

**QUALITY ASSURANCE SURVEILLANCE PLAN (QASP)
AUTOMATION SUPPORT SERVICES – CMOP**

Contract Number(s): _____

1. INTRODUCTION:

This Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP) is pursuant to the requirements listed in the performance work statement (PWS) for the contract and each task order. This plan sets forth the procedures and guidelines VA CMOP will use to ensure the required performance standards or service levels are achieved by the contractor(s).

2. PURPOSE:

2.1 The purpose of the QASP is to describe the systematic methods used to monitor performance and to identify the required documentation and resources to be employed. The QASP provides a means for evaluating whether the contractor(s) is meeting the performance standards / quality levels identified in the PWS and the contractor's quality control plan (QCP), and to ensure that the Government pays only for the level of services received.

2.2 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. In addition, the QASP should recognize that unforeseen and uncontrollable situations may occur.

2.3 This QASP defines the roles and responsibilities of team members, identifies the performance objectives, defines the methodologies used to monitor and evaluate the contractor's performance, describes quality assurance documentation requirements, and describes the analysis of quality assurance monitoring results.

3. GOVERNMENT ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES:

3.1 **Contracting Officer (CO):** The CO is responsible for monitoring contract compliance, contract administration, and cost control, and for resolving any difference between the observations documented by the COR and the contractor(s). The CO shall also assure that the contractor(s) 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: Leah Thurman, Contracting Officer, NCO 15 CMOP

3.2 **Contracting Officer's Representative (COR):** The COR is designated in writing by the CO to act as an authorized representative to assist in the technical administration of the contract. COR limitations are contained in the written appointment letter. The COR shall assure proper Government surveillance of the contractor's performance. The COR will have the responsibility for completing QA monitoring forms used to document the inspection and evaluation of the contractor's work performance. Government surveillance may occur under the inspection of services clause for any service relating to the contract. The COR is not empowered to make any contractual commitments or to authorize any

**QUALITY ASSURANCE SURVEILLANCE PLAN (QASP)
AUTOMATION SUPPORT SERVICES – CMOP**

contractual changes on the Government’s behalf. The contractor(s) shall refer any changes they deem may affect contract price, terms, or conditions to the KO for action.

Assigned COR: Byron Abshier, Chief Engineer, National CMOP

4. PERFORMANCE STANDARDS:

The required performance standard and/or quality levels are included in the PWS. Failure of the contractor(s) to meet acceptable levels of quality can result in restriction on future task order awards. If the contractor(s) meet the required service or performance level, it may be rated as “Satisfactory” on the annual Contractor Performance Assessment Report (CPAR). If the contractor exceeds the service or performance, it is eligible to receive an “Excellent”. However, failure to meet the required level of quality will result in “Unsatisfactory” ratings.

5. METHODS OF QA SURVEILLANCE:

5.1 Various methods exist to monitor performance. The COR shall use the surveillance methods listed below in the administration of this QASP. Regardless of the surveillance method, the COR shall always contact the contractor's program manager, or on-site representative, when a defect is identified with the specifics of the problem.

Surveillance Method	Description
Direct Observation	Observation of direct services and/or products is used to survey the requirements. Performed periodically or through 100% surveillance.
Periodic Inspection	Comprehensive evaluation of select outputs. Applicable to interim outputs whose quality is also measured in final outputs. Inspections may be scheduled or unscheduled, as required.
Validated Customer Complaints	Feedback from the port engineers and engineering project leads on the amount of change orders issued due to deficient drawings or specification developed by the contractor.
100% Inspection	Evaluates all outputs of the award requirement.
Periodic Sampling	Variation of random sampling; however, sample is only taken when a deficiency is suspected.
Progress / Status Meetings	Ascertain performance from information presented at progress reviews or project status meetings.

Surveillance results may be used as the basis for actions (to include payment deductions) against the contractor. In such cases, the Inspection of Services clause in the Contract becomes the basis for the CO’s actions.

5.2 Acceptable Quality Levels:

The acceptable quality levels (AQLs) for contractor(s) performance are structured to allow the contractor(s) to manage how the work is performed.

**QUALITY ASSURANCE SURVEILLANCE PLAN (QASP)
AUTOMATION SUPPORT SERVICES – CMOP**

PWS Reference	Performance Requirement	Standard	Acceptable Quality Level	Surveillance Method	Incentive	Disincentive
12.1, 13.4, 14.1	Provide deliverable(s) in accordance with the schedule in the Task Order.	Deliverable(s) provided on time, every time.	100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct Observation • Periodic Sampling • Validated Customer Complaints • Progress / Status Meetings 	Favorable contractor performance evaluation.	Unfavorable contractor performance evaluation
12.1.2	Provide an Executive Summary of findings and recommendations	No later than 14-business days after the completion of all deliverables identified in the task order.	100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct Observation 	Favorable contractor performance evaluation.	Unfavorable contractor performance evaluation
10.1.3	Administer quality control plan (QCP) according to task order award, including subcontractor management in accordance with contractors' QCP.	In compliance with QCP 100% of the time.	100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct Observation • Periodic Sampling • Validated Customer Complaints • Progress / Status Meetings 	Favorable contractor performance evaluations	Unfavorable contractor performance evaluation
12.1.3	Provide technically correct accurate, and complete documents for each Task Order.	Maximum of one (1) resubmission for comment resolution.	100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct Observation • Periodic Sampling • Validated Customer Complaints • Progress / Status Meetings 	Favorable contractor performance evaluations	Unfavorable contractor performance evaluation
13.6.1	Attends kickoff meetings with five days of Task Order issuance.	Timeliness	100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct Observation 	Favorable contractor performance evaluations	Unfavorable contractor performance evaluation

6. RATINGS:

Metrics and methods are designed to determine if performance exceeds, meets, or does not meet a given standard and acceptable quality level. A rating scale shall be used to determine a positive, neutral, or negative outcome. The following ratings shall be used:

Rating	Description
Exceptional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance clearly exceeds contractual requirements. • There are no problems requiring corrective action.
Very Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds some to the Government's benefit. • Performance of the tasks was accomplished with some minor problems for which

**QUALITY ASSURANCE SURVEILLANCE PLAN (QASP)
AUTOMATION SUPPORT SERVICES – CMOP**

	corrective action taken by the contractor was effective.
Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance clearly meets contractual requirements. • Some minor problems for which the corrective actions appear satisfactory.
Marginal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance meets contractual requirements. • One or more serious problem for which corrective action(s) has not yet been identified, appears marginally effective, or has not been fully implemented.
Unsatisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicates the contractor is in danger of not being able to satisfy contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. • Contains one or more serious problems for which corrective action(s) appear ineffective.

7. DOCUMENTING PERFORMANCE:

7.1 ACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE:

The Government may document positive performance. Any report may become a part of the supporting documentation for CPAR ratings or any other actions.

7.2 UNACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE:

7.2.1 When unacceptable performance occurs, the COR shall inform the contractor(s). This will normally be in writing unless circumstances necessitate verbal communication. In any case the COR shall document the discussion and place it in the COR file.

7.2.2 When the COR determines formal written communication is required, the COR shall prepare a Contract Discrepancy Report (CDR), and present it to the contractor's task manager or on-site representative. A sample CDR template is provided below.

7.2.3 The contractor shall acknowledge receipt of the CDR in writing. The CDR will specify if the contractor is required to prepare a corrective action plan to document how the contractor shall correct the unacceptable performance and avoid a recurrence. The CDR will also state how long after receipt the contractor has to present this corrective action plan to the COR. The Government shall review the contractor's corrective action plan to determine acceptability.

7.2.4 Any CDRs may become a part of the supporting documentation for contract payment deductions, CPAR ratings, or other actions deemed necessary by the CO.

8. ANALYSIS OF MEASUREMENT:

8.1 **Analysis of Measurement.** During contract/order performance, the COR shall take periodic measurements, as specified in paragraph 5, and shall analyze whether the measurement is appropriate for the work being performed.

8.2 Reviews and Resolution:

**QUALITY ASSURANCE SURVEILLANCE PLAN (QASP)
AUTOMATION SUPPORT SERVICES – CMOP**

8.2.1 The CO and/or the COR may require the contractor(s), or designated alternate, to meet to discuss performance evaluation. The agenda of the reviews may include:

- Performance assessment data and trend analysis
- Issues and concerns of both parties
- Projected outlook for upcoming months and progress against expected trends, including a correct action plan analysis
- Recommendations for improved efficiency and/or effectiveness

8.2.2 The CO and the COR must coordinate and communicate with the contractor to resolve issues and concerns regarding marginal or unacceptable performance.

8.2.3 The CO, COR, and the contractor should jointly formulate tactical and long-term courses of action. Decisions regarding changes to metrics, thresholds or service levels should be clearly documented. Changes to metrics, thresholds or service levels will be incorporated into the contract via modification.

**QUALITY ASSURANCE SURVEILLANCE PLAN (QASP)
AUTOMATION SUPPORT SERVICES – CMOP**

CONTRACT DISCREPANCY REPORT (CDR)

1. **Contract Number:** <insert number>
2. **TO:** (Contractor Program Manager or on-site representative) <insert name>
3. **FROM:** (Name of COR) <insert name>
4. **Date and time observed discrepancy:**
5. **Discrepancy:**

<Describe in detail. Identify any attachments.>

6. **Corrective action plan:**

A written corrective action plan < is / is not > required.

< If a written corrective action plan is required include the following. > The written Corrective Action Plan will be provided to the undersigned not later than < # days after receipt of this CDR. >

Prepared by: <Enter COR's name>

Contracting Officer's Representative

Date

Received by:

Contractor Program Manager or on-site representative

Date

< The COR may initiate a CDR at any time, including whenever the number of monthly recorded defects for a performance standard exceeds the allowable number of defects; anytime unacceptable performance is determined critical in nature and requires formal corrective action; and whenever an unfavorable trend is detected in contractor performance.>