

Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP)

For: Integrated Pest Management Services for VACIHCS located at 3600 30th Street Des Moines, IA 50310

Contract Number: TBD

Contractor's name: TBD

The contractor will be evaluated in accordance with the following:

1. PURPOSE

This Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP) provides a systematic method to evaluate performance for the stated contract. This QASP explains the following:

- What will be monitored?
- How monitoring will take place.
- Who will conduct the monitoring?
- How monitoring efforts and results will be documented.

This QASP does not detail how the contractor accomplishes the work. Rather, the QASP is created with the premise that the contractor is responsible for management and quality control actions to meet the terms of the contract. It is the Government's responsibility to be objective, fair, and consistent in evaluating performance.

This QASP is a "living document" and the Government may review and revise it on a regular basis. However, the Government shall coordinate changes with the contractor through contract modification. Copies of the original QASP and revisions shall be provided to the contractor and Government officials implementing surveillance activities.

2. GOVERNMENT ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The following personnel shall oversee and coordinate surveillance activities.

a. Contracting Officer (CO) – The CO shall ensure performance of all necessary actions for effective contracting, ensure compliance with the contract terms, and shall safeguard the interests of the United States in the contractual relationship. The CO shall also assure that the contractor receives impartial, fair, and equitable treatment under this contract. The CO is ultimately responsible for the final determination of the adequacy of the contractor's performance.

Assigned CO: Mr. Shea Colby

Organization or Agency: Department of Veterans Affairs
Network Contracting Office 23 (NCO 23)
708 S 3RD ST SUITE 200E
Minneapolis, MN 55415
(612)-344-2184 Fax (612)-333-3667
shea.colby@va.gov

b. Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) – The COR is responsible for technical administration of the contract and shall assure proper Government surveillance of the contractor's performance. The COR shall keep a quality assurance file. The COR is not empowered to make any contractual commitments or to authorize any contractual changes on the Government's behalf.

Assigned COR: Phillip Skrdlant

Organization or Agency: VA Central Iowa Healthcare System (515) 699-5536

3. CONTRACTOR REPRESENTATIVES

The following employee(s) of the contractor serve as the contractor's program manager(s) for this contract.

Primary:

Alternate:

Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP)

4. PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

The contractor is responsible for performance of ALL terms and conditions of the contract. CORs will provide contract progress reports quarterly to the CO reflecting performance on this plan and all other aspects of the resultant contract. The performance standards outlined in this QASP shall be used to determine the level of contractor performance in the elements defined. Performance standards define desired services. The Government performs surveillance to determine the level of Contractor performance to these standards.

The Performance Requirements are listed below in Section 6. The Government shall use these standards to determine contractor performance and shall compare contractor performance to the standard and assign a rating. At the end of the performance period, these ratings will be used, in part, to establish the past performance of the contractor on the contract.

5. METHODS OF QA SURVEILLANCE

Various methods exist to monitor performance. The COR shall use the surveillance methods listed below in the administration of this QASP.

a. **DIRECT OBSERVATION. 98% surveillance:** Accomplished by direct observation by COR or Assistant COR. Inspections may be scheduled quarterly.

b. **VALIDATED USER/CUSTOMER COMPLAINTS.** Data collected from MAXIMO service requests and phone/email communications from customers. Reported by COR to Contractor technician/Supervisor/Program Manager. Relies on the customer to identify deficiencies. Complaints are then investigated and validated.

c. **VERIFICATION AND/OR DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED BY CONTRACTOR.** Monthly review of contractor log of bait stations/traps by COR to confirm regular maintenance of control methods.

Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP)

6. QASP PERFORMANCE REPORT DATE: 5/23/2017

Measures	SOW Reference	Performance Requirement	Standard	Acceptable Quality Level	Surveillance Method	Met AQL/DID NOT MEET AQL-CPAR RATING/ADD COMMENTS
Emergency call back and Support	E.1.	Vendor responds to service calls	Return calls within 2 hours after receipt of notification 98% of time to schedule IPM services to correct the emergent condition	95%	Periodic inspection.	
Service Reports	G.2.	Vendor to provide documentation as mentioned in Paragraph G In (SOW) section 2	After each scheduled or non-scheduled service contractor personnel will submit documentation outlined in Paragraph G section 2, 98% of the time.	95%	Periodic Inspection of records.	
Monthly Invoices	Q.1 Q.2	Vendor to provide accurate and timely monthly invoices	Vendor to provide accurate and timely invoices clearly stating all dates, type of services and location of service all on one monthly invoice 98% of the time.	95%	Periodic Inspection of records	
Daily Reports	G.1.	Vendor will sign in at the beginning and out at the end of their work shift with COR	Daily sign in log/out must be completed each visit 98% of the time	95%	Periodic Inspection of records	

Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP)

7. CPAR RATINGS ASSIGNED TO QASP ITEMS:

Metrics and methods are designed to determine rating for a given standard and acceptable quality level. The following ratings shall be used (Reference: CPARS User Manual <https://www.cpars.gov/pdfs/CPARS-Guidance.pdf> p. A2-1):

EXCEPTIONAL:	<p>Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds many to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were highly effective.</p> <p>Note: To justify an Exceptional rating, you should identify <u>multiple</u> significant events in each category and state how it was a benefit to the GOVERNMENT. However a singular event could be of such magnitude that it alone constitutes an Exceptional rating. Also there should have been NO significant weaknesses identified.</p>
VERY GOOD:	<p>Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds some to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were effective.</p> <p>Note: To justify a Very Good rating, you should identify a significant event in each category and state how it was a benefit to the GOVERNMENT. Also there should have been NO significant weaknesses identified.</p>
SATISFACTORY:	<p>Performance meets contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor appear or were satisfactory.</p> <p>Note: To justify a Satisfactory rating, there should have been only minor problems, or major problems the contractor recovered from without impact to the contract. Also there should have been NO significant weaknesses identified.</p>
MARGINAL:	<p>Performance does not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed reflects a serious problem for which the contractor has not yet identified corrective actions. The contractor's proposed actions appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented.</p> <p>Note: To justify Marginal performance, you should identify a significant event in each category that the contractor had trouble overcoming and state how it impacted the GOVERNMENT. A Marginal rating should be supported by referencing the management tool that notified the contractor of the contractual deficiency (e.g. Management, Quality, Safety or Environmental Deficiency Report or letter).</p>
UNSATISFACTORY:	<p>Performance does not meet most contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed contains serious problem(s) for which the contractor's corrective actions appear or were ineffective.</p> <p>Note: To justify an Unsatisfactory rating, you should identify multiple significant events in each category that the contractor had trouble overcoming and state how it impacted the GOVERNMENT. However, a singular problem could be of such serious magnitude that it alone constitutes an unsatisfactory rating. An Unsatisfactory rating should be supported by referencing the management tools used to notify the contractor of the contractual deficiencies (e.g. Management, Quality, Safety or Environmental Deficiency Reports, or letters).</p>

Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP)

CONTRACT REPORT				
1. CONTRACT NUMBER		2. REPORT NUMBER FOR THIS DISCREPANCY		
3. TO: <i>(Contracting Officer)</i>		4. FROM: <i>(Name of COR)</i>		
5. DATES				
a. CR PREPARED		b. RETURNED BY CONTRACTOR:		c. ACTION COMPLETE
6. Issue Identified <i>(Describe in detail. Include reference to PWS Directive; attach continuation sheet if necessary.)</i>				
7. SIGNATURE OF COR				Date:
8. SIGNATURE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER				Date:
9a. TO <i>(Contracting Officer)</i>		9a. FROM <i>(Contractor)</i>		
10. CONTRACTOR RESPONSE AS TO CAUSE AND ACTIONS TO PREVENT RECURRENCE. <i>(Cite applicable quality control program procedures or new procedures. Attach continuation sheet(s) if necessary.)</i>				
11. SIGNATURE OF CONTRACTOR REPRESENTATIVE				Date:
12. GOVERNMENT EVALUATION.				
13. GOVERNMENT ACTIONS				
14. CLOSE OUT				
	NAME	TITLE	SIGNATURE	DATE
CONTRACTOR NOTIFIED				
COR				
CONTRACTING OFFICER				