



Civil Aviation Authority of the Philippines

Client Satisfaction Measurement Report

Consolidated

YEAR 2022 (1st Edition)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Overview	3
II.	Scope	5
III.	Methodology	8
IV.	Data and Interpretation	10
V.	Results of the Agency Action Plan	20
VI.	Continuous Agency Improvement Plan	21
Annex A. Survey Questionnaire Used		24
Annex B. List of Regional and Satellite Offices		25
Annex C. CSM Result Per Office		26

I. Overview

The Civil Aviation Authority of the Philippines (CAAP) is the government agency responsible for regulating and supervising civil aviation in the Philippines. Established under Republic Act No. 9497, CAAP is attached to the Department of Transportation (DOTr) for policy coordination and is tasked with ensuring the safety, efficiency, and sustainability of the country's aviation industry.

CAAP's primary functions include:

Regulation and Oversight: CAAP sets and enforces regulations and standards related to aviation safety, security, and environmental protection. It oversees the licensing and certification of aviation personnel, airports, airlines, and other aviation entities to ensure compliance with international standards and best practices.

Safety Oversight: CAAP conducts inspections, audits, and safety assessments of aviation facilities, equipment, and operations to maintain and enhance safety standards within the Philippine aviation industry. It collaborates with international aviation organizations, such as the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), to ensure alignment with global aviation safety standards.

Air Traffic Management: CAAP manages and regulates air traffic services, including air navigation services, air traffic control, and airspace management, to facilitate safe and efficient air travel within Philippine airspace.

Airport Development and Management: CAAP is involved in the planning, development, and management of airports and air navigation facilities across the Philippines. It works to improve airport infrastructure, facilities, and services to accommodate the growing demands of air transportation and enhance the passenger experience.

Aviation Security: CAAP implements measures to enhance aviation security and protect against threats to civil aviation, including terrorism, unlawful interference, and other security risks. It collaborates with relevant government agencies and international partners to strengthen aviation security measures and ensure compliance with international security standards.

In compliance with the ARTA Memorandum Circular No. 2023-05 or the "Amendment to ARTA Memorandum Circular No. 2022-005 or the Guidelines on the Implementation of the Harmonized Client Satisfaction Measurement", the Agency implemented the Harmonized Client Satisfaction Measurement (CSM) to its Central Office down to the Area Centers (regional offices).

In summary, the data collected from the period 22 August 2023 to 31 March 2024, responses from CAAP clients show:

	Score
CC Awareness:	50.36%
CC Visibility:	20.29%
CC Helpfulness:	51.83%
Response Rate:	63.32%
Overall Score:	46.45%

II. Scope

The Client Satisfaction Measurement (CSM) Report outline covers the period of responses gathered from 22 August 2023 to 31 March 2024, in the CAAP Central Office and CAAP Area Centers.

Scope of Assessment:

Responses from the different CAAP frontline services were extracted and rated on Citizen's Charter Awareness, Citizen's Charter Visibility, Citizen's Charter Helpfulness, and Response Rate:

	Score
CC Awareness:	50.36%
CC Visibility:	20.29%
CC Helpfulness:	51.83%
Response Rate:	63.32%
Overall Score:	46.45%

Citizen's Charter (CC) Awareness:

A significant 50.36% of the total number of clienteles surveyed within the period specified indicates a relatively high level of awareness about the Citizen's Charter in government offices.

CC Visibility:

A moderate fraction of 20.29% of the surveyed clients found the Citizen's Charter visible and accessible within the office.

CC Helpfulness:

Relatively high at 51.83% of the clients responded that the Citizen's Charter was helpful in their transactions.

CC Response Rate:

63.32% of the clients responded that the Citizen's Charter helped them in their transactions. This indicates that there is an opportunity to increase client engagement and utilization of the services provided by the Citizen's Charter.

Overall, the responses reflect a positive trend in terms of client awareness and visibility of the Citizen's Charter. However, there is a need to further enhance the

helpfulness and response rate of the Citizen's Charter to ensure a more seamless and efficient service delivery to clients. Implementing improvements based on the feedback provided by the clients can lead to increased satisfaction and better service outcomes in the future.

Data Collection Methods:

Further, this Authority utilized data collection methods (physical and digital) capturing as many responses from clients as possible including in-person interviews, paper-based surveys, and online surveys.

Likert Scale and Survey Scoring System:

The survey will utilize a 5-point Likert scale to measure client satisfaction levels, with responses ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. The survey scoring system will assign numerical values to responses for analysis and calculation of average scores.

Data Analysis:

Responses from both physical and digital surveys will be compiled and analyzed to identify trends, patterns, and areas for improvement in the implementation of the Citizen's Charter, Harmonized CSM, and services based on the responses provided.

Reporting:

The findings from the data analysis will be presented in the CSM Report, highlighting key insights, recommendations for improvement, and action plans based on the feedback received from clients as per their responses and recommendations.

By aligning the scope of the CSM Report with the responses provided in the file, the report will offer a comprehensive assessment of client satisfaction levels, the effectiveness of the Citizen's Charter, and opportunities for enhancing service delivery and client experiences in compliance with the relevant regulations.

The services of the Civil Aviation Authority of the Philippines surveyed were the following:

External Services	Responses	Total Transactions
FSIS-AEB Conduct of Knowledge Test	240	1000
FSIS-AEB Issuance of Knowledge Test Report	43	1000
FSIS-LCD Renewal of Airmen License	9	500
FSIS-AWD Issuance of Certificate of Registration	15	300
FSIS-OFSAM Aeromedical Review Board for Special Issuances, Statement of Demonstrated Ability and Medical Flight Test Results	1	200
Acceptance of On-the-Job Trainees	7	200
Processing of Flight Plan	51	1000
Issuance of Access Pass	23	1000
Pay Parking Collection	17	1000
Processing Application for Concession	1	100
Application of Height Clearance	1	200
N/A response	87	
External Service Total	495	
OVERALL TOTAL	495	

III. Methodology

Data Collection Methods:

a. Physical Methods:

In-person interviews: Agency representatives conduct face-to-face interviews with clients to gather feedback on their experience with the services and the Citizen's Charter.

Paper-based surveys: Clients are provided with paper surveys to fill out their responses regarding the effectiveness of the Citizen's Charter and their satisfaction levels.

b. Digital Methods:

QR Code/Online surveys: Clients can scan the QR Code to collect feedback on their interactions with the agency, focusing on the service that they have availed.

The survey will utilize a 5-point Likert scale to measure client satisfaction levels. The scale includes the following responses:

Scale	Rating
5	Strongly Agree
4	Agree
3	Neither Agree nor Disagree
2	Disagree
1	Strongly Disagree

Data Analysis:

Responses from both physical and digital surveys will be compiled and analyzed to identify trends, patterns, and areas for improvement in the implementation of the Citizen's Charter.

Statistical analysis will be conducted to calculate average scores, percentages, and other relevant metrics to assess client satisfaction levels.

Reporting:

The findings from the data analysis will be presented in the CSM Report, highlighting key insights, recommendations for improvement, and action plans based on the feedback received from clients.

The report will include visual representations of the survey results, such as graphs and tables, to provide a clear overview of client satisfaction levels and areas of focus for enhancement.

By incorporating both physical and digital data collection methods, utilizing a 5-point scale, and implementing a structured survey scoring system, the methodology for the CSM Report will ensure a comprehensive assessment of client satisfaction and effective analysis of the feedback received regarding the service that they have availed.

Scale	Rating
5	Strongly Agree
4	Agree
3	Neither Agree nor Disagree
2	Disagree
1	Strongly Disagree

The Overall score for the 8 SQDs was computed based on the following formula:

$$\text{Overall Score} = \frac{\text{Number of 'Strongly Agree' answers} + \text{Number of 'Agree' answers}}{\text{Total Number of Respondents} - \text{Number of 'N/A' answers}}$$

The interpretation of the results are as follows:

Percentage	Rating
Below 60.0%	Poor
60.0% - 79.9%	Fair
80.0% - 89.9%	Satisfactory
90.0% - 94.9%	Very Satisfactory
95.0% - 100%	Outstanding

IV. Data and Interpretation

A. Demographic Profile

D1. Age and D2. Sex	External	Overall
1. 19 or lower	2.46%	2.46%
2. 20-34	87.19%	87.19%
3. 35-49	8.62%	8.62%
4. 50-64	1.73%	1.73%
5. 65 or higher	N/A	N/A
6. Did not specify	N/A	N/A
1. Male	81.17%	81.17%
2. Female	18.83%	18.83%
3. Did not specify	0	0

19 or lower: The satisfaction level among individuals aged 19 or lower is 2.46%. This suggests that there might be some challenges or factors affecting satisfaction among this age group. Further examination could help identify specific issues and develop targeted solutions to improve satisfaction.

20-34: The satisfaction level among individuals aged 20-34 is quite high at 87.19%. This indicates that the services or products are meeting the expectations of the majority within this age group. However, it's essential to continue monitoring and maintaining this satisfaction level.

35-49: The satisfaction level among individuals aged 35-49 is 8.62%. While this is lower compared to the 20-34 age group, it still represents a noteworthy proportion of satisfied individuals. Identifying and addressing any concerns specific to this age group could help improve satisfaction further.

50-64: The satisfaction level among individuals aged 50-64 is 1.73%. This is relatively low compared to other age groups, indicating potential areas for improvement in meeting the needs of this demographic.

65 or higher: There are no responses in this category, which might suggest a lack of representation from this age group in the data. It's essential to ensure inclusivity in data collection to accurately represent all demographics.

Using QR codes for data collection might limit access to clients who are familiar with and have access to smartphones or QR code scanners. This could lead to underrepresentation of clients who are less technologically inclined or don't have access to smartphones.

Clients with higher levels of digital literacy may be more likely to participate in the QR code survey, potentially skewing the sample towards this demographic. This might not accurately represent the entire client base, particularly if there are significant differences in satisfaction levels among different demographic groups.

D3. Region	External	Overall
1. Area I	2%	2%
4. Area IV	79%	79%
5. Area V	19%	19%
12. Did not specify	N/A	N/A

Area I: This region shows the lowest levels of both external and overall satisfaction, with only 2% satisfaction reported in both categories. This suggests that there might be specific challenges or issues within this region that are affecting client satisfaction. Further investigation into the reasons behind this low satisfaction level could help identify areas for improvement.

Area IV: This region demonstrates the highest levels of both external and overall satisfaction, with 79% satisfaction reported in both categories. This indicates a strong performance in meeting client expectations and suggests that the services or products provided in this region are well-received by clients. It might be beneficial to analyze the factors contributing to this high satisfaction level to replicate successful strategies in other regions.

Area V: This region falls between Area I and Area IV in terms of satisfaction levels, with 19% satisfaction reported in both external and overall categories. While not as high as Area IV, it still indicates a moderate level of satisfaction. Similar to Area I, understanding the factors contributing to this satisfaction level and identifying areas for improvement could help enhance client satisfaction in this region.

Overall, the analysis of this table highlights regional variations in client satisfaction levels, with Area IV performing notably well and Area I performing the lowest. Understanding the factors driving these differences can inform

targeted strategies to improve satisfaction levels and enhance overall client experience across all regions.

Customer Type	External	Overall
D4. Citizen	3.67%	3.67%
D4. Business	86.80%	86.80%
D4. Government	9.53%	9.53%
D4. Did not specify	0	0

Citizen: The satisfaction level among citizens is 3.67%. This suggests that there might be some room for improvement in meeting the needs and expectations of citizens. Further investigation might be needed to understand the specific issues or concerns they have.

Business: The satisfaction level among businesses is significantly higher at 86.80%. This is a positive indication that the services or products provided are meeting the expectations of the business clients. However, it's still important to monitor and maintain this level of satisfaction to ensure continued success and satisfactory ratings from business clients.

Government: The satisfaction level among government entities is 9.53%. This is also a positive sign, indicating that the services provided to government clients are generally meeting their needs. Similar to the business category, it's essential to continue monitoring and addressing any issues to sustain this level of satisfaction.

Did not specify: It seems there are no responses in this category, it's important to ensure that data collection methods are clear and that respondents are encouraged to provide accurate information.

Overall, the analysis indicates a relatively high level of satisfaction among business and government clients, with a lower level among citizens. This suggests potential areas for improvement in serving citizen clients, while also maintaining the high satisfaction levels among business and government clients. Ongoing monitoring and feedback collection will be essential for maintaining and improving client satisfaction across all groups.

B. Count of CC and SQD results

Citizen's Charter Answers	Responses	Percentage
CC1. Which of the following describes your awareness of the CC?		
1. I know what a CC is and I saw this office's CC.	233	57%
2. I know what a CC is but I did not see this office's CC.	23	6%
3. I learned of the CC only when I saw this office's CC.	94	23%
4. I do not know what a CC is and I did not see this office's CC.	59	14%
CC2. If aware of CC, would you say that the CC of this office was...?		
1. Easy to see	244	60%
2. Somewhat easy to see	90	22%
3. Difficult to see	12	3%
4. Not visible at all	63	1%
CC3. If aware of CC, how much did the CC help you in your transaction?		
1. Helped very much	285	70%
2. Somewhat helped	63	15%
3. Did not help	61	2%

CC1. Awareness of Citizen's Charter:

1 (I know what a CC is and I saw this office's CC): The majority of respondents, 57%, are aware of what a Citizen's Charter is and have seen the office's Citizen's Charter. This indicates a reasonable level of awareness and engagement with the Citizen's Charter.

2 (I know what a CC is but I did not see this office's CC): A smaller percentage, 6%, are aware of the concept of a Citizen's Charter but have not seen the specific office's version.

3 (I learned of the CC only when I saw this office's CC): 23% of respondents only became aware of the Citizen's Charter when they saw the office's version. This suggests that there may be room for improvement in publicizing the Citizen's Charter to reach a wider audience.

4 (I do not know what a CC is and I did not see this office's CC): 14% of respondents are not aware of what a Citizen's Charter is and have not seen the office's version. This highlights a significant portion of the population that may need more education or outreach regarding the Citizen's Charter.

CC2. Visibility of Citizen's Charter:

1 (Easy to see): 60% of respondents who are aware of the Citizen's Charter find it easy to see. This indicates that the majority of those who are aware of the Charter can readily access it, which is positive for transparency and accountability.

2 (Somewhat easy to see): 22% find it somewhat easy to see, suggesting that there might be minor improvements needed in visibility.

3 (Difficult to see): Only 3% find it difficult to see, indicating good visibility overall.

4 (Not visible at all): A small percentage, 1% find the Charter not visible at all, which suggests there might be some areas where visibility could be improved.

CC3. Effectiveness of Citizen's Charter in Transactions:

1 (Helped very much): The majority of respondents, 70% feel that the Citizen's Charter helped them very much in their transactions. This indicates that the Citizen's Charter is effective in providing guidance and improving the transaction experience for most individuals.

2 (Somewhat helped): 15% feel that the Citizen's Charter somewhat helped them, suggesting that there might be some areas where improvements could enhance its effectiveness.

3 (Did not help): A small percentage, 2% feel that the Citizen's Charter did not help them. Understanding the reasons behind this sentiment could help in refining the Citizen's Charter to better meet user needs.

Overall, the analysis indicates a generally positive reception of the Citizen's Charter, with opportunities for improvement in awareness, visibility, and effectiveness to ensure that it reaches and benefits a broader range of stakeholders.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Total Responses	Overall
SQD0	234	86	21	12	50	6	409	79.40%

Strongly Agree: 234 responses were indicating strong agreement.

Agree: There were 86 responses indicating agreement.

Neither Agree nor Disagree: There were 21 responses indicating neutrality.

Disagree: There were 12 responses indicating disagreement.

Strongly Disagree: 50 responses were indicating strong disagreement.

N/A: 6 responses were indicating that the question did not apply to those respondents.

Total Responses: Summing up all the responses gives a total of 409.

For the percentage of the SQD0 responses:

Strongly Agree: 57.19% of the total responses strongly agreed.

Agree: 21.02% of the total responses agreed.

Neither Agree nor Disagree: 5.13% of the total responses neither agreed nor disagreed.

Disagree: 2.93% of the total responses disagreed.

Strongly Disagree: 12.23% of the total responses strongly disagreed.

N/A: 1.47% of the total responses were marked as not applicable.

Overall, the majority of respondents (78.21%) expressed some level of agreement (combining strongly agree and agree), while a smaller portion (15.16%) indicated disagreement (combining disagree and strongly disagree). A small percentage (5.13%) remained neutral, and a minor portion (1.47%) found the question not applicable.

Service Quality Dimensions	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Total Responses	Overall
Responsiveness	173	119	31	25	51	10	409	73.18%
Reliability	208	102	28	10	50	11	409	77.89%
Access and Facilities	199	101	27	16	47	19	409	76.92%
Communication	188	112	33	11	46	19	409	76.92%
Costs	167	111	35	11	48	37	409	74.73%
Integrity	172	109	42	8	44	34	409	74.49%
Assurance	172	109	35	14	46	33	409	74.73%
Outcome	205	99	26	13	50	16	409	77.35%
Overall	1,484	862	257	108	382	179	409	75.85%

Responsiveness:

73.18% of respondents strongly agree or agree that the CAAP is responsive to their needs. This indicates a generally positive perception of the organization's ability to address customer concerns promptly.

Reliability:

77.89% of respondents strongly agree or agree that the agency is reliable. This suggests a high level of trust in the CAAP's ability to deliver services consistently and accurately.

Access and Facilities:

76.92% of respondents strongly agree or agree that the agency provides adequate access and facilities. This indicates satisfaction with the physical infrastructure and availability of services.

Communication:

76.92% of respondents strongly agree or agree that communication from the agency is effective. This suggests that the organization communicates clearly and efficiently with its customers.

Costs:

74.73% of respondents strongly agree or agree that the costs associated with the agency's services are reasonable. This indicates satisfaction with the pricing structure and affordability of services.

Integrity:

74.49% of respondents strongly agree or agree that the agency operates with integrity. This suggests trust in the CAAP's ethical standards and honesty in its dealings.

Assurance:

74.73% of respondents strongly agree or agree that the agency assures quality. This indicates confidence in the CAAP's ability to deliver high-quality services consistently.

Outcome:

77.35% of respondents strongly agree or agree with the outcomes of the agency's services. This suggests satisfaction with the results or outcomes achieved through the CAAP's services.

Overall:

Across all dimensions, 75.85% of respondents strongly agree or agree with the various aspects of service quality assessed in the survey. This indicates a generally positive perception of the CAAP's overall service quality.

Overall, the analysis suggests that the CAAP is performing well across multiple dimensions of service quality, with a majority of respondents expressing satisfaction with responsiveness, reliability, communication, and other key aspects. However, there may be areas for improvement, as indicated by the smaller percentages of respondents expressing dissatisfaction or neutrality in some dimensions. Further exploration of these areas could help identify specific areas for enhancement to better meet customer expectations.

C. Overall score per service

FSIS-AEB Conduct of Knowledge Test: Among the respondents, 240 reported interactions related to the conduct of knowledge tests. This indicates a significant number of individuals who have engaged with this service, potentially reflecting a crucial aspect of their experience with FSIS.

FSIS-AEB Issuance of Knowledge Test Report: 43 respondents interacted with the issuance of knowledge test reports. This suggests that a portion of the respondents underwent knowledge tests and received reports as part of their interactions with FSIS.

FSIS-LCD Renewal of Airmen License: Only 9 respondents reported interactions related to the renewal of airmen licenses. While fewer in number compared to other services, this indicates that some respondents have gone through the process of renewing their licenses.

FSIS-AWD Issuance of Certificate of Registration: 6 respondents reported interactions related to the issuance of certificates of registration. This suggests that a small subset of respondents had dealings with registering aircraft or related equipment.

FSIS-OFSAM Aeromedical Review Board for Special Issuances, Statement of Demonstrated Ability, and Medical Flight Test Results: Only 1 respondent reported an interaction related to the Aeromedical Review Board for special issuances. This indicates a rare or specialized aspect of service provision within FSIS.

Acceptance of On-The-Job Trainees: 6 respondents reported interactions related to the acceptance of on-the-job trainees. This suggests that a small number of respondents may have been involved in training or mentorship programs offered by the CAAP.

Issuance of Certificate of Registration: 15 respondents reported interactions related to the issuance of certificates of registration. This indicates a moderate level of engagement with registration-related services offered by FSIS.

Processing of Flight Plan: 50 respondents reported interactions related to the processing of flight plans. This indicates a substantial number of individuals who have utilized FSIS services for coordinating and managing flight plans.

Issuance of Access Pass: 3 respondents reported interactions related to the issuance of access passes. This suggests that a small subset of respondents required access to restricted areas within airports or aviation facilities.

N/A: There were 36 instances where the service type was not specified by the respondents. It's essential to investigate these instances further to understand why respondents did not provide this information, as it could provide insights into potential areas of improvement in survey design or data collection methods.

Overall, analyzing respondent interactions with various FSIS services provides valuable insights into their experiences and satisfaction levels. Understanding the frequency and nature of these interactions can help identify areas of strength and opportunities for improvement within FSIS's service delivery model. Additionally, addressing instances where service types were not specified can help ensure more comprehensive data collection and analysis in future surveys.

External Services	Overall Rating
FSIS-AEB Conduct of Knowledge Test	240
FSIS-AEB Issuance of Knowledge Test Report	43
FSIS-LCD Renewal of Airmen License	9
FSIS-AWD Issuance of Certificate of Registration	6
FSIS-OFSAM Aeromedical Review Board for Special Issuances, Statement of Demonstrated Ability and Medical Flight Test Results	1
ACCEPTANCE OF ON-THE-JOB TRAINEES	6
ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION	15
PROCESSING OF FLIGHT PLAN	50
ISSUANCE OF ACCESS PASS	3
N/A	36
EXTERNAL SERVICES TOTAL	409

V. Result of the Agency Action Plan reported for FY 2022:

ACTION/S	REMARKS
1. Conduct an internal review of all processes (CAAP Central Office, Area Centers and Satellite Airports)	The CART Compliance Officers conduct a monthly review of processes to ensure compliance with the prescribed processing times of 3, 7, and 20 days for services.
2. Issuance of Authority Order designating CART members from Area Centers and Satellite Airports.	The CART Authority Order was reconstituted on January 12, 2024, in accordance with the annual updating protocol for both the Authority Order and the directory of CART members.
3. Conduct a reorientation and workshop on RA 11032 and ARTA-related policies to all CART members/ARTA Focal Persons.	Annually, the CART conducts an internal reorientation session for its members, reaffirming their understanding of the Implementing Rules and Regulations of RA 11032.
4. Submission of the updated/revised process flow.	On April 1, 2024, the CART submitted the updated or revised process flow of the CAAP, ensuring compliance with ARTA's evaluation requirements.
5. Submission of the revised Citizen's Charter to ARTA.	On April 1, 2024, the CART submitted the updated or revised process flow of the CAAP, ensuring compliance with ARTA's evaluation requirements.

VI. Continuous Agency Improvement Plan for FY 2024:

Objective:

To ensure sustained compliance with the provisions of Republic Act 11032, otherwise known as the Ease of Doing Business and Efficient Government Service Delivery Act of 2018, and its Implementing Rules and Regulations (IRR).

Key Areas of Focus:

I. Process Review and Streamlining

Conduct a comprehensive review of all agency processes to identify areas for improvement and streamlining in line with RA 11032 and its IRR.

Collaborate with relevant stakeholders to streamline processes and eliminate unnecessary bureaucratic procedures.

Implement a system for regular monitoring and evaluation of process efficiency and effectiveness.

II. Customer Service Enhancement

Develop and implement training programs for staff members to enhance customer service skills and promote a customer-centric approach.

Establish mechanisms for soliciting feedback from clients and stakeholders to identify areas for improvement in service delivery.

Utilize technology solutions to enhance accessibility and convenience for clients, such as online application portals and electronic document submission.

III. Transparency and Accountability

Ensure transparency in all agency transactions by providing clear and accessible information to clients regarding service requirements, procedures, and timelines.

Implement measures to enhance accountability among staff members, including performance monitoring and regular performance evaluations.

Establish a system for tracking and reporting compliance with RA 11032 and its IRR, including the submission of required reports and documentation.

IV. Capacity Building and Training

Provide regular training and capacity-building programs for staff members to enhance their understanding of RA 11032 and its IRR, as well as their roles and responsibilities in compliance.

Foster a culture of continuous learning and improvement within the agency, encouraging staff members to stay updated on relevant regulations and best practices.

V. Monitoring and Evaluation

Establish a monitoring and evaluation framework to track progress in implementing the Continuous Agency Improvement Plan.

Conduct regular reviews and assessments to measure the effectiveness of implemented initiatives and identify areas for further improvement.

Solicit feedback from stakeholders, including clients and partner agencies, to gauge satisfaction levels and identify opportunities for enhancement.

Key Performance Indicators (KPIs):

- Percentage reduction in processing time for key services.
- Percentage increase in client satisfaction scores.
- Number of complaints or grievances related to service delivery.
- Percentage of staff members trained on RA 11032 and its IRR.
- Timeliness and completeness of required reports and documentation.

Budget Allocation:

- Training and capacity-building programs.
- Technology upgrades and infrastructure improvements.
- Consultancy services for process review and streamlining efforts.
- Monitoring and evaluation activities.

Conclusion:

The Continuous Agency Improvement Plan for FY 2024 aims to ensure sustained compliance with RA 11032 and its IRR while enhancing service delivery and promoting a culture of efficiency, transparency, and accountability within the agency. By focusing on process improvement, customer service enhancement, capacity building, and monitoring and evaluation, the agency will be better equipped to meet the evolving needs of its clients and stakeholders while upholding the principles of good governance and effective public service.

- VII. CSM results of each central, regional, and satellite office (if consolidated)**
 - i. Response rates of each office**
 - ii. Citizen's Charter results of each office**
 - iii. SQD results of each office**

ANNEX A. Survey Questionnaire Used



This Client Satisfaction Measurement (CSM) tracks the customer experience of government offices. Your feedback on your recently concluded transaction will help this office provide a better service. Personal information shared will be kept confidential and you always have the option to not answer this form.

Client type: Citizen Business Government
(employee or another agency)

Date: _____ Sex: Male__ Female__

Age: _____

Region of Residence: _____

Service Availed: _____

INSTRUCTIONS: **Check mark (✓)** your answer to the Citizen's Charter (CC) questions. The Citizen's Charter is an official document that reflects the services of a government agency/office including its requirements, fees, and processing times among others.

CC1. Which of the following best describes your awareness of a CC?

- I know what a CC is and I saw this office's CC.
 I know what a CC is but I did NOT see this office's CC
 I learned of the CC only when I saw this office's CC.
 I do not know what a CC is and I did NOT see one in this office. (Answer N/A on CC2 and CC3)

CC2. If aware of CC (answered 1-3 in CC1), would you say that the CC of this office was...?

- Easy to see. Not visible at all
 Somewhat easy to see. N/A
 Difficult to see.

CC3. If aware of CC (answered codes 1-3 in CC1), how much did the CC help you in your transaction?

- Helped very much Did not help
 Somewhat Helped N/A

INSTRUCTIONS:

For SQD 0-8, Please put a **Check mark (✓)** on column that best corresponds to your answer.

	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A NOT APPLICABLE
SQD0. I am satisfied with the service that I availed.						
SQD1. I spent reasonable amount of time for my transaction.						
SQD2. The office followed the transaction's requirements and steps based on the information provided.						
SQD3. The steps (Including payment) I needed to do for my transaction were easy and simple.						
SQD4. I easily found information about my transaction from the office or its website.						
SQD5. I paid reasonable amount of fees for my transaction. (If service was free, mark the 'N/A' column)						
SQD6. I feel the office was fair to everyone, or "walang pagpapaliwanag", during my transaction.						
SQD7. I was treated courteously by the staff, and (if asked for help) the staff was helpful.						
SQD8. I got what I needed from the government office, or (if denied) denial of request was sufficiently explained to me.						

Suggestion on how we can further improve our services (optional):

ANNEX B. List of Regional and Satellite Offices

Office	Responses	Total Population
Central Office	409	1000
Area 1	2	500
Area 4	73	500
Area 5	17	500

ANNEX C. CSM Results Per Office

1. Central Office

Citizen's Charter Answers	Responses	Percentage
CC1. Which of the following describes your awareness of the CC?		
1. I know what a CC is and I saw this office's CC.	233	57%
2. I know what a CC is but I did not see this office's CC.	23	6%
3. I learned of the CC only when I saw this office's CC.	94	23%
4. I do not know what a CC is and I did not see this office's CC.	59	14%
CC2. If aware of CC, would you say that the CC of this office was...?		
1. Easy to see	244	60%
2. Somewhat easy to see	89	22%
3. Difficult to see	13	3%
4. Not visible at all	4	1%
5. N/A	59	14%
CC3. If aware of CC, how much did the CC help you in your transaction?		
1. Helped very much	285	70%
2. Somewhat helped	63	15%
3. Did not help	7	2%
4. N/A	54	13%

Service Quality Dimensions	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Total Responses	Overall
Responsiveness	173	119	31	25	51	10	409	73.18%
Reliability	208	102	28	10	50	11	409	77.89%
Access and Facilities	199	101	27	16	47	19	409	76.92%
Communication	188	112	33	11	46	19	409	76.92%
Costs	167	111	35	11	48	37	409	74.73%
Integrity	172	109	42	8	44	34	409	74.49%
Assurance	172	109	35	14	46	33	409	74.73%
Outcome	205	99	26	13	50	16	409	77.35%
Overall	1,484	862	257	108	382	179	409	75.85%

External Services	Responses	Total Transactions
FSIS-AEB Conduct of Knowledge Test	240	1000
FSIS-AEB Issuance of Knowledge Test Report	43	1000
FSIS-LCD Renewal of Airmen License	9	500
FSIS-AWD Issuance of Certificate of Registration	6	300
FSIS-OFSAM Aeromedical Review Board for Special Issuances, Statement of Demonstrated Ability and Medical Flight Test Results	1	200
Acceptance of On-The-Job Trainees	6	200
Processing of Flight Plan	50	1000
Issuance of Access Pass	3	1000
N/A		51
External Service Total	409	5,200
OVERALL TOTAL	409	5,200

2. AREA I

Citizen's Charter Answers	Responses	Percentage
CC1. Which of the following describes your awareness of the CC?		
1. I know what a CC is and I saw this office's CC.	0	0
2. I know what a CC is but I did not see this office's CC.	1	50%
3. I learned of the CC only when I saw this office's CC.	1	50%
4. I do not know what a CC is and I did not see this office's CC.	0	0
CC2. If aware of CC, would you say that the CC of this office was...?		
1. Easy to see	1	100%
2. Somewhat easy to see	0	0
3. Difficult to see	0	0
4. Not visible at all	0	0
CC3. If aware of CC, how much did the CC help you in your transaction?		
1. Helped very much	1	100%
2. Somewhat helped	0	0
3. Did not help	0	0

Service Quality Dimensions	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Total Responses	Overall
Responsiveness	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	1%
Reliability	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	1%
Access and Facilities	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	1%
Communication	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	1%
Costs	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	1%
Integrity	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	1%
Assurance	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	1%
Outcome	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	1%
Overall	13	3	0	0	0	0	2	8%

External Services	Responses	Total Transactions
Processing of Flight Plan	1	1000
N/A	1	N/A
External Service Total	2	1000
OVERALL TOTAL	2	1000

3. AREA IV

Citizen's Charter Answers	Responses	Percentage
CC1. Which of the following describes your awareness of the CC?		
1. I know what a CC is and I saw this office's CC.	36	49%
2. I know what a CC is but I did not see this office's CC.	3	4%
3. I learned of the CC only when I saw this office's CC.	13	18%
4. I do not know what a CC is and I did not see this office's CC.	5	7%
5. N/A	16	22%
CC2. If aware of CC, would you say that the CC of this office was...?		
1. Easy to see	39	54%
2. Somewhat easy to see	9	13%
3. Difficult to see	1	1%
4. Not visible at all	2	3%
5.N/A	21	29%
CC3. If aware of CC, how much did the CC help you in your transaction?		
1. Helped very much	40	55%
2. Somewhat helped	8	11%
3. Did not help	2	3%
4. N/A	22	31%

Service Quality Dimensions	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Total Responses	Overall
Responsiveness	39	22	2	2	2	6	73	91.04%
Reliability	45	22	2	0	2	2	73	94.36%
Access and Facilities	41	23	0	1	2	6	73	95.52%
Communication	41	23	2	0	3	4	73	92.75%
Costs	39	19	1	1	2	11	73	93.54%
Integrity	46	20	0	1	2	4	73	95.65%
Assurance	46	23	0	1	2	1	73	95.83%
Outcome	42	25	1	0	2	3	73	95.71%
Overall	339	117	8	6	17	37	584	83.36%

External Services	Responses	Total Transactions
Issuance of Access Pass	20	1000
Processing Application for Concession	1	200
Application of Height Clearance	1	200
N/A	51	N/A
External Service Total	73	1400
OVERALL TOTAL	73	1400

4. AREA V

Citizen's Charter Answers	Responses	Percentage
CC1. Which of the following describes your awareness of the CC?		
1. I know what a CC is and I saw this office's CC.	8	47.1%
2. I know what a CC is but I did not see this office's CC.	2	11.8%
3. I learned of the CC only when I saw this office's CC.	1	5.9%
4. I do not know what a CC is and I did not see this office's CC.	3	17.6%
5. N/A	3	17.6%
CC2. If aware of CC, would you say that the CC of this office was...?		
1. Easy to see	6	35.3%
2. Somewhat easy to see	5	29.4%
3. Difficult to see	0	0
4. Not visible at all	0	0
5. N/A	6	35.3%
CC3. If aware of CC, how much did the CC help you in your transaction?		
1. Helped very much	11	64.7%
2. Somewhat helped	1	5.9%
3. Did not help	0	0
4. N/A	5	29.4%

Service Quality Dimensions	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Total Responses	Overall
Responsiveness	10	4	1	0	2	0	17	82.35%
Reliability	10	5	0	0	2	0	17	88.24%
Access and Facilities	10	5	0	0	2	0	17	88.24%
Communication	10	5	0	0	2	0	17	88.24%
Costs	10	5	0	0	2	0	17	88.24%
Integrity	10	5	0	0	2	0	17	88.24%
Assurance	10	5	0	0	2	0	17	88.24%
Outcome	10	5	0	0	2	0	17	88.24%
Overall	80	39	1	0	16	0	136	87.5%

External Services	Responses	Total Transactions
Pay Parking Collection	17	1000
External Service Total	17	1000
OVERALL TOTAL	17	1000