

Table 1: Full results for the 2020/2021 survey of public toilet facilities in New Zealand (n=400 surveyed), showing column percentages.

Characteristic	Attempted complete sample of three city LAs (n=228 unless indicated otherwise)		Additional convenience sample (n=172 unless indicated otherwise)		Total (n=400)		Comments
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Type, location							
Toilet complexes (ie, some with multiple toilet facilities)	131	–	111	–	242	–	That is the average toilet complex had 1.7 separate toilet facilities (400/242) (median=1 facility; range: 1 to 6 facilities). All but one complex had no user charges; and one complex had an office with a supervisor.
Male toilet facility	44	19.3%	65	37.8%	109	27.3%	Four of these were urinals only.
Unisex toilet facility	184	80.7%	107	62.2%	291	72.8%	
Toilet facilities in the North Island	228	100.0%	126	73.3%	354	88.5%	The range was from Auckland to Wellington.
In the South Island	0	0.0%	46	26.7%	46	11.5%	The range was from Picton to Christchurch.
In a city council territory	228	100.0%	40	23.3%	268	67.0%	8 out of the 13 city councils in NZ were included (62%).
In a district council territory	0	0.0%	132	76.7%	132	33.0%	14 out of the 53 district councils in New Zealand were included (26%).
In a major urban areas (100,000+ population)*	185	81.1%	9	5.2%	194	48.5%	These were: Auckland City (n=5), Hutt City (n=50), Wellington City (n=135), Christchurch City (n=4).
In a small, medium or large urban areas (1,000 to 99,999 population)*	38	16.7%	123	71.5%	161	40.3%	
In a small town or rural area (<1,000 population)*	5	2.2%	40	23.3%	45	11.3%	
Water for handwashing							
Water not available	1	0.4%	9	5.2%	10	2.5%	
Automatic, no-touch water delivery	104	45.6%	8	4.7%	112	28.0%	
Lever mechanism for tap	5	2.2%	11	6.4%	16	4.0%	This is a subset of the above row.

Table 1: Full results for the 2020/2021 survey of public toilet facilities in New Zealand (n=400 surveyed), showing column percentages (continued).

Characteristic	Attempted complete sample of three city LAs (n=228 unless indicated otherwise)		Additional convenience sample (n=172 unless indicated otherwise)		Total (n=400)		Comments
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Soap							
Not available	22	9.6%	37	21.5%	59	14.8%	
Dispenser not working / empty	12	5.3%	3	1.7%	15	3.8%	This is a subset of the above row.
Bar/cake soap only	0	0.0%	24	14.0%	24	6.0%	
Toilet bowls							
Automatic flushing (no need to use a button or lever)	58/226	25.7%	14/163	8.6%	72/389	18.5%	Denominator excluded urinal only toilet facilities
Lid missing	78/240	32.5%	68/205	33.2%	146/445	32.8%	Denominator includes all separate toilet bowls in toilet cubicles
Urinal flushing							
Automatic flushing	52/55	94.5%	43/63	68.3%	95/118	80.5%	Other urinals required a button/level/cord to be used
Notable facility damage							
Damage	6	2.6%	3	1.7%	9	2.3%	See footnote for details.**
Health-related signage							
Any COVID-19-related behavioural messaging	33	14.5%	45	26.2%	78	19.5%	Excluding QR codes—see below. There was an example of a hand-washing sign involving soap in a toilet with no soap available.
Any COVID-19 QR code signage	27	11.8%	22	12.8%	49	12.3%	Inside or on outside wall/door. We included one sign that had fallen onto the floor.
Any handwashing signage	7	3.1%	0	0.0%	7	1.8%	That is generic signage, not COVID-19 specific
Any non-smoking signage	2	0.9%	3	1.7%	5	1.3%	
No health-related signage	175	76.8%	116	67.4%	291	72.8%	None of the four categories above.

* Using the New Zealand Statistical Standard for Geographic Areas 2018.

** Damage included broken seats, a toilet bowl lid with a hole, soap dispenser container remnants, the light not working and a toilet roll holder on the ground.