Some highlights and figures

- The majority of respondents source over 80% of their revenue from domain name registrations
- 40% of respondents are private companies, most of which are not for profit
- 52% of respondents also act as a Registrar (mostly for their own ccTLD)
- The most unrestricted SLD among respondents is .net and the most restricted is .gov
- The median proportion of ICANN accredited Registrars among the respondents is 50%
- 61% of respondents charged fees to their Registrars in some form (either once off or ongoing)
Introduction

As the domain name market changes and evolves, there are increasing reasons that Registries may wish to diversify their activities. The APTLD A-level survey 2014 however found that the majority of Registries source 80% or more of their total organisations revenue from domain name registrations. There are also a number of members which are engaged with other activities other than standard Registry services. This report will outline a few of the observations made from the A Survey in relation to Registry activities as well as some details on Registry/Registrar interactions and relations.

Note: Although the survey received 22 responses from APTLD members, not all questions were responded to in full. This means some statistics reported may use a different number as denominator – this will be expressed in the text.

Organisation Types

Most APTLD members are either a private company (9) or a government department (5). (‘Private company’ here is taken to include both for profit organisations as well as not for profit). In terms of the split between for profit and not for profit, most are not for profit.

Geographic comparison: The split between for profit and not for profit is very similar to ccTLDs in other regions of the world as shown in the chart to the right. Proportionally, the Latin America region has the highest percentage of not for profit ccTLDs. In all regions the average of not for profit organisations is around 80%
Registry activities

The survey asked which other activities the organisation is active in above and beyond their usual Registry services. By far the most common extra activity listed was to act as Registrar. 12 of out 22 respondents (roughly 52%) perform this function on top of their function as a Registry. Several others are ISPs, Regulators, telecom companies and CERTs (see Annex for all individual responses). Of the 12 who act as Registrars, 11 of them act only as a Registrar for their own ccTLD, the remaining one (.jp) acts as Registrar for their own ccTLD as well as gTLDs and other ccTLDs.

7 of the respondent (32%) stated they allocate IP addresses within their community. Of these 7 there are only 2 that act as a Registrar meaning there is not much overlap between those that act as Registrar and those that allocate IP addresses. Other lines of business some of the members are engaged with are listed in the annex of this report.

Services offered

Below shows the services offered by respondents to the survey in order of the most common. The darker sections of the bars represent where the service is offered but at an additional fee. There are only three services to which all respondents offer and do not charge for – cancellations, name server changes and data modifications.
Top and Second LevelRegistrations

18 respondents out of 22 stated they allow registrations under both the top level and second level of their TLD. 3 allow only under the top level and 1 allow only under the second level. Below show the number of respondents who offer the SLDs (left) and the breakdown of whether they are open to registrations or closed/restricted in some way. According to the data, .net is the most open (in terms of the number of respondents) SLD and .gov is the most closed or restricted.

Registry/Registrar relations

The number of registrars a ccTLD Registry has ranges anywhere from 1 to almost 650. Factors determining these numbers are most likely related to historic reasons such as the nature and definition of what a registrar is, the requirements to become a registrar and of course the size of the ccTLD zone. The numbers of Registrars per ccTLD registry are included in the annex of this report.

The chart (left) shows the proportions of ICANN accredited Registrars used by some of the respondents to the survey. The median value of ICANN accredited Registrars is 50%.

Geographic comparison: It is worth noting the situation in Europe with regard to Registries using ICANN accredited Registrars. As seen (left), most ccTLDs use only a small fraction of ICANN accredited registrars as compared with the above chart for APTLD. The median value of ICANN accredited Registrars for European ccTLD is 15% (as compared to 50% among the APTLD sample).
Registrar fees and Transaction methods

The survey also found that most (61%) respondents charge fees (either once off or ongoing) to Registrars with the remaining 7 that do not charge fees at all.

Geographic comparison: The distribution shown (right) is almost exactly the same within the European region.

Most respondents stated they use EPP as their transaction method with their registrars with many of those respondents also using web forms (ie offering both possibilities). With regard to the transport layer, 45% use https, 40% use TCP, 20% use http and 20% use email. Note: percentages are based on all respondents to the question and not cumulative.
## ANNEX

### Data Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISP</th>
<th>Telecom company</th>
<th>Registrar</th>
<th>CERT</th>
<th>Regulator</th>
<th>Allocate IPs</th>
<th>Registrars</th>
<th>ICANN Accred.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.ae</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.af</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.as</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.au</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.cn &amp; .中国</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.cx</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>280</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.hk</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.jo</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.jp</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>630</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.lk</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.mn</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.mo</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.my</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.nr</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.nu</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.nz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.om</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.sa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.tj</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.tw</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.vn</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.nc</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Registry Activities

- .af: Vocational Training, Consulting, Infrastructure security and design, software development
- .cn & .中国: SSL certificate
- .jo: ICT in government of Jordan
- .jp: New gTLD Registry ICANN accredited registrar
- .lk: Facilitating development of internet infrastructure
- .mn: Email and web hosting
- .my: Retail with resellers and special projects
- .nr: Internet Service Provider - Internet Cafe / Business Center
- .vn: National internet exchange

Registry/Registrar: Software used

- .ae: EPP and Web based portal
- .af: CoCCA Registry / Registrar system
- .as: Bespoke (Legacy System) CoCCA (New Production System)
- .au: Own Software
- .cx: CoCCA
- .hk: off-the-shelf w/ customisation
- .jo: self-developed software
- .jp: JPRS original transaction interface based on RRP
- .lk: In-house developed software
- .mn: API
- .mo: BIND
- .my: Custom made software
- .nr: Software was provided for and installed by SPC in 1988. Details not known.
- .nu: Home developed
- .nz: The New Zealand Shared Registry System (SRS) written in Perl has been under continual development since 2002. We use PostgreSQL as a backend database.
- .tw: API and EPP