	45%
Neutral IXPs	37%	37%	36%	43%	47%	33%	28%	28%	39%
CDN caching	25%	27%	20%	22%	17%	25%	35%	37%	22%
DNS root servers	21%	19%	24%	21%	21%	18%	23%	18%	21%
DNS TLD servers	14%	13%	15%	11%	13%	10%	18%	19%	11%
Other	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%

35b. You ranked community development as an important area for Internet development. What aspects of community development support should be the main priority?

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Sample Size	662	427	235	107	100	175	209	155	436
NOGs	57%	58%	54%	64%	60%	54%	57%	63%	56%
CERTs	50%	51%	48%	49%	52%	55%	45%	39%	54%
IGFs or Schools of Internet Governance	41%	39%	44%	25%	36%	45%	44%	48%	36%
NRENs	22%	21%	24%	22%	13%	23%	24%	28%	20%
Other	3%	3%	3%	3%	4%	2%	2%	2%	3%

35c. You ranked human resource capacity building as an important area for Internet development. What aspects of capacity building should be the main priority?

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Sample Size	965	614	351	156	162	268	301	246	641
Technical training for network engineers	59%	60%	57%	59%	60%	58%	58%	61%	58%
Scholarships/Internships at APNIC	38%	36%	42%	27%	30%	44%	46%	48%	36%
Fellowships supporting the next generation of Internet engineers	35%	35%	34%	40%	34%	31%	32%	33%	34%
Internet subjects/topics offered for final year University engineers/graduates	23%	23%	24%	24%	28%	21%	22%	19%	25%
Funding to improve equal Internet access to all economies in the region	19%	18%	22%	14%	17%	23%	21%	20%	19%
Improving diversity in Internet-related roles	16%	17%	15%	23%	19%	15%	13%	13%	18%
Other	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%

35d. You ranked relationship development as an important area for Internet development. What aspects of relationship development should be the main priority?

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Sample Size	675	442	233	113	132	197	181	157	466
Education and training for government regulators about the Internet ecosystem	63%	60%	70%	68%	61%	59%	65%	62%	63%
Funding for better access to the Internet for less developed economies in the region	47%	46%	48%	35%	40%	53%	48%	55%	42%
Policy training for governments	41%	40%	43%	46%	41%	41%	43%	43%	42%
Greater investment in government relationships in the region	32%	34%	29%	27%	33%	37%	28%	27%	34%
Other	1%	1%	1%	0%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%

Q36. *Thinking about your membership of APNIC, please indicate how much you AGREE with the following:

APNIC is sufficiently open and transparent in its activities	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Sample Size	1,061	1,061		168	206	287	334	302	693
Strongly disagree	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%
2	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3	2%	2%	-	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%
Neutral	8%	8%	-	12%	14%	6%	3%	3%	9%
5	11%	11%	-	16%	10%	8%	11%	11%	10%
6	57%	57%	-	54%	57%	61%	58%	60%	57%
Strongly agree	21%	21%	-	15%	17%	23%	25%	22%	21%
Top 3	89%	89%	-	85%	83%	92%	94%	93%	88%
Mean	5.83	5.83	-	5.64	5.67	5.95	5.97	5.88	5.83
Std. Dev.	1.02	1.02	-	1.06	1.09	0.93	0.98	1.04	1.00

APNIC is responsive to the changing needs of its community	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Sample Size	1,061	1,061		168	206	287	334	302	693
Strongly disagree	0%	0%	-	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
2	1%	1%	-	1%	0%	0%	1%	2%	1%
3	1%	1%	-	0%	1%	0%	1%	2%	0%
Neutral	10%	10%	-	15%	16%	8%	5%	6%	12%
5	13%	13%	-	16%	15%	11%	10%	11%	13%
6	56%	56%	-	52%	53%	57%	60%	63%	54%
Strongly agree	19%	19%	-	14%	14%	23%	21%	17%	20%
Top 3	88%	88%	-	83%	82%	91%	91%	91%	87%
Mean	5.78	5.78	-	5.60	5.59	5.92	5.89	5.84	5.76
Std. Dev.	0.99	0.99	-	1.05	1.03	0.91	0.98	0.95	1.01

Q36. *Thinking about your membership of APNIC, please indicate how much you AGREE with the following:

APNIC is respected in the Internet community	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Sample Size	1,061	1,061		168	206	287	334	302	693
Strongly disagree	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%
2	0%	0%	-	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%
3	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%
Neutral	4%	4%	-	10%	5%	4%	1%	3%	5%
5	8%	8%	-	11%	8%	6%	7%	6%	8%
6	52%	52%	-	53%	50%	56%	49%	54%	51%
Strongly agree	34%	34%	-	24%	33%	32%	42%	34%	34%
Top 3	93%	93%	-	88%	91%	94%	97%	95%	93%
Mean	6.09	6.09	-	5.85	5.99	6.12	6.27	6.14	6.08
Std. Dev.	0.96	0.96	-	1.02	1.12	0.89	0.81	0.91	0.97

APNIC practices environmental sustainability in its service delivery	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Sample Size	1,061	1,061		168	206	287	334	302	693
Strongly disagree	0%	0%	-	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%
2	0%	0%	-	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%
3	1%	1%	-	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%
Neutral	19%	19%	-	18%	45%	11%	8%	9%	22%
5	9%	9%	-	15%	6%	7%	9%	9%	9%
6	51%	51%	-	50%	39%	59%	54%	59%	49%
Strongly agree	19%	19%	-	15%	9%	22%	27%	22%	19%
Top 3	80%	80%	-	81%	54%	88%	91%	89%	77%
Mean	5.68	5.68	-	5.60	5.10	5.87	5.97	5.90	5.61
Std. Dev.	1.05	1.05	-	1.03	1.12	0.97	0.91	0.92	1.09

Q37. *Which of these phrases best describes the way you speak about APNIC to others?

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Sample Size	1,622	1,061	561	269	275	454	486	395	1089
I am critical of APNIC without being asked	2%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	3%	4%	1%
I tend to be critical of APNIC if I am asked	4%	4%	4%	3%	2%	4%	4%	4%	3%
I am neutral	31%	31%	33%	40%	30%	37%	24%	29%	33%
I speak well about APNIC if I am asked	44%	46%	40%	39%	44%	45%	45%	45%	43%
I speak highly of APNIC without being asked	19%	18%	21%	17%	23%	13%	24%	18%	19%
Average	3.75	3.76	3.73	3.68	3.86	3.65	6.83	3.71	3.77
Standard Deviation	0.87	0.84	0.92	0.81	0.83	0.81	0.94	0.93	0.84

Q41. Do you have a disability that requires APNIC to make adjustments so you can engage with us online or at events?

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Sample Size	1,622	1,061	561	269	275	454	486	395	1089
Yes	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%	3%	3%	5%	1%
No	91%	91%	93%	94%	95%	87%	92%	86%	93%
Prefer not to say	6%	7%	4%	5%	4%	10%	5%	9%	5%

Q42. How well can you speak, read and write English?

	Total	Members	Stakeholders	East Asia	Oceania	SE Asia	South Asia	LDEs	Other
Sample Size	1,622	1,061	561	269	275	454	486	395	1089
I am fluent in English	45%	46%	44%	15%	85%	29%	46%	31%	46%
I can understand most English and have English conversations comfortably	30%	30%	29%	23%	14%	39%	37%	42%	27%
I can understand some English and have basic English conversations	19%	19%	20%	42%	1%	27%	14%	23%	20%
I understand little English and need assistance	6%	5%	6%	19%	0%	5%	3%	4%	7%