

## Shared Services Integration Sector 2017-2018 Client Satisfaction Survey

Contract number: EP597-182681/001/CY  
Original contract date: 2018-01-29  
POR Registration Number: POR 088-17

Prepared for:  
Public Services and Procurement Canada  
Prepared by:  
Environics Research Group

Final report delivery date: March 23 2018  
PA 9815

Ce rapport est aussi disponible en français

For more information on this report:  
[por-rop@pspc-spac.gc.ca](mailto:por-rop@pspc-spac.gc.ca)

## Table of Contents

<b>Summary</b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b>FreeBalance</b> .....	<b>3</b>
A. Overall satisfaction – scale .....	3
B. Satisfaction with service attributes .....	3
C. Agreement with statements about services received .....	4
D. Importance of service aspects .....	5
E. Quadrant analysis – satisfaction vs. importance .....	6
F. Service improvement suggestions .....	7
G. Value for money improvement suggestions .....	7
<b>IFMS</b> .....	<b>8</b>
A. Overall satisfaction – scale .....	8
B. Satisfaction with service attributes .....	8
C. Agreement with statements about services received .....	9
D. Importance of service aspects .....	10
E. Quadrant analysis – satisfaction vs. importance .....	11
F. Service improvement suggestions .....	12
G. Value for money improvement suggestions .....	14
<b>SCMS</b> .....	<b>15</b>
A. Overall satisfaction – scale .....	15
B. Satisfaction with service attributes .....	15
C. Agreement with statements about services received .....	16
D. Importance of service aspects .....	17
E. Quadrant analysis – satisfaction vs. importance .....	18
F. Service improvement suggestions .....	19
<b>Conclusions and recommendations</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<b>Appendix A: Methodology</b> .....	<b>22</b>
<b>Appendix B: Survey instrument (English and French)</b> .....	<b>24</b>
<b>Appendix C: Broadcast invitations and reminders</b> .....	<b>39</b>
<b>Appendix D: Departments and agencies included in the survey</b> .....	<b>51</b>



## Summary

### Background and purpose

The Shared Services Integration (SSI) Sector provides integrated program support and management to various departments and agencies using corporate shared financial and materiel systems. SSI conducts regular research to measure client satisfaction, the results of which inform SSI's performance indicator reporting requirements. The 2017-2018 Client Satisfaction Survey is a continuation of this ongoing research.

The purpose of this wave of the survey is to assess the satisfaction of other government department project authorities with the SSI's program delivery.

### Methodology

Environics conducted an online survey with 64 clients of SSI, from February 20 to March 16, 2018. As this was an attempted census, no margin of sampling error is calculated. The initial survey invitation was broadcast to 303 contacts provided by SSI. 64 responses were received, for a calculated response rate of 22%.

The qualifying population was defined as representatives of client departments and agencies who are members of the various Governance Committees and Working Groups administered by Integrated Financial and Materiel System (IFMS), FreeBalance and Shared Case Management Solution (SCMS).

All research work was conducted in accordance with the professional standards established by the MRIA, as well as applicable federal legislation (PIPEDA) and to the Privacy Act and Treasury Board and PSPC privacy policies, directives and standards. The survey was registered with the National Survey Registration System.

A more detailed description of the methodology appears as Appendix A to this report.

### Using the results

The survey results will be distributed to Branch management for information and reference and for arranging follow up as warranted, to identify opportunities for improving service.

### Cost of research

The cost of this research was \$26,386.08 (HST included).

### Key findings

Clients of SSI programs generally identify the same service aspects as being very important to them: work being done correctly, getting what they need, and having their needs understood. In general, FreeBalance and SCMS clients are the most likely to indicate their level of satisfaction with specific service attributes matches their corresponding importance. IFMS clients are the least likely to express satisfaction with several important service attributes.

**Political neutrality statement and contact information**

I hereby certify as a Senior Research Associate of Environics Research Group that the 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 contain any reference to electoral voting intentions, political party preferences, standings with the electorate, or ratings of the performance of a political party or its leader.

Brenda Sharpe  
Senior Research Associate, Corporate and Public Affairs  
Environics Research Group  
[brenda.sharpe@environics.ca](mailto:brenda.sharpe@environics.ca) / 613.699.6886

**Supplier name:** Environics Research Group  
PSPC contract number: EP597-182681/001/CY  
Original contract date: 2018-01-029

For more information, contact [por-rop@pspc-spac.gc.ca](mailto:por-rop@pspc-spac.gc.ca)

## FreeBalance

### A. Overall satisfaction – scale

All 18 FreeBalance clients indicate they are satisfied overall with the quality of service they received from the program, with most being very satisfied.

**Overall satisfaction with quality of service received from FreeBalance**

	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied
<b>FreeBalance (n=18)</b>	-	-	-	<b>5</b>	<b>13</b>

29. Overall, how satisfied were you with the quality of service you received from the [FULL PROGRAM NAME]?

### B. Satisfaction with service attributes

Almost all FreeBalance clients express satisfaction with four service attributes.

**Satisfaction with service attributes**

	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Not applicable
The amount of time it took to receive the service(s)	-	-	-	<b>5</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>1</b>
The amount of time it took to receive a response to my questions/comments.	-	-	-	<b>6</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>
The effectiveness of communications.	-	-	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>
The ease of access to the service(s).	-	-	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>1</b>

Q1-4 Please indicate your level of satisfaction with each of the following service attributes you received from the [FULL PROGRAM NAME]:

**C. Agreement with statements about services received**

FreeBalance clients largely agree with each of nine service delivery statements, especially that staff were respectful.

**Agreement with statements about services received**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not applicable
I was provided with all the instructions needed to receive the service(s)	-	-	-	9	8	1
Personnel were knowledgeable	-	-	-	5	12	1
Personnel were respectful	-	-	-	2	15	1
Personnel understood my needs	-	-	1	7	9	1
Personnel went the extra mile to meet my needs	-	-	1	5	11	1
In the end, I consider that the work was done correctly	-	-	-	8	9	1
In the end, I got what I needed	-	-	2	8	7	1
The cost was reasonable	-	-	2	4	7	5
I consider FreeBalance to be a valuable partner in government operations.	-	-	1	6	11	-

Q5-13 Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the service(s) you received from the [FULL PROGRAM NAME]:

**D. Importance of service aspects**

FreeBalance clients feel all service aspects are at least somewhat important, but are most likely to say getting the work done correctly is very important.

**Agreement with statements about importance of service aspects**

	Not at all important	Not very important	Neither important nor unimportant	Somewhat important	Very Important
The amount of time it took to receive the service(s)	-	-	-	10	8
The amount of time it took to receive a response to my questions/comments.	-	-	1	10	7
The effectiveness of communications.	-	-	2	7	9
The ease of access to the service(s).	-	-	2	8	8
The provision of instructions to receive the service	-		1	10	7
Knowledge of the personnel	-		-	8	10
Respectfulness of the personnel	-		-	7	11
Personnel’s understanding of my needs	-		-	7	11
Personnel go the extra mile to meet my needs	-		-	9	9
In the end, the work is done correctly	-		-	4	14
In the end, I get what I needed	-		-	6	12
The cost was reasonable	-		5	5	8

Q14-25 Please indicate the level of importance of each the following service aspects.

### E. Quadrant analysis – satisfaction vs. importance

The following analysis is designed to provide very general guidance to programs on which service aspects may require attention. Satisfaction/agreement with specific service aspects (the number indicating they are very satisfied or strongly agree) has been plotted against stated importance (the number stating each is very important). While it should be noted that all aspects are important and satisfaction rates are quite similar, this grid uses a simple ranking to compare priorities.

FreeBalance may wish to consider concentrating resources on ensuring the work is done correctly, staff understand client needs and clients get what they need, as satisfaction with these aspects are not matching importance.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Lower satisfaction / Higher importance</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Service factors in this quadrant require additional attention and resources</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>The work was done correctly</i></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>Understood my needs</i></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>Got what was needed</i></b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Higher satisfaction / Higher importance</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Service factors in this quadrant are meeting higher expectations; continue monitoring</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>Personnel are knowledgeable</i></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>Personnel are respectful</i></b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Lower satisfaction / Lower importance</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Service factors in this quadrant match lower expectations; but could be improved if/when resources permit</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>Instructions provided to receive service</i></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>Reasonable cost</i></b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Higher satisfaction / Lower importance</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Service factors in this quadrant meet or exceed expectations</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>Time to receive response to questions</i></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>Effectiveness of communications</i></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>Time to receive service</i></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>Ease of access</i></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>Went extra mile</i></b></p>

Q1-4 Please indicate your level of satisfaction with each of the following service attributes you received from the [FULL PROGRAM NAME]:

Q5-12 Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the service(s) you received from the [FULL PROGRAM NAME]:

Q14-25 Please indicate the level of importance of each the following service aspects.



## F. Service improvement suggestions

*Suggestions for service improvement for FreeBalance include a central portal, improved French language service, faster service, and better coordination with other agencies.*

*Establish a central portal for FreeBalance, with information in each section where departmental contacts can go and retrieve information or search*

*Il faut continuer à être vigilant pour que le Cluster ne s'approprie pas des rôles qui appartiennent à FMT.*

*Interpret Chair's needs better to reduce the time requirement of the FB Cluster Chair.*

*Parfois obtenir le service en français n'est pas évident. Bien que je parle bien l'anglais, cela complique les discussions lorsqu'on ne connaît pas nécessairement les termes techniques dans l'autre langue. Somme toute j'ai eu un bon service, c'est seulement que cela prend plus de temps pour que nous nous comprenions tous clairement.*

*Une meilleure coordination avec le bureau du contrôleur general concernant la Solution de gestion des finances et du matériel du gouvernement du Canada. Essentiellement, l'expertise et les ressources du Bureau du programme de FreeBalance aurait du ou devrait être transférées vers la solution puisque ceci est la priorité du gouvernement du Canada.*

*Venir travailler à notre lieu de travail plus rapidement.*

*I do not directly use the service but my staff do. The quality of the service is important... however I was not able to respond directly on how the service was delivered.*

30. *What could have been done to serve you better?*

## G. Value for money improvement suggestions

*Value for money comments for FreeBalance essentially echo other improvement comments.*

*Reduce time requirement of FB Cluster Chair.*

*Essentiellement, l'expertise et les ressources du Bureau du programme de FreeBalance aurait du ou devrait être transférées vers la solution (GCFM) puisque ceci est la priorité du gouvernement du Canada..*

*Excellent rapport qualite-prix.*

*Rien de plus. Je suis satisfaite.*

*The value for money is appropriate.*

31. *What could have been done to increase value for money?*

## IFMS

### A. Overall satisfaction – scale

The 22 IFMS clients responding to the survey are divided in their assessment of overall satisfaction with services received. Eleven are satisfied to some extent, eight are dissatisfied, and three are neutral.

**Overall satisfaction with quality of service received from IFMS**

	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied
<b>IFMS (n=22)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>

29. Overall, how satisfied were you with the quality of service you received from the [FULL PROGRAM NAME]?

### B. Satisfaction with service attributes

While majorities of IFMS clients are satisfied to some extent with each of four service attributes, they are more likely to be satisfied than very satisfied. A notable number are dissatisfied with the time it took to receive the service and the effectiveness of communications.

**Satisfaction with service attributes**

	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Not applicable
The amount of time it took to receive the service(s)	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>
The amount of time it took to receive a response to my questions/comments.	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>
The effectiveness of communications.	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>
The ease of access to the service(s).	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>

Q1-4 Please indicate your level of satisfaction with each of the following service attributes you received from the [FULL PROGRAM NAME]:

### C. Agreement with statements about services received

A slim majority of IFMS clients are satisfied to some extent with seven of nine service aspects, but again are more likely to be satisfied than very satisfied. Clients are most likely to agree to some extent that personnel were respectful or knowledgeable, and that IFMS is a valued partner. They are least likely to agree staff went the extra mile or that the cost was reasonable and notably numbers disagree to some extent that the work was done correctly.

**Agreement with statements about services received**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't know	Not applicable
I was provided with all the instructions needed to receive the service(s)	-	3	7	8	3	-	1
Personnel were knowledgeable	-	3	4	12	3	-	-
Personnel were respectful	-	-	2	13	7	-	-
Personnel understood my needs	3	1	5	10	3	-	-
Personnel went the extra mile to meet my needs	2	4	6	8	-	-	2
In the end, I consider that the work was done correctly	1	7	2	9	3	-	-
In the end, I got what I needed	4	1	6	10	1	-	-
The cost was reasonable	3	4	3	5	1	1	5
I consider IFMS to be a valuable partner in government operations.	3	3	1	7	8	-	-

Q5-13 Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the service(s) you received from the [FULL PROGRAM NAME]:

**D. Importance of service aspects**

IFMS clients are most likely to say it is very important personnel understand their needs and are knowledgeable; they are least likely to say provision of instructions or going the extra mile is very important.

**Agreement with statements about importance of service aspects**

	Not at all important	Not very important	Neither important nor unimportant	Somewhat important	Very Important
The amount of time it took to receive the service(s)	1	-	-	7	14
The amount of time it took to receive a response to my questions/comments.	1	-	1	10	10
The effectiveness of communications.	1	-	1	7	13
The ease of access to the service(s).	1	-	-	12	9
The provision of instructions to receive the service	2	-	2	12	6
Knowledge of the personnel	-	-	-	7	15
Respectfulness of the personnel	-	-	-	9	13
Personnel’s understanding of my needs	-	-	-	4	18
Personnel go the extra mile to meet my needs	-	-	4	11	7
In the end, the work is done correctly	-	-	1	5	16
In the end, I get what I needed	-	1	1	8	12
The cost was reasonable	1	1	5	4	11

Q14-25 Please indicate the level of importance of each the following service aspects.

### E. Quadrant analysis – satisfaction vs. importance

The following analysis is designed to provide very general guidance to programs on which service aspects may require attention. Satisfaction/agreement with specific service aspects (the number indicating they are very satisfied or strongly agree) has been plotted against stated importance (the number stating each is very important). While it should be noted that all aspects are generally considered important and strong satisfaction rates are uniformly low for this program, this grid uses a simple ranking to compare priorities.

There are several service attributes for which only a small number of IFMS clients (from one to three) indicate they are very satisfied, but for which higher importance is assigned (see upper left quadrant of table below). IFMS should concentrate resources to the extent possible on improving in these areas.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Lower satisfaction / Higher importance</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Service factors in this quadrant require additional attention and resources</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>Understood my needs</i></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>The work was done correctly</i></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>Personnel were knowledgeable</i></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>Effectiveness of communications</i></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>Reasonable cost</i></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>Got what was needed</i></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>Time to receive service</i></b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Higher satisfaction / Higher importance</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Service factors in this quadrant are closer to meeting higher expectations; continue monitoring</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>Personnel were respectful</i></b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Lower satisfaction / Lower importance</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Service factors in this quadrant are closer to matching lower expectations; but should be improved when resources permit</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>Went extra mile</i></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>Instructions provided to receive service</i></b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Higher satisfaction / Lower importance</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Service factors in this quadrant match lower expectations</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>Ease of access</i></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>Time to receive response to questions</i></b></p>

Q1-4 Please indicate your level of satisfaction with each of the following service attributes you received from the [FULL PROGRAM NAME]:

Q5-12 Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the service(s) you received from the [FULL PROGRAM NAME]:

Q14-25 Please indicate the level of importance of each the following service aspects.

## F. Service improvement suggestions

*Reflecting lower satisfaction ratings, most comments involve the need for more staff, better communications and accountability, more clarity and coordination, better third party service provision, and some calls to rethink or eliminate this service.*

*Better communications and response time.*

*Ensure that personnel in the office have a good grasp of the challenges faced by departments in terms of their systems. The more knowledgeable they are, the better they can translate departmental requests into meaningful results for the departments.*

*Share the open tickets information/responses to cluster member representatives to increase learning and information sharing between members.*

*Innovation, High Quality Services, Enterprise view are missing from IFMS services. The lowest common denominator approach and attitude has not served client needs, especially large departments well.*

*Provide list of key resources. Knowledge transfer on files. Consistent service*

*Je sais qu'il manque du personnel mais l'impact ne devrait pas trop se faire sentir.*

*Establishment of better processes to enable the teams to be proactive with regards to policy changes that impact the system.*

*Having leaders who can empathise with their clients needs. Leaders who treat people with respect and dignity and are looking for the best interest of Canada.*

*Better understanding of the needs of the client.*

*Better response time.*

*Better service delivery strategy.*

*More accountability for resources both FTE and financial, planned and actual.*

*Better communication, avoid long delays, table drop.*

*More proactive communications to Departments with changes coming from central agencies.*

*More clarity around R&R of IFMS as it pertains to FMT and GoC licences.*

*Ensure value for money when proposing upgrades/enhancements and alignment to FMT.*

*Respond more timely and accurately and be more interested in delivering what is requested.*

*Ensure providers of the service are aware of service standards and services to be provided, roles and responsibilities. Also, that these get communicated clearly to clients.*

*The mandate of IFMS has deteriorated over the last few years. There is no longer a single compelling vision for the group. Instead, it has moved away from its original intent to become a surrogate to the TBS FMT initiative. IFMS leadership needs to present to its clients a clear mandate and vision for either acceptance and support of the service by the membership or the discontinuance of the group.*

*Vous avez fourni du bon service.*

*Take feedback on different approaches to providing services. Install additional systems. ECC/SOLMAN. isn't very leading edge. Might be time to get rid of IFMS...*

*The services received from SSI is good. However the services received from 3rd parties (PSPC-CIO Branch) is unacceptable; in the quality of the services, the accuracy of the information or work done and in the timeliness of the service delivery.*

*Have more personnel to address questions faster.*

*Perhaps some questions could have been handled a bit more quickly.*

*Analysis to help department in decision making should be improved; for example before a vote or to help prioritize a change request.*

*Internal communications between SIGMA Finance and PSPC CIOB need to be better managed. This should be transparent to the client and it is most certainly not. This causes significant delays in getting the final solutions to our department and is a major cause of frustration for all levels of our department.*

*All is managed well.*

*The service provided by the IFMS Program Office to support the procurement of SAP Licenses for the AAFC Cluster was excellent. The secretariat function to the IFMS Cluster is well done. However, the value of the IFMS Program Office in supporting the IFMS Cluster is no longer present. While this is in large part due to the unclear vision and direction of the IFMS Cluster, it is also the result of an ineffective service delivery model of the IFMS Program Office.*

30. *What could have been done to serve you better?*

## G. Value for money improvement suggestions

*Value for money mentions include calls for more efficiencies, lower administration costs and higher client focus, improved timeliness, and a mandate review.*

*Have knowledgeable people available.*

*Financial Management Transformation and the Cluster are vying for the same funding. Long-term planning of the Cluster officer along with the member departments' input becomes more critical to ensure funds are spent in the right place during the next 5 years.*

*Identify how much is invested in each service offering and who benefits.*

*Target annual efficiency improvements and report of their achievement.*

*For each undertaking, understand the objective, the budgeted cost and confirm with cluster members that they support that undertaking and then report on actuals (time, scope and cost).*

*Client focus, high standard, innovation, lower administration cost.*

*Je ne touche pas à ce côté.*

*Bon équilibre gouvernance et effectifs.*

*Being in tune with government wide initiative specifically as it relates to impacts to the system.*

*Playing the challenge role on behalf of the cluster.*

*Spending funding on projects of value to the membership. Ensuring projects are well managed and deliverables are achieved.*

*Install some new SAP products.*

*Provide fixes in a timely fashion.*

*Priorization process should be improve. Impact analysis could be improved.*

*Additional people who have significant experience with SAP configuration and SAP implementations across government (not just PSPC) would provide a wider range of views and opinions and ultimately lead to a better client experience.*

*The costing model needs revision - there should be a combination of metrics beyond departmental size, and hosted departments shouldn't get such a large 'break'.*

*To increase value for money, the IFMS Program Office mandate and service delivery model needs to be redefined. Unfortunately, uncertainties surrounding FMT activities and timelines, and the unclear vision/direction of the IFMS Cluster, have made that effort challenging.*

31. What could have been done to increase value for money?



## SCMS

### A. Overall satisfaction – scale

The majority of the 24 SCMS clients surveyed are satisfied overall with the service they received.

#### Overall satisfaction with quality of service received from SCMS

	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Don't know
<b>SCMS (n=24)</b>	-	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>

29. Overall, how satisfied were you with the quality of service you received from the [FULL PROGRAM NAME]?

### B. Satisfaction with service attributes

SCMS clients are generally satisfied with four service attributes, most notably the effectiveness of communications. Strong satisfaction is lowest for ease of access.

#### Satisfaction with service attributes

	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Not applicable
The amount of time it took to receive the service(s)	-	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>3</b>
The amount of time it took to receive a response to my questions/comments.	-	-	<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>1</b>
The effectiveness of communications.	-	-	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>1</b>
The ease of access to the service(s).	-	-	<b>1</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>

Q1-4 Please indicate your level of satisfaction with each of the following service attributes you received from the [FULL PROGRAM NAME]:

**C. Agreement with statements about services received**

SCMS clients largely agree with each of eight statements about services received, but are most likely to agree staff are knowledgeable and respectful, and that in the end they got what they needed.

**Agreement with statements about services received**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not applicable
I was provided with all the instructions needed to receive the service(s)	-	-	3	5	10	6
Personnel were knowledgeable	-	-	1	10	11	2
Personnel were respectful	-	-	1	5	16	2
Personnel understood my needs	-	1	3	8	10	2
Personnel went the extra mile to meet my needs	-	1	5	8	8	2
In the end, I consider that the work was done correctly	-	-	3	9	9	3
In the end, I got what I needed	-	1	1	12	9	1
I consider SCMS to be a valuable partner in government operations.	-	1	3	7	13	-

Q5-13 Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the service(s) you received from the [FULL PROGRAM NAME]:

**D. Importance of service aspects**

SCMS find all eleven service aspects to be important, but the top priorities are that in the end the work is done correctly and they get what they need, as well as the time required to receive the service.

**Agreement with statements about importance of service aspects**

	Not at all important	Not very important	Neither important nor unimportant	Somewhat important	Very Important
The amount of time it took to receive the service(s)	-	-	-	5	19
The amount of time it took to receive a response to my questions/comments.	-	-	-	8	16
The effectiveness of communications.	-	-	-	8	16
The ease of access to the service(s).	-	-	-	9	15
The provision of instructions to receive the service	-	-	1	7	16
Knowledge of the personnel	-	-	1	7	16
Respectfulness of the personnel	-	-	-	9	15
Personnel’s understanding of my needs	-	-	1	6	17
Personnel go the extra mile to meet my needs	-	-	3	12	9
In the end, the work is done correctly	-	-	-	4	20
In the end, I get what I needed	-	-	-	5	19

Q14-25 Please indicate the level of importance of each the following service aspects.

### E. Quadrant analysis – satisfaction vs. importance

The following analysis is designed to provide very general guidance to programs on which service aspects may require attention. Satisfaction/agreement with specific service aspects (the number indicating they are very satisfied or strongly agree) has been plotted against stated importance (the number stating each is very important). While it should be noted that all aspects are deemed important, this grid uses a simple ranking to compare priorities.

SCMS ranks very well in this analysis, with many services matching expectations. There are only minor gaps in a few areas (see upper left quadrant). The program should continue to ensure work is done correctly, that client needs are understood and they get what they need, and that access is as easy as possible and instructions on how to get service are clear.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Lower satisfaction / Higher importance</b></p> <p><i>Service factors in this quadrant are close to matching higher expectations, and may require additional attention and resources</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Work was done correctly</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Got what was needed</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Understood needs</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Ease of access</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Instructions provided to receive service</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Higher satisfaction / Higher importance</b></p> <p><i>Service factors in this quadrant are generally meeting expectations; continue monitoring</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Time to receive service</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Personnel were knowledgeable</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Time to receive response to questions</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Personnel were respectful</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Effectiveness of communications</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Lower satisfaction / Lower importance</b></p> <p><i>Service factors in this quadrant are matching lower expectations; could be improved if/when resources permit</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Went extra mile</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Higher satisfaction / Lower importance</b></p> <p><i>Service factors in this quadrant are over-performing</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>n/a</b></p>

Q1-4 Please indicate your level of satisfaction with each of the following service attributes you received from the [FULL PROGRAM NAME]:

Q5-12 Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the service(s) you received from the [FULL PROGRAM NAME]:

Q14-25 Please indicate the level of importance of each the following service aspects.

## F. Service improvement suggestions

*Suggestions for improvements include more upfront time for planning and budgeting, improved communications, service upgrades and admin improvements, improved response times and lower costs.*

*I really have no comments. The group and service has been very responsive to our needs.*

*We are currently hosted on site so until we are hosted at SCMS, not much to comment on.*

*Sort out of the issues with the service desk losing track of items sent to them. Over FY17-18, I had 3 tickets that disappeared and I received no response when I had sent a follow up request for action on the original ticket. I finally had to forward my directly request to members of the SCMS Team in order to get the requested action.*

*The services are mediated by NRC's IT department. I am an end user and responsible for software housed on your servers. I have been impressed by the level of SSC service when we have run into server issues. Well done!*

*We would like to see an automated environment refresh.*

*Better planning for costing.*

*Plan out upgrades to the service quicker.*

*Provide more technical assistance on integration with other services.*

*Linking the work of SCMS with the increasingly available cloud hosting options would be highly beneficial going forward.*

*Cost of licenses for maintenance and support.*

*The cost model for departments who are only leveraging the licensing model negotiated with Microsoft is not reflective of services received.*

*SCMS helpdesk responses sometimes took a week. Should be improved.*

*Time to resolve outage of e-mail integration between SCMS and Exchange server took months, once escalated multiple times root cause was traced to SSC network configuration issue. This should have been resolved faster.*

*It would help if MOU indicating costs is issued in the first half of the fiscal year, and sufficient time is provided to get financial approvals.*

*Creation of a public safety enclave to support Prot B+ classification needs.*

*It is working well.*

*Provide more flexibility in the planning of major activities (examples). Client Departments should not be told when activities are to happen and not have the choice of the dates.*

*The provision for Dynamics 365 ended up taking quite a bit longer than planned. This resulted in a disconnect on user counts able to use the service this fiscal - this translated into a financial disagreement on what was appropriate compensation for service. We need to be clearer on services to compensation and have defined contract terms that make the contract explicit.*

*When seeking advice from SCMS, need to have a thorough or more complete answers with some kinds of examples and contact for others who have done it already.*

*We are in (on)going discussions regarding the costs for next year. Better advance planning would have been very beneficial.*

*First of all, an item that was done very well - the December planning session was well thought out and executed. (Department) found the process went very smoothly, the roll-ups were done quickly. The yearly budget process is still problematic as we once again have not received the (department) budget allocation for the next FY. While we saw the overall draft budget in January, we thought that we would get our allocation soon after the meeting. Without any details from the SCMS Program Team on our SCMS allocation, we have had to make our own estimate and (department) will need to stand by the size of that estimate.*

*MOU and details should have been provided sooner in the year. More time required to sign and return MOU as it has to be routed to our CEO. More emphasis on existing solutions to common business functions (e.g. Exec Correspondence and ATIP), that can be shared with other depts. Communications of cost for base, shared, and extra project could be improved as it was clearly a source of confusion for some.*

*Web portal to open tickets rather than a blank email format to the mailbox.*

*Que l'on reconsidère le modèle de licence. Dans notre cas, où notre organisation compte environ 175 personnes et que le nombre d'utilisateurs de CRM varie entre 145 et 155, nous nous devons de payer pour un total de 300 licences, considérant le modèle actuel qui va de 1 à 150 - \$10,200.00 et de 151 à 300 - \$20,400.00. Si les tranches étaient plus réduites, de 10 à 20 licences par tranche, nous croyons que ce modèle serait plus flexible et surtout abordable pour de petites organisations comme la nôtre.*

*Clearly communicate the start and end times for maintenance windows on the day of maintenance so that support teams are aware of when to coordinate their own service outages. - Ensure necessary details are included in the maintenance schedules (such as new versions being introduced)*

30. *What could have been done to serve you better?*

## Conclusions and recommendations

Clients of SSI programs consider the same service aspects to be very important: having the work done correctly, getting what they need, and having their needs understood are among the top identified priorities. The time it takes to receive responses to questions is also of notable importance to SCMS clients. On the whole, FreeBalance and SCMS clients are the most likely to indicate a level of satisfaction with specific service attributes that matches with their corresponding importance. IFMS clients are the least likely to express satisfaction, and a small number express serious concerns about the program's efficacy.

The following are general conclusions and recommendations by program.

**FreeBalance:** All FreeBalance clients are satisfied to some extent with their overall experience. Going forward, program staff should keep up this momentum, and maintain focus on fulfilling client needs and ensuring work is done correctly. A review of processes may identify further efficiencies and improvements.

**IFMS:** This program had the lowest response rate of the three, possibly indicating reduced client engagement, as well as getting the lowest satisfaction scores from its responding clients. The focus going forward should be on better understanding client needs, improving communications, educating staff, and ensuring the work is done correctly and meets all client requirements. Senior staff may wish to revisit the mandate of the program and consider a redesign or other options to deliver the services; in-depth qualitative client research may assist in this.

**SCMS:** This program had good levels of satisfaction and agreement with service attribute statements. Clients appreciate staff's knowledge and respectfulness, and feel they are getting what they need, but some would appreciate it if staff "went the extra mile." With only minor gaps in performance vs. importance, staff should continue to ensure clients' needs are met, that work is done correctly, and that access is easy with clear instructions provided.

## Appendix A: Methodology

### Background and purpose

The Shared Services Integration (SSI) Sector provides integrated program support and management to various departments and agencies using corporate shared financial and materiel systems. SSI conducts regular research to measure client satisfaction, the results of which inform SSI’s performance indicator reporting requirements. The current assignment is a continuation of this ongoing research.

The purpose of this 2017-18 wave of the survey is to assess the satisfaction of other government department project authorities with the SSI’s program delivery.

### Methodology

Environics conducted an online survey with 64 Government of Canada clients of SSI, from February 20 to March 16, 2018. To pretest the survey, Environics programmed the English and French questionnaires and sent test links to a list of identified PSPC employees on February 12, 2018. Comments were incorporated prior to the main survey. The data entered by the pretest participants were deleted prior to the survey launch and not counted as part of the final survey results.

An initial soft launch was broadcast February 20 and full launch followed February 21. Reminder emails were sent on February 27 and March 6. The program also sent out an e-mail on March 14. SSI provided bilingual broadcast e-mail text for each of the three programs, as well as bilingual text for the reminder emails.

Program	Total Supplied Per List	Bounced/Not Delivered	Soft Launch (15%) Feb 20	Full Launch Feb 21	1st Reminder Feb 27	2nd Reminder Mar 6
Free Balance	62	0	9	53	51	45
IFMS	139	6	21	118	123	119
SCMS	102	2	15	87	92	80
<b>Total</b>	<b>303</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>244</b>

All research work was conducted in accordance with the professional standards established by the MRIA, as well as applicable federal legislation (PIPEDA) and to the Privacy Act and Treasury Board and PSPC privacy policies, directives and standards. The survey was registered with the National Survey Registration System, as is done as a matter of policy for all Environics surveys, and the research met all federal government and industry standards.

### Target audience

The qualifying population was defined as representatives of client departments and agencies who are members of the various Governance Committees and Working Groups administered by Integrated Financial and Materiel System (IFMS), FreeBalance and Shared Case Management Solution (SCMS). SSI provided a contact list in electronic format for each of the three programs; 17 individuals appeared on two lists and were sent two invitations.

This survey was an attempted census, rather than a sample survey, and therefore no margin of sampling error is calculated.



### Questionnaire design

The survey uses Common Measurement Tool-style standardized satisfaction and importance questions. Individual questionnaires for the three programs were designed by SSI using tracking questions from the 2016-17 survey, and provided to Environics in both official languages. From the draft questionnaire versions provided, Environics created a consolidated version for programming, with text substitutions as needed to distinguish the appropriate Program Offices. Changes were subsequently made in consultation with PSPC and PORD. The questionnaire averaged 10 minutes to complete. Both the English and French versions of the final study questionnaire are included in an appendix to this document.

### Response rate

The initial survey invitation was broadcast to 303 contacts provided by SSI. 64 responses were received, for a calculated response rate of 22% overall. The response rate for each program is shown below.

	Total	FreeBalance	IFMS	SCMS
	N	N	N	N
<b>Total number invited to participate</b>	<b>303</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>102</b>
Invalid (undelivered)	8	0	6	2
<b>Broadcasts delivered</b>	<b>295</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>UNRESOLVED (U)</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>69</b>
Did not respond	208	40	99	69
<b>IN SCOPE NON-RESPONDING (IS)</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7</b>
Qualified respondent break-off	23	4	12	7
<b>IN SCOPE RESPONDING (R)</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>24</b>
Disqualified	0	0	0	0
Quota filled	0	0	0	0
Completed	64	18	22	24
<b>CONTACT RATE [(R+IS)/ (U + IS + R)] - %</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>31%</b>
<b>RESPONSE RATE [R / (U + IS + R)] - %</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>24%</b>

## Appendix B: Survey instrument (English and French)

2017-18 SSI Client Satisfaction Survey - English

[Choose language/choisissez la langue : English/Français](#)

### Introduction

**DISPLAY TO FREEBALANCE:** The FreeBalance Program Office of the Shared Services Integration (SSI) Sector, Public Services and Procurement Canada (PSPC) is committed to providing excellent service and to the continuous improvement of its service delivery.

You have been identified to participate in a survey to help us understand how SSI-FreeBalance is performing as a service provider and to identify areas for improvement.

**DISPLAY TO IFMS:** The Integrated Financial and Material System (IFMS) Program Office of the Shared Services Integration (SSI) Sector, Public Services and Procurement Canada (PSPC) is committed to providing excellent service and to the continuous improvement of its service delivery.

You have been identified to participate in a survey to help us understand how SSI-IFMS is performing as a service provider and to identify areas for improvement.

**DISPLAY TO SCMS:** The Shared Case Management System (SCMS) of the Shared Services Integration (SSI) Sector, Public Services and Procurement Canada (PSPC) is committed to providing excellent service and to the continuous improvement of its service delivery.

SSI-SCMS is currently providing your organization with a hosted application in a standardized, shared, multi-tenant environment used to automate a wide variety of business processes related to case management and client management as well as integration with GC standard corporate systems and data sources for client-specific systems.

You have been identified to participate in a survey to help us understand how SSI-SCMS is performing as a service provider and to identify areas for improvement.

**DISPLAY TO ALL:** The survey is being conducted by Environics Research Group on behalf of the Integrated Services Branch (ISB). It is expected that the survey will take about 10 minutes to complete. Your responses to the questionnaire are very important to us.

By participating in the survey you are giving permission to use your responses in the analysis of the data collected. Responses to this survey will be reported in aggregate form only. We will not report results by department or agency.

If you have any questions, contact [SSIsurvey-sondageISP@environics.ca](mailto:SSIsurvey-sondageISP@environics.ca)

Please complete the questionnaire and submit it by **March 2, 2018**. Thank you for your participation.

**DISPLAY TO FREEBALANCE, IFMS, SCMS:**

Stéphane Guèvremont

Director General

Shared Services Integration  
Integrated Services Branch  
Public Services and Procurement Canada

**DISPLAY TO ALL:**[Privacy Notice](#)

Provision of the personal information is collected on a voluntary basis pursuant to the [Financial Administration Act](#) and in accordance with the Policy on Communications and Federal Identity of the Government of Canada. The anonymous data will be used by the Integrated Services Branch (ISB) of Public Services and Procurement Canada for the purpose of evaluating client satisfaction. The personal information is described in the Standard Personal Information Banks [Public Communications PSU 914](#). Your personal information is protected, used, and disclosed in accordance with the [Privacy Act](#). **Do not disclose unnecessary confidential information about yourself or other individuals.**

If you require clarification about this notice, you can contact the Director, Access to Information and Privacy by email at [AIPRP.ATIP@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca](mailto:AIPRP.ATIP@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca); by phone at 873-469-3721, or by regular mail at the following address: Director, Access to Information and Privacy, Place du Portage, Phase III, 5C1, 11 Laurier St, Gatineau, Quebec, K1A 0S5. If you are not satisfied with our response to your privacy concern, you may wish to contact the [Office of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada](#).

**SHORT NAMES:**

**SSI-FreeBalance**

**SSI-IFMS**

**SSI-SCMS**

**FULL NAMES:**

**FREEBALANCE:** FreeBalance Program Office of the Shared Services Integration (SSI) Sector, Public Services and Procurement Canada (PSPC)

**IFMS:** Integrated Financial and Material System (IFMS) Program Office of the Shared Services Integration (SSI) Sector, Public Services and Procurement Canada (PSPC)

**SCMS:** Shared Case Management System (SCMS) of the Shared Services Integration (SSI) Sector, Public Services and Procurement Canada (PSPC)

A. Name of department or agency:

- (DROP DOWN LIST)
- My department or agency is not listed

B. If your department or agency was not listed in the drop-down menu in the previous question, please type it here:

**LEVEL OF SATISFACTION**

Please indicate your level of satisfaction with each of the following service attributes you received from the [FULL PROGRAM NAME]:

Select one for each row.

	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Don't Know	Not Applicable
1. The amount of time it took to receive the service(s).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. The amount of time it took to receive a response to my questions/comments.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. The effectiveness of communications.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. The ease of access to the service(s).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the service(s) you received from the [FULL PROGRAM NAME]:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Not Applicable
5. I was provided with all the instructions needed to receive the service(s).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Personnel were knowledgeable.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Personnel were respectful.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Personnel understood my needs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Personnel went the extra mile to meet my needs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. In the end, I consider that the work was done correctly.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. In the end, I got what I needed.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12. IFMS and FB: The cost was reasonable.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13. I consider (SHORT NAME) to be a valuable partner in government operations.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

LEVEL OF IMPORTANCE

Please indicate the level of importance of each the following service aspects:

	Not at all important	Not very important	Neither important nor unimportant	Somewhat important	Very Important
14. The amount of time it took to receive the service(s).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15. The amount of time it took to receive a response to my questions/comments.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16. The effectiveness of the communications.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
17. The ease of access to the service(s).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
18. The provision of instructions to receive the service.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
19. Knowledge of the personnel	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
20. Respectfulness of the personnel	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
21. Personnel's understanding of my needs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
22. Personnel go the extra mile to meet my needs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
23. In the end, the work is done correctly.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
24. In the end, I get what I needed.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
25. IFMS and FB: The cost was reasonable.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

OVERALL CLIENT SATISFACTION

29. Overall, how satisfied were you with the quality of service you received from the [FULL PROGRAM NAME]?

Very  
Dissatisfied

Dissatisfied

Neither  
Satisfied Nor  
Dissatisfied

Satisfied

Very  
Satisfied

Don't  
Know

30. What could have been done to serve you better?

ASK FREEBALANCE AND IFMS:

31. What could have been done to increase value for money?

Thank you for your participation. Your opinion is important to us!

Please press the "Submit" button below to send your responses.



## Sondage sur la satisfaction de la clientèle de l'ISP 2017-18 - FRANCAIS

Choose language/choisissez la langue : English/Français

## Présentation

**DISPLAY TO FREEBALANCE:** Le Bureau du programme de FreeBalance du secteur de l'Intégration des services partagés (ISP) de Services publics et Approvisionnement Canada (SPAC) tient à offrir un excellent service et à améliorer continuellement sa prestation de services.

Vous avez été choisi pour participer à un sondage qui nous aidera à évaluer le rendement de l'ISP-FreeBalance à titre de fournisseur de services ainsi qu'à déterminer les améliorations nécessaires.

**DISPLAY TO IFMS/SIFM:** Le Bureau de programme du Système intégré des finances et du matériel (SIFM) du secteur de l'Intégration des services partagés (ISP) de Services publics et Approvisionnement Canada (SPAC) tient à offrir un excellent service et à améliorer continuellement sa prestation de services.

Vous avez été choisi pour participer à un sondage qui nous aidera à évaluer le rendement de l'ISP-SIFM à titre de fournisseur de services ainsi qu'à déterminer les améliorations nécessaires.

**DISPLAY TO SCMS/SPGC:** Le Système partagé de gestion des cas (SPGC) du secteur de l'Intégration des services partagés (ISP) de Services publics et Approvisionnement Canada (SPAC) tient à offrir un excellent service et à améliorer continuellement sa prestation de services.

L'ISP-SPGC fournit actuellement à votre ministère une application hébergée dans un environnement normalisé, pour automatiser une vaste gamme de processus opérationnels liés à la gestion des cas et à la gestion des clients ainsi que l'intégration aux systèmes ministériels normalisés et aux sources de données du GC.

Vous avez été choisi pour participer à un sondage qui nous aidera à évaluer le rendement de l'ISP-SPGC à titre de fournisseur de services ainsi qu'à déterminer les améliorations nécessaires.

**DISPLAY TO ALL:** Le sondage est mené par le Groupe de recherche Environics pour la Direction générale des Services intégrés (DGSi). Il vous faudra environ dix minutes pour répondre au sondage. Vos réponses sont très importantes pour nous.

En participant au sondage, vous nous donnez l'autorisation d'utiliser vos réponses dans l'analyse des données recueillies. Les résultats du sondage seront présentés de manière globale seulement. Nous ne diffuserons pas de résultats par ministère ou organisme.

Si vous avez des questions, veuillez envoyer un courriel à [SSIsurvey-sondageISP@environics.ca](mailto:SSIsurvey-sondageISP@environics.ca)

Veuillez remplir le questionnaire et le soumettre d'ici **le 2 mars 2018**. Merci de votre participation.

**DISPLAY TO FREEBALANCE, IFMS, SCMS:**

Stéphane Guèvremont  
Directeur général  
Intégration des services partagés  
Direction générale des services intégrés  
Services publics et Approvisionnement Canada

**DISPLAY TO ALL:**

## Énoncé de confidentialité

Les renseignements personnels sont recueillis sur une base volontaire en vertu de la [Loi sur la gestion des finances publiques](#) et conformément à la Politique sur les communications et l'image de marque du gouvernement du Canada. Les données anonymes sont utilisées par la Direction générale des services intégrés (DGSI) de Services publics et Approvisionnement Canada aux fins d'évaluer la satisfaction de la clientèle. Les renseignements personnels sont décrits dans les Fichiers de renseignements personnels ordinaires [Communications publiques, POU 914](#). Vos renseignements personnels sont protégés, utilisés et divulgués conformément aux dispositions de la [Loi sur la protection des renseignements personnels](#). **Ne divulguez pas d'information confidentielle non nécessaire qui vous concerne ou qui concerne un autre individu.**

Pour obtenir des précisions au sujet du présent énoncé, veuillez communiquer avec la directrice de l'Accès à l'information et protection des renseignements personnels par courriel à [AIPRP.ATIP@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca](mailto:AIPRP.ATIP@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca), par téléphone au 873-469-3721 ou par courrier postal à l'adresse suivante : Directrice, Accès à l'information et protection des renseignements personnels, Place du Portage, Phase III, 5C1, 11 rue Laurier, Gatineau, Québec, K1A 0S5. Si notre réponse à vos préoccupations en matière de protection des renseignements personnels ne vous satisfait pas, vous pouvez communiquer avec le [Commissariat à la protection de la vie privée du Canada](#).

NOM COURT :

l'ISP-FreeBalance

l'ISP-SIFM

l'ISP-SPGC

NOMS COMPLETS :

**FREEBALANCE** : Bureau du programme de FreeBalance du secteur de l'Intégration des services partagés (ISP) de Services publics et Approvisionnement Canada (SPAC)

**IFMS/SIFM** : Bureau de programme du Système intégré des finances et du matériel (SIFM) du secteur de l'Intégration des services partagés (ISP) de Services publics et Approvisionnement Canada (SPAC)

**SCMS/SPGC** : Système partagé de gestion des cas (SPGC) du secteur de l'Intégration des services partagés (ISP) de Services publics et Approvisionnement Canada (SPAC)

A. Nom du ministère ou de l'organisme :

- (LISTE DÉROULANTE)
- Mon ministère ou organisme n'est pas dans la liste

B. Si votre ministère ou organisme ne figurait pas dans le menu déroulant dans la question précédente, veuillez l'indiquer ici :

**NIVEAU DE SATISFACTION**

Veuillez noter la mesure dans laquelle vous êtes satisfait ou insatisfait avec chacun des aspects du service que vous avez reçu(s) du [NOM DU PROGRAMME COMPLET]:

Veuillez inscrire une réponse pour chaque rangée.

	Très insatisfait(e)	Insatisfait(e)	Ni satisfait(e), ni insatisfait(e)	Satisfait(e)	Très satisfait(e)	S.O.	Ne sais pas
26. Le temps d'attente pour recevoir le(s) service(s).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
27. Le temps d'attente pour obtenir une réponse à mes question(s) ou commentaire(s).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
28. L'efficacité des communications.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
29. La facilité d'accès au(x) service(s).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Veuillez noter la mesure dans laquelle vous êtes en accord ou en désaccord avec chacune des affirmations suivantes sur le(s) service(s) que vous avez reçu(s) du [NOM DU PROGRAMME COMPLET] :

	Fortement en désaccord	En désaccord	Ni en accord, ni en désaccord	En accord	Fortement en accord	S.O.	Ne sais pas
30. J'ai reçu toutes les mesures nécessaires pour obtenir le(s) service(s).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
31. Le personnel est bien informé.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
32. Le personnel est respectueux.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
33. Le personnel comprend mes besoins.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
34. Le personnel a fait des efforts particuliers pour répondre à mes besoins.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
35. Au bout du compte, je considère que le travail a été accompli correctement.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
36. Finalement, j'ai obtenu ce dont j'avais besoin.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
37. IFMS et FB : Le coût était raisonnable.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
38. Je considère que [NOM COURT] comme un partenaire précieux pour les opérations du gouvernement.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

NIVEAU D'IMPORTANCE

Veillez indiquer le niveau d'importance que vous attribuez à chaque aspect de service :

	Pas du tout important	Pas très important	Ni l'un ni l'autre	Assez important	Très important
39. Le temps d'attente pour recevoir le(s) service(s).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
40. Le temps d'attente pour obtenir une réponse à mes question(s) ou commentaire(s).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
41. L'efficacité des communications.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
42. La facilité d'accès au(x) service(s).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
43. Recevoir toutes les mesures nécessaires pour obtenir le(s) service(s).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
44. Le personnel soit bien informé.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
45. Le personnel soit respectueux.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
46. Le personnel comprenne mes besoins.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
47. Le personnel fasse des efforts particuliers pour répondre à mes besoins.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
48. Au bout du compte, que le travail soit	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

accompli  
correctement.

49. Finalement, que j'obtienne ce dont j'avais besoin.      ○      ○      ○      ○      ○

50. IFMS et FB : Le coût soit raisonnable.      ○      ○      ○      ○      ○

SATISFACTION GLOBALE DE LA CLIENTÈLE

29. Quel est votre niveau de satisfaction global à l'égard de la qualité du service que vous avez reçu du [NOM DU PROGRAMME COMPLET]?

- |                        |                       |                                       |                       |                       |                         |
|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| Très<br>insatisfait(e) | Insatisfait(e)        | Ni satisfait(e),<br>ni insatisfait(e) | Satisfait(e)          | Très<br>satisfait(e)  | Je<br>ne<br>sais<br>pas |
| <input type="radio"/>  | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>                 | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>   |

30. Qu'est-ce qui aurait pu être fait pour mieux vous servir ?

DEMANDER À FREEBALANCE ET IFMS :

31. Qu'est-ce qui aurait pu être fait pour améliorer le rapport qualité-prix ?

Merci de votre participation. Votre opinion est importante pour nous!

Veuillez cliquer sur le bouton "Soumettre" ci-dessous pour envoyer vos réponses.



## Appendix C: Broadcast invitations and reminders

### 2017-18 SSI-FreeBalance Client Satisfaction Survey // Sondage sur la satisfaction de la clientèle de l'ISP-FreeBalance 2017-18

*(la version française suit)*

The FreeBalance Program Office of the Shared Services Integration (SSI) Sector, Public Services and Procurement Canada (PSPC) is committed to providing excellent service and to the continuous improvement of its service delivery.

You have been identified to participate in a survey to help us understand how SSI-FreeBalance is performing as a service provider and to identify areas for improvement. It is expected that the survey will take about 10 minutes to complete. Your responses to the questionnaire are very important to us. The survey is being conducted by Environics Research Group on behalf of the Integrated Services Branch (ISB).

By participating in the survey you are giving permission to use your responses in the analysis of the data collected. Responses to this survey will be reported in aggregate form only. We will not report results by department or agency.

Should you encounter any issues while clicking to launch the survey, open your internet browser first, then copy and paste the survey link directly into the internet browser. If you continue to have issues, please contact [SSIsurvey-sondageISP@environics.ca](mailto:SSIsurvey-sondageISP@environics.ca).

**Please complete the survey questionnaire and submit it by March 2, 2018.**

**Click this link to complete the survey: [LINK](#)**

Thank you for your participation. Your opinion is important to us!

Stéphane Guèvremont  
Director General  
Shared Services Integration  
Integrated Services Branch  
Public Services and Procurement Canada

Please note that this survey is registered with the Research Registration System maintained by the Marketing Research and Intelligence Association (MRIA); the registration status of the survey can be verified at << link >>.

#### Privacy Notice

Provision of the personal information is collected on a voluntary basis pursuant to the [Financial Administration Act](#) and in accordance with the Policy on Communications and Federal Identity of the Government of Canada. The anonymous data will be used by the Integrated Services Branch (ISB) of Public Services and Procurement Canada for the purpose of evaluating client satisfaction. The personal information is described in the Standard Personal Information Banks [Public Communications PSU 914](#). Your personal information is protected, used, and disclosed in accordance with the [Privacy Act](#). **Do not disclose unnecessary confidential information about yourself or other individuals.**

If you require clarification about this notice, you can contact the Director, Access to Information and Privacy by email at [AIPRP.ATIP@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca](mailto:AIPRP.ATIP@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca); by phone at 873-469-3721, or by regular mail at the following address: Director, Access to Information and Privacy, Place du Portage, Phase III, 5C1, 11 Laurier St, Gatineau, Quebec, K1A 0S5. If you are not satisfied with our response to your privacy concern, you may wish to contact the [Office of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada](#).

\*\*\* \*\*

Le Bureau du programme de FreeBalance du secteur de l'Intégration des services partagés (ISP) de Services publics et Approvisionnement Canada (SPAC) tient à offrir un excellent service et à améliorer continuellement sa prestation de services.

Vous avez été choisi pour participer à un sondage qui nous aidera à évaluer le rendement de l'ISP-FreeBalance à titre de fournisseur de services ainsi qu'à déterminer les améliorations nécessaires. Il vous faudra environ dix minutes pour répondre au sondage. Vos réponses sont très importantes pour nous. Le sondage est mené par le Groupe de recherche Environics pour la Direction générale des Services intégrés (DGSi).

En participant au sondage, vous nous donnez l'autorisation d'utiliser vos réponses dans l'analyse des données recueillies. Les résultats du sondage seront présentés de manière globale seulement. Nous ne diffuserons pas de résultats par ministère ou organisme.

Si vous éprouvez des difficultés en cliquant sur le lien du sondage, ouvrez votre navigateur Internet d'abord, ensuite copiez et collez le lien du sondage directement dans le navigateur Internet. Si des problèmes persistent, veuillez communiquer avec [SSIsurvey-sondageISP@environics.ca](mailto:SSIsurvey-sondageISP@environics.ca).

**Veuillez remplir le questionnaire du sondage et le soumettre d'ici le 2 mars 2018.**

**Cliquez sur ce lien pour répondre au sondage : LIEN**

Merci de votre participation. Votre opinion est importante pour nous!

Stéphane Guèvremont  
 Directeur général  
 Intégration des services partagés  
 Direction générale des services intégrés  
 Services publics et Approvisionnement Canada

Veuillez noter que ce sondage est enregistré dans le système d'enregistrement des sondages que tient à jour l'Association de la recherche et de l'intelligence marketing (ARIM). Il est possible de vérifier le statut d'enregistrement du sondage à l'adresse suivante : << lien >>.

**Énoncé de confidentialité**

Les renseignements personnels sont recueillis sur une base volontaire en vertu de la [Loi sur la gestion des finances publiques](#) et conformément à la Politique sur les communications et l'image de marque du gouvernement du Canada. Les données anonymes sont utilisées par la Direction générale des services intégrés (DGSi) de Services publics et Approvisionnement Canada aux fins d'évaluer la satisfaction de la clientèle. Les renseignements personnels sont décrits dans les Fichiers de renseignements personnels ordinaires [Communications publiques, POU 914](#). Vos renseignements personnels sont protégés, utilisés et divulgués conformément aux dispositions de la [Loi sur la protection des renseignements personnels](#). **Ne divulguez pas d'information confidentielle non nécessaire qui vous concerne ou qui concerne un autre individu.**

Pour obtenir des précisions au sujet du présent énoncé, veuillez communiquer avec la directrice de l'Accès à l'information et protection des renseignements personnels par courriel à [AIPRP.ATIP@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca](mailto:AIPRP.ATIP@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca), par téléphone au 873-469-3721 ou par courrier postal à l'adresse suivante : Directrice, Accès à l'information et protection des renseignements personnels, Place du Portage, Phase III, 5C1, 11 rue Laurier, Gatineau, Québec, K1A 0S5. Si notre réponse à vos préoccupations en matière de protection des renseignements personnels ne vous satisfait pas, vous pouvez communiquer avec le [Commissariat à la protection de la vie privée du Canada](#).

**2017-18 SSI-IFMS Client Satisfaction Survey // Sondage sur la satisfaction de la clientèle de l'ISP-SIFM 2017-18**

*(la version française suit)*

The Integrated Financial and Materiel System (IFMS) Program Office of the Shared Services Integration (SSI) Sector, Public Services and Procurement Canada (PSPC) is committed to providing excellent service and to the continuous improvement of its service delivery.

You have been identified to participate in a survey to help us understand how SSI-IFMS is performing as a service provider and to identify areas for improvement.

It is expected that the survey will take about 10 minutes to complete. Your responses to the questionnaire are very important to us. The survey is being conducted by Environics Research Group on behalf of the Integrated Services Branch (ISB).

By participating in the survey you are giving permission to use your responses in the analysis of the data collected. Responses to this survey will be reported in aggregate form only. We will not report results by department or agency.

Should you encounter any issues while clicking to launch the survey, open your internet browser first, then copy and paste the survey link directly into the internet browser. If you continue to have issues, please contact [SSIsurvey-sondageISP@environics.ca](mailto:SSIsurvey-sondageISP@environics.ca).

**Please complete the survey questionnaire and submit it by March 2, 2018.**

**Click this link to complete the survey:**

Thank you for your participation. Your opinion is important to us!

Stéphane Guèvremont  
 Director General  
 Shared Services Integration  
 Integrated Services Branch  
 Public Services and Procurement Canada

Please note that this survey is registered with the Research Registration System maintained by the Marketing Research and Intelligence Association (MRIA); the registration status of the survey can be verified at << link>>.

**Privacy Notice**

Provision of the personal information is collected on a voluntary basis pursuant to the [Financial Administration Act](#) and in accordance with the Policy on Communications and Federal Identity of the Government of Canada. The anonymous data will be used by the Integrated Services Branch (ISB) of Public Services and Procurement Canada for the purpose of evaluating client satisfaction. The personal information is described in the Standard Personal Information Banks [Public Communications PSU 914](#). Your personal information is protected, used, and disclosed in accordance with the [Privacy Act](#). **Do not disclose unnecessary confidential information about yourself or other individuals.**

If you require clarification about this notice, you can contact the Director, Access to Information and Privacy by email at [AIPRP.ATIP@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca](mailto:AIPRP.ATIP@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca); by phone at 873-469-3721, or by regular mail at the following address: Director, Access to Information and Privacy, Place du Portage, Phase III, 5C1, 11 Laurier St, Gatineau, Quebec, K1A 0S5. If you are not satisfied with our response to your privacy concern, you may wish to contact the [Office of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada](#).



**2017-18 SSI-SCMS Client Satisfaction Survey // Sondage sur la satisfaction de la clientèle de l'ISP-SGCP 2017-18**

*(la version française suit)*

The Shared Case Management System (SCMS) of the Shared Services Integration (SSI) Sector, Public Services and Procurement Canada (PSPC) is committed to providing excellent service and to the continuous improvement of its service delivery.

SSI-SCMS is currently providing your organization with a hosted application in a standardized, shared, multi-tenant environment used to automate a wide variety of business processes related to case management and client management as well as integration with GC standard corporate systems and data sources for client-specific systems.

You have been identified to participate in a survey to help us understand how SSI-SCMS is performing as a service provider and to identify areas for improvement. It is expected that the survey will take about 10 minutes to complete. Your responses to the questionnaire are very important to us. The survey is being conducted by Environics Research Group on behalf of the Integrated Services Branch (ISB).

By participating in the survey you are giving permission to use your responses in the analysis of the data collected. Responses to this survey will be reported in aggregate form only. We will not report results by department or agency.

Should you encounter any issues while clicking to launch the survey, open your internet browser first, then copy and paste the survey link directly into the internet browser. If you continue to have issues, please contact [SSIsurvey-sondageISP@environics.ca](mailto:SSIsurvey-sondageISP@environics.ca).

**Please complete the survey questionnaire and submit it by March 2, 2018.**

**Click this link to complete the survey:**

Thank you for your participation. Your opinion is important to us!

Stéphane Guèvremont  
Director General  
Shared Services Integration  
Integrated Services Branch  
Public Services and Procurement Canada

Please note that this survey is registered with the Research Registration System maintained by the Marketing Research and Intelligence Association (MRIA); the registration status of the survey can be verified at << link >>.

**Privacy Notice**

Provision of the personal information is collected on a voluntary basis pursuant to the [Financial Administration Act](#) and in accordance with the Policy on Communications and Federal Identity of the Government of Canada. The anonymous data will be used by the Integrated Services Branch (ISB) of Public Services and Procurement Canada for the purpose of evaluating client satisfaction. The personal information is described in the Standard Personal Information Banks [Public Communications PSU 914](#). Your personal information is protected, used, and disclosed in accordance with the [Privacy Act](#). **Do not disclose unnecessary confidential information about yourself or other individuals.**

If you require clarification about this notice, you can contact the Director, Access to Information and Privacy by email at [AIPRP.ATIP@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca](mailto:AIPRP.ATIP@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca); by phone at 873-469-3721, or by regular mail at the following address: Director, Access to Information and Privacy, Place du Portage, Phase III, 5C1, 11 Laurier St, Gatineau, Quebec, K1A 0S5. If you are not satisfied with our response to your privacy concern, you may wish to contact the [Office of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada](#).

\*\*\* \*\*

Le Système de gestion de cas partagé (SGCP) du secteur de l'Intégration des services partagés (ISP) de Services publics et Approvisionnement Canada (SPAC) tient à offrir un excellent service et à améliorer continuellement sa prestation de services. L'ISP-SGCP fournit actuellement à votre ministère une application hébergée dans un environnement normalisé, pour automatiser une vaste gamme de processus opérationnels liés à la gestion des cas et à la gestion des clients ainsi que l'intégration aux systèmes ministériels normalisés et aux sources de données du GC.

Vous avez été choisi pour participer à un sondage qui nous aidera à évaluer le rendement de l'ISP-SGCP à titre de fournisseur de services ainsi qu'à déterminer les améliorations nécessaires.

Il vous faudra environ dix minutes pour répondre au sondage. Vos réponses sont très importantes pour nous. Le sondage est mené par le Groupe de recherche Environics pour la Direction générale des Services intégrés (DGSi).

En participant au sondage, vous nous donnez l'autorisation d'utiliser vos réponses dans l'analyse des données recueillies. Les résultats du sondage seront présentés de manière globale seulement. Nous ne diffuserons pas de résultats par ministère ou organisme.

Si vous éprouvez des difficultés en cliquant sur le lien du sondage, ouvrez votre navigateur Internet d'abord, ensuite copiez et collez le lien du sondage directement dans le navigateur Internet. Si des problèmes persistent, veuillez communiquer avec [SSIsurvey-sondageISP@environics.ca](mailto:SSIsurvey-sondageISP@environics.ca).

**Veuillez remplir le questionnaire du sondage et le soumettre d'ici le 2 mars 2018.**

**Cliquez sur ce lien pour répondre au sondage :**

Merci de votre participation. Votre opinion est importante pour nous!

Stéphane Guèvremont

Directeur général

Intégration des services partagés

Direction générale des services intégrés

Services publics et Approvisionnement Canada

Veuillez noter que ce sondage est enregistré dans le système d'enregistrement des sondages que tient à jour l'Association de la recherche et de l'intelligence marketing (ARIM). Il est possible de vérifier le statut d'enregistrement du sondage à l'adresse suivante : << lien >>.

#### Énoncé de confidentialité

Les renseignements personnels sont recueillis sur une base volontaire en vertu de la [Loi sur la gestion des finances publiques](#) et conformément à la Politique sur les communications et l'image de marque du gouvernement du Canada. Les données anonymes sont utilisées par la Direction générale des services intégrés (DGSi) de Services publics et Approvisionnement Canada aux fins d'évaluer la satisfaction de la clientèle. Les renseignements personnels sont décrits dans les Fichiers de renseignements personnels ordinaires [Communications publiques, POU 914](#). Vos renseignements personnels sont protégés, utilisés et divulgués conformément aux dispositions de la [Loi sur la protection des renseignements personnels](#). **Ne divulguez pas d'information confidentielle non nécessaire qui vous concerne ou qui concerne un autre individu.**

Pour obtenir des précisions au sujet du présent énoncé, veuillez communiquer avec la directrice de l'Accès à l'information et protection des renseignements personnels par courriel à [AIPRP.ATIP@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca](mailto:AIPRP.ATIP@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca), par téléphone au 873-469-3721 ou par courrier postal à l'adresse suivante : Directrice, Accès à l'information et protection des renseignements personnels, Place du Portage, Phase III, 5C1, 11 rue Laurier, Gatineau, Québec, K1A 0S5. Si notre réponse à vos préoccupations en matière de protection des renseignements personnels ne vous satisfait pas, vous pouvez communiquer avec le [Commissariat à la protection de la vie privée du Canada](#).

***Subject: Survey: Your participation is vital in evaluating client satisfaction! // Sondage : Votre participation est essentielle pour évaluer la satisfaction de la clientèle!***

***2017-18 SSI-FreeBalance Client Satisfaction Survey // Sondage de 2017-18 sur la satisfaction de la clientèle de l'ISP-FreeBalance***

*(la version française suit)*

Dear members,

A week ago we sent you a survey seeking your feedback to our latest client satisfaction survey. Thanks to all of you who have already provided valuable input. If you have not yet participated, please take a few minutes to do so now by clicking the link below.

**Please complete the survey questionnaire and submit it by March 2, 2018.**

Your particular responses are vital in helping us evaluate our programs. We really want to know more about our clients, and surveys such as this are the best way to help us align our services with your interests! The survey is being conducted by Environics Research Group on behalf of the Integrated Services Branch (ISB).

Should you encounter any issues while clicking to launch the survey, open your internet browser first, then copy and paste the survey link directly into the internet browser. If you continue to have issues, please contact [SSIsurvey-sondageISP@environics.ca](mailto:SSIsurvey-sondageISP@environics.ca).

**Here's the link:**

Thank you for your participation!

Stéphane Guèvremont  
 Director General  
 Shared Services Integration  
 Integrated Services Branch  
 Public Services and Procurement Canada

\*\*\* \*\*

Chers membres,

Cela fait une semaine depuis que nous vous avons envoyé un sondage cherchant vos commentaires à notre dernier sondage sur la satisfaction de la clientèle. Merci à tous ceux d'entre vous qui ont déjà fourni un apport précieux. Si vous n'avez pas encore participé, veuillez prendre quelques minutes pour le faire maintenant en cliquant sur le lien ci-dessous.

**Veuillez remplir le questionnaire du sondage et le soumettre d'ici le 2 mars 2018.**

Vos réponses particulières sont essentielles pour nous aider à évaluer nos programmes. Nous voulons vraiment en savoir plus sur nos clients, et un sondage comme celui-ci est le meilleur moyen de nous aider à aligner nos services avec vos intérêts! Le sondage est mené par le Groupe de recherche Environics pour la Direction générale des Services intégrés (DGSi).

Si vous éprouvez des difficultés en cliquant sur le lien du sondage, ouvrez votre navigateur Internet d'abord, ensuite copiez et collez le lien du sondage directement dans le navigateur Internet. Si des problèmes persistent, veuillez communiquer avec [SSIsurvey-sondageISP@environics.ca](mailto:SSIsurvey-sondageISP@environics.ca).

**Voici le lien :**

Merci de votre participation!

Stéphane Guèvremont  
Directeur général  
Intégration des services partagés  
Direction générale des services intégrés  
Services publics et Approvisionnement Canada



***Subject: Survey: Your participation is vital in evaluating client satisfaction! // Sondage : Votre participation est essentielle pour évaluer la satisfaction de la clientèle!***

***2017-18 SSI-IFMS Client Satisfaction Survey // Sondage de 2017-18 sur la satisfaction de la clientèle de l'ISP-SIFM***

*(la version française suit)*

Dear members,

A week ago we sent you a survey seeking your feedback to our latest client satisfaction survey. Thanks to all of you who have already provided valuable input. If you have not yet participated, please take a few minutes to do so now by clicking the link below.

**Please complete the survey questionnaire and submit it by March 2, 2018.**

Your particular responses are vital in helping us evaluate our programs. We really want to know more about our clients, and surveys such as this are the best way to help us align our services with your interests! The survey is being conducted by Environics Research Group on behalf of the Integrated Services Branch (ISB).

Should you encounter any issues while clicking to launch the survey, open your internet browser first, then copy and paste the survey link directly into the internet browser. If you continue to have issues, please contact [SSIsurvey-sondageISP@environics.ca](mailto:SSIsurvey-sondageISP@environics.ca).

**Here's the link:**

Thank you for your participation!

Stéphane Guèvremont  
 Director General  
 Shared Services Integration  
 Integrated Services Branch  
 Public Services and Procurement Canada

\*\*\* \*\*

Chers membres,

Cela fait une semaine depuis que nous vous avons envoyé un sondage cherchant vos commentaires à notre dernier sondage sur la satisfaction de la clientèle. Merci à tous ceux d'entre vous qui ont déjà fourni un apport précieux. Si vous n'avez pas encore participé, veuillez prendre quelques minutes pour le faire maintenant en cliquant sur le lien ci-dessous.

**Veuillez remplir le questionnaire du sondage et le soumettre d'ici le 2 mars 2018.**

Vos réponses particulières sont essentielles pour nous aider à évaluer nos programmes. Nous voulons vraiment en savoir plus sur nos clients, et un sondage comme celui-ci est le meilleur moyen de nous aider à aligner nos services avec vos intérêts! Le sondage est mené par le Groupe de recherche Environics pour la Direction générale des Services intégrés (DGSi).

Si vous éprouvez des difficultés en cliquant sur le lien du sondage, ouvrez votre navigateur Internet d'abord, ensuite copiez et collez le lien du sondage directement dans le navigateur Internet. Si des problèmes persistent, veuillez communiquer avec [SSIsurvey-sondageISP@environics.ca](mailto:SSIsurvey-sondageISP@environics.ca).

**Voici le lien :**

Merci de votre participation!

Stéphane Guèvremont  
Directeur général  
Intégration des services partagés  
Direction générale des services intégrés  
Services publics et Approvisionnement Canada

***Subject: Survey: Your participation is vital in evaluating client satisfaction! // Sondage : Votre participation est essentielle pour évaluer la satisfaction de la clientèle!***

***2017-18 SSI-SCMS Client Satisfaction Survey // Sondage de 2017-18 sur la satisfaction de la clientèle de l'ISP-SGCP***

*This survey applies to all clients of the SCMS service and not only those on the shared common platform. // Cette enquête s'applique à tous les clients du service des SGCP et non seulement ceux sur la plate-forme commune partagée.*

*(la version française suit)*

Dear members,

A week ago we sent you a survey seeking your feedback to our latest client satisfaction survey. Thanks to all of you who have already provided valuable input. If you have not yet participated, please take a few minutes to do so now by clicking the link below.

**Please complete the survey questionnaire and submit it by March 2, 2018.**

Your particular responses are vital in helping us evaluate our programs. We really want to know more about our clients, and surveys such as this are the best way to help us align our services with your interests! The survey is being conducted by Environics Research Group on behalf of the Integrated Services Branch (ISB).

Should you encounter any issues while clicking to launch the survey, open your internet browser first, then copy and paste the survey link directly into the internet browser. If you continue to have issues, please contact [SSIsurvey-sondageISP@environics.ca](mailto:SSIsurvey-sondageISP@environics.ca).

**Here's the link:**

Thank you for your participation!

Stéphane Guèvremont  
 Director General  
 Shared Services Integration  
 Integrated Services Branch  
 Public Services and Procurement Canada

\*\*\* \*\*

Chers membres,

Cela fait une semaine depuis que nous vous avons envoyé un sondage cherchant vos commentaires à notre dernier sondage sur la satisfaction de la clientèle. Merci à tous ceux d'entre vous qui ont déjà fourni un apport précieux. Si vous n'avez pas encore participé, veuillez prendre quelques minutes pour le faire maintenant en cliquant sur le lien ci-dessous.

**Veuillez remplir le questionnaire du sondage et le soumettre d'ici le 2 mars 2018.**

Vos réponses particulières sont essentielles pour nous aider à évaluer nos programmes. Nous voulons vraiment en savoir plus sur nos clients, et un sondage comme celui-ci est le meilleur moyen de nous aider à aligner nos services avec vos intérêts! Le sondage est mené par le Groupe de recherche Environics pour la Direction générale des Services intégrés (DGSi).

Si vous éprouvez des difficultés en cliquant sur le lien du sondage, ouvrez votre navigateur Internet d'abord, ensuite copiez et collez le lien du sondage directement dans le navigateur Internet. Si des problèmes persistent, veuillez communiquer avec [SSIsurvey-sondageISP@environics.ca](mailto:SSIsurvey-sondageISP@environics.ca).

**Voici le lien :**

Merci de votre participation!

Stéphane Guèvremont  
Directeur général  
Intégration des services partagés  
Direction générale des services intégrés  
Services publics et Approvisionnement Canada

## Appendix D: Departments and agencies included in the survey

The 43 federal departments and agencies below are represented in the 64 responses to the survey.

Administrative Tribunals Support Service of Canada  
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada  
Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency  
Canada Border Services Agency  
Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions  
Canada Revenue Agency  
Canada School of Public Service  
Canadian Dairy Commission  
Canadian Food Inspection Agency  
Canadian Heritage  
Canadian Institutes of Health Research  
Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission  
Canadian Transportation Agency  
Chief Electoral Officer (Office of the)  
Commissioner for Federal Judicial Affairs Canada (Office of the)  
Commissioner of Official Languages (Office of the)  
Communications Security Establishment Canada  
Courts Administration Service  
Elections Canada  
Employment and Social Development Canada  
Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario  
Financial Transactions and Reports Analysis Centre of Canada  
Fisheries and Oceans Canada  
Global Affairs Canada  
Governor General of Canada  
Health Canada  
Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada  
Infrastructure Canada  
Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada  
Justice Canada (Department of)  
Library and Archives Canada  
National Defence  
National Energy Board  
National Research Council Canada  
Natural Resources Canada  
Public Prosecution Service of Canada  
Public Service Commission of Canada  
Public Services and Procurement Canada  
Royal Canadian Mounted Police  
Shared Services Canada  
Transport Canada  
Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat  
Veterans Affairs Canada