

## **Audit of the Integrity of Performance Information In Consulting and Audit Canada**

CAC proposes the following plan to address the recommendations:

### **1. Connection between Planned Results and Reported Performance**

#### **Conclusions**

“It is not always possible to follow the path from planned results to actual performance for some of the Planned Results in the DPR.”

#### **Recommendations**

“CAC review its Planned Results if there are more appropriate performance indicators and/or more information, which could enhance the understanding of the reader in the DPR and provide assurance of integrity and balance.”

#### **Management Comment / Proposed Actions**

Based on the detailed comments of this audit report, CAC took the opportunity to make changes to its planned results and performance indicators as part of the first phase of the 2003 PRAS review.

### **2. Changes over Time**

#### **Conclusions**

“It was not clear how CAC’s performance indicators have changed from previous years and what was the intended or actual impact from the changes. This may be confusing to the reader.

Again, in this respect, PWGSC Corporate Planning advice, via the Call Letter, may have led to CAC providing minimal information, to which further data could easily have been added, since it is available. At present there is no notation in the DPR to inform readers where they could access additional information.”

#### **Recommendations**

“CAC should provide additional explanatory information when there are changes to the Planned Results or to the performance indicators, so that the baseline benchmarks changes from year to year, and impact of these, are apparent.”

CAC should enter into discussions with PWGSC Corporate Planning to ensure there is an appropriate vehicle for them to add explanatory information when there are changes to benchmarks and performance indicators occur or additional background information is required. The use of Internet hyperlinks [for DPR electronic versions], which some departments are using, could be reviewed as a tool here.”

### **Management Comment / Proposed Actions**

CAC will endeavour to provide to provide additional information to the reader on changes to performance indicator and where appropriate, will make use Internet hyperlinks.

### **3. Data Integrity**

#### **Conclusions**

“While client satisfaction rates of over two thirds in our small sample are very good, we were unable to attest and assure that the data reported in the DPR is accurate and unbiased, for information reported on client surveys and training days per employee.

CAC requires additional controls on its client satisfaction survey. The system would be more timely and effective if surveys were sent out to all clients automatically. As well, the Agency’s record keeping in this area needs improvement. The overall results may not present the same picture depending on the tabulation methodology selected, as our small sample demonstrated, and the present methodology should be reviewed. There is inconsistency between the three Directorates in the handling of client questionnaires.

An enhanced client survey system would help CAC to better identify trends in declining satisfaction in particular practice areas or with particular project managers, in a timely manner.

The inclusion of official language training days with professional development days may be misleading to the reader of the DPR, although CAC clearly provides significant training to its employees.

We understand from CAC that there are plans to address these controls and activities and they will continue to address the need to enhance their client satisfaction survey.”

#### **Recommendations**

“CAC reduce the risk in client satisfaction reporting and report business data by revising the basic Client Survey system to broaden coverage to all project assignments [or do this on a sampling basis], including work done by sub-contractors, reduce manual intervention to suppress surveys questionnaires being sent out by those project managers being rated and increase the timeliness of the distribution of survey questionnaires.

CAC improve their record keeping practices for projects and client surveys.

CAC revise the AMS Procedure Manual and remove the “Client Dissatisfied” exemption code.

CAC should validate the performance data in each Directorate and institute regular reporting to their senior management on the results of surveys returned and follow up with clients who express some reservations with CAC.

CAC should report official languages training and professional development days separately, so that there is consistency between the different branches of PWGSC and with other Departments.”

#### **Management Comment / Proposed Actions**

CAC is reviewing its processes related to collecting and compiling client satisfaction information in order to address the deficiencies observed.

#### **4. Balance in Reporting**

##### **Conclusions**

“While the overall performance of CAC is very good as stated in the DPR, CAC could improve the balance of the DPR report by including some areas for improvement.”

##### **Recommendations**

“CAC should indicate key areas for improvement in their next DPR and relate this to the previous year, to ensure balanced reporting.”

#### **Management Comment / Proposed Actions**

Agreed.

## **5. Clarity of Wording**

### **Conclusions**

“The use of some terms without a clear definition is confusing and could be misinterpreted by the general public and Members of Parliament.”

### **Recommendations**

“CAC should use terms that are easily understood by the general public and MP’s who are the readers of the DPR.

PWGSC Corporate Planning should review the input provided by CAC and provide advice on clarity of wording or provide a glossary of terms.”

### **Management Comment / Proposed Actions**

Agreed.