

**QUALITY ASSURANCE SURVEILLANCE PLAN (QASP)**  
**for**  
**DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY – DLA ENERGY**  
**SUSTAINMENT RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION (SRM)**

**TECHNICAL SUPPORT SERVICES SP0604-22-Q-0404**

**1. Purpose**

This Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan is a government-developed document used to determine if the contractor's performance meets the performance standards contained in the contract. The QASP establishes procedures on how this assessment/inspection process will be conducted. It provides the detailed process for a continuous oversight process:

- a) What will be monitored
- b) How monitoring will take place
- c) Who will conduct the monitoring
- d) How monitoring efforts and results will be documented

This QASP does not detail how the contractor accomplishes the work. The contractor is responsible for implementing and delivering performance that meets contract standards using its Quality Control Plan. The QASP provides the structure for the government's surveillance of the contractor's performance to assure that it meets contract standards. It is the government's responsibility to be objective, fair and consistent in evaluating contractor performance.

The QASP is not part of the contract nor is it intended to duplicate the contractor's quality control plan. This QASP is a "living document" and the Government may review and revise it on a regular basis. Flexibility in the QASP is required to allow for an increase or decrease in the level of surveillance necessary based on contractor performance.

The government may provide a copy of the QASP to the contractor to facilitate open communication. In addition, the QASP should recognize that unforeseen or uncontrollable circumstances might occur that are outside the control of the contractor.

**2. Authority**

Authority for issuance of The QASP is developed to comply with FAR Subparts 37-6, Performance-Based Acquisition, and 46-4, Government Contract Quality Assurance. In addition, FAR Subpart 46.103, Contracting Officer Responsibilities, states that agencies shall develop quality assurance surveillance plans when acquiring services. This acceptance is to be executed by the contracting officer or a duly authorized representative.

**3. Roles and Responsibilities**

The following personnel shall oversee and coordinate surveillance activities.

**Program/Project Manager (PM)** – The PM provides primary program oversight, nominates the COR, ensures the COR is trained before performing any COR duties and supports the COR’s performance assessment activities. While the PM may serve as a direct conduit to provide Government guidance and feedback to the Contractor on technical matters, they are not empowered to make any contractual commitments or any contract changes on the government’s behalf.

Assigned PM: <enter name>

Organization or Agency: <enter organization or Agency name>

Telephone: <enter number>

Email: <enter address>

**Contracting Officer (KO)** – The KO 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 KO shall also ensure that the contractor receives impartial, fair, and equitable treatment under this contract. Determine the final assessment of the contractor’s performance.

Assigned KO: <enter name>

Organization or Agency: <enter organization or Agency name>

Telephone: <enter number>

Email: <enter address>

**Contracting Officer’s Representative (COR)** The COR is responsible for providing continuous technical oversight of the contractor’s performance. The COR uses the QASP to conduct the oversight/surveillance process. The COR shall keep a Quality Assurance file that accurately documents the contractor’s actual performance. The purpose is to ensure that the contractor meets the performance standards contained in the contract. The COR is responsible for reporting early identification of performance problems to the KO. The COR is required to provide an annual performance assessment to the KO which will be used in documenting past performance. The QASP is the primary tool for documenting contractor performance. The COR is not empowered to make any contractual commitments or to authorize any contractual change on the Government’s behalf.

**Other Key Government Personnel** (enter name or delete these line if not applicable) This may include performance monitors, inspectors, technical experts, or others who provide information that helps the COR monitor contractor performance.

### **Contractor Representatives**

The following employees of the contractor serve as the contractor’s Program Manager and Task Manager for this contract. (Complete this section after the contract award)

**Program Manager** - <upon award, enter name>

Telephone: <enter number>

Email: <enter address>

**Task Manager** - <upon award, enter name>

Telephone: <enter number>

Email: <enter address>

**Other Key Contract Personnel** - <upon award, enter name or delete these lines if not applicable>

Title: <enter title>

Telephone: <enter number>

Email: <enter address>

#### **4. Performance Requirements and Method of Surveillance**

##### **4.1. Performance Standards**

Performance standards define desired services. The Government performs surveillance to determine if the contractor exceeds, meets or does not meet these standards. The table below identifies the Critical Performance Elements and the respective Performance Standards and Acceptable Quality Levels (AQLs) which the Government will use to determine contractor performance. The Government performs surveillance, using this QASP, to determine the quality of the contractor's performance as it relates to the performance element standards. The Performance Requirement Summary (PRS) should be used to form the foundation of the COR's inspection checklist.

Table 4.1- Performance Requirement Summary

<b>PWS Paragraph</b>	<b>Performance Objective</b>	<b>Performance Metric</b>	<b>Acceptable Quality Level (AQL)</b>	<b>Source/Frequency of Surveillance</b>
2.3.1.1	Develop, implement and update FSD processes	Quality of strategy to Include timeliness, effectiveness and ability to get Stakeholder buy-in	No more than one instance where the contractor earned less than satisfactory rating from Leadership and Stakeholders	COR surveillance through Leadership and Stakeholder assessment review
2.3.1.4	Conduct one maintenance updates per year on FSD process maps and SOPs	Number of updates performed per year	Zero instances where contractor failed to perform 1 maintenance updated per year	COR surveillance every year
2.3.2.1	Provide strategic	Quality of support	No more than one	COR surveillance

	advice and technical, analytical and management support to the FSD program	to include timeliness, thoroughness and effectiveness of any outcome resulting from FSD support services	instance where the contractor earned less than satisfactory rating from end users	through end user surveys
2.3.2.2	Provide advisory support on FSD processes	Quality of advice to include timeliness and effectiveness of recommended	No more than one instance where the contractor earned less than satisfactory rating from end users	COR surveillance through end user surveys
2.3.3.1; 2.3.4.6	Provide assistance for daily functional maintenance for the existing database	Quality of trouble shooting and resolution of technical issues, implementation	No more than one instance where the contractor earned less than satisfactory rating from end users	COR surveillance through end user surveys
2.3.3.1.3; 2.3.4.9	Monitor, process and update System Change Requests.	Quality of monitoring and updating SCRs	No more than one instance where the contractor earned less	COR surveillance through end user surveys
2.3.4.1	Conduct an assessment of existing data management and present and execute a plan for developing new data management and reporting capabilities	Quality of strategy to include timeliness, effectiveness and ability to get Stakeholder buy-in	Zero instances where the contractor failed to perform and deliver	COR surveillance
2.3.4.5	Implement two Version enhancements to the data management and	Number of times per year performance and delivery is made.	Zero instances where contractor failed to deliver two version	COR surveillance

	reporting capabilities yearly		enhancements per year	
2.3.4.5.2	Conduct informational briefings and update user guides for each enhancement	Number of enhancements performed	Zero instances per year where the contractor failed to perform briefings or update guides for each enhancement	COR surveillance per each enhancement
2.5	Provide necessary resources and quality control and management plan for effective execution of contract performance requirements	Quality of resources to include timeliness of on-boarding, staffing effectiveness, timeliness and quality of deliverables and meeting of performance objectives.	No more than one instance where the contractor earned less than satisfactory rating from end users	COR surveillance through end user surveys
2.3.5.6.2	At contract initiation, the contractor shall ensure planned personnel are appropriately pre- screened and on- boarded to DLA per the proposed Staffing Plan.	Staff Transition Metric = number of planned staff positions fully on-boarded at DLA Energy / number of staff positions scheduled to be on-boarded at end of performance period.	1st Month AQL > 85% 2nd Month AQL > 95% 3rd Month AQL > 98%	Data will be collected from Monthly Status Report and compared to Staffing Plan in the Proposal. Metrics will be as of the cut-off date of the MSR. Metric can be validated using DLA security records.
2.3.6.1	After the initial transition period, the contract shall ensure staffing is available as required to meet performance	Metric = number of Key Personnel staff positions filled / number of Key Personnel established in the PWS	AQL for Key Personnel > 100%  AQL for Non-Key Personnel > 90%	MSR and will be as of the cut-off date of the MSR for each period

	requirements, and unplanned staff vacancies are held to a minimum.	Non-Key Personnel Availability Metric= number of staff positions reporting / number of staff in staffing plan		
2.3.6.2	Program and Contract Management-prepare monthly contract status review	Number of times per year monthly status review is delivered.	Zero instances where the contractor failed to provide support in this area	Monthly Surveillance
2.3.6.4	Program and Contract Management-conduct contract Kick-Off/Post Award meeting	Timeliness of Kick-Off/Post Award meeting relative to the start date of the performance period of the contract	Conduct Kick-Off/Post Award meeting within 10 days from first day of contract.	One Time Surveillance
2.3.7.1	Program Management-designate and provide a Program Manager for the duration of the contract	Timeliness of availability of the Program manager relative to the start date of the performance period of the contract	Program Manager to be designated and available on the first day of contract. No more than 2 days without a designated PM.	Monthly Surveillance

#### **4.2. Contract Surveillance**

The goal of the QASP is to ensure that contractor performance is effectively monitored and documented. The COR uses the methods contained in this QASP to ensure the contractor is in compliance with contract requirements. The COR function is responsible for a wide range of surveillance requirements that effectively measure and evaluate the contractor's performance. Additionally, this QASP is based on the premise that the contractor, not the government, is responsible for management and QC/QA actions to successfully meet the terms of the contract.

The Government reserves the right to perform inspections and surveillance to evaluate the Contractor's compliance to the contract terms and performance of the requirements in the PWS. The Government will make every effort to ensure that the surveillance methods described below are conducted in an objective, fair, and consistent manner.

4.2.1. Periodic Surveillance. This action occurs when the COR or other Government official observes a deficiency. Examples include evidence from accidents, incidents, or delays. Regardless of where in the line-of-duty the COR observes contractual procedures not being followed, he/she has an obligation to document and report the deficiency to the Contracting Officer.

4.2.2. Customer Complaint Surveillance. This action is instituted when the COR receives a complaint from a stakeholder (stakeholder organizations include: EHRIS Directorate). The COR will obtain the complaint in writing and then conduct an investigation to determine its validity. If the complaint is deemed valid, the COR will immediately notify the contracting Officer for action. The COR will notify both the Contract Manager and the complainant of the Government's response to their complaint.

4.2.3. Regardless of the surveillance method, the COR will always contact the contractor's manager or on-site representative when a defect is identified and inform the manager of the specifics of the problem. The COR, with assistance from the TRs and Other Key Government Personnel, will be responsible for monitoring the contractor's performance in meeting a specific performance standard/AQL.

4.2.4. 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.

### 4.3. Performance Rating Definitions

Contractor performance will be rated using the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) in accordance with FAR 42.1503. Metrics and methods are designed to determine if performance exceeds, meets, or does not meet a given standard and acceptable quality level. Use the rating scale in the ratings table below to determine a positive, neutral, or negative outcome. Use the notes to properly complete CPARS rating documentation

Table 4.3- Performance Rating Definitions

Performance Rating	Criteria	Notes
Excellent / Outstanding	Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds many to the government's benefits. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with no problems and contractor actions	To justify an Exceptional rating, identify multiple significant events and state how they were of benefit to the Government. A singular benefit, however, could be of such magnitude that it alone constitutes an Exceptional rating. Also, there

	were highly effective.	should have been NO significant weaknesses identified.
Very Good	Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds some to the government benefits. The contractual performance was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were effective.	To justify a Very Good rating, identify a significant even and state how it was a benefit to the Government. There should be no significant weaknesses identified.
Satisfactory	Performance meets contractual requirements. The contractual performance contains some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were satisfactory.	To justify a Satisfactory rating, there should have been only minor problems, or major problems the contractor recovered from without impact to the contract/order. There should be NO significant weaknesses identified. A fundamental principle of assigning ratings is that contractors will not be evaluated with a rating lower than Satisfactory solely for not performing beyond the requirements of the contract/order.
Marginal	Performance does not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance reflects a serious problem for which the contractor has not yet identified corrective actions. The contractor's proposed actions appear marginally effective or were not fully implemented.	To justify Marginal performance, 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).
Unsatisfactory	Performance does not meet most contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The contractual performance contains serious problem(s) for which the contractor's corrective actions appear or were ineffective.	To justify an Unsatisfactory rating, identify multiple significant events in each category that the contractor had trouble overcoming and state how it impacted the Government. A singular problem, however, 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).
--	--	--

## **5. Performance Reporting**

- 5.1. Acceptable Performance. The Government will document positive performance. The most common format used for this action will be via CPARs. Any report may become a part of the supporting documentation for fixed fee payments, award fee payments, or other actions.
- 5.2. Unacceptable Performance. When unacceptable performance occurs, the COR will inform the contractor. This will normally be in writing unless circumstances necessitate verbal communication. In any case the COR will document the discussion and place it in the COR file.

6.2.1. When the COR determines formal written communication is required, the COR will prepare a Contract Discrepancy Report (CDR), and present it to the contractor's manager or on-site representative. A CDR template is attached to this QASP.

6.2.2. The contractor shall be required to 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 will review the contractor's corrective action plan to determine acceptability.

6.2.3 Any CDR will become a part of the supporting documentation for contract payment deductions, fixed fee deductions, award fee nonpayment when applicable. The Government will use any completed CDR as part of an overall evaluation of Contractor performance when determining present or future contractual actions.

## **6. Frequency of Measurement**

- 6.1. During contract/order performance, the COR will take periodic measurements and analyze whether the negotiated frequency of measurement is appropriate for the work being performed.
- 6.2. The COR will interact with the contractor at least monthly and meet annually to assess performance and will provide a written assessment.

## **7. Attachment:**

- 7.1. Customer Complaint Form (CCR)
- 7.2. Contract Discrepancy Report (CDR)
- 7.3. Corrective Action Report (CAR)



<b>CUSTOMER COMPLAINT RECORD (CCR)</b>			<b>DATE/TIME OF COMPLAINT</b>
<b>SOURCE OF COMPLAINT</b>			
<b>ORGANIZATION</b>	<b>BUILDING NUMBER</b>	<b>INDIVIDUAL</b>	<b>PHONE NUMBER</b>
<b>NATURE OF COMPLAINT</b>			
<b>CONTRACT REFERENCE</b>			
<b>VALIDATION</b>			
<b>DATE/TIME CONTRACTOR INFORMED OF COMPLAINT</b>			
<b>ACTION TAKEN BY CONTRACTOR</b>			
<b>RECEIVED/VALIDATED BY</b>			

CONTRACT DISCREPANCY REPORT (CDR)					
1. CONTRACT/TASK ORDER NUMBER		2. CONTRACTOR		3. TYPE OF SERVICES	
4. QUALITY ASSURANCE PERSONNEL (COR) SIGNATURE AND DATE				5. COR PHONE	6. SUSPENSE DATE
<b>I. PERFORMANCE</b>					
7. <input type="checkbox"/> DEFICIENCY (CHECK ALL BOXES THAT APPLY) <input type="checkbox"/> NEW <input type="checkbox"/> REPEAT <input type="checkbox"/> NO DEFICIENCY NOTED			8. SERVICES SUMMARY or PWS PARAGRAPH ITEM REVIEWED		
9. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEFICIENCY (IF DEFICIENCY BOX WAS CHECKED)			10. DETAILED PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT		
<b>II. CONTRACTOR VALIDATION</b>					
11. CONTRACTOR REPRESENTATIVE <input type="checkbox"/> CONCUR <input type="checkbox"/> NON-CONCUR			12. CORRECTIVE ACTION ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE		
13. CONTRACTOR REPRESENTATIVE CORRECTIVE ACTION AND PREVENTION OF RECURRENCE <u>OR</u> REASON FOR NON-CONCURRENCE OF COR CITED DEFICIENCY					
<b>III. ACTION CORRECTED</b>					
14. <input type="checkbox"/> CONCUR <input type="checkbox"/> NON-CONCUR			COR SIGNATURE AND DATE		
15. COR REMARKS (REQUIRED)					

6. CONTRACTOR REPRESENTATIVE REMARKS



11. COR DETERMINATION

☐ ACCEPTED    ☐ REJECTED

12. CLOSE DATE