

QUALITY ASSURANCE SURVEILLANCE PLAN (QASP)
Network Integration Evaluation (NIE) Industry Participation

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1. Purpose. The role of the Government in quality assurance is to ensure contract standards are achieved. The purpose of the Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP) is to identify the methods and procedures the Government will use to evaluate contractor actions while performing the requirements in the Performance Work Statement (PWS). It is designed to provide an effective surveillance method by monitoring contractor performance for each listed performance objective in the Performance Requirements Summary (PRS) (Section 7 of this document).

1.1.1. The QASP provides a systematic method to evaluate the services the contractor is required to perform as specified in the PWS and the Contract.

1.1.2. The QASP has been developed by the requiring activity. It is designed to provide direction to personnel performing contract surveillance activities. Personnel surveying the contract terms and conditions and PWS requirements will periodically review the QASP throughout the life of the contract.

2.0. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.

2.1. Contracting Officer Representative. The Contracting Officer Representative (COR) is responsible for quality assurance guidance and to ensure that contract quality requirements, provisions, standards, and thresholds are defined, practical, enforceable, necessary, and verifiable.

2.1.1. The COR evaluates and documents contractor performance in accordance with the QASP and PWS.

2.1.2. The COR shall notify the Contracting Officer of any significant performance deficiencies using a Contractor Discrepancy Report with supporting documentation.

2.1.3. The COR will upload copies of ALL surveillance documentation to the VCE COR Tool, unless otherwise directed by the contracting officer.

2.1.4. The COR will submit a monthly report to the contracting officer concerning performance of services rendered under this contract.

2.1.5. The COR recommends improvements to the QASP and PWS throughout the life of the contract.

2.2. Contracting Officer. The Contracting Officer is responsible for safeguarding the interests of the United States Government in contractual relationships. Only the Contracting Officer is authorized to bind the Government and then, only to the extent of the authority delegated to them through the issuance of a warrant.

2.2.1. The Contracting Officer delegates authority for inspection and/or acceptance in accordance with the terms of the contract.

2.2.2. The Contracting Officer informs the contractor of the names, duties, and limitations of authority for all quality assurance personnel assigned to the contract.

3.0. DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES

3.1. Scope of Work. The scope of this PWS is to provide field support to the Government needed to perform the planning, design, integration, installation, and system operations during the NIE. The services to be provided are in direct support of the contractors Vehicle Tactical Router. Services covered include Lab Based Risk Reduction integration, operational training and troubleshooting and NIE engineering and technical support for Golden Vehicle (GV) Design, Fleet Build, Communications Exercise (COMMEX), Validation Exercise (VALEX) Field Exercise (FIELDDEX), Pilot, NIE, and

system Recovery. The contractor shall accomplish these services by supporting government managers, engineers, and technicians; interacting with Systems Engineering and Technical Assistance (SETA) contractor personnel providing specialized engineering services; and interacting with and coordinating participation of government and contractor agencies during NIE planning and execution.

4.0. QUALITY REQUIREMENTS

4.1. Quality Control Program. The contractor, not the Government, is responsible for management and quality control actions to meet the terms of the contract.

5.0 SURVEILLANCE. The COR will perform monthly surveillance based on the quality and effectiveness of the services provided and contractor’s data deliverables.

5.1 Unacceptable Performance. If the number of complaints/defects exceeds the performance threshold for any objective, the COR will determine the possible cause of this unacceptable performance. Government-caused complaints/defects will not be counted against the contractor. The same applies to any other requirement of the contract when Government-caused complaints/defects are the cause of unacceptable contractor performance. If the contractor’s performance is judged unacceptable for any requirement by the COR, the COR will inform the contracting officer for resolution. Significant performance deficiencies must be submitted to the Contracting Officer using a Contractor Discrepancy Report and include supporting documentation.

6.0 PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS SUMMARY (PRS)

6.1 Overview. This PRS identifies the services required by the PWS over which the Government will exercise surveillance.

6.2 Performance Evaluation. Performance of a service will be evaluated to determine whether or not it meets the performance threshold. The contractor shall provide the Government a written response as to why the performance threshold was not met, how performance will be returned to acceptable levels, and how recurrence of the cause will be prevented in the future. When documentation does not meet performance thresholds, revising and resubmitting the documentation at no cost to the Government is the preferred method for correcting unacceptable performance.

6.3 Performance Objectives, Indicators, Thresholds, and Surveillance Methods. The services required by the contractor are summarized into performance objectives and indicators, along with the minimum standards that relate directly to mission essential items. The performance threshold briefly describes the minimum acceptable levels of service required for each requirement. These thresholds are critical to mission success.

PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS SUMMARY (PRS)

SOW Ref	Service	Standard	Acceptable Quality Level	Method of Surveillance
C.3.1 and C.3.2	Product Delivery	Delivery of products to APG and FBTX	Products and services are delivered in accordance with contract delivery schedule	COR Inspection
C.3.4	Golden Vehicle Design	GV passes safety assessment	0% failure due to VTR	COR Inspection
C.3.5	3.5 Fleet Build	All products installed per NIE Architecture	100% Complete	COR Inspection
C.3.7	VALEX	Integration team validates an instrumented	0% network failure due to VTR configuration or	COR Inspection

		and integrated network	performance	
C.3.9	NIE	Network is turned over to the soldier operators for evaluation	1. Soldiers are fully trained on VTR operational performance 2. FSR responds to 100% of trouble tickets involving FSR	COR Inspection
C.3.10	Recovery	Contractor removed its products from NIE Architecture	100% of the VTRs are removed from vehicle platforms without damage to the host vehicle.	COR Inspection

The evaluation ratings are as follows:

Very Good - Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds some to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the task and sub-task being assessed was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were effective.

Satisfactory - Performance meets contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the task and sub-task contain some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor appear or were satisfactory.

Marginal - Performance does not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the task and sub-task 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.

Unsatisfactory - Performance does not meet most contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The contractual performance of the task or sub-task contains a serious problem(s) for which the contractor's corrective actions appear or were ineffective.

Signature:

Contracting Officer Representative (COR), and date