Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan

1. Objective. This Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP) serves as the principal basis for assessing overall performance quality associated with TECOM/ASB's Marine Sierra Hotel Aviation Readiness Program (M-SHARP) Software development and sustainment services. This document will be used by the Government to assess the effectiveness of the Contractor's quality with respect to management and technical services provided. This QASP provides the methodology by which the Contractor's performance will be monitored to determine compliance with established performance objectives and to establish performance benchmarks that ensure a quantifiable basis for measuring effectiveness. The plan is designed so that surveillance is limited to that which is necessary to verify the Contractor is performing management and technical services delineated in the PWS.

2. Government Surveillance. The Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) will serve as the administering authority for this contract, and his authority will be limited to administering specific technical aspects of the contract. The COR will not provide direction that is outside the scope of responsibilities delineated under this contract and task orders and will defer any conditional interpretations to the Contracting Officer. The COR will:

- Maintain a detailed knowledge of the technical requirements of the contract;
- Document Contractor performance in accordance with the QASP;
- Identify and immediately forward notifications of deficient, or non-compliant performance to the Contracting Officer;
- Approve priorities of support, resources, and associated schedules.

3. Surveillance Methods. Surveillance of Contractor performance is the method used by the Government to determine whether the contractor is effectively and efficiently complying with all terms and conditions of the contract. In addition to statistical analysis, the functional expertise of the COR plays a critical role in adequately evaluating contractor performance. The below listed methods of surveillance shall be used in the administration of this QASP:

<u>Demonstration</u> - A qualification method that is carried out by operation and relies on observable functional operation. It does not require the use of instrumentation or special test equipment;

<u>Analysis</u>. A qualification method that is carried out by examining and assessing the application of techniques in order to determine if they are appropriate and sufficient. The quality of performance can be determined from government or contractor task-based or Management Information System (MIS) reports, contractor ISO 9000 techniques and procedures, or from government observation of completed tasks. In some instances, reports may be available in the form of information on a contractor's performance against contract requirements. Reports generally provide information regarding various characteristics of tasks and can, therefore, be used to determine acceptability of a contractor's performance.

<u>Inspections</u>: A qualitative inspections can be accomplished through one of the following techniques:

- *Random/Stratified Sampling*: With random sampling, services are sampled to determine if the level of performance is acceptable. Random sampling works best when the number of instances of the services being performed is very large and a statistically valid sample can be obtained. Stratified sampling focuses on selected parts of total contractor output for sampling. Computer programs may be available to assist in establishing sampling procedures.
- *Periodic Inspection, Judgmental Inspection or Planned Sampling*: This method, sometimes called "planned sampling", consists of the evaluation of tasks selected on other than a 100% or random basis.

4. Performance Requirements. The performance requirements set forth in this section correspond to the material content cited in the PWS and the evaluation factors. Corresponding ratings will be generated for each of the weighted performance areas and aggregated monthly. The COR will track performance using a moving average and reconcile performance with the Contractors Program Manager and Task Leads. This information will also be shared with the Contracting Officer and included in CPARs reports and any past performance assistance requests:

Performance Characteristic / Wt.	RFP Relationship	Evaluation Rating ¹
Quality of Work Performed: .50	Factor 1 – Technical Capability	Excellent / Exceeds: >.95 Acceptable / Meets: .8594 Unacceptable: <.85
Responsiveness / Planning: .20	Factor 1 – Technical Capability	Excellent / Exceeds: >.95 Acceptable / Meets: .8594 Unacceptable: <.85
Staffing: .15	Factor 1 - Technical Capability	Excellent / Exceeds: >.95 Acceptable / Meets: .8594 Unacceptable: <.85
Management & Administration: .15	Factor 1 - Technical Capability	Excellent / Exceeds: >.95 Acceptable / Meets: .8594 Unacceptable: <.85

The criteria that will be used to accomplish the evaluation ratings is derived from the RFP and from the elements of performance determined to be most influential to performance.

¹ Numerical values for the adjectival ratings are: >.95 – Excellent – Exceeds standard compliance; .85 - .94 standard compliance – Acceptable; and <.85 – unacceptable.

PERFORMANCE REQUIRE		· · ·	Method of Surveillance
Performance Objective	Performance Standard	Acceptable Quality Level	Method of Surveillance
 Quality of Work Performed: Use of resources to provide acceptable or better results through the following: Technical accuracy, thoroughness of analysis / findings; and Appropriateness of resources (people, computers, money, time) applied to achieve results. 	< 5% rejection rate of <u>all</u> formal deliverables submitted under the performance provisions of the task order;	95%	 Weekly Reconciliation by COR and Section Leads; Monthly reconciliation by COR/CPM and tracked as a 3-mos. moving average. <u>Consequence of Non-compliance</u> – Extended periods of vacancy for staff, or consequential impacts to performance may warrant financial consideration / Negative CPARS entry / Termination
 <u>Responsiveness</u>: Effective use of prime and subcontractor resources to meet ongoing work requirements emerging at the Division levels, including: Providing effective responses to requirements / reallocations of labor within the WBS; Effective balancing of resources to accomplish work requirements without sacrificing priorities, or creating unstable performance; and Using suitable benchmarking to establish staff allocations and work packages within the WBS. 	Response provided to COR within 24-hrs., strategy provided to COR <48-hrs. from notification, including: - WBS review; - Approach agreement; - Deliverables ; and - Availability of staff.	100%	 Weekly Reconciliation by COR and Section Leads Reconciled monthly by COR / CPM and tracked as a 3-mos. moving average. Consequence of Non-compliance Extended periods of vacancy for staff, or consequential impacts to performance may warrant financial consideration / Negative CPARS entry / Termination
 Planning: Includes the effective use of the WBS as a principal management tool, assignment of staff to work priorities and tasks therein delineated, and effectively managed across both contract and Division levels, including: Coordination with COR and Division Leads; Thoroughness of resource assessments; Effectiveness of labor usage; and Effectiveness of benchmarking. 	WBS stability and forecast use of labor resources to meet quality standards without increasing current performance scope (e.g., change orders <1%); and <5% vacancy based upon scheduled departures (e.g., 30-days notice) for backfill of staff	95%	Number of change orders submitted to COR and KO; Reconciled monthly by COR / CPM and tracked as a 3-mos. moving average. Consequence of Non-compliance – Extended periods of vacancy for staff, or consequential impacts to performance may warrant financial consideration / Negative CPARS entry / Termination
Staffing: Includes selection of qualified staff to meet requirements:	Staff stability maintained at 90% of target	95%	Reconciled monthly by COR / CPM and tracked as a 3-mos. moving average.

PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS SURVEY (PRS)

 Adequacy of skills, experience of staff to meet program requirements Use of team members, subcontractor staff to ensure most qualified capabilities are applied; and Responsiveness and use of staff within the WBS framework for workload management. 	WBS allocation; New hires within 30-days of notification of vacancy; Subcontractor staffing pulls <10- days from notification of vacancy; and <14-days backfill for unscheduled staff departures.		<u>Consequence of Non-compliance</u> – Extended periods of vacancy for staff, or consequential impacts to performance may warrant financial consideration / Negative CPARS entry / Termination
 Management and Administration: Includes the following measures of performance and compliance: Deliverables shall be complete, accurate, and prepared to a professional standard; Quality of the Contractor's overall technical management strategy; Ability to identify and preclude problems, or resolve issues; and Effectiveness of their use corporate quality practices, resolution of invoice anomalies, WBS compliance, and effectiveness of their overall subcontract management. 	Aggregation of subordinated areas assessed using progressively more objective criteria – ratings considered: <u>Excellent</u> – Exceeded performance expectations and abated, or immediately mitigated know problems; <u>Acceptable</u> – Met performance expectations and generally responded to problems in a satisfactory manner; and <u>Unacceptable</u> – Areas of inconsistent performance, prolific problems remain unresolved, and two, or more performance areas are noted as substandard.	100%	 Weekly Reconciliation by COR and Section Leads Performance evaluation at TBD milestones; Reconciled monthly by COR / CPM and tracked as a 3-mos. moving average. Consequence of Non-compliance – Extended periods of vacancy for staff, or consequential impacts to performance may warrant financial consideration / Negative CPARS entry / Termination