Synovate
P.O.Box 22098,
1583 Nicosia

Tel +357 22 366 000
Fax +357 22 332 533
www.synovate.com

The Business Environment and Enterprise Performance Survey (BEEPS) 2005:

A brief report on observations, experiences and methodology from the surveys in Spain and the Irish Republic

Prepared for: The European Bank for Reconstruction and Development

Prepared by: Synovate

Date: November 2005

Table of contents

1. Background

The Business Environment and Enterprise Performance Survey ("BEEPS") is a joint initiative of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development ("EBRD") and the World Bank Group. The survey was first undertaken on behalf of the EBRD and the World Bank in 1999 – 2000, when it was administered to approximately 4,000 enterprises in 26 countries of Central and Eastern Europe ("CEE") (including Turkey) and the Commonwealth of Independent States ("CIS") to assess the environment for private enterprise and business development.

In the second round of the BEEPS, the survey instrument was administered to approximately 6,500 enterprises in 27 counties (including Turkey but excluding Turkmenistan).

In the third round ("BEEPS III") the BEEPS instrument was administered to approximately 9,500 enterprises in the 27 countries covered by the second round of the BEEPS. In 7 of the countries the survey also included an additional sampling overlay of the manufacturing sector in addition to the main BEEPS sample.

Synovate implemented the BEEPS instrument and provided the EBRD with electronic data sets. As data analysis would be the responsibility of the EBRD, the objective of this report is to summarise Synovate's observations and experiences arising from the survey and the methodology employed.

2. Specifications of the survey

In this round of the BEEPS, the targeted sample was 550 in Spain and 500 in the Irish Republic ("Ireland").

2.1 Targeted distributional criteria of the sample

The general targeted distributional criteria of the sample in each country, were as follows:

- **Sector:** In each country, the sectoral composition in terms of manufacturing (including agro-processing) (1) versus services (including commerce)(2) was to be determined by the relative contribution to GDP, subject to a 10% minimum for each category. Firms that operated in sectors subject to government price regulation and prudential supervision, such as banking, electric power, rail transport, and water and waste water, were to be excluded from the sample
- **Size:** At least 10% of the sample was to be in the small(3) and 10% in the large size categories. Firms with only one employee and more than 10,000 employees were to be excluded from the sample
- **Ownership:** At least 10% of the firms were to have foreign control(4) and 10% were to have state control
- **Exporters:** At least 10% of the firms were to be exporters(5), meaning that some significant share of their output was to be exported
- **Location:** At least 10% of firms were to be in the category of "small city or countryside" (6)

(1). Mining and quarrying (Section C: 10-14), Construction (Section F: 45), Manufacturing (Section D: 15-37)
(2). Transportation, storage and communications (Section I: 60-64),
Wholesale, retail, repairs (Section G: 50-52), Real estate, business services (Section K: 70-74),
Hotels and restaurants (Section H: 55),
Other community, social and personal activities (Section O: selected groups)
(3). Small=2-49 employees, Medium=50-249, Large=250, 9,999
(4). More than 50% shareholding
(5). Exports 20% or more of total sales
(6). Population under 50,000 inhabitants

3. Scope of the work

3.1 Brief outline of the implementation of the survey

A brief outline of the survey is described below:

- We conducted two 2-day training workshops, in Spain and the other in Ireland
- Fieldwork supervisors were trained locally in each country
- The questionnaires (screener and main) were piloted with 5 enterprises from each country from 30th May – 2nd June 2005
- Refresher training courses were conducted for fieldwork personnel based on the experiences and observations from the pilots
- The main survey was conducted from 6th of June – end of September 2005
- A minimum of 20% call-back checks were made in order to verify and clarify responses
- Data entry and 1st checking and validation of the results were undertaken locally
- Final checking and validation of the results was made at Synovate Head Office

3.2 Sample

3.2.1 Establishment of the sample frame and population of enterprises

In each country we developed as complete as possible sample frames of businesses within the defined parameters of the study. We established the sample frames by collecting information, among others, from the following sources:

- National statistical institutes
- Chambers of commerce and industry
- Published information in industry registers
- Commercial directories

For some enterprise parameters (i.e., firm population/distribution by region, etc) where statistical information was not available, we estimated these from other accessible demographic (e.g., human population concentrations in rural and urban areas) and socio-economic (e.g., employment levels) data. The populations of eligible enterprises in each country are shown in Appendix A.

3.2.2 Sample design

The sample structure for this survey was designed to be as representative (self-weighted) as possible to the population of firms within the Industry and Service sectors subject to the minimum quotas (specified in the TOR) of the total sample. This approach ensured that there was sufficient weight in the tails of the distribution of firms by the various relevant controlled parameters (sector, size and location). This was also the approach we used for the design of samples of comparable surveys

As pertinent data on the actual population of foreign-owned or exporting enterprises were not readily available, it was not possible to build these two parameters into the design of the sample from the onset. The primary parameters used for the design of the sample were as follows:

- Longitudinal parameters
  - Total population of enterprises
  - Size of enterprise: Small, medium and large
  - Geographic location: Spread (capital city, small cities and countryside, etc) across each country
- Latitudinal parameter
  - Economic sub-sectors (e.g., manufacturing, wholesale, etc)

Because of the interlocking nature of the controlled parameters, we generated sample guidelines, and not definitive sample designs. The objective of the sample guidelines was to meet the survey quotas and at the same time maintain representativeness to the population of firms.

Step 1: The first step was to determine the GDP contribution of all major economic sectors and their constituent sub-sectors (see Appendix B, Table B1).

Step 2: As firms within agriculture and some sub-sectors within Industry and Services were excluded from the survey, their contribution to the GDP was also excluded by re-weighting total Industry and total Services so that Industry+Services=100%. The BEEPS total industry and service quotas were calculated from the re-weighted GDP contribution (see Appendix B, Table B2). The quotas by major economic activity are summarised below.

Country	**Industry**	**Services**	**Total**
Spain	216	334	550
Ireland	263	237	500
Total	**479**	**571**	**1,050**

Step 3: The population of eligible enterprises was obtained from the Statistical office and other sources and was broken down in the longitudinal and latitudinal parameters.

Step 4: Based on the universe data, the proportions of longitudinal and latitudinal parameters of the sample within Industry and Services were estimated.

Step 5: Using the proportions estimated in step 4, and the number of enterprises apportioned to each sector (step 2), a self-weighted sample within each sector and across all parameters was constructed.

Step 6: The sample size of some parameters resulting from the self-weighted sample from step 5 was outside the minimum quotas of this survey. For this reason, we re-weighed the sub-sector with the revised total samples (quotas) but still maintained the proportions of the original self-weighted universe. The same procedure was applied across enterprise size and location.

Step 7: As some sub-sectors (i.e wholesale/retail, business services) dominated the sample of the Services we considered a trade-off between representativeness and a better "mix" of sub-sectors within the Service industry. For example, the wholesale/retail/repairs sector was associated with small enterprises; therefore the sample design suggested that the majority of firms within Services should be wholesalers, retailers, etc, the implication of this was that the quotas for medium and large enterprises were unlikely to be met. For this reason, we decreased judgmentally the sample of wholesale, retail, repair firms and increased the number of interviews with firms operating in transportation, real estate, etc, Judgmental adjustments were done systematically and consistently so as to ensure that all Service sub-sectors were adequately represented in the survey and at the same time improve our chances of meeting the minimum quotas, especially those of enterprise size.

The target samples in each country are shown in Appendix C.

3.3 Survey instrument

The survey instrument (split into a "*screener*" and a "*main*" questionnaire) was identical to that used in BEEPS III.

The "*screener*" questionnaire was administered by phone and its objective was to establish enterprise and respondent eligibility and to secure recruitment. Once eligibility was established, the enterprise and respondent details were recorded and appointments were made to administer the "*main*" questionnaire, which contained the bulk of the BEEPS questions.

3.3.1 Translation of the questionnaire

The English questionnaire was translated into Spanish. An independent translator who had not worked on the translation and who had not seen the original English questionnaires back-translated the questionnaires into English in order to ensure accurate translation of the substance and meaning of the questions.

3.4 Piloting

The questionnaires were piloted with 5 enterprises in each country so as to:

- Adapt, if necessary, questions to make them more appropriate to local context
- Ensure that respondents understood the questions
- Identify problems in the survey instruments

3.5 Fieldwork and quality control

At all stages of the survey, the ESOMAR guidelines and code of conduct were observed.

3.5.1 Training

We conducted two 2-day training workshops, one in Spain and the other in Ireland. The objectives of the two workshops included:

- A debrief by the project director on the objectives, quality control and overall conduct of the project
- Training on and detailed explanation of the questionnaires
- Issues related to data entry and checking of questionnaires
- Review of detailed instructions and manuals for implementing the survey
- Establishing lines of communication between the members of the team
- Drawing-up of detailed timescales

Country and fieldwork managers trained supervisors and interviewers. Fieldwork personnel were trained before, as well as after, piloting.

Throughout the duration of the fieldwork, we conducted regular refresher training sessions and results of completed questionnaires were used to identify areas requiring particular attention.

3.5.2 Questionnaire checking, call back visits and telephone checks

A questionnaire was regarded as "successfully completed" if respondents answered approximately 85% of the applicable questions. Interviews with persistent Refusals/Not applicable or Don't Know answers (i.e., where it was obvious that respondents were unwilling to cooperate) were discarded and replacement interviews were conducted.

The country and fieldwork managers as well as fieldwork supervisors checked all completed questionnaires and conducted a minimum of 20% call back visits or telephone checks in order to verify the accuracy of the data recorded and, where deemed necessary, to clarify with respondents any inconsistencies in their answers.

Interviewers were required to submit brief qualitative reports for each interview completed, giving details of comments (on and off the record) made by respondents and further elaborations on questions, problems, reactions, etc.

3.5.3 Interviewing method and questionnaire administration

The eligible respondent at each enterprise was the person (e.g., CEO, general manager, finance director, etc) who normally represented the firm for official purposes. In larger enterprises we conducted "composite" interviews (i.e., more than one person answering questions).

The *"screener"* questionnaire was administered by phone. The *"main"* questionnaire was administered face-to-face.

3.5.4 Arrangement of interviews

To enhance respondent co-operation, we provided respondents with a letter from the EBRD explaining the objectives of the survey and confirming that the survey was conducted on the Bank's behalf.

For each randomly selected enterprise, 5 attempts were made to administer the questionnaires. If not successful on the 5^{th} attempt, that enterprise was ignored and we proceeded with fresh recruitment.

3.6 Samples and quotas achieved

In total we conducted 1,107 interviews, all with privately owned enterprises. The final sample sizes and quotas achieved in each country were as follows:

	Number of interviews		City/Town*			Main activity		Size of firm			Foreign own firms	Exporting firms
Country	Target	Completed	Large	Medium	Small	Industry	Services	Small	Medium	Large		
Spain	550	606	25%	41%	34%	39%	61%	72%	19%	9%	6%	10%
Ireland	500	501	33%	17%	50%	45%	55%	78%	15%	7%	11%	18%
Total	**1,050**	**1,107**	**29%**	**30%**	**41%**	**42%**	**58%**	**75%**	**17%**	**8%**	**8%**	**14%**

* Large = Capital + Cities with over 1 million
Medium = Cities 50,000 - 250,000 + 250,000-1,000,000
Small = Cities under 50,000

3.7 Interview success rates

The interview success rates in each country are summarised in the table below.

	Number of enterprises				% of total contacted		
Country	Enterprices contacted	Completed interviews	Refused/Not available	Not eligible/Quotas already met	Completed interviews	Refused/Not available	Not eligible/Quotas already met
Spain	2,286	606	1,079	601	26.51%	47.20%	26.29%
Ireland	1,802	501	589	712	27.80%	32.69%	39.51%
Total	**4,088**	**1,107**	**1,668**	**1,313**	**27.08%**	**40.80%**	**32.12%**

In total we contacted 4,088 eligible enterprises and achieved an overall interview completion rate of 27.08%.

Respondents who either refused outright (i.e. not interested) or were unavailable to be interviewed (i.e. on holiday, etc) accounted for 40.80% of all contacts.

Enterprises which were contacted but were non-eligible (i.e. business activity, etc) or quotas were already met (i.e. size, ownership etc) or to which "blind calls" were made to meet quotas (i.e. foreign ownership, exporters, etc) accounted for 32.12% of the total number of eligible enterprises contacted.

3.8 Permission to include enterprise details in database for future BEEPS

The percentage of respondents (total sample) who agreed to include their firms' details in our database for future BEEPS was 75.6%.

		Permission	
Country	Completed	Granted	Refused
Spain	606	70.3%	29.7%
Ireland	501	82.4%	17.6%
Total	**1107**	**75.6%**	**24.4%**

4 Overall observations and experiences from the survey

4.1 Enterprise recruitment

The length of the interview was a major barrier for participation but could possibly have been overcome with the provision of an incentive.

In excess of 100 and 150 interviews in Ireland and Spain had to be re-scheduled at least once (because of the holiday season, respondent pre-occupation with other issues, etc) and this had a major effect on the progress of the survey. In addition we experienced a high number of cancellations in both countries, which also affected timings and the continuous re-assessment of the quotas.

4.1.1 Questions asked by respondents during recruitment

Questions asked by respondents during recruitment included:

- How much time would the interview take?
- Could the questionnaire be sent in advance of the interview?
- Who is the sponsor of the survey?
- Can we conduct the survey over the phone?
- Will I get to see a copy of the report?
- Will you give me an incentive for my time?
- How would the interview benefit my company and myself?

4.1.2 Reasons for which respondents could not/would not take part in the survey

Reasons for which respondents could not/would not participate in the survey included the following:

- The interview duration is too long (recruiters mentioned approximately 1 hour)
- No incentive given
- No free time to take part
- Not interested in the topic of this survey
- The survey will not change anything
- Company policy not to participate in surveys
- Respondents going on or returning from holidays and had other priorities
- Not particularly impressed by the sponsor of the survey

4.1.3 Difficult enterprises to find and/or interview

The most difficult enterprises to find and or interview were as follows:

- Exporters – very few direct exporters and no database could be found
- Foreign owned- very few and no database could be found
- Small – could not see the relevance/impact of the survey to their businesses. Frequent interruptions by customers
- Large – very few and because of time constraints and work pressure
- Service companies – because some of the questions related to materials inputs/manufacturing activities

4.2 General comments

While the majority of respondents could be described as friendly and helpful, a small number were rude and unwilling to co-operate despite agreeing to the interview.

Only a small number of interviewers noted concerns about respondents' honesty and truthfulness of their answers.

Several respondents in Ireland commented that corrupt business people would not answer certain questions honestly.

Comments made by respondents tended to focus on the negative perception respondents had towards government policies, legislation and bureaucracy. These comments mostly came from respondents in small enterprises.

Some respondents commented that the questionnaire was not relevant to Spain/Ireland and questions seemed to be more appropriate to the Eastern/Central Europe, business environment.

Some respondents did not see the point of the survey at all and could not wait for it to be finished.

Smaller companies seem to have more difficulty keeping up with changes in government policies. Some respondents described having to spend a long time to figure out what the government wants and what penalties exist.

Interviews lasted between 1 to 2 hours, with the average length being one hour. The length of the interview was the main reason of complaint from respondents.

Most interviews were conducted with one respondent. Interviews that involved more than one respondent included accountants of financial officers being brought in to assist with the completion of the financial questions, e.g. Q57.

Two interviews in Ireland were terminated because the first respondent did not have enough time to complete the interview. The second respondent refused to continue because of the sensitivity of some questions.

4.3 Interviewer and respondent specific comments

- The attitude of banks towards women in business is not good. This company left a bank because of this (Ireland)
- Banks are no longer interested in small businesses
- The Irish government is far too quick to implement laws and regulations (Ireland)
- If enterprise were to give gifts/payments to government officials its business would be much better (Ireland)
- Ireland is a rip off society. The overheads the government gets in rates etc are crippling business Ireland)
- A lot of the questions were badly worded
- Questions were much more suited to a developing economy rather than the current economic situation
- Would not provide details for Q57. Not even the firm's bankers would be told that information (Ireland)
- Some questions require a lot of information and some of the questions were irrelevant
- Some of the information was sensitive and respondents were unwilling to answer
- Some trouble answering some of the questions because companies were small and all accounts are done by outside accountants

- Could see no reason why the questions were not sent out in advance
- The survey was inappropriate for the catering business
- The survey should have covered problems like: a) delays in transmissions from one European account into another, b) lack of transparency in bank charges, c) lack of advice given to business about how to operate accounts (Ireland)
- The respondent had very little business acumen but did her best to come up with the answers (Ireland)
- The respondent believed that 'rip-off' Ireland is true. He was cheesed off with the rules and regulations of the banks, financial house and insurance companies (Ireland)
- Some of the questions were difficult to answer and confusing

APPENDIX A

Population of eligible enterprises

Universe - Ireland

SECTOR		Ownership			Size (No of employees)				Location				
	Total	State owned	Private	Total	2-49 Employees	50-249 Employees	Over 249 Employees	Total	Capital	Over 1 million	250,000-1,000,000	50,000-250,000	Under 50,000
TOTAL	**82,402**	**27**	**82,375**	**82,402**	**75,747**	**5,649**	**1,006**	**82,402**	**29,817**	**0**	**0**	**17,339**	**35,246**
Mining and Quarrying (10-14)	**187**	1	186	**187**	146	36	5						
Construction (45)	**646**	0	646	**646**	594	45	7	**6,089**	2,015	0	0	1,236	2,838
Manufacturing (15-37)	**5,256**	0	5,256	**5,256**	4,468	683	105						
TOTAL INDUSTRY	**6,089**	**1**	**6,088**	**6,089**	**5,208**	**764**	**117**	**6,089**	**2,015**	**0**	**0**	**1,236**	**2,838**
Transportation, Storage and Communications (60-64)	**5,799**	22	5,777	**5,799**	5,277	406	116						
Wholesale, retail, repairs (50-52)	**29,239**	0	29,239	**29,205**	26,865	2,047	293						
Real Estate and Buisness Service (70-74)	**22,857**	1	22,856	**22,824**	21,452	1,143	229	**76,313**	27,802	0	0	16,103	32,408
Hotels and Restaurants (55)	**11,775**	0	11,775	**11,775**	10,833	824	118						
Other community, social and personal activities (92,93, only)	**6,643**	3	6,640	**6,710**	6,112	465	133						
TOTAL SERVICES	**76,313**	**26**	**76,287**	**76,313**	**70,539**	**4,885**	**889**	**76,313**	**27,802**	**0**	**0**	**16,103**	**32,408**

Universe - Spain

SECTOR		Ownership			Size (No of employees)				Location				
	Total	State owned	Private	Total	2-49 Employees	50-249 Employees	Over 249 Employees	Total	Capital	Over 1 million	250,000-1,000,000	50,000-250,000	Under 50,000
TOTAL	**498,893**	**12**	**498,881**	**498,893**	**481,439**	**15,018**	**2,436**	**498,893**	**51,241**	**32,058**	**65,214**	**101,994**	**248,386**
Mining and Quarrying (10-14)	**2,365**	3	2,362	**2,365**	2,202	145	18						
Construction (45)	**64,150**	0	64,150	**64,150**	62,064	1,922	164	**168,095**	11,134	7,434	16,784	31,702	101,041
Manufacturing (15-37)	**101,580**	2	101,578	**101,580**	95,120	5,444	1,016						
TOTAL INDUSTRY	**168,095**	**5**	**168,090**	**168,095**	**159,386**	**7,511**	**1,198**	**168,095**	**11,134**	**7,434**	**16,784**	**31,702**	**101,041**
Transportation, Storage and Communications (60-64)	**25,836**	2	25,834	**25,836**	24,674	968	194						
Wholesale, retail, repairs (50-52)	**161,494**	0	161,494	**161,494**	158,170	2,932	392						
Real Estate and Buisness Service (70-74)	**101,621**	5	101,616	**101,621**	98,456	2,656	509	**330,798**	40,107	24,624	48,430	70,292	147,345
Hotels and Restaurants (55)	**30,575**	0	30,575	**30,575**	29,716	760	99						
Other community, social and personal activities (92,93, only)	**11,272**	0	11,272	**11,272**	11,037	191	44						
TOTAL SERVICES	**330,798**	**7**	**330,791**	**330,798**	**322,053**	**7,507**	**1,238**	**330,798**	**40,107**	**24,624**	**48,430**	**70,292**	**147,345**

APPENDIX B

Sample design based on GDP

Table B1. GDP Contribution

	Spain	Ireland
Agriculture,forestry and fishing	3.1%	3.1%
1. Total agriculture, forestry and fishing	**3.1%**	**3.1%**
Mining and quarrying	0.5%	0.6%
Manufacturing	9.7%	32.2%
Construction	14.4%	7.8%
2. Total BEEPS industry	**24.6%**	**40.6%**
Electricity, gas and water supply	1.7%	1.3%
3. Total electricity, gas and water supply	**1.7%**	**1.3%**
Transport, storage and communication	6.6%	5.6%
Wholesale and retail trade, repairs	9.9%	8.7%
Real estate, renting and business activities	14.6%	17.0%
Hotels and restaurants	6.9%	2.8%
Community, social and personal service activities		2.5%
4. Total BEEPS services	**38.0%**	**36.6%**
Financial intermediation	4.2%	4.6%
Public administration and defence: Compulsory social security	5.4%	3.8%
Education	4.3%	3.9%
Health and social work	4.7%	5.7%
Other service activities	3.3%	
Scientific activities and technology	0.0%	
Recreational, cultural and sporting activities	0.0%	
Activities of Party and of membership organisations	0.0%	
Private households with employed persons	0.8%	0.01%
5.Total excluded services	**22.6%**	**18.0%**
6. Total Service sector	**60.6%**	**54.6%**
Total	**100%**	**100%**

Table B2. Sample Design Based on the BEEPS Sector GDP Contribution

Sector	**Spain**	**Ireland**
Total agriculture (section 1)		
Total BEEPS Industry (section 2)	24.60%	40.60%
Total BEEPS Services (section 4)	38.00%	36.60%
Total BEEPS	**62.60%**	**77.20%**
Total Sample	**550**	**500**
Re-weighted Industry sample (excluding agriculture)	216	263
Re-weighted Services sample (excluding agriculture)	334	237

APPENDIX C

Target Samples

Ireland
Sample: 500

SECTOR		Ownership			Size (No of employees)				Location				
	Total	State owned	Private	Total	2-49 Employees	50-249 Employees	Over 249 Employees	Total	Capital	Over 1 million	250,000-1,000,000	50,000-250,000	Under 50,000
TOTAL	500 100%	0 0%	500 100%	500 100%	380 76.10%	70 13.90%	50 10.00%	500 100%	173 34.68%	0 0%	0 0%	103 20.68%	223 44.65%
Mining and Quarrying (10-14)	10		10										
Construction (45)	40		40										
Manufacturing (15-37)	213		213										
TOTAL INDUSTRY	263 53%	0 0%	263 53%	263 53%	195 39%	48 10%	20 4%	263 53%	87 17%	0 0%	0 0%	53 11%	123 25%
Transportation, Storage and Communications (60-64)	40		40										
Wholesale, retail, repairs (50-52)	73		73										
Real Estate and Buisness Service (70-74)	58		58										
Hotels and Restaurants (55)	45		45										
Other community, social and personal activities (92,93, only)	21		21										
TOTAL SERVICES	237 47%	0 0%	237 47%	237 47%	185 37%	22 4%	30 6%	237 47%	86 17%	0 0%	0 0%	50 10%	101 20%

Note:
Group 90.0-91.3: exclude
Group 92.1-92.4: include
Group 92.5-92.7: exclude

Spain
Sample:550

SECTOR		Ownership			Size (No of employees)				Location				
	Total	State owned	Private	Total	2-49 Employees	50-249 Employees	Over 249 Employees	Total	Capital	Over 1 million	250,000-1,000,000	50,000-250,000	Under 50,000
TOTAL	**550** **100%**	**0** **0%**	**550** **100%**	**550** **100%**	**424** **77.05%**	**72** **13.03%**	**55** **9.92%**	**100%**	**69** **12.50%**	**58** **10.55%**	**90** **16.31%**	**120** **21.82%**	**214** **38.82%**
Mining and Quarrying (10-14)	**10**		10										
Construction (45)	**82**		82										
Manufacturing (15-37)	**124**		124										
TOTAL INDUSTRY	**216** **39%**	**0** **0%**	**216** **39%**	**216** **39%**	**157** **29%**	**35** **6%**	**24** **4%**	**216** **39%**	**18** **3%**	**27** **5%**	**28** **5%**	**44** **8%**	**99** **18%**
Transportation, Storage and Communications (60-64)	**50**		50										
Wholesale, retail, repairs (50-52)	**125**		125										
Real Estate and Buisness Service (70-74)	**79**		79										
Hotels and Restaurants (55)	**50**		50										
Other community, social and personal activities (92,93, only)	**30**		30										
TOTAL SERVICES	**334** **61%**	**0** **0%**	**334** **61%**	**334** **61%**	**267** **49%**	**36** **7%**	**31** **6%**	**334** **61%**	**51** **9%**	**31** **6%**	**62** **11%**	**76** **14%**	**114** **21%**

Note:
Group 90.0-91.3: exclude
Group 92.1-92.4: include
Group 92.5-92.7: exclude
Group 93: include