



Natural Resources
Canada

Ressources naturelles
Canada

Canada Land Survey System (CLSS) Client Satisfaction Survey 2020-21 Final Report

Prepared for Natural Resources Canada

Supplier name: Earncliffe Strategy Group
Contract number: 23483-210097/001/CY
Contract value: \$64,122.53 (including HST)
Award date: July 08, 2020
Delivery date: January 15, 2021

Registration number: POR 010-20

For more information on this report, please contact Natural Resources Canada at:
nrcan.por-rop.rncan@canada.ca

Ce rapport est aussi disponible en français.

Canada 

Canada Land Survey System (CLSS) Client Satisfaction Survey 2020-21 Final Report

Prepared for Natural Resources Canada
Supplier name: Earncliffe Strategy Group
January 2021

This public opinion research report presents the results of the online survey conducted by Earncliffe Strategy Group on behalf of Natural Resources Canada. The research was conducted from November to December 2020.

Cette publication est aussi disponible en français sous le titre : Système d'arpentage des terres du Canada (SATC) : Sondage sur la satisfaction de la clientèle 2020-2021

This publication may be reproduced for non-commercial purposes only. Prior written permission must be obtained from Natural Resources Canada. For more information on this report, please contact Natural Resources Canada at nrcan.por-rop.rncan@canada.ca.

Catalogue Number: M124-11/1-2021E-PDF

International Standard Book Number (ISBN): 978-0-660-37910-4

Related publications (registration number: POR 010-20)

M124-11/1-2021F-PDF
978-0-660-37911-1 (Final Report, French)

© Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, as represented by the Minister of Natural Resources, 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
INTRODUCTION	6
DETAILED FINDINGS	7
SECTION A: SURVEYORS	8
SECTION B: APPROVERS	25
SECTION C: INDIGENOUS.....	38
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	51
APPENDIX A: METHODOLOGY REPORT	53
APPENDIX B: QUESTIONNAIRES	57
APPENDIX C: VERBATIM OPEN-END RESPONSES	84

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Earnscliffe Strategy Group (Earnscliffe) is pleased to present this report to Natural Resources Canada summarizing the results of the quantitative research conducted to gain a better understanding of how and why different client groups use the Canada Land Survey System (CLSS) services and tools.

Recently, the Surveyor General Branch (SGB) committed to reinstating user feedback surveys measuring customer satisfaction of clients' experiences with the CLSS system. The Canada Lands Survey System (CLSS) administers a statutory framework, standards and information systems as well as the land survey ground infrastructure that legally identifies and protects the boundaries of property rights and enables land transactions on Canada Lands. The reinstating of user feedback surveys is important to gather input on the effectiveness of services and tools from the perspective of key stakeholders. The research findings will be used to enhance client satisfaction with CLSS products and services. The results will be used to improve the relationship with key stakeholders by providing better understanding of how and why different client groups use these services, tools and data. The research will also be helpful in identifying any priority areas for future improvements.

The objectives of the research were to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of Canada Land Survey System (CLSS) services, tools, and data to identify areas for potential improvements. Additionally, the research sought to gain a better understanding of how and why different client groups use CLSS services and tools. The contract value for this project was \$64,122.53 including HST.

To meet these objectives, Earnscliffe conducted a comprehensive wave of quantitative research with three specific stakeholder groups: Canada Lands Surveyors, other government land approvers, and Indigenous end-users and organizations. In total 105 Canada Lands Surveyors completed the online survey (26% response rate), which was conducted from November 1st to December 7th, 2020, the survey was an average of 10 minutes in length. In total 51 other government land approvers completed the survey online (23% response rate) from November 1st to December 7th, the survey was an average of 7 minutes in length. Lastly, in total 78 Indigenous end-users and organizations completed the survey either by telephone or online (27% response rate) from November 1st to December 18th, the survey was an average of 15 minutes in length.

Due to the very small sample sizes of each respective audience regional significance testing was not undertaken, however regional differences can be observed in the appended data tables.

Overall Findings

- Overall satisfaction levels are high regardless of audience and for two of the audiences the results are quite high. Just under two-thirds (65%) of Indigenous end-users and organizations are at least somewhat satisfied with the SGB. Only 1% of Indigenous end-users and organizations were dissatisfied, while 8% offered no opinion. Surveyors are more satisfied, with 80% saying at least somewhat satisfied (a mere 1% dissatisfied, and 13% DK/NR/NA), while Approvers are the most satisfied with 91% (with 2% dissatisfied, and 4% offering no opinion).

- In terms of frequency of requests, usage varies somewhat by audience. Approvers are the most likely to have requested services in the past two years whereas Indigenous audiences are the least.
 - The plurality of Indigenous respondents have requested services 1 to 5 times in the past 2 years. As for Surveyors there is a split, a third have requested services over 10 times in the past 2 years, and a third have requested 1 to 5 times. Finally over half of approvers (53%) have requested services over 10 times in the past 2 years.
- Email is by far the preferred primary method of communication, followed closely by telephone.
- The majority of respondents are able to find a clear point of contact, and virtually all respondents indicate they are served in the language of their choice.
- Regardless of audience the most common reason to have communicated with the SGB is a specific survey project.
 - Among Indigenous respondents, the second most popular reason is a boundary concern or question (75%). For surveyors the second most common reason is a survey standard or requirement (68%), and for approvers it is legal descriptions (70%).
- Satisfaction with SGB is also quite high on a variety of specific criteria.
 - Surveyors are most satisfied with the SGB's helpfulness (69%), knowledge of staff (65%) and responsiveness (62%). Only 2-3% of surveyors were dissatisfied with any given attribute.
 - Approvers are most satisfied with the SGB providing a clear point of contact (76%) knowledge of staff (75%) and helpfulness (71%). Responsiveness (65%) and effective communication (63%) were slightly less satisfactory. Only 2-6% of approvers were dissatisfied with any given attribute.
 - Indigenous respondents are most satisfied with knowledge of staff (68% very satisfied), followed closely by helpfulness (46%), and effective communication (44%). While responsiveness and providing information that is easy to understand (both tied at 41%) were last. Only 1-8% of Indigenous respondents were dissatisfied with any given attribute.
 - It is important to note, while Indigenous responses were slightly lower in terms of satisfaction, the levels of dissatisfaction remain the same (low) across all three audiences.
- With regards to service to Indigenous communities, over one-in-five (22%) have conducted over 20 surveys in their community in the past two years, another one-in-five have conducted 6 to 20 surveys in the past two years.
 - The most common type of survey is interior boundary survey or subdivision (75%), followed by exterior boundary survey (57%) and right of way survey (46%). One in four (26%) report having done a community survey within the past months.
- Indigenous respondents typically prefer band council resolution (59%), emails from an authorized person (44%), or signature on a survey plan (41%) as their preferred format to provide the approval for a survey plan.
 - The majority (55%) are comfortable approving survey plans.
 - Three-quarters feel that they are consulted enough during the survey process (72%).
 - Recommendations that could improve the survey process in their community are better communication (12%), access to surveyors or local surveyors (9%), and community engagement (8%).

- Almost two-thirds (62%) are not at all familiar with the First Nation Approval form or band approval form on myCLSS Website. Of those who are, just under half (48%) are at least somewhat satisfied.
- Two-in-three respondents would appreciate being able to provide approval of survey plans through an online application and 78% would use online application to provide approval of survey plans if there were one available.
- Taking a closer look at surveyors' usage of, and satisfaction with, the survey resources, two-in-five have access or used the myCLSS website for research or links to other tools and information pages, while one-in-two have never accessed or used CLEVER.
 - When thinking specifically about their experience with the national standards for the survey of Canada Lands many are satisfied with its ability to meet the needs of Canada lands survey system (81%) less so with notion it is well adapted to client needs (67%). Only 2-6% of surveyors were dissatisfied with any given attribute. Similarly, only 5-10% of surveyors were dissatisfied with any given aspect.
 - Thinking specifically about their experience with myCLSS the majority (88%) are satisfied that it meets their needs, slightly fewer are satisfied with its ability to get issues resolved or to get answers to questions (75%). Only 2-6% of surveyors were dissatisfied with any given aspect.
- By far a time delay in service of five days or more would have a very significant impact on two-in-five surveyors, whereas a time delay of one hour would have no impact at all for two-thirds of surveyors.
 - Nine-in-ten surveyors (89%) are satisfied with the issuance of survey instruction in a timely manner, satisfaction is less prevalent with regards to the process to request amendments through myCLSS (73%). Only 2-9% of surveyors were dissatisfied with any given attribute.
 - Looking specifically at their experience processing and reviewing legal survey plans, satisfaction is highest with the service of the SGB staff (85%), less so with the information and notifications available in myCLSS (80%). Only 4-10% of surveyors were dissatisfied with any given attribute.
 - In terms of experience with digital signature and myKEY, two-thirds are satisfied with the ease of using for signing survey document, however satisfaction drops significantly to 27% with regards of ease to setup and renew.
 - Lastly, when it comes to CLEVER three-quarters are satisfied with the ease to access (73%), while satisfaction with the information provided in the report being easy to understand drops to 60%. Only 4-13% of surveyors were dissatisfied with any given attribute.
- Overall, approvers less frequently access survey resources, 45% have never accessed or used the eApproval system, the same is true for a third of respondents having never requested SGB to provide the management of the provision of survey services, and a quarter having never received services relating to the regulation of surveys.
 - Satisfaction with attributes regarding experiences with the SGB providing the management of the provision of services are high, between 85% and 93% depending on the attribute. Only 2-6% of approvers were dissatisfied with any given attribute.
 - With regards to experiences with service related to the regulation of surveys, satisfaction is highest in terms of effective problem-solving (97%) and lowest in terms of ensuring necessary corrections were made to the plans (81%). Only 0-3% of approvers were dissatisfied with any given attribute.
 - Finally, looking specifically at experiences with eApproval respondents are most satisfied with the ease of use (80%), meeting the needs for the approval of the survey (79%), and the checklist

being both up-to-date and relevant (79%). Only 0-4% of approvers were dissatisfied with any given attribute.

- Switching to the topic of usage of and satisfaction with digital services, responses are quite similar across the three audiences. Frequency of use of digital services is highest with the Survey Plan search tool, and the Canada Lands Overlay in Google Earth, regardless of audience.
 - For Indigenous respondents and approvers this is followed by the Canada Lands Surveys section of the Natural Resources Canada website. Among surveyors this is followed by the map browser application.
 - Among surveyors, satisfaction is highest again with the Canada lands overlay in Google earth, and the Geospatial web services. For approvers, satisfaction is highest with the Survey Plan search tool and the Canada land survey section of the natural resources Canada website. Lastly, among Indigenous end-users and organizations, satisfaction is highest with the Canada lands overlay in Google Earth tool and the Survey Project search tool.

- Looking specifically at Indigenous respondents close to one-in-two (46%) are satisfied with the accessibility of SGBs cadastral/boundary data.
 - The majority (82%) would prefer to have all the information available organized by Indigenous nation or community. Nine-in-ten (88%) feel that aerial photos would better help manage their lands, cadastral mapping products including more detailed maps and training followed closely at 82%.
 - Should this information be provided, 19% feel it would improve efficiency while another 17% feel it would provide better access to information. For those who opted for more training popular topics included SGB's online tools, reading survey plans and project planning all tied at 86%.

Research Firm:

Earnscliffe Strategy Group Inc. (Earnscliffe)

Contract Number: 23483-210097/001/CY

Contract award date: January 15, 2021

I hereby certify as a Representative of Earnscliffe Strategy Group that the final deliverables fully comply with the Government of Canada political neutrality requirements outlined in the Communications Policy of the Government of Canada and Procedures for Planning and Contracting Public Opinion Research. Specifically, the deliverables do not include information on electoral voting intentions, political party preferences, standings with the electorate or ratings of the performance of a political party or its leaders.

Signed:

Date: January 15, 2021



Doug Anderson
Principal, Earnscliffe

INTRODUCTION

Earnscliffe Strategy Group (Earnscliffe) is pleased to present this report to Natural Resources Canada summarizing the results of the quantitative research conducted to gain a better understanding of how and why different client groups use the Canada Land Survey System (CLSS) services and tools.

Recently, the Surveyor General Branch (SGB) committed to reinstating user feedback surveys measuring customer satisfaction of clients' experiences with the CLSS system. The Canada Lands Survey System (CLSS) administers a statutory framework, standards and information systems as well as the land survey ground infrastructure that legally identifies and protects the boundaries of property rights and enables land transactions on Canada Lands. The reinstating of user feedback surveys is important to gather input on the effectiveness of services and tools from the perspective of key stakeholders.

The objectives of the research were to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of Canada Land Survey System (CLSS) services, tools, and data to identify areas for potential improvements. Additionally, the research sought to gain a better understanding of how and why different client groups use CLSS services and tools. The specific objectives of the research are to:

- identify client needs, preferences and expectations;
- gain awareness of any issues with the program's services, tools or data that impact its functionality or consistency;
- gather ideas and recommendations for new functions or features that may provide additional benefit;
- obtain insight into how clients view the accessibility, accuracy and timeliness of CLSS products and services; and
- measure satisfaction with staff in terms of knowledge, professionalism and responsiveness.

To meet these objectives, Earnscliffe conducted a comprehensive wave of quantitative research with three specific stakeholder groups; Canada Lands Surveyors, other government land approvers, and Indigenous end-users and organizations. In total 78 Canada Lands Surveyors conducted the online survey which was conducted from November 1st to December 7th, 2020, the survey was an average of 10 minutes in length. In total 51 other government land approvers conducted the survey online from November 1st to December 7th, the survey was an average of 7 minutes in length. Lastly, in total 105 Indigenous end-users and organizations conducted the survey either by telephone or online from November 1st to December 18th, the survey was an average of 15 minutes in length.

The research findings will be used to enhance client satisfaction with CLSS products and services. The results will be used to improve the relationship with key stakeholders by providing better understanding of how and why different client groups use these services, tools and data. The research will also be helpful in identifying any priority areas for future improvements.

Appended to this report are the questionnaires and methodology report.

DETAILED FINDINGS

This report is divided into three sections: Surveyors, Approvers, and Indigenous.

The findings represent the combined results regardless of location or language (English and French). Due to rounding, results may not always add to 100%. The use of the acronym 'DK/NR/NA' throughout the report refers to 'Don't Know/No Response'/'Not Applicable'. Due to the very small sample sizes of each respective audience regional significance testing was not undertaken, however regional differences can be observed in the appended data tables.

SECTION A: SURVEYORS

Important to note that NRCan employees were permitted to participate in the survey, however they were not isolated in the analysis as they do not statistically impact the overall results.

Overall Satisfaction with the SGB

In this section respondents were asked a series of logistics questions about their interactions with the SGB over the past two years, followed by their satisfaction with the SGB overall, as well as satisfaction with SGB attributes.

The plurality of surveyors have requested services or advice from the SGB over 10 times in the past 2 years (28%). One in five (20%) have requested services 6-10 times, while one in four (26%) have requested services 2-5 times. The most common method of communication is email. Almost all (99%) use this method to request services. Many surveyors also use telephones (87%), while a fifth (20%) make requests in person.

When asked if they are always able to find a clear point of contact, 86% of surveyors said ‘yes’, and all were served in the language of their choice. Most requests were made due to a specific survey project (87%), survey standards of requirements (68%), or review of survey plans (60%). Fewer requests were made due to an issue with digital signature or myKEY (40%), an issue with the SGB’s online tools or myCLSS (32%), or boundary advice (31%).

Overall satisfaction with the SGB is high among surveyors. Two in three (65%) are very satisfied, while another 15% are somewhat satisfied. Of note, only 1% of surveyors are dissatisfied with the SGB, while 13% offer no response. In terms of specific SGB attributes, 69% found the SGB to be helpful, 65% found the SGB staff to be knowledgeable and 62% found them responsive. Only 2-3% of surveyors were dissatisfied with any given attribute.

Exhibit A1: Q3 – *Over the past two years, how many times would you estimate you requested services or advice from the Surveyor General Branch (SGB)? n=105*

Frequency of SGB Requests	
Not at all	11%
Once	7%
2-5 times	26%
6-10 times	20%
Over 10 times	28%
DK/NR/NA	8%

Exhibit A2: Q4 – *[IF REQUESTED SERVICES OR ADVICE FROM SGB AT LEAST ONCE] Over the past two years, what methods of communication have you used to request services or advice from the SGB? Please indicate all that apply. n=85*

Methods of Communicating with SGB	
In person	20%
Email	99%

Telephone	87%
Traditional mail	0%
Other	5%
DK/NR/NA	0%

Exhibit A3: Q5 – *[IF Q3 AT LEAST ONCE] Were you always able to find a clear point of contact? n=85*

Point of Contact	
Yes	86%
No	13%
DK/NR/NA	1%

Exhibit A4: Q6 – *[IF REQUESTED SERVICES OR ADVICE FROM SGB AT LEAST ONCE] Were you served in the language of your choice? n=85*

Preferred Language Used	
Yes	100%
No	0%
DK/NR/NA	0%

Exhibit A5: Q7 – *[IF REQUESTED SERVICES OR ADVICE FROM SGB AT LEAST ONCE] What were the reasons for communicating with the SGB? Please indicate all that apply. n=85*

Reasons to Communicate with SGB	
A specific survey project	87%
Survey standards of requirements	68%
Review of survey plans	60%
An issue with digital signature or myKEY	40%
An issue with the SGB’s online tools or myCLSS	32%
Boundary advice	31%
Other*	4%
DK/NR/NA	1%

* Other responses include advice, collaboration, and clarification.

Exhibit A6: Q8A – *Overall, how satisfied are you with your interactions with the SGB over the past two years? n=105*

Overall Satisfaction with SGB	
Very satisfied	65%
Somewhat satisfied	15%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	6%
Somewhat dissatisfied	1%
Very dissatisfied	0%
DK/NR/NA	13%

Exhibit A7: Q8B – *Can you briefly explain why your interactions with the SGB over the past two years have been disappointing? n=1*

Reasons for Disappointing Interactions	
--	--

DK/NR/NA	100%
----------	------

Exhibit A8: Q9-11 – Overall, to what extent are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the SGB on each of the following attributes? n=105

Satisfaction with SGB Attributes						
	Very Satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	DK/NR/NA
Helpful	69%	15%	4%	2%	1%	10%
Knowledge of Staff	65%	20%	4%	1%	1%	10%
Responsive	62%	22%	4%	2%	1%	10%

Usage of & Satisfaction with Survey Resources

In this section respondents were about their satisfaction with a variety of survey resources including national standards, myCLSS, processing and review of legal survey plans, myKEY, and CLEVER.

In the past two years, one-in-two surveyors have accessed or used the myCLSS website for research or links to other tools and information pages (52%) over 10 times. Slightly fewer (46%) have accessed or used the national standards for the survey of Canada Lands over 10 times. Over one-in-four (28%) have opened a survey project through myCLSS and submitted a survey plan for review or processing over 10, while just one in ten (11%) have accessed or used CLEVER over 10 times.

Asked specifically about experiences with national standards for the survey of Canada Lands, one-in-two (47%) of surveyors are satisfied with its ability to meet the needs of the Canada Lands Survey System. Satisfaction drops slightly to 44% regarding ease of finding information, and ease of getting answers to questions about standards. Surveyors report the lowest levels of satisfaction for adequate types of plans (38%) and adaptation to client needs (35%). Only 5-10% of surveyors were dissatisfied with any given attribute.

Surveyors identified a variety of priority elements, although a third (30%) felt nothing should be added or modified, and over a third (36%) did not offer an answer. One priority identified by more than one surveyor was a request of more examples of plans.

Exhibit A9: Q12-15 – Over the past two years, how many times would you estimate you have done any of the following? n=105

Usage of Resources						
	Not at all	1 time	2-5 times	6-10 times	Over 10 times	DK/NR/NA
Accessed or used the National Standards for the Survey of Canada Lands	8%	3%	24%	18%	46%	2%

Accessed or used the myCLSS website for research or links to other tools and information pages	11%	5%	18%	11%	52%	2%
Opened a survey project through myCLSS and submitted a survey plan for review and/or processing	21%	12%	22%	11%	28%	5%
Accessed or used CLEVER (Canada Lands e-validation of electronic returns)	49%	10%	15%	10%	11%	6%

Exhibit A10: Q16-20 – [IF ACCESSED OR USED THE NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR THE SURVEY OF CANADA LANDS AT LEAST ONCE] Thinking specifically about your experience with the National Standards for the Survey of Canada Lands, to what extent are you satisfied or dissatisfied on the following attributes? n=95

Satisfaction with Survey Resources						
	Very Satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	DK/N R/NA
Meets the needs of the Canada Lands Survey System	47%	34%	8%	3%	2%	5%
Easy to find information	44%	34%	11%	7%	1%	3%
Easy to get answers to questions about standards	44%	34%	8%	5%	1%	7%
Has adequate types of plans	38%	37%	11%	6%	3%	5%
Well-adapted to client needs	35%	32%	19%	9%	1%	4%

Exhibit A11: Q21 – Can you indicate one or more elements of the standards that should be modified or added as a priority? n=105

Priority Elements of Standards	
Other*	33%
Nothing needs to be modified or added	30%

DK/NR/NA	36%
----------	-----

*Verbatim responses can be found in Appendix C

Overall two-in-five (41%) surveyors know how to submit a suggestion regarding changes to the National Standards. Slightly more (46%) do not know how.

Surveyors’ satisfaction with myCLSS is highest when it comes to its ability to meet their needs (60%). Less so with reliability of the site (54%), ease of use (49%), and ease of getting issues resolved (37%). Only 2-6% of surveyors were dissatisfied with any given attribute.

If myCLSS and SGB’s digital tools were down for 1 hour it would cause no impact at all for the majority (63%) of surveyors. However if they were down for 2 days it would have very significant impacts on 14% of surveyors, and if they were down for 5 days or more it would have significant impacts on 38% of surveyors. When asked how myCLSS could be improved, a quarter (26%) feel it could not be improved, and almost half (46%) do not provide an answer. Of those who do provide an answer, one commonality is the request to be able to add and correct documents in myCLSS.

Exhibit A12: Q22 – *Do you know how to submit a suggestion regarding changes to the National Standards?* n=105

National Standards Suggestion Submissions	
Yes	41%
No	46%
DK/NR/NA	13%

Exhibit A13: Q23-26 – *[IF OPENED A SURVEY PROJECT THROUGH MYCLSS AT LEAST ONCE] Thinking specifically about your experience with myCLSS, to what extent are you satisfied or dissatisfied on the following attributes?* n=78

Satisfaction with myCLSS Attributes						
	Very Satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	DK/N R/NA
Meets your needs	60%	28%	9%	1%	1%	0%
Reliability of the site – also known as “uptime”	54%	31%	9%	4%	0%	3%
Easy to use	49%	37%	10%	3%	1%	0%
Easy to get issues resolved or get answers to questions	37%	38%	15%	5%	1%	2%

Exhibit A14: Q27-30 – *If myCLSS and SGB’s digital tools were down for each of the following lengths of time, how significant an impact, if any, would this have on the finances or operations of your business?* n=105

Impact if SGB’s Digital Tools Were Down					
	A very significant impact	A significant impact	An insignificant impact	No impact at all	DK/NR/NA
1 hour	2%	2%	26%	63%	8%
4 hours	2%	11%	30%	48%	9%
2 days	14%	28%	34%	15%	9%
5 days or more	38%	29%	18%	7%	9%

Exhibit A15: Q31 – *Can you indicate one or more ways myCLSS could be improved? n=105*

Suggested Improvements of myCLSS	
Other*	29%
Nothing needs to be modified or added	26%
DK/NR/NA	46%

*Verbatim responses can be found in Appendix C

Asked about their experiences with the request of survey instructions, over two-thirds of surveyors are satisfied with the issuance of survey instructions in a timely manner (68%). Over half are satisfied with the process making sense through myCLSS (56%) and being kept informed of any delays with survey instructions or problems regarding survey instructions (51%). Further, exactly half (50%) are satisfied with the process to make amendments making sense through myCLSS. Only 2-9% of surveyors were dissatisfied with any given attribute.

Surveyors, when asked to think specifically about processing and review of legal survey plans, are most satisfied with the service of the SGB staff (67%), and the reliability of service (53%). Less than half are satisfied with the way problems were handled (49%), the process making sense (47%), being kept informed (47%), reviews being conducted in a timely manner (46%), the information and notifications available through myCLSS (44%), and lastly critical issue process and functionality (44%). Only 4-10% of surveyors were dissatisfied with any given attribute.

Surveyors suggested a variety of improvements towards the review and processing of legal survey plans, however over half failed to provide an answer, and one in four (23%) felt that nothing could be improved.

Exhibit A16: Q32-36 – *[IF OPENED A SURVEY PROJECT THROUGH MYCLSS AT LEAST ONCE] Thinking specifically about your experience with the request of survey instructions, to what extent are you satisfied or dissatisfied on the following attributes? n=78*

Satisfaction with Survey Instruction Attributes						
	Very Satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	DK/NR/NA
Issuance of survey instruction in a	68%	21%	4%	3%	1%	4%

timely matter (2 business days)						
Process make sense through myCLSS	56%	28%	8%	1%	3%	4%
Being kept informed of any issues or delays with survey instructions	51%	24%	12%	4%	1%	8%
Being kept informed of any survey problem regarding survey instructions	51%	21%	17%	1%	1%	9%
Process to request amendments make sense through myCLSS	50%	23%	8%	8%	1%	10%

Exhibit A17: Q37-44 – [IF OPENED A SURVEY PROJECT THROUGH MYCLSS AT LEAST ONCE] Thinking specifically about your experience with the processing and review of legal survey plans, to what extent are you satisfied or dissatisfied on the following attributes? n=78

Satisfaction with Processing and Review of Legal Survey Plans and Attributes						
	Very Satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	DK/N R/NA
The service of the SGB staff	67%	18%	4%	3%	1%	7%
Reliability of service	53%	27%	8%	3%	3%	7%
The way any problems or conflicts were handled	49%	23%	10%	5%	3%	11%
Process makes sense through myCLSS	47%	32%	8%	3%	3%	7%
Being kept informed of any issues or delays with plan review	47%	24%	12%	6%	1%	9%
Review conducted in a timely manner	46%	28%	8%	9%	1%	7%

The information and notifications available in myCLSS	44%	36%	6%	4%	3%	7%
Critical issue process and functionality	44%	29%	9%	4%	5%	9%

Exhibit A18: Q45 – Can you indicate one or more ways the review and processing of legal survey plans could be improved? n=105

Suggested Improvements of myCLSS	
Other*	18%
Nothing needs to be modified or added	23%
DK/NR/NA	59%

*Verbatim responses can be found in Appendix C

Digital signature and myKEY attributes receive the lowest levels of satisfaction of the digital tools. While two-in-five surveyors are very satisfied with the ease of use for signing survey documents (40%) satisfaction drops for the other attributes. Over a third (37%) are very satisfied with the ease of preparing files for digital signature, 27% are very satisfied with the ease of getting support regarding an issue, 15% are very satisfied with the help documentation provided, and a mere one in ten (10%) are satisfied with the ease of use to set up and renew.

Satisfaction was higher in terms of CLEVER attributes. Half of surveyors (48%) are very satisfied with the ease of access, and ease of use. Slightly fewer are very satisfied of the reliability of results (38%), and the ease with which they can understand the information being provided (31%). Only 4-13% of surveyors were dissatisfied with any given attribute.

While there are several improvements provided for CLEVER, the most prevalent is the ability to identify and resolve problems. Though important to note that almost three-quarters (71%) do not offer an improvement.

Exhibit A19: Q46-50 – [IF OPENED A SURVEY PROJECT THROUGH MYCLSS AT LEAST ONCE] Thinking specifically about your experience with digital signature and myKEY, to what extent are you satisfied or dissatisfied on the following attributes? n=78

Satisfaction with myKEY Attributes						
	Very Satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	DK/N R/NA
Easy to use for signing survey documents	40%	26%	6%	8%	5%	16%
Easy to prepare files for digital signature (PDF/A)	37%	21%	13%	8%	6%	16%

Easy to get support regarding an issue	27%	27%	13%	14%	3%	17%
The help documentation provided	15%	29%	19%	12%	8%	17%
Easy to set up and renew	10%	17%	17%	26%	17%	14%

Exhibit A20: Q51-54 – [IF ACCESSED/USED CLEVER AT LEAST ONCE] Thinking specifically about your experience with CLEVER, to what extent are you satisfied or dissatisfied on the following attributes? n=48

Satisfaction with CLEVER Attributes						
	Very Satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	DK/N R/NA
Easy to access	48%	25%	10%	2%	2%	12%
Easy to use	48%	17%	15%	8%	0%	12%
Reliability of the results from CLEVER	38%	27%	10%	13%	0%	12%
Information provided in the report is easy to understand	31%	29%	17%	10%	0%	12%

Exhibit A21: Q55 – [IF ACCESSED/USED CLEVER AT LEAST ONCE] Can you indicate one or more ways CLEVER could be improved? n=48

Suggested Improvements of CLEVER	
Would be nice if it could do some dimension checks similar to SPOC in Alberta - not a bounce back failure issue due to difficulty of setting this up properly but would be good as a 'warning' issue for feedback to surveyors.	1%
Sometimes we have problems understanding what CLEVER is telling us - maybe we have to spend more time with the instruction manual.	1%
I have struggled with both the results from CLEVER and the standards for the file. I really support having a tool like CLEVER and at the same time it should not take 5 or 10 passes to figure out what is wrong with a file and yet that is what has happened each time I have used it. In fact, each time I have had to seek help from others.	1%
Access to drafting staff.	1%
I fix one or two items and the next check there are more problems. I don't think I ever had a clean sheet - probably just me.	1%
The reports indicate that a particular problem exists but not necessarily what it is. I occasionally have to ask a contact with SGB to run a separate analysis for me to determine the specific issue to correct. He send me a .pdf showing	1%

where line gaps are or what duplicate lines need to be removed. Why can't CLEVER do this?	
CLEVER is annoying to use, even after a few years. It doesn't work easily with our version of CAD so we are always having to save it to a different format which is just one more annoying thing about it. The digital signature is fine now that it has been in effect for a few years. I appreciate that there is now a long period before renewal. SGB staff is great with digital signature, it is just annoying to set up. We use this fairly often; I imagine this whole thing would be annoying for a practitioner who only does a few plans a year.	1%
If there was a simple tutorial - video format - this would prove very useful.	1%
The elevations were flagged as possibly not being ellipsoidal; however, they were in fact ellipsoidal, so this warning did not make sense and confused the process. This may have already been corrected.	1%
Too many other organizations are using the same acronym.	1%
I have heard from other surveyors that CLEVER kicks you out after it finds the first problem. If you have 10 problems, you will have to go through the system 10 times. It would be better if all problems could be identified the first time so they could all be resolved at the same time.	1%
Nothing needs to be modified or added	19%
DK/NR/NA	71%

*Some response were edited to improve readability.

Usage of & Satisfaction with Digital Services

Finally, respondents were asked of their usage of 8 key digital services, as well as their satisfaction with the services and suggested improvements.

The most frequently used digital services include the Survey Plan search tool (67% over 10 times in the last 2 years) and the Map Browser application (62%). Not far behind are the Geospatial web services and the Canada Lands Overlay in Google Earth (tied at 58%) and the Canada Lands Digital Cadastral Data (50%). Followed by the Canada Lands Surveys section of the Natural Resources Canada web site (43%) and the Survey Project Search tool (41%). By far the least used digital service is the Oil and Gas tools, whereby only 1% used this service over 10 times in the past 2 years.

Surveyors are most satisfied with the Canada Lands Overlay in Google Earth (70%), and the Geospatial web services (67%). Surveyors are least satisfied with the Map Browser application (43%), and the Oil and Gas tools (29%). The Survey Project Search tool (59%), the Survey Plan Search tool (57%), the Canada Lands Cadastral Data (56%), and the Canada Lands section of the Natural Resources website (48%) all fell in the middle. Only 3-12% of surveyors were dissatisfied with any given tool.

Exhibit A22: Q56-63 – *Over the past two years, how many times would you estimate you accessed or used the any of the following? n=105*

	Usage of Digital Services					DK/NR/NA
	Not at all	1 time	2-5 times	6-10 times	Over 10 times	
The Survey Plan search tool	2%	6%	10%	12%	67%	3%

The Map Browser application	7%	5%	12%	12%	62%	2%
The Canada Lands Surveys section of the Natural Resources Canada web site	10%	7%	19%	13%	43%	8%
The Canada Lands Digital Cadastral data	14%	4%	18%	11%	50%	2%
The Geospatial web services (Aboriginal lands, CSRS-PPP, GPS H)	16%	3%	10%	10%	58%	4%
The Canada Lands Overlay in Google Earth	18%	3%	9%	10%	58%	2%
The Survey Project search tool	26%	4%	15%	10%	41%	4%
The Oil and Gas tools	82%	3%	6%	7%	1%	2%

Exhibit A22: Q64-71 – *How satisfied would you say you were with each of the following over the past two years?*

Satisfaction with Digital Services						
	Very Satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	DK/N R/NA
The Canada Lands Overlay in Google Earth (n=84)	70%	23%	1%	1%	2%	2%
The Geospatial web services (Aboriginal lands, CSRS-PPP, GPS H) (n=84)	67%	20%	8%	1%	1%	2%
The Survey Project search tool (n=74)	59%	15%	18%	4%	1%	3%
The Survey Plan search tool (n=100)	57%	25%	7%	5%	3%	3%
The Canada Lands Digital Cadastral data (n=88)	56%	23%	14%	1%	3%	3%

The Canada Lands Surveys section of the Natural Resources Canada web site (n=87)	48%	28%	11%	3%	5%	5%
The Map Browser application (n=96)	43%	33%	8%	6%	6%	3%
The Oil and Gas tools (n=17)	29%	18%	29%	6%	0%	18%

Exhibit A23: Q72 – [IF USED THE CANADA LANDS SURVEY SECTION AT LEAST ONCE] Can you indicate one or more ways the Canada Lands Surveys section of the Natural Resources Canada web site could be improved? n=87

Sources of Improvement of the Canada Lands Surveys section of the Natural Resources Canada web site	
Make it easier to find on the web site.	8%
Make it more like ISC. ISC has better interactivity.	1%
Better search capability.	1%
Nothing needs to be modified or added	28%
DK/NR/NA	63%

Exhibit A24: [IF USED THE SURVEY PLAN SEARCH TOOL AT LEAST ONCE] Q73 – Can you indicate one or more ways the Survey Plan search tool could be improved? n=100

Sources of Improvement of the Survey Plan search tool	
Allow for batch download of survey plans selected. Downloading plans one at a time is cumbersome.	1%
Add it to the map browser.	1%
There are a lot of steps to go through to get a plan but overall I am satisfied.	1%
Not user friendly.	1%
The ability to search all plans associated and adjacent to a lot of interest.	1%
Put the link to a PDF of the plan at the top of the page so I don't need to scroll to the bottom each time. Maybe also have a preview function.	1%
After downloading a plan and back paging to the initial request page it would be nice to be at the top of that page. Instead on my browser I am taken to the bottom of page and have to scroll back to the top to request the next plan.	1%
I love this tool so much and use it daily. My only very minor comment is that I actually liked it when all of these files were .tifs and find the PDFs okay too, but the files tend to be huge, whereas the tifs are crisp and clean and not as massive.	1%
Ability to rotate the map and make it easier to make printouts.	1%
Very slow to accept typed search data?? Examples of parcel search options... does not work well now as there are many options and no idea how to enter data.	1%

Give each of these tools a Name. I use them but without being in to myCLSS for 3-4 months, I am not familiar with exactly this tool. A distinct nick-name might help.	1%
Don't have surveyors listed multiple ways ie Jane Doe Smith (1647, Doe Smith, Jane.	1%
Perhaps a preview of the plan might be helpful in some cases, but overall I find it very efficient and easy to use.	1%
It works fine. Just wanted to note we research probably 4 jobs for every one we are awarded.	1%
Nothing needs to be modified or added	31%
DK/NR/NA	55%

*Some response were edited to improve readability.

Exhibit A25: Q74 – [IF USED THE SURVEY PROJECT SEARCH TOOL AT LEAST ONCE] Can you indicate one or more ways the Survey Project search tool could be improved? n=74

Sources of Improvement of the Survey Project search tool	
The map browser could be improved, the window is small and the background information is a bit dated and would be nice if can choose different background imagery.	2%
Perhaps certain names for these applications could be applied. I reading the various tools in the prior question, the names Map Browser Application is something I likely have used but I do not think in terms of these generic names. I know what CLEVER is, though I have not used it myself.	2%
Have only one name per surveyor.	2%
Works pretty good.	2%
Nothing needs to be modified or added	35%
DK/NR/NA	58%

*Some response were edited to improve readability.

Exhibit A26: Q75 – [IF USED THE MPA BROWSER APPLICATION AT LEAST ONCE] Can you indicate one or more ways the Map Browser application could be improved? n=96

Sources of Improvement of the Map Browser application	
Develop a modernized application when resources are available.	1%
Better intuitive integration between internal and external applications.	1%
Improve the display, the search and the fluidity of the system!	1%
Add plan search.	1%
Not user friendly.	1%
Replace it, it is terrible.	1%
Zoom feature doesn't seem to make it easy to move around.	1%
It should be faster/easier to zoom into a particular region. You should be able to make a particular region a default home screen in the browser.	1%
Have a better background: more detailed map/air photo.	1%
Show imagery behind map layers.	1%
See a previous answer - hard to use, window in a window makes it hard for panning and scrolling, not intuitive to see a copy of a plan.	1%

Improve the speed of the tool and the way to navigate -Allow the selection of a lot to see the information on the lot (like Google Earth) instead of the table of results.	1%
Select and request a plan directly from here rather than having to write them down and requesting using a different part of the system.	1%
Time to load and base map lacking. Use Bing or Google as background.	1%
There is something about this platform that is just not that easy to use. I've tried in many different browsers and it just seems a bit ancient- clunky, hard to navigate around. If I can avoid using it, I do.	1%
I am sure there is some way that this can be improved, however it would take more of an advanced user to determine this.	1%
Difficult to print composite plans from the map browser. Slow and cumbersome to use. This tool could use an upgrade	1%
Difficult to see CLSR plan numbers unless you are at a certain view scale. It would be good to enter in, say Sec-Twp-Rge-Mer, and plan numbers populate. This suggestion is similar to Alberta Land Titles GIS application called SPIN2.	1%
CLSS Map browser online is 15 years old. It's aged and should be updated. SGB needs to do it at some point. You should make it a priority now.	1%
Very slow to respond some days.	1%
Select an existing boundary or polygon to search, instead of having to draw a polygon each time.	1%
Larger viewing window.	1%
The window could be bigger. There could be a default select tool. Different background imagery or dataset.	1%
Give each of these tools a Name. I use them but without being in to myCLSS for 3-4 months, I am not familiar with exactly this tool. A distinct nick-name might help.	1%
Sometimes information disappears when you zoom in.	1%
Make searches of plans possible by window.	1%
Find it a bit slow at times, and could use a refresh of the interface, otherwise I suppose it works good enough for the purposes I need.	1%
I prefer to use the eRIP browser. It is possible that I just don't know how to use the browser through the myCLSS system.	1%
Nothing needs to be modified or added	23%
DK/NR/NA	48%

*Some response were edited to improve readability.

Exhibit A27: Q76 – [IF USED THE CANADALANDS OVERLAY IN GOOGLE EARTH AT LEAST ONCE] Can you indicate one or more ways the Canada Lands Overlay in Google Earth could be improved? n=84

Sources of Improvement of the Canada Lands Overlay in Google Earth	
More Land ID information available, instead of using a combination of overlay and ILRS to identify parcel information.	1%
Better integration.	1%
Maybe I haven't used this feature - I will have to have a look - I just look at google earth normally.	1%

It reverts to loading the whole country each time I use it. I would prefer it if it held my preferences (just my province).	1%
Decrease the current projects so that they don't overlap on the cadastre. Just have them if you turn them on, e.g.	1%
This is very helpful but takes my PC about 5 minutes to load (as compared with about 30 seconds). Some way to speed up the process would be good, but the tool itself is very useful.	1%
Make the data smart to have more information on boundaries and different registries. GAD should work hand in hand with the different registries.	1%
It needs a refresh button so that one can ensure that the data is up to date without reload.	1%
I use this tool many many many times every day. If there was a way the updates could push to me, that would be awesome, as I tend to not re-download the kmz as much as I should, but I appreciate that you keep it current daily and publish the fact that it is updated daily. This is by far the best tool you offer, thank you.	1%
The ability to go from the overlay into the system using a link is handy. It may be useful to have the link go to a page that would provide options compared to its current destination. The current model works incredibly well, however there may be blind spots for searches done in this manor.	1%
The infill colour obscures the Google Earth image. There could be an obvious toggle to turn it off or on or to alter the shade.	1%
Insert a layer containing field notes. You can also insert LAYER concerning superseded plans.	1%
Completeness/Accuracy of visual identification Settlement Land parcels.	1%
It's 99% reliable. There is some instances that it doesn't load but likely a google issue. Overall satisfied.	1%
Google earth doesn't appear to show all plans that are part of the CLSR, only those that are associated with Lands that are now deemed Canada Lands. It would be helpful for the other plans to show up as properties in the overlay.	1%
Only thing I don't like, and perhaps it's just me not being able to figure it out, is that I can't restrict my viewing just my Province and have GE remember that, thereby not clogging up my computer's resources with all the other provinces and territories. If I deselect the other areas and save my places, Google Earth won't remember so I still get all the data loading up next time I use it. Similarly, I'm not able to delete the other areas and have it remember that either. I'd like to just have my area of interest/Province load up each time and dispense with the other parts of Canada that I do not need at this time. Otherwise, I find it an absolutely essential tool in my work and that it works extremely well.	1%
Nothing needs to be modified or added	35%
DK/NR/NA	46%

*Some response were edited to improve readability.

Exhibit A28: Q77 – [IF USED THE CANADA LANDS DIGITAL CADASTRAL AT LEAST ONCE] Can you indicate one or more ways the Canada Lands Digital Cadastral data could be improved? n=88

Sources of Improvement of the Canada Lands Digital Cadastral data

The map browser is clunky in comparison to provincial LTO mapping systems, this could use modernization.	1%
Migrate to authoritative coordinates..	1%
I have encountered a number of errors in the digital data that has not been repaired as of this date - it has been reported but not fixed yet.	1%
Give it to the Yukon Government to own and manage.	1%
Allow a direct file download of the dwg rather than a zipped file.	1%
Same comment: hard to find on NRCan website, separate info by ground from Canada.	1%
The odd time I found it wasn't up to date.	1%
Better integration with the cadastral data of the provinces.	1%
The data is extremely powerful and useful. Some indication of expected accuracy of the data would be helpful (ie - if the actual base of coordinates is approximate then say this - in areas around me I find it is usually within 10cm which is amazing but I have been on some First Nations where it was out by 100m, because there has never been any georeferencing done on the Reserve. This would be a good initiative for SGB to follow up on.	1%
Make the search for plans more easier.	1%
Same as for the cadastral data in Google Earth.	1%
Better georeferencing of remote reserves.	1%
Erip and indian lands registry info is hard to follow and use.	1%
Dataset could be less busy, a lot of linework not used (for me anyway).	1%
Provide indication of what has been used to georeference the data.	1%
Sometimes information disappears when you zoom in.	1%
More control surveys to integrate the cadastral fabric to NAD83 CSRS and to improve the absolute accuracy of NRCAN dataset.	1%
Nothing needs to be modified or added	33%
DK/NR/NA	48%

*Some response were edited to improve readability.

Exhibit A29: Q78 – *Can you indicate one or more ways the Geospatial web services (Aboriginal lands, CSRS-PPP, GPS H) could be improved? n=84*

Sources of Improvement of the Geospatial web services (Aboriginal lands, CSRS-PPP, GPS H)	
Give NRCan more money to develop RTK-PPP.	1%
Better integration.	1%
PPP is excellent.	1%
More band width.	1%
Difficult to find this information on NRCan's website. Divide the information, if applicable, by Aboriginal community/land of Canada and not by product type.	1%
PPP is a fabulous tool.	1%
These systems should be put forward more. There GAD seems to work in silo when it comes to geospatial positioning and land surveying when these two entities should be working hand in hand and putting in place joint tools for the public.	1%
The Google overlay needs an update function.	1%

This is an amazing set of tools that are well thought out and generally easy to use. Perhaps a video tutorial would help, but for the most part they are incredibly impressive.	1%
Nothing needs to be modified or added	37%
DK/NR/NA	52%

*Some response were edited to improve readability.

Exhibit A30: Q79 – *[IF USED OIL AND GAS TOOLS AT LEAST ONCE] Can you indicate one or more ways the Oil and Gas tools could be improved? n=17*

Sources of Improvement of the Oil and Gas tools	
Nothing needs to be modified or added	35%
DK/NR/NA	65%

SECTION B: APPROVERS

Overall Satisfaction with the SGB

In this section respondents were asked a series of logistics questions about their interactions with the SGB over the past two years, followed by their satisfaction with the SGB overall, as well as satisfaction with SGB attributes.

Over half of approvers have requested services or advice from the Surveyor General Branch (SGB) over 10 times in the past 2 years (53%). A quarter (27%) have requested services 6-10 times, while one in ten (10%) have requested services 1-5 times. The most common method of communication is email (98%), though a large portion rely on telephone (78%) or in-person (70%) requests.

When asked if they are always able to find a clear point of contact, 93% of approvers said ‘yes’, and all were served in the language of their choice. Most requests they make are because of issues on a specific survey project (80%), with slightly fewer because of legal description (78%). Boundary advice (67%), consultation (52%), and the SGB’s online tools and data (13%) are less common reasons to communicate with the SGB.

The vast majority of approvers are satisfied with the SGB over the past 2 years. Of the 91% satisfied, 71% are very satisfied and the other 20% are somewhat satisfied. Further, a mere 2% are dissatisfied with the SGB, and 4% offer no response. In terms of specific attributes, three-quarters are very satisfied with the SGB’s ability to provide a clear point of contact (76%), and the knowledge of staff (75%). Satisfaction is lower, though still very high, with the SGB’s ability to communicate effectively (71%), their responsiveness (65%), and their ability to be pro-active in solving issues (63%). Only 0-6% of approvers were dissatisfied with any given attribute.

Exhibit B1: Q3 – *Over the past two years, how many times would you estimate you requested services or advice from the Surveyor General Branch (SGB)?* n=51

Frequency of SGB Requests	
Not at all	6%
Once	4%
2-5 times	6%
6-10 times	27%
Over 10 times	53%
DK/NR/NA	4%

Exhibit B2: Q4 – *[IF REQUESTED SERVICES OR ADVICE FROM SGB LEAST ONCE] Over the past two years, what methods of communication have you used to request services or advice from the SGB? Please indicate all that apply.* n=46

Methods of Communicating with SGB	
In person	70%
Email	98%
Telephone	78%
Traditional mail	4%
Other*	11%

DK/NR/NA	0%
----------	----

* Other responses include online and Microsoft Teams.

Exhibit B3: Q5 – *[IF REQUESTED SERVICES OR ADVICE FROM SGB AT LEAST ONCE] Were you always able to find a clear point of contact? n=46*

Point of Contact	
Yes	93%
No	4%
DK/NR/NA	2%

Exhibit B4: Q6 – *[IF REQUESTED SERVICES OR ADVICE FROM SGB AT LEAST ONCE] Were you served in the language of your choice? n=46*

Preferred Language Used	
Yes	100%
No	0%
DK/NR/NA	0%

Exhibit B5: Q7 – *[IF REQUESTED SERVICES OR ADVICE FROM SGB AT LEAST ONCE] What were the reasons for communicating with the SGB? Please indicate all that apply. n=46*

Reasons to Communicate with SGB	
Issues on a specific survey project	80%
Legal description	78%
Boundary advice	67%
Consultation	52%
The SGB’s online tools and data	48%
Other*	13%
DK/NR/NA	2%

*Other responses include copies of plans, advice, and survey records.

Exhibit B6: Q8A – *Overall, how satisfied are you with your interactions with the SGB over the past two years? n=51*

Overall Satisfaction with SGB	
Very satisfied	71%
Somewhat satisfied	20%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	4%
Somewhat dissatisfied	2%
Very dissatisfied	0%
DK/NR/NA	4%

Exhibit B7: Q9 – *Can you briefly explain why your interactions with the SGB over the past two years have been disappointing? n=2*

Reasons for Disappointing Interactions	
Hard to find a person who could help.	100%

Exhibit B8: Q10-14 – Overall, to what extent are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the SGB on each of the following attributes? n=51

Satisfaction with SGB Attributes						
	Very Satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	DK/NR/NA
Providing a clear point of contact	76%	12%	6%	0%	0%	6%
Knowledge of Staff	75%	14%	6%	2%	0%	4%
Effective communication	71%	16%	6%	4%	2%	2%
Responsive	65%	27%	2%	2%	0%	4%
Being pro-active in solving issues	63%	20%	6%	4%	0%	8%

Usage of & Satisfaction with Survey Resources

In this section respondents were asked about their satisfaction with a variety of survey resources including management and provisions of survey services, regulation of surveys, and eApproval.

One-in-five approvers (20%) have received services relating to the regulation of surveys over 10 times in the past 2 years. Slightly fewer (14%) have requested SGB provide the management of the provision of survey services (14%) or accessed/use eApproval over 10 times in the past 2 years (16%).

Looking specifically at the management of the provision of survey service attributes, approvers are most satisfied with the survey services being conducted in a timely manner (81% very satisfied), serving as a liaison between the contractor and their organization (77%), and providing sufficient feedback or communication (73%). While timely notification of delays or problems (65%), and effective problem solving (62%) were areas with less satisfaction, it is still very high overall. Only 0-8% of approvers were dissatisfied with any given attribute.

Exhibit B9: Q15-17 – Over the past two years, how many times would you estimate you have done any of the following? n=51

Usage of Survey Resources						
	Not at all	1 time	2-5 times	6-10 times	Over 10 times	DK/NR/NA
Received services relating to the regulation of surveys	25%	4%	18%	20%	20%	14%
Have you requested SGB to provide the management of	33%	2%	18%	18%	14%	16%

the provision of survey services						
Accessed or used the eApproval system	45%	6%	14%	12%	16%	8%

Exhibit B10: Q18-22 – [IF REQUESTED SGB TO PROVIDE MANAGEMENT OF SURVEY SERVICES AT LEAST ONCE] Thinking specifically about your experience with SGB providing the management of the provision of survey services for my organisation, to what extent are you satisfied or dissatisfied about the service provided by the SGB on the following? n=26

Satisfaction with Survey Resources						
	Very Satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	DK/N R/NA
Survey services conducted in a timely manner	81%	8%	4%	8%	0%	0%
Serving as an effective liaison between contractor and your organization	77%	8%	0%	8%	0%	8%
Providing sufficient feedback or communication	73%	19%	4%	4%	0%	0%
Timely notification of delays or problems	65%	23%	4%	8%	0%	0%
Effective problem-solving	62%	31%	8%	0%	0%	0%

Exhibit B11: Q23 – [IF REQUESTED SGB TO PROVIDE MANAGEMENT OF SURVEY SERVICES AT LEAST ONCE] Can you indicate one or more ways SGB’s delivery of surveys needs to be improved? n=26

Suggested Improvements of the Delivery of Surveys	
SGB would benefit from additional staff to handle the requests, particularly relating to historic survey issues - staff need to have an interest in and an ability to access historic information also staff to assist with Additions to Reserve/Reserve Creation which is becoming a bigger business line.	4%
HQ staff provide direction on the inclusion of watercourses, which is a legal decision of land ownership and should not be included in the surveys. All legal parameters are not included in the plans, why are watercourses. NRCan offices must be property funded in order to continue to provide required services.	4%
Need to consult with and inform First Nations before determining boundaries on matters in dispute or contention.	4%

My department is a client of NRCan - as such SGB needs to be more responsive, proactive, communicative. No accountability to client and no alternatives.	4%
This does not apply to all of their Regional staff, but in some cases some staff are not well experienced, lack the ability to provide clear responses, in some situations their correspondence is significantly delayed (requiring further follow up, up to several times), and in some situations they overstep their authority on projects (not recognizing that the project is not theirs to make certain unilateral decisions on).	4%
In our line of work with reserves, SGB needs to adhere to the original reserve boundaries and not accept provincial assertions of road and waterway boundaries. Current practice will generate numerous Specific Claims in future years.	4%
Nothing needs to be modified or added	62%
DK/NR/NA	15%

*Some response were edited to improve readability.

With regards to services related to the regulation of surveys, approvers are most satisfied with the review and ratification process being conducted in a timely manner (77%), effective problem-solving and ensuring accuracy (both tied at 74%). Satisfaction is slightly lower with services such as confirming the survey met your regulatory requirements for land administration (71%) and ensuring necessary corrections were made to the plans (65%). Only 0-3% of approvers were dissatisfied with any given attribute.

Exhibit B12: Q24-28 – [IF Q16 AT LEAST ONCE] Thinking specifically about your experience with services related to the regulation of surveys, to what extent are you satisfied or dissatisfied on the following attributes? n=31

Satisfaction with Regulation of Survey Attributes						
	Very Satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	DK/N R/NA
Review and ratification process was conducted in a timely manner	77%	6%	6%	3%	0%	6%
Effective problem-solving	74%	23%	3%	0%	0%	0%
Ensuring accuracy	74%	19%	3%	3%	0%	0%
Confirming the survey met your regulatory requirements for land administration	71%	16%	10%	0%	0%	3%
Ensuring necessary corrections were made to the plans	65%	16%	6%	3%	0%	9%

Exhibit B13: Q29 – [IF RECEIVED SERVICES RELATING TO THE REGULATION OF SURVEYS AT LEAST ONCE] Can you indicate one or more ways the service related to the regulation of surveys needs to be improved? n=31

Suggested Improvements of the Regulation of Surveys	
Surveyors need to understand the land transactions the surveys are required for a little better i.e. when multiple parties are on title they all have to agree with the survey as most transactions require signature from all. Or if the survey creates an easement over another parcel or unsurveyed band land, the legal description will not be suitable for a land transaction that will grant exclusive use of the land.	3%
Just to ensure there is staff to handle the workload.	3%
Stop having remainder lots! Worst thing ever, the land needs to be clearly defined and this is bad as the old metes and bounds descriptions of yesteryear. Also the reviewing of the plans by ISC for locatee or indirect plans should still be done and the plan before being finalized should be reviewed by the band and locatee with the approval on the plan before it is given a number.	3%
More staffing - staff workload impacts timely review and approval of surveys.	3%
There appears to be a gap between the survey instruction writers and plan reviewers as some projects that the Region prepared instructions for have been rejected at the regulations review. Plan reviews can take a significant amount of time (beyond the 3 week turnaround). and not having someone familiar with the Province that they are reviewing the plan for can lead to some issues.	3%
Nothing needs to be modified or added	65%
DK/NR/NA	16%

*Some response were edited to improve readability.

Thinking specifically about experiences with eApproval, slightly less than two-thirds of approvers are very satisfied with its ease of use (63%). Over half of approvers are very satisfied with the ability to meet their needs for the approval of survey documents (58%), and technical issues being resolved in a timely manner (54%). One-in-two (50%) are very satisfied with the process for obtaining their eApproval account. Satisfaction is lowest (though still high) with the checklist being both up to date and relevant (46%), and the help documentation and manual provided (38%). Only 0-4% of approvers were dissatisfied with any given attribute.

Exhibit B14: Q30-35 – [IF ACCESSED OR USED THE EAPPROVAL SYSTEM AT LEAST ONCE] Thinking specifically about your experience with eApproval, to what extent are you satisfied or dissatisfied on the following attributes? n=24

	Satisfaction with eApproval					
	Very Satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	DK/N R/NA
Easy to use	63%	17%	13%	0%	0%	8%
Meeting your needs for the	58%	21%	4%	4%	0%	12%

approval of survey documents						
Technical issues resolved in a timely manner	54%	13%	0%	0%	0%	33%
The process for obtaining your eApproval account	50%	25%	17%	0%	0%	8%
The checklist being both up to date and relevant	46%	33%	4%	0%	0%	16%
The help documentation and manual provided	38%	25%	4%	0%	0%	33%

Exhibit B15: Q36 – [IF ACCESSED OR USED THE EAPPROVAL SYSTEM AT LEAST ONCE] Can you indicate one or more ways eApproval could be improved? n=24

Suggested Improvements of eApproval	
Please give more options to sort through survey plans, or, otherwise, to organize them into groups (by year?). Currently, myCLSS shows me all the historical Nunavut survey plans at once, which is a lot. The publicly-available CLSS has a Description column; could you maybe add this to myCLSS, in order to help sort which survey is which?	4%
I think it would be useful to be able to answer no to the following question and still approve the survey: This plan complies with Nunavut Planning Act and the respective zoning By-Law. There are some instances where, especially relating to new subdivisions, the by-law may have not yet received third reading. Unfortunately, there is no option to override the No and Approved options at the same time and proceed with approval. A no, with explanation below option would be ideal.	4%
I used to be in eApproval but now I do not have access.	4%
Getting it finalised and in place with PCA.	4%
Filtering/sorting to find older approvals. I find that I have to search through every one - the only way to sort them is by date. The ability to sort them by area, or Quad would be beneficial. Also the name of the file descriptions are random, If the file name had a specific format that would be helpful as well. (ie sometimes the file name/description is just the Quad, and sometimes its a place name. The place name is more useful as there can be many projects in the queue for approval with the same Quad).	4%
Delineation between a 'reviewer' and 'approver' in the Land Administrator portal to prevent accidental eApproval by staff without delegated authority.	4%
Enabling First Nation eApprovals would be helpful.	4%
Nothing needs to be modified or added	54%
DK/NR/NA	17%

*Some response were edited to improve readability.

Usage of & Satisfaction with Digital Services

Finally, approvers were asked of their usage of 8 key digital services, as well as their satisfaction with the services and suggested improvements.

The most frequently used digital services by approvers are the Survey Plan search tool (79% over 10 times in the last 2 years), and the Canada Lands Overlay in Google Earth (61%). These are followed closely by the Canada Lands Surveys section of the Natural Resources Canada web site (57%), and the Map Browser application (51%). The least used services were the Geospatial web services (39%), the Survey Project search tool (35%) and the Canada Lands Digital Cadastral data (31%).

Approvers are most satisfied with the Survey Plan search tool (60% very satisfied), and the Canada Lands Surveys section of the Natural Resources Canada web site (59%). The Canada Lands Overlay in Google Earth (56%) and the Geospatial web services (55%) are not far behind. While satisfaction is lowest with the Survey Project search tool (53%), the Map Browser application (51%), and the Canada Lands Digital Cadastral data (41%). Only 0-5% of approvers were dissatisfied with any given tool.

Exhibit B16: Q37-43 – *Over the past two years, how many times would you estimate you accessed or used the any of the following? n=51*

Usage of Digital Services						
	Not at all	1 time	2-5 times	6-10 times	Over 10 times	DK/NR/NA
The Survey Plan search tool	12%	4%	6%	0%	79%	0%
The Canada Lands Surveys section of the Natural Resources Canada web site	18%	4%	10%	10%	57%	2%
The Map Browser application	20%	4%	8%	14%	51%	4%
The Geospatial web services (Aboriginal lands, CSRS-PPP, GPS H)	22%	6%	10%	10%	39%	14%
The Canada Lands Overlay in Google Earth	24%	0%	8%	8%	61%	0%
The Survey Project search tool	31%	0%	16%	12%	35%	6%
The Canada Lands Digital Cadastral data	31%	2%	12%	8%	31%	16%

Exhibit B17: Q44-50 – *How satisfied would you say you were with each of the following over the past two years?*

Satisfaction with Digital Services						
	Very Satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	DK/NR/NA
The Survey Plan search tool (n=45)	60%	31%	7%	0%	0%	2%
The Canada Lands Surveys section of the Natural Resources Canada web site (n=41)	59%	32%	7%	2%	0%	0%
The Canada Lands Overlay in Google Earth (n=39)	56%	31%	10%	3%	0%	0%
The Geospatial web services (Aboriginal lands, CSRS-PPP, GPS H) (n=33)	55%	24%	15%	0%	0%	6%
The Survey Project search tool (n=32)	53%	28%	16%	0%	0%	3%
The Map Browser application (n=39)	51%	23%	15%	5%	0%	5%
The Canada Lands Digital Cadastral data (n=27)	41%	41%	15%	0%	0%	4%

Exhibit B18: Q51 – *[IF USED THE CANADA LANDS SURVEY SECTION OF THE NRCAN WEBSITE] Can you indicate one or more ways the Canada Lands Surveys section of the Natural Resources Canada web site could be improved? n=41*

Sources of Improvement of the Canada Lands Surveys section of the Natural Resources Canada web site	
Make it easier to find.	8%
Please try to update the cadastre more often, as we regularly require an up-to-date cadastral layer.	2%
Getting to the CLSS section from the main homepage can be a bit exasperating. Something a bit more obvious, a bit more direct would be helpful. And I note that the CLSS page is saying to update bookmarks (sigh).	2%
Civic address on Reserves.	2%
Adding O&G Wellhead data.	2%
Tools should be simpler to define.	2%
Nothing needs to be modified or added	46%

DK/NR/NA	32%
----------	-----

*Some response were edited to improve readability.

Exhibit B19: Q52 – [IF USED SURVEY PLAN SEARCH TOOL] Can you indicate one or more ways the Survey Plan search tool could be improved? n=45

Sources of Improvement of the Survey Plan search tool	
Works pretty well. Sometimes the search sets might need refining. But that's probably the searcher too.	2%
I really liked the search feature that allowed people to filter to certain types of lands (national parks, national historic sites, etc.). The filter has since changed and we are unable to filter down as much.	2%
Have the latest most recent plans in a IR come up first without much searching. Takes a long time to get to the first/oldest plans when researching. i.e. page 1 of 21 and have to go through each and everyone to get there	2%
Appreciate the link/use of associated plan numbers, such as the registration number from the local land titles office, for conducting searches, as many times the CLSR is not known.	2%
Place a 'search' button at both the top and bottom of the screen to eliminate the need to scroll	2%
Nothing needs to be modified or added	47%
DK/NR/NA	42%

*Some response were edited to improve readability.

Exhibit B19: Q53 – [IF USED THE SURVEY PROJECT SEARCH TOOL] Can you indicate one or more ways the Survey Project search tool could be improved? n=32

Sources of Improvement of the Survey Project search tool	
Provide information for all survey projects, even if the project was cancelled. Sometimes its unclear why sequence of numbers jumps, but I'm assuming because not all projects are recorded in the search tool.	3%
There are so many different last names for a surveyor, why more than one name?	3%
For a non-survey person, I do not find the tool very intuitive to use.	3%
Place a 'search' button at both the top and bottom of the screen to eliminate the need to scroll	3%
Nothing needs to be modified or added	47%
DK/NR/NA	41%

*Some response were edited to improve readability.

Exhibit B20: Q54 – [IF USED MAP BROWSER APPLICATION] Can you indicate one or more ways the Map Browser application could be improved? n=39

Sources of Improvement of the Map Browser application	
In remote areas (e.g. Nunavut), could you display the community names ? And on a relatively low scale too (zoomed-out) please. Otherwise, please make it easier to navigate to remote communities. As it is right now, you basically have	3%

to have a mental picture of the geography in your mind in order to find a community in a reasonable amount of time.	
Would be nice to be able to search by sgb item number rather than zoom in manually until it is found.	3%
The Print function. When printing a section of the reserve only the parcel boundary lines are showing without the lot descriptions - at least that was the case last time when I tried to print. The Map Browser is designed for on-line use but sometimes clients want a hard copy of the entire reserve printed.	3%
Works very well. Just need to ensure that other Government departments (Indigenous Services Canada, for example) can retain optimum access if/when an upgrade is done.	3%
It's kind of hard to navigate once you are in there.	3%
If possible, include Order in Council metes and bounds data for Block Land Transfers, other land transfers.	3%
When looking for plans through Reserves it can be a challenge to find the relevant plan. Changing where the links are doesn't help.	3%
It could allow the orientation to be viewed in north south.	3%
Is unresponsive at times, kind of slow to get to the area. not simple to search has redundant sections. i.e. province/I.R./Band should be streamlined simply.	3%
Wider/bigger window to navigate.	3%
It can be slow to load / respond.	3%
Sometimes when I search for information on a particular parcel (on the actual map) it lists several plans and I have to sift through the underlying plans and find the one I am interested in (current survey fabric).	3%
Nothing needs to be modified or added	36%
DK/NR/NA	31%

*Some response were edited to improve readability.

Exhibit B21: Q55 – [IF USED CANADA LANDS OVERLAY] Can you indicate one or more ways the Canada Lands Overlay in Google Earth could be improved? n=39

Sources of Improvement of the Canada Lands Overlay in Google Earth	
More often than not, the overlay doesn't automatically appear when I load Google Earth. To get it to appear, I have to navigate to one of the overlay's subfolders (weird, but works). I appreciate that this may be Google's fault, but please address this issue if possible. It has been happening to me for years.	3%
Make it work on google earth mobile. It would be great for conducting field work on the go.	3%
The lot description that appears on screen does not indicate that a parcel is a remainder - it is available only in the details and most users don't look at it.	3%
This is such a useful tool. Cannot speak to how useful it is. I use it every week. Sometimes it's necessary to snip an image and the colour and/or info changes as you zoom in. But this is a small thing and may well be the ISC interface.	3%
Should make it easier to find parcels.	3%
Include overlay for Order in Council metes and bounds land transfers (i.e. block land transfers, other).	3%

Make mailing addresses searchable everywhere. There are isolated Aboriginal communities where postal address searches do not work. Also, it would be helpful if the reserve names could be harmonized in the menu and put in alphabetical order for faster retrieval.	3%
Have the purple highlights that are pending surveys back in, even if it's been over 10 years. It's helpful to know that survey work was done, even if it wasn't approved by the FN.	3%
It would be great if it showed lands under First Nation Land Management as well as lands that are designated for commercial leasing.	3%
Simple accessibility to a tablet or phone app.	3%
Increase functionality to allow certain layers to be turned off over larger areas. for example, in the NWT, ability to turn off mineral interests across the whole region, versus having to go into each quad area and turn off from there. this function may exist, but it is not readily identifiable to a lay person like myself. Is there a definitions or guide document that can be accessed?	3%
I am assuming that the Canada Lands overlay in Google Earth is the same Overlay used on the GeoYukon mapping tool. The GeoYukon mapping tool is what I use the most, and I know that the survey data from Canada Lands is a layer on that. https://mapservices.gov.yk.ca/GeoYukon/ It works great - no issues.	3%
See improvements in ground view for communities in northern and remote regions.	3%
Nothing needs to be modified or added	36%
DK/NR/NA	31%

*Some response were edited to improve readability.

Exhibit B22: Q56 – *[IF USED THE CANADA LANDS DIGITAL CADASTRAL DATA] Can you indicate one or more ways the Canada Lands Digital Cadastral data could be improved? n=27*

Sources of Improvement of the Canada Lands Digital Cadastral data	
Get rid of outdated and archaic layers, such as Archived layers and sketches from 2009, etc...	4%
Should be easier to print maps etc. And it should ensure the info is correct between the ilrs and this system.	4%
Layer data in dwg/shp files by plan number, so that you can turn on and off data for individual plans.Simplify instructions to get used in a gis.	4%
Additional investments in ground view of reserve communities, especially those in northern and remote regions.	4%
Nothing needs to be modified or added	36%
DK/NR/NA	45%

*Some response were edited to improve readability.

Exhibit B23: Q57 – *[IF USED THE GEOSPATIAL WEB SERVICES] Can you indicate one or more ways the Geospatial web services (Aboriginal lands, CSRS-PPP, GPS H) could be improved? n=33*

Sources of Improvement of the Geospatial web services (Aboriginal lands, CSRS-PPP, GPS H)	
Adding O&G wellhead data.	3%

Make it easier to reach the plans and ten easier to display. Sometimes they work well, sometimes they don't.	3%
There needs to be a consistency in names (some spell out Indian Reserve, some use IR which causes searching issues). Perhaps a warning could be added that indicates the Google Earth overlay is not to be relied upon for determining the location of boundaries or encroachments The use of Satellite imagery on the Map Browser instead of the topographic map information.	3%
Nothing needs to be modified or added	45%
DK/NR/NA	45%

*Some response were edited to improve readability.

SECTION C: INDIGENOUS

Overall Satisfaction with the SGB

In this section respondents were asked a series of logistics questions about their interactions with the SGB over the past two years, followed by their satisfaction with the SGB overall, as well as satisfaction with SGB attributes. Respondents were also asked about community surveys.

The plurality of Indigenous end-users and organizations have requested services from the SGB about 2-5 times in the past 2 years. Only 15% have requested services over 10 times. Four-in-five respondents (81%) use email as a form of communication with the SGB and 62% use telephone.

Over three-quarters of Indigenous end-users and organizations are able to find a clear point of contact (77%), and almost all (98%) are served in the language of their choice. Three-in-four requests are made either for a specific survey project, or a boundary concern or question (75%). A third of requests are made because of the SGB’s online tools and data or consultation on how to get a survey done (33%).

In terms of community surveys a quarter have conducted over 10 in the last 2 years (27%). Main reasons for conducting a community survey include interior boundary survey or subdivision (72%) or exterior boundary survey (57%). Right of way surveys (46%), boundary investigation (37%), and additions to reserves (36%) are conducted less frequently. Condominium surveys or building units is the least prevalent reason to conduct a community survey (21%). A quarter (26%) have conducted a community survey in the past month, and an equal portion have conducted one within the past 5 months.

Overall, two-thirds of Indigenous end-users and organizations are satisfied with the SGB, 40% being very satisfied and 26% being somewhat satisfied. Only 1% are dissatisfied, while 7% offer no response. Specific attributes relating to the SGB with the highest satisfaction rating include helpfulness and knowledge of staff (both tied at 46%). Satisfaction is slightly lower in terms of effective communication (44%), providing information that is easy to understand (41%), and responsiveness (41%). Only 1-8% of Indigenous end-users and organizations were dissatisfied with any given attribute.

Exhibit C1: Q3 – *Over the past two years, how many times would you estimate you requested services or advice from the Surveyor General Branch (SGB)? n=78*

Frequency of SGB Requests	
Not at all	23%
Once	6%
2-5 times	28%
6-10 times	17%
Over 10 times	15%
DK/NR/NA	10%

Exhibit C2: Q4 – *[IF REQUESTED SERVICES OR ADVICE FROM SGB AT LEAST ONCE] Over the past two years, what methods of communication have you used to request services or advice from the SGB? Please indicate all that apply. n=52*

Methods of Communicating with SGB	
In person	0%

Email	81%
Telephone	62%
Traditional mail	8%
Other*	19%
DK/NR/NA	0%

*Other responses include referrals, ISC, and third party websites.

Exhibit C3: Q5 – *[IF REQUESTED SERVICES OR ADVICE FROM SGB AT LEAST ONCE] Were you always able to find a clear point of contact? n=52*

Point of Contact	
Yes	77%
No	15%
DK/NR/NA	8%

Exhibit C4: Q6 – *[IF REQUESTED SERVICES OR ADVICE FROM SGB AT LEAST ONCE] Were you served in the language of your choice? n=52*

Preferred Language Used	
Yes	98%
No	0%
DK/NR/NA	2%

Exhibit C5: Q7 – *[IF REQUESTED SERVICES OR ADVICE FROM SGB AT LEAST ONCE] What were the reasons for communicating with the SGB? Please indicate all that apply. n=52*

Reasons to Communicate with SGB	
A specific survey project	75%
A boundary concern or question	75%
The SGB's online tools and data	33%
Consultation on how to get a survey done	33%
Other*	17%
DK/NR/NA	0%

*Other responses include survey histories, consultations, survey costs and timelines, and training.

Exhibit C6: Q8 – *Over the past two years, how many surveys have been conducted in your community? n=78*

Frequency of Community Surveys	
Not at all	9%
Once	13%
2-5 times	31%
6-10 times	15%
Over 10 times	27%
DK/NR/NA	5%

Exhibit C7: Q9 – *[IF AT LEAST ONE SURVEY CONDUCTED] Over the past two years, what types of surveys have been conducted in your community? n=67*

Types of Community Surveys	
Interior boundary survey or subdivision	72%
Exterior boundary survey	57%
Right of way (easement) survey	46%
Boundary investigation or boundary maintenance survey	37%
Addition to reserve (Provincial lands)	36%
Condominium survey or building units	21%
Other*	12%
DK/NR/NA	1%

*Other responses include wildlife and habitat surveys, volume surveys, road surveys, energy consumption, and industrial or commercial development surveys.

Exhibit C8: Q10 – *How long ago was your community’s most recent survey? n=78*

Length of Community Surveys	
Have never done one	3%
Over 2 years ago	9%
Between 1 and 2 years ago	13%
6-12 months ago	18%
2-5 months ago	26%
Within the past month	26%
DK/NR/NA	6%

Exhibit C9: Q11 – *Overall, how satisfied are you with your interactions with the SGB over the past two years? n=78*

Overall Satisfaction with SGB	
Very satisfied	40%
Somewhat satisfied	26%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	26%
Somewhat dissatisfied	1%
Very dissatisfied	0%
DK/NR/NA	8%

Exhibit C10: Q12 – *Can you briefly explain why your interactions with the SGB over the past two years have been disappointing? n=1*

Reasons for Disappointing Interactions	
They make rulings and put things in place that don't consult with first nation, the most recent is remainder of lots that have to be surveyed but when we want the remainder of the lot renamed they say it is policy but we have issues getting that done.	100%

Exhibit C11: Q13-17 – *Overall, to what extent are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the SGB on each of the following attributes? n=78*

Satisfaction with SGB Attributes	
----------------------------------	--

	Very Satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	DK/NR/NA
Helpful	46%	22%	14%	3%	3%	13%
Knowledge of Staff	46%	22%	13%	0%	1%	18%
Effective communication	44%	28%	9%	8%	0%	11%
Providing information that is easy to understand	41%	32%	10%	3%	1%	13%
Responsive	41%	31%	10%	4%	0%	14%

Approval Process of Survey Documents

Respondents were then asked a series of questions concerning the approval process of survey plans, consultations during the survey process, and First Nation Approval forms, and SGB services.

Over half of Indigenous end-users and organizations (59%) typically arrange to provide survey plan approvals in Band Council resolution format. Internal forms are the most uncommon with 26% opting for this method. One-in-two respondents are comfortable approving survey plans (46%). Many of those who are not comfortable many feel that more education, training, and knowledge would help them to be more comfortable.

Exhibit C12: Q18 – *In what format do you typically arrange to provide the approval for a survey plan? Please indicate all that apply. n=78*

Typical Survey Plan Approval Formats	
Band Council resolution	59%
Email from an authorized person	44%
Signature on a survey plan	41%
First Nation Approval form / Band Approval form	29%
Internal form	26%
Other*	12%
DK/NR/NA	1%

*Other responses include letters, agreements, community votes, and BCR.

Exhibit C13: Q19 – *Are you comfortable approving survey plans? n=78*

Survey Plan Approval	
Yes	46%
No	15%
DK/NR/NA	3%

Exhibit C14: Q20 – *[IF COMFORTABLE APPROVING SURVEY PLANS] What would help you be more comfortable approving survey plans? n=22*

Improvements for Survey Plan Approval

Getting more training to understand them.	4%
Understanding the whole process.	4%
The in and out of how to approve a plan.	4%
Knowledge on what's going on with the survey.	4%
Education.	4%
I would definitely have to have more authority and more training on surveys.	4%
More experience, more time and assistance.	4%
Knowledge and training.	4%
I feel more comfortable when my boss approves it.	4%
Better understanding of the plans and what has changed.	4%
I would need to understand what is being surveyed.	4%
More training.	4%
I would have to have authorization from the council, more training.	4%
Understanding more of the plans being designed, should not be to technical.	4%
A surveyor in the office with the CLS, the government of Canada that is their responsibility, but they will not put a surveyor in the office. So being realistic how can we approve surveyors in this office, and signed them off to carry any weight.	4%
We go base on past plans. We self government our land and each property self-government manage on their own level.	4%
It helps when the Locatee reviews the plan and agrees to it also. Normally if I have questions I will contact the surveyor or NRCAN for assistance.	4%
There should be more info	4%
DK/NR/NA	18%

*Some response were edited to improve readability.

Most respondents feel consulted enough during the survey process (72%), and 12% feel that better communication would help improve the survey process in their community.

The majority of Indigenous end-users and organizations are not at all familiar with the First Nations Approval form (62%). Of the 32% that are familiar, half (48%) are satisfied with the form, while not a single respondent was dissatisfied with the approval form, and 24% neglected to provide an answer.

Exhibit C15: Q21 – *Do you feel consulted enough during the survey process?* n=78

Survey Process Consultation	
Yes	72%
No	19%
DK/NR/NA	9%

Exhibit C16: Q22 – *Do you have any recommendations that could improve the survey process for your community?* n=78

Improvements for Survey Process	
Better communication	12%
Access to surveyors/local surveyor	9%
Community engagement	8%

Improve timeliness of plans/projects	6%
Less expensive/costly	4%
Better website (accurate information, more user friendly, etc.)	3%
Better funding	3%
More training	3%
Other	5%
None/ Nothing	8%
DK/NR/NA	51%

Exhibit C17: Q23 – *How familiar are you with the First Nation Approval form or Band Approval form on the myCLSS website? n=78*

Familiarity with First Nation Approval Form/Band Approval Form	
Very familiar	5%
Somewhat familiar	8%
Not very familiar	19%
Not at all familiar	62%
DK/NR/NA	7%

Exhibit C18: Q24 – *[IF AT LEAST NOT VERY FAMILIAR] How satisfied are you with the First Nation Approval form or Band Approval form? n=25*

Satisfaction with First Nation Approval Form/Band Approval Form	
Very satisfied	12%
Somewhat satisfied	36%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	28%
Somewhat dissatisfied	0%
Very dissatisfied	0%
DK/NR/NA	24%

Two-thirds (65%) would appreciate being able to provide approval of survey plans through an online application, further over three-quarters (78%) would use an online application to provide approval of survey plans.

Exhibit C19: Q25 – *Would you appreciate being able to provide approval of survey plans through an online application? n=78*

Online Application for Approval of Survey Plans	
Yes	65%
No	29%
DK/NR/NA	5%

Exhibit C20: Q26 – *Would you use an online application to provide approval of survey plans if one were available? n=78*

Use of Online Application for Approval of Survey Plans	
Yes	78%
No	15%

DK/NR/NA	6%
----------	----

Exhibit C21: Q27 – *Can you indicate one or more ways the SGB service provided to you could be improved?*
n=78

Improvements for SGB Service	
Quicker responses.	1%
More communication.	1%
Someone give the land managers or councils a call to make sure they understand about land surveys and to explain the process of getting a survey completed, done.	1%
More communications and consult with us on changes.	1%
It would be preferable to us if the SGB weren't involved in the process at all. The CLS could just deposit the plan with us. SGB process too colonial, government still overlooking our affairs.	1%
So number one, follow through with their intructions (ie. stell markers every half a mile). Number two is approved surveys in a timely fashion and if the community doesn't agree with the survey, then the governement should hold a meeting to find out why they don't agree.	1%
More accessible & open to new ideas /partnerships.	1%
Better better communication overall. If we don't know you're out there how are we going to use it.	1%
Providing all the proper steps and information packages not just for the staff but for members.	1%
If we had a webinar. Set up an introduction and overview of the program.	1%
More engangement as to what they do.	1%
I would think is the checking in with us. I think that the 30 to 60 days would much better.	1%
Right now go back to the email with the letter or fax or litterally have something online on what projects that we're on a website.	1%
Making sure the first nation is aware of the survey sent out, it would be nice to have transparent communication on not just the surveyor general being aware of the project.	1%
Papalitive emails and letters.	1%
Training session.	1%
Reduce survey costs. Speed up the process so that the plan is available quickly.	1%
Know what exactly is being done throughout survey registration process... after we give approval to surveyor to procced with registration of provisional plan, no idea what is happening after this approval is given. No clue if NRCan is working on registering the plan we are at mercy of everyone involved... no clue what is being done. Be good if there was a chart we could click on to see what progress is being made, some idea when survey potentially going to be registered.	1%
What are the external boundaries? Can we do parcel fabric interior surveys? Zoning, etc. Can fee simple lands - surveys be done to Lands that are not yet Status?	1%

Having more options for us to do self service.	1%
More understanding how it works and what it is for, an introduction would be fine of SGB.	1%
Just more CLSS so we can get surveys done quickly, get budgets to get surveys done as necessary.	1%
We don't want to be working through a middle person or organization like Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada, just do the plan with them and then strictly with the surveyor, not a triage because you could lose information that way.	1%
The service we are getting is excellent.	1%
We need more surveyors in our area.	1%
It should be more advertised.	1%
Just the cost is way too high because we're very remote. We only have access one surveyor. It's the only one on the island.	1%
Nothing needs to be modified or added	13%
DK/NR/NA	51%

*Some responses were edited to improve readability.

Usage of & Satisfaction with Digital Services

Lastly, Indigenous end-users and organizations were asked of their usage of 8 key digital services, as well as their satisfaction with the services and suggested improvements.

Among the top 3 most frequently used digital services are the Canada Lands Surveys section of the Natural Resources Canada web site (41% more than 10 times in the past 2 years), the Canada Lands Overlay in Google Earth (38%), and the Survey Plan search tool (37%). The Map Browser application was not far behind (31%). However, the Geospatial web services (17%), the Canada Lands Digital Cadastral data (15%), and the Survey Project search tool (9%) were the least used digital services by Indigenous end-users and organizations.

With regards to satisfaction, the Canada Lands Overlay in Google Earth (43%) is highest, followed closely by the Survey Project search tool (39%), the Survey Plan search tool (38%), and the Map Browser application (36%). Indigenous end-users and Organizations were less satisfied with the Geospatial web services (27%), the Canada Lands Surveys section of the Natural Resources Canada web site (25%), and the Canada Lands Digital Cadastral data (20%). Only 0-8% of Indigenous end-users and organizations were dissatisfied with any given tool.

Exhibit C22: Q28-34 – *Over the past two years, how many times would you estimate you accessed or used the any of the following? n=78*

	Usage of Digital Services					
	Not at all	1 time	2-5 times	6-10 times	Over 10 times	DK/NR/NA
The Canada Lands Overlay in Google Earth	23%	4%	22%	10%	38%	3%

The Canada Lands Surveys section of the Natural Resources Canada web site	33%	5%	8%	8%	41%	5%
The Survey Plan search tool	38%	9%	8%	4%	37%	4%
The Map Browser application	41%	1%	10%	6%	31%	10%
The Geospatial web services (Aboriginal lands, CSRS-PPP, GPS H)	50%	3%	8%	6%	17%	17%
The Survey Project search tool	53%	3%	8%	6%	23%	8%
The Canada Lands Digital Cadastral data	56%	3%	9%	6%	15%	12%

Exhibit C23: Q35-41 – *How satisfied would you say you were with each of the following over the past two years?*

Satisfaction with Digital Services						
	Very Satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	DK/N R/NA
The Canada Lands Overlay in Google Earth (n=58)	43%	41%	10%	0%	0%	5%
The Survey Project search tool (n=31)	39%	39%	16%	0%	3%	3%
The Survey Plan search tool (n=45)	38%	42%	16%	0%	2%	2%
The Map Browser application (n=38)	34%	45%	13%	5%	0%	3%
The Geospatial web services (Aboriginal lands, CSRS-PPP, GPS H) (n=26)	27%	35%	15%	0%	4%	19%
The Canada Lands Surveys section of the Natural Resources Canada web site (n=48)	25%	52%	21%	0%	2%	0%

The Canada Lands Digital Cadastral data (n=25)	20%	52%	12%	8%	0%	8%
--	-----	-----	-----	----	----	----

Exhibit C24: Q42 – [Can you indicate one or more ways the Canada Lands Surveys section of the Natural Resources Canada web site could be improved? n=48

Sources of Improvement of the Canada Lands Surveys section of the Natural Resources Canada web site	
All the steps having them go back and forth, have links to the actual plan itself, instead of having to measure acres and have a button that provides sizes of different lots.	2%
More training on the website or a tutorial about their website.	2%
The cadastral data can be more easily accessible and more user friendly.	2%
Satisfied.	2%
Make it easier to find things.	2%
Faster download.	2%
Same thing - updating in rural areas.	2%
Maybe too add more quick links.	2%
There should be more information regarding central Saskatchewan.	2%
Up to date information.	2%
Improve user accessability, sometimes it doesn't load properly and this has been happening with whatever device we use.	2%
Nothing needs to be modified or added	29%
DK/NR/NA	48%

*Some response were edited to improve readability.

Exhibit C25: Q43 – [IF USED SURVEY PLAN SEARCH TOOL] Can you indicate one or more ways the Survey Plan search tool could be improved? n=45

Sources of Improvement of the Survey Plan search tool	
All the steps having them go back and forth, have links to the actual plan itself, instead of having to measure acres and have a button that provides sizes of different lots.	2%
I guess letting people within my positon now that it's available.	2%
I don't know the meaning of SIAA.	2%
If I used it more often, I could answer. But not now!	2%
Little more user friendly.	2%
Faster downloads.	2%
Provide more information on the location and outline in the overlay on First Nation lands. Ex. Highways through Nations lands.	2%
Improve user accessability and general bug fixes.	2%
Nothing needs to be modified or added	31%
DK/NR/NA	51%

*Some response were edited to improve readability.

Exhibit C26: Q44 – [IF USED SURVEY PROJECT SEARCH TOOL] Can you indicate one or more ways the Survey Project search tool could be improved? n=31

Sources of Improvement of the Survey Project search tool	
It always reliance on a official survey plan number which is good as long as the survey plan has been approved by Canada and the cummunity. Most surveys aren't available for online.	3%
Some of the information that they provide isn't clear enough.	3%
Little more user friendly.	3%
One portion I would change is the position of the search button. Minimize the necessity to scroll through all the optional text boxes to the bottom of the page. Position the search text box within each option; search by survey, search text box, search by keyword, search text box. etc..	3%
Improve user accessability. sometimes it doesn't load properly and this has been happening with whatever device we use.	3%
Nothing needs to be modified or added	29%
DK/NR/NA	55%

*Some response were edited to improve readability.

Exhibit C27: Q45 – [IF USED MAP BROWSER APPLICATION] Can you indicate one or more ways the Map Browser application could be improved? n=38

Sources of Improvement of the Map Browser application	
It doesn't feel right that all First Nation survey data is open to the public. There should be issues like Indigenous Data Sovereignty addressed by SGB.	3%
It's a little confusing the legends and stuff.	3%
Simply it a little more.	3%
The only issue we ever had was the cadastral data was not super user friendly.	3%
If there was an ability to see when I am on cite. The landscape image.	3%
Accuracy.	3%
I have tried to do some prints of the images and the print,when I try to print the images,the print that comes out does not include all the information that is on the screen.	3%
Stop that it is not available because computer bugs (I know it is sometimes unpredictable).	3%
I wish it was faster.	3%
Updating the cite every year because it is always changing.	3%
It should have more up to date information.	3%
It needs update with the very remote areas of the land.	3%
Nothing needs to be modified or added	13%
DK/NR/NA	56%

*Some response were edited to improve readability.

Exhibit C28: Q46 – [IF USED THE CANADA LANDS OVERLAY IN GOOGLE EARTH] Can you indicate one or more ways the Canada Lands Overlay in Google Earth could be improved? n=58

Sources of Improvement of the Canada Lands Overlay in Google Earth	
Training to become more familiar with it and how we can use it.	2%

More accessible training should be offered to First Nations using this service by gsb when performing a service call. It should be part of their delivery service.	2%
The Google earth can be more focused and more up to date.	2%
Not the service itself, but awareness of it's existence. I would have used it a long time ago if I knew it was there.	2%
Actually have instructions or information included, easier access.	2%
It should have some more geographic information on the google earth objects themselves.	2%
Updated more frequently.	2%
Maybe a tutorial on how to use the tool.	2%
They shape have shape files available.	2%
It would be nice to manipulate the layers a little bit more than what we can now and being able to add layers and take layers off and being able to print with lot numbers on them.	2%
Satisfied.	2%
If it could work all the time.	2%
We need more training on GIS.	2%
At least annual updates,about the satellite imagery,only problem I see in last year is they updated the satellite imagery and overlaid it with fabric and the 2 overlays are not exact,it is out by about 15 feet.	2%
There are distortions in the maps that are offset by 30-40 feet so it is an issue.	2%
Keep making it user friendly.	2%
To be survey plans of reserves.	2%
Update it more frequently.	2%
In manipulation - to be able to see parcels in addition to reserve processes.	2%
Break it up into more species. Its way too large when you're looking for the KMZ, it is very diffcult to find on their actual website.	2%
Nothing needs to be modified or added	22%
DK/NR/NA	44%

*Some response were edited to improve readability.

Exhibit C29: Q47 – [IF USED THE CANADA LANDS DIGITAL CADASTRAL] Can you indicate one or more ways the Canada Lands Digital Cadastral data could be improved? n=25

Sources of Improvement of the Canada Lands Digital Cadastral data	
Well I would just say that my reliance on the township system for identification of lands. It's very hard to find.	4%
Make it more user friendly.	4%
The cadastral data can be more accessible.	4%
Wms capabilities	4%
More clear direction for first time users.	4%
There's gaps and errors in the fabric so those can be addressed to be more accurate.	4%
Updating it so I dont have to change it myself.	4%
If its updated more often.	4%
More updates.	4%

Nothing needs to be modified or added	20%
DK/NR/NA	44%

*Some response were edited to improve readability.

Exhibit C30: Q48 – *[IF USED GEOSPATIAL WEB SERVICES] Can you indicate one or more ways the Geospatial web services (Aboriginal lands, CSRS-PPP, GPS H) could be improved? n=26*

Sources of Improvement of the Geospatial web services (Aboriginal lands, CSRS-PPP, GPS H)	
Its not user friendly. Its more difficult to find a geo-land than the provincial system. Even the federal people on land use the provincial system.	4%
Simply is more.	4%
Some training in this area would be appreciated.	4%
Faster download speeds, sometimes it is very hard to load.	4%
Update info more often.	4%
Make it more accessible.	4%
Nothing needs to be modified or added	27%
DK/NR/NA	50%

*Some response were edited to improve readability.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of this research demonstrate that most users are reasonably satisfied with the CLSS services, tools and data. Satisfaction is clearly much higher among surveyors and approvers than among Indigenous users and the results shed some light on how satisfaction may be further improved among each audience.

In considering the few specific areas where satisfaction lags and the various suggestions made for improving user satisfaction, it is important to bear in mind that while some users are indeed dissatisfied, the level of actual dissatisfaction with any aspect investigated among any category of user is quite low. As a result, most of the recommendations for improvement might reasonably be viewed as constructive criticism or aspirational objectives that may not result in improved satisfaction metrics once implemented. When satisfaction levels are as high as they are for the surveyors and approvers, increasing them becomes a less achievable objective. For the Indigenous users, there appears to be more room for improvement.

Regardless of the user group being asked or the service, tool or data in question for most of the specific criteria investigated, widespread favourable responses were consistently found.

That said, there are a few insightful patterns of constructive criticism that do appear:

- Ratings on the quality of documentation provided for any tool are consistently among the weakest and there are recommendations for making it easier to get answers to the questions with which users are left;
- With CLEVER, a number of respondents indicate having difficulty interpreting the output; and
- Among Indigenous users, many respondents request additional training and education on the tools, as well as more effective (or more) communication on what tools and services exist to raise awareness and, in turn, stimulate usage that ultimately provides users with the intended benefits of usage.

Repeatedly throughout the survey, when asked to provide recommendations, few patterns existed among the relatively few suggestions offered. A diverse array of possible improvements were put forward, but it is difficult to conclude whether one or more of these would be appreciated among many within each user category.

Based on our analysis of the results, we offer the following recommendations:

- Based upon the extremely low levels of dissatisfaction, there is more opportunity for erosion in satisfaction than improvement in satisfaction. As a result, we recommend that these satisfaction levels primarily be considered levels to maintain rather than improve and expectations and targets be set accordingly;
- In terms of areas for improvement, it is clear that if there is one thing that users would like to see improved it is in their level of understanding of how to use the various tools provided. While the survey tested documentation and found satisfaction levels lagging in that area, it is not clear whether documentation, training, user interface adjustments or some other solution may be more effective.

- The responses among Indigenous users demonstrate that SGB would be wise to consider a specific outreach to help Indigenous users develop greater comfort with the CLSS and the various tools available.
- Before selecting specific improvements to develop and implement, we recommend convening a discussion among a group of users to gather reactions to various ideas proposed, brainstorm on others and refine any that users feel would significantly improve their experience with the tools, services and data of the CLSS. One approach that would be very good for more fully understanding what kinds of improvements would be most helpful would be conducting qualitative research with separate online communities among a random sample of each target user audience. This research would provide the opportunity to more clearly understand the nature of user satisfaction as well as investigate how users respond to the suggestions raised by survey respondents, each other or initiatives being considered by the SGB.
- Similarly, one approach that is sometimes helpful in the circumstances discovered in this study is to improve the ongoing dialog between the SGB and users of the CLSS. As an example, pro-actively reaching out periodically, perhaps by email or by telephone, to ask individual users if they are having any difficulties with any specific products or services or finding information that would make their use of the system more efficient may be an initiative that could ultimately improve satisfaction levels. Although it was not investigated in this study, SGB may wish to explore the level of interest in a user conference within each of the separate user audiences to help them share experience, suggestions for improvement and tips for how to get the most out of the system or use it more efficiently.
- For future waves of study, place a priority on maintaining question phrasing and response categories in order to enable long-term tracking. It is sometimes better to continue asking a near-perfect question in order to ascertain how user satisfaction is evolving rather than perfecting or refining a question and losing the ability to know what progress has been made.
- Finally, future waves of this research may benefit from user lists that have a variety of metrics or information appended to them. For example, if the SGB were able to add information such as what products or services each user uses, how many times that have used each in the past 12 or 24 months and information about the level of interaction they have had with SGB, the analysis of the results may be more robust and help ease future decisions about what to improve for whom.

APPENDIX A: METHODOLOGY REPORT

Survey Methodology

Earncliffe Strategy Group’s overall approach for this study was to conduct an online survey of 105 surveyors, 51 approvers, and 78 Indigenous end-users and organizations. A detailed discussion of the approach used to complete this research is presented below.

Questionnaire Design

The questionnaires for this study were designed by Earncliffe, in collaboration with Natural Resources Canada, and provided for fielding to Leger. The survey was offered to respondents in both English and French and completed based on their language preference. Respondents could not skip any of the questions as all questions required a response before continuing to the next question.

Sample Design and Selection and Weighting

The sampling plan for the study was designed by Earncliffe in collaboration with Natural Resources Canada. Lists were provided by Natural Resources Canada with the target audience contact information.

Data Collection

The online survey was conducted from November 1st to December 7th for surveyors and approvers, and November 1st to December 18th for Indigenous end-users and organizations. All surveys were provided in both English and in French. The survey was undertaken by Leger using their the provided contact lists.

Reporting

Due to rounding, results may not always add to 100%.

Quality Controls

The survey link is reviewed multiple times before a comprehensive soft launch is conducted in both languages. The soft launch data is thoroughly reviewed, and any changes are made before another test of the links and full-launch of the survey.

Results

FINAL DISPOSITIONS - SURVEYORS

A total of 174 individuals entered the online survey, of which 105 qualified as eligible and completed the survey. The response rate for this survey was 26%.

Total Entered Survey	174
Completed	105
Not Qualified/Screen out	2
Over quota	0
Suspend/Drop-off	69

Unresolved (U)	235
Email invitation bounce-backs	0
Email invitations unanswered	235
In-scope - Non-responding (IS)	69
Non-response from eligible respondents	N/A
Respondent refusals	N/A
Language problem	N/A
Selected respondent not available	N/A
Qualified respondent break-off	69
In-scope - Responding units (R)	105
Completed surveys disqualified – quota filled	0
Completed surveys disqualified – other reasons	2
Completed surveys	105
Response Rate = $R/(U+IS+R)$	26%

FINAL DISPOSITIONS - APPROVERS

A total of 54 individuals entered the online survey, of which 51 qualified as eligible and completed the survey. The response rate for this survey was 23%.

Total Entered Survey	54
Completed	51
Not Qualified/Screen out	0
Over quota	0
Suspend/Drop-off	3

Unresolved (U)	116
Email invitation bounce-backs	4
Email invitations unanswered	112
In-scope - Non-responding (IS)	51
Non-response from eligible respondents	N/A
Respondent refusals	N/A
Language problem	N/A
Selected respondent not available	N/A
Qualified respondent break-off	51
In-scope - Responding units (R)	51
Completed surveys disqualified – quota filled	0
Completed surveys disqualified – other reasons	0

Completed surveys	51
Response Rate = $R/(U+IS+R)$	23%

FINAL DISPOSITIONS – INDIGENOUS – ONLINE

A total of 84 individuals entered the online survey, of which 78 qualified as eligible and completed the survey. The response rate for this survey was 27%.

Total Entered Survey	84
Completed	78
Not Qualified/Screen out	0
Over quota	0
Suspend/Drop-off	6

Unresolved (U)	197
Email invitation bounce-backs	10
Email invitations unanswered	187
In-scope - Non-responding (IS)	6
Non-response from eligible respondents	N/A
Respondent refusals	N/A
Language problem	N/A
Selected respondent not available	N/A
Qualified respondent break-off	6
In-scope - Responding units (R)	78
Completed surveys disqualified – quota filled	0
Completed surveys disqualified – other reasons	0
Completed surveys	78
Response Rate = $R/(U+IS+R)$	27%

FINAL DISPOSITIONS – INDIGENOUS – TELEPHONE

A total of 104 numbers were dialed, of which 50 qualified as eligible and completed the survey. The response rate for this survey was 16%.

	LL/Cell combined
Total Numbers Attempted	104
Invalid	67
NIS, fax/modem, business/non-res.	37
Unresolved (U)	152

Busy	5
No answer, answering machine	147
In-scope - Non-responding (IS)	118
Household refusal	4
Respondent refusal	91
Language problem	0
Illness, incapable	2
Selected respondent not available	17
Qualified respondent break-off	4
In-scope - Responding units (R)	52
Language disqualify	
No one 18+	2
Other disqualify	
Completed interviews	50
Response Rate = R/(U+IS+R)	16%

NONRESPONSE

Respondents for the online survey were selected from among lists of users provided by NRCan. Without more detailed knowledge about the universe (its actual profile, usage habits and ideally, sentiments), it is difficult to empirically identify what nonresponse bias might exist.

Perhaps the only tool available for estimating how the final sample may compare to the non-responsive segment of the universe is in the response rates. Currently, it is not unusual for online surveys of the general population to achieve response rates of less than 10% and for telephone surveys this can frequently be lower than 5%.

Although we may not be able to demonstrate how the responsive segment compares to the non-responsive segments, to achieve response rates far in excess of these norms is an encouraging sign and suggests the data have value.

MARGIN OF ERROR

The survey was undertaken as a census, rather than using any type of sampling. Every individual in the known universe being studied was invited to participate in the survey. As this survey was not a random sample of a universe, it is impossible to estimate a margin of error.

SURVEY DURATION

The online survey took an average of 10 minutes for surveyors, 7 minutes for approvers, and 15 minutes for Indigenous end-users and organizations.

APPENDIX B: QUESTIONNAIRES

SURVEYORS

Survey Introduction

Hello/Bonjour,

The Government of Canada – more specifically, the Surveyor General Branch (SGB) of Natural Resources Canada – is conducting a research survey to gather feedback on, and gauge satisfaction with, the Canada Lands Survey System (CLSS) among those who use its services, tools and/or data.

Your participation in the survey is voluntary and completely confidential – your answers will remain anonymous and will be combined with responses from all other respondents. To proceed to the survey, please click on the following link (or copy and paste it into your browser):

[INSERT URL]

Please complete this survey no later than December 7th, 2020.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.

[FRENCH]

Bilingual Landing Page:

Welcome and thank you for your interest in this survey being conducted on behalf of the Government of Canada. The purpose of this survey is to provide the Surveyor General Branch (SGB) of Natural Resources Canada with feedback on, and gauge satisfaction with, the Canada Lands Survey System (CLSS) among those who use its services, tools and/or data.

The survey takes approximately 15 minutes to complete. Your participation in the survey is voluntary and completely confidential. All your answers will remain anonymous and will be combined with responses from all other respondents.

During the survey, please do not use your browser's FORWARD and BACK buttons. Please use the button below to move forward through the survey.

Click “next” at the bottom of the page to begin the survey.

[FRENCH]

Section 1: Basic Demographic Questions

1. Would you prefer to complete the survey in English or French?

English	1
French	2

2. In which province(s) and/or territory(ies) do you provide services? Please select all that apply.

Newfoundland and Labrador	1
Nova Scotia	2
Prince Edward Island	3
New Brunswick	4
Quebec	5
Ontario	6
Manitoba	7
Saskatchewan	8
Alberta	9
British Columbia	10
Yukon	11
Nunavut	12
Northwest Territories	13
Prefer not to say	99

Section 2: Overall satisfaction with the SGB

3. Over the past two years, how many times would you estimate you requested services or advice from the Surveyor General Branch (SGB)?

Not at all	0
Once	1
2-5 times	2
6-10 times	3
11-20 times	4
Over 20 times	5
Don't know / Prefer not to say	9

4. [IF Q3 AT LEAST ONCE] Over the past two years, what methods of communication have you used to request services or advice from the SGB? Please indicate all that apply. [CHECK ALL]

In person	1
Email	2
Telephone	3
Traditional mail	4
Other (SPECIFY)	8
Don't know / Prefer not to say	9

5. [IF Q3 AT LEAST ONCE] Were you always able to find a clear point of contact?	
Yes	1
No	2
Don't know / Prefer not to say	9
6. [IF Q3 AT LEAST ONCE] Were you served in the language of your choice?	
Yes	1
No	2
Don't know / Prefer not to say	9
7. [IF Q3 AT LEAST ONCE] What were the reasons for communicating with the SGB? Please indicate all that apply. [CHECK ALL]	
Survey standards or requirements	1
A specific survey project	2
Boundary advice	3
An issue with the SGB's online tools or myCLSS	4
An issue with digital signature or myKEY	5
Review of survey plans	6
Other (SPECIFY)	8
Don't know / Prefer not to say	9
8. Overall, how satisfied are you with your interactions with the SGB over the past two years?	
Very satisfied	1
Somewhat satisfied	2
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	3
Somewhat dissatisfied	4
Very dissatisfied	5
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	9
[IF Q8 DISSATISFIED] Can you briefly explain why your interactions with the SGB over the past two years have been disappointing?	
Don't know/Prefer not to answer	99
Overall, to what extent are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the SGB on each of the following attributes? [RANDOMIZE]	
9. Responsive	
10. Knowledge of staff	
11. Helpful	

Very satisfied	1
Somewhat satisfied	2
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	3
Somewhat dissatisfied	4
Very dissatisfied	5
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	9

Section 3: Usage of & Satisfaction with Survey Resources

Over the past two years, how many times would you estimate you have done any of the following?
[RANDOMIZE]

12. Accessed or used the National Standards for the Survey of Canada Lands
13. Accessed or used the myCLSS website for research or links to other tools and information pages
14. Opened a survey project through myCLSS and submitted a survey plan for review and/or processing
15. Accessed or used CLEVER (Canada Lands e-validation of electronic returns)

Not at all	0
Once	1
2-5 times	2
6-10 times	3
11-20 times	4
Over 20 times	5
Don't know / Prefer not to say	9

[IF Q12 AT LEAST ONCE] Thinking specifically about your experience with the National Standards for the Survey of Canada Lands, to what extent are you satisfied or dissatisfied on the following attributes?
[RANDOMIZE]

16. Well-adapted to client needs
17. Meets the needs of the Canada Lands Survey System
18. Has adequate types of plans
19. Easy to find information
20. Easy to get answers to questions about standards

Very satisfied	1
Somewhat satisfied	2
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	3
Somewhat dissatisfied	4
Very dissatisfied	5
NOT APPLICABLE	8
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	9

21. Can you indicate one or more elements of the standards that should be modified or added as a priority?
[OPEN-END. ACCEPT UP TO THREE.]

Nothing needs to be modified or added 0
 Don't know/Prefer not to say / No answer 99

Don't know/Prefer not to say / No answer 9

22. Do you know how to submit a suggestion regarding changes to the National Standards?

Yes 1
 No 2
 Don't know / Prefer not to say 9

[IF Q14 AT LEAST ONCE] Thinking specifically about your experience with myCLSS, to what extent are you satisfied or dissatisfied on the following attributes? [RANDOMIZE]

- 23. Easy to use
- 24. Meets your needs
- 25. Easy to get issues resolved or get answers to questions
- 26. Reliability of the site – also known as “uptime”

Very satisfied 1
 Somewhat satisfied 2
 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 3
 Somewhat dissatisfied 4
 Very dissatisfied 5
 NOT APPLICABLE 8
 Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer 9

If myCLSS and SGB's digital tools were down for each of the following lengths of time, how significant an impact, if any, would this have on the finances or operations of your business?

- 27. 1 hour
- 28. 4 hours
- 29. 2 days
- 30. 5 days or more

No impact at all 1
 An insignificant impact 2
 A significant impact 3
 A very significant impact 4
 Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer 9

31. Can you indicate one or more ways myCLSS could be improved? [OPEN-END. ACCEPT UP TO THREE.]

Nothing could be improved 0

Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer 99

[IF Q14 AT LEAST ONCE] Thinking specifically about your experience with the request of survey instructions, to what extent are you satisfied or dissatisfied on the following attributes? [RANDOMIZE]

- 32. Process make sense through myCLSS
- 33. Issuance of survey instruction in a timely matter (2 business days)
- 34. Being kept informed of any issues or delays with survey instructions
- 35. Being kept inform of any survey problem regarding survey instructions
- 36. Process to request amendments make sense through myCLSS

Very satisfied	1
Somewhat satisfied	2
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	3
Somewhat dissatisfied	4
Very dissatisfied	5
NOT APPLICABLE	8
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	9

[IF Q14 AT LEAST ONCE] Thinking specifically about your experience with the processing and review of legal survey plans, to what extent are you satisfied or dissatisfied on the following attributes? [RANDOMIZE]

- 37. Process makes sense through myCLSS
- 38. Review conducted in a timely manner
- 39. Critical issue process and functionality
- 40. The information and notifications available in myCLSS
- 41. The service of the SGB staff
- 42. Being kept informed of any issues or delays with plan review
- 43. The way any problems or conflicts were handled
- 44. Reliability of service

Very satisfied	1
Somewhat satisfied	2
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	3
Somewhat dissatisfied	4
Very dissatisfied	5
NOT APPLICABLE	8
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	9

- 45. Can you indicate one or more ways the review and processing of legal survey plans could be improved? [OPEN-END. ACCEPT UP TO THREE.]

Nothing could be improved	0
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	99

[IF Q14 AT LEAST ONCE] Thinking specifically about your experience with digital signature and myKEY, to what extent are you satisfied or dissatisfied on the following attributes? [RANDOMIZE]

- 46. Easy to set up and renew
- 47. Easy to use for signing survey documents
- 48. Easy to prepare files for digital signature (PDF/A)
- 49. Easy to get support regarding an issue
- 50. The help documentation provided

Very satisfied	1
Somewhat satisfied	2
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	3
Somewhat dissatisfied	4
Very dissatisfied	5
NOT APPLICABLE/ DO NOT USE DIGITAL SIGNATURE	8
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	9

[IF Q15 AT LEAST ONCE] Thinking specifically about your experience with CLEVER, to what extent are you satisfied or dissatisfied on the following attributes? [RANDOMIZE]

- 51. Easy to access
- 52. Easy to use
- 53. Reliability of the results from CLEVER
- 54. Information provided in the report is easy to understand

Very satisfied	1
Somewhat satisfied	2
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	3
Somewhat dissatisfied	4
Very dissatisfied	5
NOT APPLICABLE	8
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	9

- 55. Can you indicate one or more ways CLEVER could be improved? [OPEN-END. ACCEPT UP TO THREE.]

Nothing could be improved	0
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	99

Section 4: Usage of & Satisfaction with Digital Services

Over the past two years, how many times would you estimate you accessed or used the any of the following? [RANDOMIZE]

- 56. The Canada Lands Surveys section of the Natural Resources Canada web site
- 57. The Survey Plan search tool

- 58. The Survey Project search tool
- 59. The Map Browser application
- 60. The Canada Lands Overlay in Google Earth
- 61. The Canada Lands Digital Cadastral data
- 62. The Geospatial web services (Aboriginal lands, CSRS-PPP, GPS H)
- 63. The Oil and Gas tools

Not at all	0
Once	1
2-5 times	2
6-10 times	3
11-20 times	4
Over 20 times	5
Don't know / Prefer not to say	9

How satisfied would you say you were with each of the following over the past two years? [DISPLAY ONLY THE ITEMS RESPONDENT HAS DONE. DISPLAY IN THE SAME ORDER AS ABOVE.]

- 64. [IF Q58 AT LEAST ONCE] The Canada Lands Surveys section of the Natural Resources Canada web site
- 65. [IF Q59 AT LEAST ONCE] The Survey Plan search tool
- 66. [IF Q60 AT LEAST ONCE] The Survey Project search tool
- 67. [IF Q61 AT LEAST ONCE] The Map Browser application
- 68. [IF Q62 AT LEAST ONCE] The Canada Lands Overlay in Google Earth
- 69. [IF Q63 AT LEAST ONCE] The Canada Lands Digital Cadastral data
- 70. [IF Q64 AT LEAST ONCE] The Geospatial web services (Aboriginal lands, CSRS-PPP, GPS H)
- 71. [IF Q65 AT LEAST ONCE] The Oil and Gas tools

Very satisfied	1
Somewhat satisfied	2
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	3
Somewhat dissatisfied	4
Very dissatisfied	5
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	9

Can you indicate one or more ways could be improved? [OPEN-END. ACCEPT UP TO THREE.]

- 72. [IF Q58 AT LEAST ONCE] Can you indicate one or more ways the Canada Lands Surveys section of the Natural Resources Canada web site could be improved? [OPEN-END. ACCEPT UP TO THREE.]

Nothing could be improved	0
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	99

- 73. [IF Q59 AT LEAST ONCE] Can you indicate one or more ways the Survey Plan search tool could be improved? [OPEN-END. ACCEPT UP TO THREE.]

Nothing could be improved	0
---------------------------	---

Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	99
74. [IF Q60 AT LEAST ONCE] Can you indicate one or more ways the Survey Project search tool could be improved? [OPEN-END. ACCEPT UP TO THREE.]	
Nothing could be improved	0
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	99
75. [IF Q61 AT LEAST ONCE] Can you indicate one or more ways the Map Browser application could be improved? [OPEN-END. ACCEPT UP TO THREE.]	
Nothing could be improved	0
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	99
76. [IF Q62 AT LEAST ONCE] Can you indicate one or more ways the Canada Lands Overlay in Google Earth could be improved? [OPEN-END. ACCEPT UP TO THREE.]	
Nothing could be improved	0
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	99
77. [IF Q63 AT LEAST ONCE] Can you indicate one or more ways the Canada Lands Digital Cadastral data could be improved? [OPEN-END. ACCEPT UP TO THREE.]	
Nothing could be improved	0
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	99
78. [IF Q64 AT LEAST ONCE] Can you indicate one or more ways the Geospatial web services (Aboriginal lands, CSRS-PPP, GPS H) could be improved? [OPEN-END. ACCEPT UP TO THREE.]	
Nothing could be improved	0
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	99
79. [IF Q65 AT LEAST ONCE] Can you indicate one or more ways the Oil and Gas tools could be improved? [OPEN-END. ACCEPT UP TO THREE.]	
Nothing could be improved	0
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	99

Section 5: Demographics

80. Please indicate how many full-time employees your organization has.	
None	0
One	1
2-5	2

6-10	3
11-20	4
Over 20	5
Don't know / Prefer not to say	9

81. How many years have you worked as a surveyor?

None	0
One	1
2-5	2
6-10	3
11-20	4
Over 20	5
NOT APPLICABLE	8
Don't know / Prefer not to say	9

82. Are you currently an NRCan employee

Yes	0
No	1

APPROVERS

Survey Introduction

Hello/Bonjour,

The Government of Canada – more specifically, the Surveyor General Branch (SGB) of Natural Resources Canada – is conducting a research survey to gather feedback on, and gauge satisfaction with, the Canada Lands Survey System (CLSS) among those who use its services, tools and/or data.

Your participation in the survey is voluntary and completely confidential – your answers will remain anonymous and will be combined with responses from all other respondents.

To proceed to the survey, please click on the following link (or copy and paste it into your browser):

[INSERT URL]

Please complete this survey no later than XXXX XX, 2020.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.

[FRENCH]

Bilingual Landing Page:

Welcome and thank you for your interest in this survey being conducted on behalf of the Government of Canada. The purpose of this survey is to provide the Surveyor General Branch (SGB) of Natural Resources Canada with feedback on, and gauge satisfaction with, the Canada Lands Survey System (CLSS) among those who use its services, tools and/or data.

The survey takes approximately 15 minutes to complete. Your participation in the survey is voluntary and completely confidential. All your answers will remain anonymous and will be combined with responses from all other respondents.

During the survey, please do not use your browser's FORWARD and BACK buttons. Please use the button below to move forward through the survey.

Click “next” at the bottom of the page to begin the survey.

[FRENCH]

Section 1: Basic Demographic Questions

1. Would you prefer to complete the survey in English or French?

English	1
French	2

2. In which province(s) and/or territory(ies) do you work? Please select all that apply.

Newfoundland and Labrador	1
Nova Scotia	2
Prince Edward Island	3
New Brunswick	4
Quebec	5
Ontario	6
Manitoba	7
Saskatchewan	8
Alberta	9
British Columbia	10
Yukon	11
Nunavut	12
Northwest Territories	13
Prefer not to say	99

Section 2: Overall satisfaction with the SGB

3. Over the past two years, how many times would you estimate you requested services or advice from the Surveyor General Branch (SGB)?

Not at all	0
Once	1
2-5 times	2
6-10 times	3
11-20 times	4
Over 20 times	5
Don't know / Prefer not to say	9

4. [IF Q3 AT LEAST ONCE] Over the past two years, what methods of communication have you used to request services or advice from the SGB? Please indicate all that apply. [CHECK ALL]

In Person	1
Email	2
Telephone	3
Traditional mail	4
Other (SPECIFY)	8
Don't know / Prefer not to say	9

5. [IF Q3 AT LEAST ONCE] Were you always able to find a clear point of contact	
Yes	1
No	2
Don't know / Prefer not to say	9
6. [IF Q3 AT LEAST ONCE] Were you served in the language of your choice?	
Yes	1
No	2
Don't know / Prefer not to say	9
7. [IF Q3 AT LEAST ONCE] What were the reasons for communicating with the SGB? Please indicate all that apply. [CHECK ALL]	
Issues on a specific survey project	1
Boundary advice	2
Legal description	3
Consultation	4
The SGB's online tools and data	5
Other (SPECIFY)	88
Don't know / Prefer not to say	99
8. Overall, how satisfied are you with your interactions with the SGB over the past two years?	
Very satisfied	1
Somewhat satisfied	2
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	3
Somewhat dissatisfied	4
Very dissatisfied	5
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	9
9. [IF Q8 DISSATISFIED] Can you briefly explain why your interactions with the SGB over the past two years have been disappointing?	
Don't know / Prefer not to say	99
Overall, to what extent are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the SGB on each of the following attributes? [RANDOMIZE]	
10. Responsive	
11. Knowledge of staff	
12. Being pro-active in solving issues	
13. Effective communication	
14. Providing a clear point of contact	

Very satisfied	1
Somewhat satisfied	2
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	3
Somewhat dissatisfied	4
Very dissatisfied	5
NOT APPLICABLE	8
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	9

Section 3: Usage of & Satisfaction with Survey Resources

Over the past two years, how many times would you estimate you done any of the following?
[RANDOMIZE]

15. Have you requested SGB to provide the management of the provision of survey services
16. Received services relating to the regulation of surveys
17. Accessed or used the eApproval system

Not at all	0
Once	1
2-5 times	2
6-10 times	3
11-20 times	4
Over 20 times	5
Don't know / Prefer not to say	9

[IF Q15 AT LEAST ONCE] Thinking specifically about your experience with SGB providing the management of the provision of survey services for my organisation, to what extent are you satisfied or dissatisfied about the service provided by the SGB on the following? [RANDOMIZE]

18. Timely notification of delays or problems
19. Serving as an effective liaison between contractor and your organization
20. Providing sufficient feedback or communication
21. Effective problem-solving
22. Survey services conducted in a timely manner

Very satisfied	1
Somewhat satisfied	2
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	3
Somewhat dissatisfied	4
Very dissatisfied	5
NOT APPLICABLE	8
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	9

23. [IF Q15 AT LEAST ONCE] Can you indicate one or more ways SGB's delivery of surveys needs to be improved? [OPEN-END. ACCEPT UP TO THREE.]

Nothing needs to be modified or added	0
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	99

[IF Q16 AT LEAST ONCE] Thinking specifically about your experience with services related to the regulation of surveys, to what extent are you satisfied or dissatisfied on the following attributes? [RANDOMIZE]

24. Ensuring accuracy	
25. Ensuring necessary corrections were made to the plans	
26. Effective problem-solving	
27. Confirming the survey met your regulatory requirements for land administration	
28. Review and ratification process was conducted in a timely manner	
Very satisfied	1
Somewhat satisfied	2
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	3
Somewhat dissatisfied	4
Very dissatisfied	5
NOT APPLICABLE	8
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	9

29. [IF Q16 AT LEAST ONCE] Can you indicate one or more ways the service related to the regulation of surveys needs to be improved? [OPEN-END. ACCEPT UP TO THREE.]	
Nothing needs to be improved	0
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	99

[IF Q17 AT LEAST ONCE] Thinking specifically about your experience with eApproval, to what extent are you satisfied or dissatisfied on the following attributes? [RANDOMIZE]

30. Meeting your needs for the approval of survey documents	
31. Easy to use	
32. The process for obtaining your eApproval account	
33. Technical issues resolved in a timely manner	
34. The help documentation and manual provided	
35. The checklist being both up to date and relevant	
Very satisfied	1
Somewhat satisfied	2
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	3
Somewhat dissatisfied	4
Very dissatisfied	5
NOT APPLICABLE	8
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	9

36. [IF Q17 AT LEAST ONCE] Can you indicate one or more ways eApproval could be improved? [OPEN-END. ACCEPT UP TO THREE.]

Nothing needs to be improved	0
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	99

Section 4: Usage of & Satisfaction with Digital Services

Over the past two years, how many times would you estimate you accessed or used the any of the following? [RANDOMIZE]

37. The Canada Lands Surveys section of the Natural Resources Canada web site
38. The Survey Plan search tool
39. The Survey Project search tool
40. The Map Browser application
41. The Canada Lands Overlay in Google Earth
42. The Canada Lands Digital Cadastral data
43. The Geospatial web services (Aboriginal lands)

Not at all	0
Once	1
2-5 times	2
6-10 times	3
11-20 times	4
Over 20 times	5
Don't know / Prefer not to say	9

How satisfied were you with each of the following over the past two years? [DISPLAY ONLY THE ITEMS RESPONDENT HAS DONE. DISPLAY IN THE SAME ORDER AS ABOVE.]

44. [IF Q37 AT LEAST ONCE] The Canada Lands Surveys section of the Natural Resources Canada web site
45. [IF Q38 AT LEAST ONCE] The Survey Plan search tool
46. [IF Q39 AT LEAST ONCE] The Survey Project search tool
47. [IF Q40 AT LEAST ONCE] The Map Browser application
48. [IF Q41 AT LEAST ONCE] The Canada Lands Overlay in Google Earth
49. [IF Q42 AT LEAST ONCE] The Canada Lands Digital Cadastral data
50. [IF Q43 AT LEAST ONCE] The Geospatial web services (Aboriginal lands)

Very satisfied	1
Somewhat satisfied	2
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	3
Somewhat dissatisfied	4
Very dissatisfied	5
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	9

51. [IF Q37 AT LEAST ONCE] Can you indicate one or more ways the Canada Lands Surveys section of the Natural Resources Canada web site could be improved? [OPEN-END. ACCEPT UP TO THREE.]	
Nothing could be improved	0
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	99
52. [IF Q38 AT LEAST ONCE] Can you indicate one or more ways the Survey Plan search tool could be improved? [OPEN-END. ACCEPT UP TO THREE.]	
Nothing could be improved	0
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	99
53. [IF Q39 AT LEAST ONCE] Can you indicate one or more ways the Survey Project search tool could be improved? [OPEN-END. ACCEPT UP TO THREE.]	
Nothing could be improved	0
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	99
54. [IF Q40 AT LEAST ONCE] Can you indicate one or more ways the Map Browser application could be improved? [OPEN-END. ACCEPT UP TO THREE.]	
Nothing could be improved	0
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	99
55. [IF Q41 AT LEAST ONCE] Can you indicate one or more ways the Canada Lands Overlay in Google Earth could be improved? [OPEN-END. ACCEPT UP TO THREE.]	
Nothing could be improved	0
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	99
56. [IF Q42 AT LEAST ONCE] Can you indicate one or more ways the Canada Lands Digital Cadastral data could be improved? [OPEN-END. ACCEPT UP TO THREE.]	
Nothing could be improved	0
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	99
57. [IF Q43 AT LEAST ONCE] Can you indicate one or more ways the Geospatial web services (Aboriginal lands) could be improved? [OPEN-END. ACCEPT UP TO THREE.]	
Nothing could be improved	0
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	99

Section 5: Demographics

58. Please indicate the type of government in which you work.

Indigenous	1
Federal	2
Provincial / Territorial	3
Municipal	4
Other (Please specify)	5
Don't know / Prefer not to say	9

59. Which of the following best describes your position?

Senior manager	1
Project manager / Supervisor / Officer	2
Analyst / Technician	3
Administrator / Support	4
Other (Please specify)	6
Don't know / Prefer not to say	9

INDIGENOUS

Survey Introduction

Hello/Bonjour,

The Government of Canada – more specifically, the Surveyor General Branch (SGB) of Natural Resources Canada – is conducting a research survey to gather feedback on, and gauge satisfaction with, the Canada Lands Survey System (CLSS) among those who use its services, tools and/or data.

Your participation in the survey is voluntary and completely confidential – your answers will remain anonymous and will be combined with responses from all other respondents.

May I begin?

Section 1: Basic Demographic Questions

1. Would you prefer to complete the survey in English or French?	
English	1
French	2
2. [For sorting purposes only] In which region do you provide services? Please select all that apply.	
Newfoundland and Labrador	1
Nova Scotia	2
Prince Edward Island	3
New Brunswick	4
Quebec	5
Ontario	6
Manitoba	7
Saskatchewan	8
Alberta	9
British Columbia	10
Yukon	11
Nunavut	12
Northwest Territories	13
Prefer not to say	99

Section 2: Overall satisfaction with the SGB

3. Over the past two years, how many times would you estimate you requested services or advice from the Surveyor General Branch (SGB)?	
Not at all	0
Once	1
2-5 times	2
6-10 times	3
11-20 times	4
Over 20 times	5
Don't know / Prefer not to say	9
4. [IF Q3 AT LEAST ONCE] Over the past two years, what methods of communication have you used to request services or advice from the SGB? Please indicate all that apply. [SELECT ALL]	
Email	2
Telephone	3
Traditional mail	4
Other (SPECIFY)	8
Don't know / Prefer not to say	9

5. [IF Q3 AT LEAST ONCE] Were you always able to find a clear point of contact	
Yes	1
No	2
Don't know / Prefer not to say	9
6. [IF Q3 AT LEAST ONCE] Were you served in the language of your choice?	
Yes	1
No	2
Don't know / Prefer not to say	9
7. [IF Q3 AT LEAST ONCE] What were the reasons for communicating with the SGB? Please indicate all that apply. [SELECT ALL]	
A specific survey project	1
A boundary concern or question	2
The SGB's online tools and data	3
Consultation on how to get a survey done	4
Other (SPECIFY)	8
Don't know / Prefer not to say	9
8. Over the past two years, how many surveys have been conducted in your community?	
None at all	0
One	1
2-5	2
6-10	3
11-20	4
Over 20	5
Don't know / Prefer not to say	9
9. [IF Q8 AT LEAST ONE] Over the past two years, what types of surveys have been conducted in your community? [SELECT ALL]	
Exterior boundary survey	1
Interior boundary survey or subdivision	2
Right of way (easement) survey	3
Addition to reserve (Provincial lands)	4
Boundary investigation or boundary maintenance survey	5
Condominium survey or building units	6
Other (SPECIFY)	8
Don't know / Prefer not to say	9
10. How long ago was your community's most recent survey?	
Have never done one	0

Within the past month	1
2-5 months ago	2
6-12 months ago	3
Between 1 and 2 years ago	4
Over 2 years ago	5
Don't know / Prefer not to say	9

11. Overall, how satisfied are you with your interactions with the SGB over the past two years?

Very satisfied	1
Somewhat satisfied	2
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	3
Somewhat dissatisfied	4
Very dissatisfied	5
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	9

12. [IF Q11 DISSATISFIED] Can you briefly explain why your interactions with the SGB over the past two years have been disappointing?

Don't know / Prefer not to say	99
--------------------------------	----

Overall, to what extent are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the SGB on each of the following attributes?
[RANDOMIZE]

- 13. Responsive
- 14. Knowledge of staff
- 15. Effective communication
- 16. Helpful
- 17. Providing information that is easy to understand

Very satisfied	1
Somewhat satisfied	2
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	3
Somewhat dissatisfied	4
Very dissatisfied	5
NOT APPLICABLE [VOLUNTEERED]	8
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	9

Section 3: Approval Process of Survey Documents

This should always be the first point for this section:

Any survey plans used to create new parcels, including easements, rights-of-way and permit areas, within Reserve Lands must be approved by the First Nation Council prior to being submitted to SGB for recording. This approval is to ensure that the plan is suitable for the intended transaction and that

the plan meets with any planning or land use requirements of the First Nation. Normally, the surveyor is responsible for obtaining approval.

18. In what format do you typically arrange to provide the approval for a survey plan? Please indicate all that apply. [SELECT ALL]

Band Council resolution	1
First Nation Approval form / Band Approval form	2
Internal form	3
Email from an authorized person	4
Signature on a survey plan	5
Other (SPECIFY)	6
NOT APPLICABLE [VOLUNTEERED]	8
Don't know / Prefer not to say	9

19. Are you comfortable approving survey plans?

Yes	1
No	2
NOT APPLICABLE [VOLUNTEERED]	8
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	9

20. [IF Q19 NO] What would help you be more comfortable approving survey plans? [OPEN END]

Don't know / Prefer not to say	99
--------------------------------	----

21. Do you feel consulted enough during the survey process?

Yes	1
No	2
NOT APPLICABLE [VOLUNTEERED]	8
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	9

22. Do you have any recommendations that could improve the survey process for your community? [OPEN END]

Don't know / Prefer not to say	99
--------------------------------	----

23. How familiar are you with the First Nation Approval form or Band Approval form on the myCLSS website?

Very familiar	1
Somewhat familiar	2
Not very familiar	3
Not at all familiar	4
NOT APPLICABLE [VOLUNTEERED]	8
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	9

24. [IF Q23 AT LEAST NOT VERY FAMILIAR] How satisfied are you with the First Nation Approval form or Band Approval form?

Very satisfied	1
Somewhat satisfied	2
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	3
Somewhat dissatisfied	4
Very dissatisfied	5
NOT APPLICABLE [VOLUNTEERED]	8
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	9

25. Would you appreciate being able to provide approval of survey plans through an online application?

Yes	1
No	2
NOT APPLICABLE [VOLUNTEERED]	8
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	9

26. Would you use an online application to provide approval of survey plans if one were available?

Yes	1
No	2
NOT APPLICABLE [VOLUNTEERED]	8
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	9

27. Can you indicate one or more ways the SGB service provided to you could be improved? [OPEN-END. ACCEPT UP TO THREE.]

Nothing could be improved	0
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	99

Section 4: Usage of & Satisfaction with Digital Services

Over the past two years, how many times would you estimate you accessed or used any of the following? [RANDOMIZE]

- 28. The Canada Lands Surveys section of the Natural Resources Canada web site
- 29. The Survey Plan search tool
- 30. The Survey Project search tool
- 31. The Map Browser application
- 32. The Canada Lands Overlay in Google Earth
- 33. The Canada Lands Digital Cadastral data (ESRI Shapefile, DWG)
- 34. The Geospatial web services (Aboriginal lands)

Not at all	0
Once	1
2-5 times	2
6-10 times	3
11-20 times	4
Over 20 times	5
Don't know / Prefer not to say	9

How satisfied were you with each of the following over the past two years? [DISPLAY ONLY THE ITEMS RESPONDENT HAS DONE. DISPLAY IN THE SAME ORDER AS ABOVE.]

35. [IF Q28 AT LEAST ONCE] The Canada Lands Surveys section of the Natural Resources Canada web site
36. [IF Q29 AT LEAST ONCE] The Survey Plan search tool
37. [IF Q30 AT LEAST ONCE] The Survey Project search tool
38. [IF Q31 AT LEAST ONCE] The Map Browser application
39. [IF Q32 AT LEAST ONCE] The Canada Lands Overlay in Google Earth
40. [IF Q33 AT LEAST ONCE] The Canada Lands Digital Cadastral data (ESRI Shapefile, DWG)
41. [IF Q34 AT LEAST ONCE] The Geospatial web services (Aboriginal lands)
- | | |
|--|---|
| Very satisfied | 1 |
| Somewhat satisfied | 2 |
| Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | 3 |
| Somewhat dissatisfied | 4 |
| Very dissatisfied | 5 |
| Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer | 9 |
42. [IF Q28 AT LEAST ONCE] Can you indicate one or more ways the Canada Lands Surveys section of the Natural Resources Canada web site could be improved? [OPEN-END. ACCEPT UP TO THREE.]
- | | |
|--|----|
| Nothing could be improved | 0 |
| Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer | 99 |
43. [IF Q29 AT LEAST ONCE] Can you indicate one or more ways the Survey Plan search tool could be improved? [OPEN-END. ACCEPT UP TO THREE.]
- | | |
|--|----|
| Nothing could be improved | 0 |
| Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer | 99 |
44. [IF Q30 AT LEAST ONCE] Can you indicate one or more ways the Survey Project search tool could be improved? [OPEN-END. ACCEPT UP TO THREE.]
- | | |
|--|----|
| Nothing could be improved | 0 |
| Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer | 99 |
45. [IF Q31 AT LEAST ONCE] Can you indicate one or more ways the Map Browser application could be improved? [OPEN-END. ACCEPT UP TO THREE.]

Nothing could be improved	0
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	99
46. [IF Q32 AT LEAST ONCE] Can you indicate one or more ways the Canada Lands Overlay in Google Earth could be improved? [OPEN-END. ACCEPT UP TO THREE.]	
Nothing could be improved	0
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	99
47. [IF Q33 AT LEAST ONCE] Can you indicate one or more ways the Canada Lands Digital Cadastral data (ESRI Shapefile, DWG) could be improved? [OPEN-END. ACCEPT UP TO THREE.]	
Nothing could be improved	0
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	99
48. [IF Q34 AT LEAST ONCE] Can you indicate one or more ways the Geospatial web services (Aboriginal lands) could be improved? [OPEN-END. ACCEPT UP TO THREE.]	
Nothing could be improved	0
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	99
49. How satisfied are you with the accessibility of SGB's cadastral (parcel or survey fabric) or boundary data?	
Very satisfied	1
Somewhat satisfied	2
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	3
Somewhat dissatisfied	4
Very dissatisfied	5
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	9
50. Would you prefer to have all the information/documents available on the SGB website organized by Indigenous Nation or community?	
Yes	1
No	2
Don't know / Prefer not to say / No answer	9
51. Would any of the following products or services better help you support or manage your lands? [READ LIST. SELECT ALL.]	
Cadastral (parcel or survey fabric) mapping products including more detailed maps	1
Aerial Photos, orthophotographs or large scale (1:1,000) Community Mapping	2
More accurately georeferenced cadastral (parcel or survey fabric) data	3
A mobile version of the CLSS map browser	4
Online tutorials	5
Training (SGB's online tools, reading survey plans, doing research, project planning, approving surveys)	6
Other (SPECIFY)	8

Don't know / Prefer not to say 9

51A. [If selected any answer for Q51] Please describe how the information would improve your land management responsibilities. [OPEN-END]

52. [If selected training for Q51] Please provide topics of training you would be interested in? [READ LIST. SELECT ALL.]

SGB's online tools	1
Reading survey plans	2
Doing research	3
Project planning	4
Approving surveys	5
Other (SPECIFY)	8
Don't know / Prefer not to say	9

Section 5: Demographics

53. Which of the following best describes your category of land management?

First Nation Land Management	1
<i>Indian Act</i>	2
Self-Government	3
Other (SPECIFY)	8
Don't know / Prefer not to say	9

54. Which of the following best describes your position?

Land manager	1
Clerk	2
Office manager	3
Government official	4
Other (SPECIFY)	8
Don't know / Prefer not to say	9

APPENDIX C: VERBATIM OPEN-END RESPONSES

Exhibit A11: Q21 – *Can you indicate one or more elements of the standards that should be modified or added as a priority? n=105*

Priority Elements of Standards	
Plan without field survey.	1%
To say that nothing needs to be modified would be wrong, but I think that the system works pretty well.	1%
Less subjectivity More direct clarity.	1%
Lacking long term continuity. The Standards and requirements have changed some may times in the 10 years that they are different on every project.	1%
Use of authoritative coordinates for boundary definition	1%
Facilitates the option of cadastralizing a lot without staking it. Sometimes it is not logical to stake a lot where the street is not built, but cadastral development would be necessary.	1%
Current examples of plans. More information on how to replace a survey post. No need for a registered plan for a designation vote - that is a waste of time and money.	1%
Definitions should be updated and Plan sample plans formats updated.	1%
Need more information (or where to look) on disposition surveys in the territories.	1%
The installation of bollards should not always be mandatory.	1%
Make sure addendums are updated in the standards as quickly as possible after they are made.	1%
Current specimen plans.	1%
Reduced posting for bare land condos needs to be extended digital signature sytem is a mess.	1%
Possibly more samples of plans.	1%
Simplification of plan types.	1%
Clear designation when a provincial licence and CLS is required on jurisdictional boundaries. Are both required or not?	1%
The standards are very detailed and prescriptive compared to provincial standards. In my view this takes flexibility away from a CLS and drives the cost of the project up for the client un-necessarily.	1%
Explanatory plans should not show monuments as this is confusing to clients.	1%
Have a live version on the web to eliminate the need to watch the Addendums to see if the standards have changed from a topic or standard.	1%
I question the requirement for ellipsoidal elevations. I don't believe this has any value to the public, and can be extremely confusing for them. If this information is required by SGB perhaps it could be given in a different format, such as a .txt file submitted along with the DSF.	1%
The standards should reflect today's realities. The cadastre should be computerized to better serve the needs of registries and users. Intelligent digital data is now part of our daily lives.	1%

PDF plans are open to interpretation, very cumbersome to process, and lead to numerous disputes. If the GAD continues in this way, the SATC may not be used in the future.	
Standard blocking for right side plan title and registration information. This is would standardize like a provincial standard.	1%
I think they are fine. Sometimes it can be hard to see how the rules are applied in a specific situation but it is impossible to have it perfect in every scenario. The deferred posting is something we do quite often for multi-lot subdivisions. I believe the rules want a Field notes of Control Survey and then a Plan of Survey submitted at the start, which are literally almost identical. The SGB has allow the last few deferred postings to instead just have 1 plan at the outset, just a plan of survey showing the deferred monuments, which is more practical. Perhaps the rules could be updated to reflect this.	1%
More information regarding common property and limited common property.	1%
Timely updating to reflect changes as a result of northern devolution.	1%
As I only do a Canada Lands survey very infrequently I would prefer if a plan prepared to provincial standards could be used and accepted with minimal changes (as per 30 years ago).	1%
Provincial plan examples as coast to coast CLS plans differ in look and it would be good to see examples that relate to a specific province.	1%
Questions about the title block and the information on it (2 cm margin, caption, etc.) should be reduced because a title block is slightly modified with each mandate.	1%
Would like to see the option to prepare partial surveys as outlined in previous versions of the National Standards.	1%
Specimen plans tend to be very simple in nature. It would be helpful to have some examples of more complex tyeps of plans.	1%
Would be useful if myCLSS had as part of the checklist section, a final question that asked for input to the checklist that may be considered (by a real person) at a later date for future updates to the checklist. I find one or two questions in the checklists that I feel do not apply or are implying something be done on the plan that is simply not in the National Standards and is inconsistent with our firms normal way of addressing that point. Irritating at the time, forgotten about 2 days later but no easy way to communicate to a real person, in that moment, that something should be addressed in the checklists in the future.	1%
Checklist systems is a bit clunky. Other than that everything is easy to use.	1%
Real Property Reports: they relate features to boundaries, boundaries are surveys - they should be in the Standards, but the north would freak out.	1%
Having more specimen plans available.	1%
Plans for easements or permits should be differentiated between those that require a field survey and those for which nor field survey is required.	1%
Nothing needs to be modified or added	30%
DK/NR/NA	36%

*Some response were edited to improve readability.

Exhibit A15: Q31 – *Can you indicate one or more ways myCLSS could be improved? n=105*

Suggested Improvements of myCLSS	
User-friendliness of the site.	1%
Allow submission of survey reports larger than 25mb, Air Photos are large.	1%
Design changes for ease of use - the design little bit quirky and dated.	1%
More use of digital information.	1%
The ability to add/modify information once uploaded. Once the system locks, you can only use the SGB to add items in my project.	1%
Allow documents to be modified or added to a project after the plan has been submitted for a review. Right now once you submit, you are locked out and can't modify or add anything. If you make a mistake and realize it after you hit submit, you need to contact the SGB to get the correct document uploaded.	1%
Had problems removing plans that needed minor corrections after submission. Should CLS have this ability rather than having SGB do it.	1%
Used quite a bit lately and getting much more familiar with the system - checklist is a bit cumbersome when you have to do a number of plans.	1%
Allow for completed projects to be removed from displayed project list.	1%
When uploading documents for final submission (Recording) there should be an option to upload multiple files - specifically if there are more than one approval.	1%
I find the map browser to be cumbersome to use. It would be ideal if I could set an opening view preference so that I would not need 5 or more scrolls or windows to get to the area that I work in most. I also find it awkward because it is a window within a window and therefore very sensitive to where my mouse is when I pan or scroll. Once I get to my area of interest it is fairly good to use although I do get confused by the language on the tools when it comes to viewing a copy of a plan. The View tool pans to the location of that plan on the map whereas at that stage I am thinking that view will open a copy of the plan.	1%
Allow members to add documents upon initial request, e.g. authorizations or overdue research documents.	1%
Perhaps some sort of live chat function could be considered. I have been active as a CLS for over 30 years so have developed a large number of contacts at SGB that I can contact whenever questions or issues come up. Someone with fewer contacts might be at a real loss.	1%
Eliminate PDF survey plans and piecemeal instructions. Working with data. Make the cadastre intelligent.	1%
I seem to struggle with the digital signature and create PDF 1/a plans.	1%
Re; outages, if we knew there was a planned outage, even a 5 day outage, we could definitely work around it as we don't need it every day. But it is unplanned or unexpected outages that are frustrating. If you plan to work through a checklist on a weekend and it is unavailable but you didn't receive notice, that can impact the business. Most of the time outages can be worked around.	1%
There were some original webinars put out on the myCLSS system when it was first introduced. It would be great to review these to see if there are any uses or abilities that one is simply unaware of.	1%

Adding the functionality for surveyors to create their own project envelope connected to NRCan's GIS/KML cadastral file.	1%
Band approval letter reminder as a deliverable for the plan would be great as I keep forgetting to submit that.	1%
Easier to add documents to project, regardless of status.	1%
Plan Search Tool could use some improvement. Is it not intuitive to figure out how to use unless you are using it on a frequent basis. Example, try searching an I.R. to get a listing of all plans within in order to figure out what all you need to download. Also, no way to to select multiple plans to download as a ZIP or batch.	1%
Allow for submission of preliminary plans/documents for contractual review by Regional Office prior to generating a checklist number and final submission.	1%
Link it to google earth for surveyors can create project envelopes.	1%
Add link to tool for checking digital reference plans.	1%
The overall process of how MyCLSS moves application by application, through a project is not intuitive to this user. I only use the tool sporadically and in bursts of small projects. Using the tool, after a 6 month absence, I am always frustrated on knowing the flow of process (again perhaps due to how applications are named). After using 2 to 3 times in a row, the hesitation disappears, but I always wonder initially why the overall flow of process is not more evident to the user. Perhaps a side button that can be toggled at any stage that shows a schematic of the process using the particular name assigned to the applications. One could find his/her position on this map and know what is coming up in the process.	1%
It works well.	1%
When doing a plan or project search, some surveyors' names are listed in 2 ways. Sometimes you get different results, depending on which name you choose for the same surveyor.	1%
If surveyors can still upload documents such as a missing report after the checklist is obtained.	1%
Searches could be made much easier by allowing more refined geographic searches. The addition of many additions to reserves in other locations has made searches by Reserve almost useless. Using the map browser for searches is not very user friendly.	1%
Increase the number of miscellaneous items that can be uploaded.	1%
Nothing needs to be modified or added	26%
DK/NR/NA	46%

*Some response were edited to improve readability.