



## Independent Procurement Review Report

### Why We Did This Review

In accordance with Atlanta City Charter Article 8, Section 8-107, the Independent Procurement Review Division of the Office of the Inspector General must review all solicitations with an aggregate value of \$1,000,000 or greater, seeking approval by the Atlanta City Council, for file completeness, conflicts of interest, and other areas of perceived deficiency.

Solicitation#	IFB/DOA/2210-1230131
Estimated Dollar Amount:	\$54,000,000
Type of Procurement:	Invitation for Bid
Contract Description:	Explosive Detection System (EDS) Recapitalization and Optimization - Concourse E at Hartsfield-Jackson Atlanta International Airport
Requesting Department:	Department of Aviation
All Proponents:	Jervis B. Webb Company Vanderlande Industries, Inc.
DOP Responsive Proponents:	Jervis B. Webb Company Vanderlande Industries, Inc.
Recommended Awardee:	Vanderlande Industries, Inc.

### TABLE OF FINDINGS

Review Area	Risk/Criteria	Results	DOP Response
<b>Evaluation Team</b>	DOP procedures require evaluators to possess the necessary and appropriate experience needed to evaluate the proposals or offerors submitted to the city.	No findings identified	N/A
<b>Solicitation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bids shall only be evaluated on requirements and evaluation criteria outlined in the formal solicitation (DOP SOP 4.3.6.(E)(3)). Having selection criteria established in the solicitation can help prevent bid manipulation.</li> <li>Evaluation criteria that are too vague or subjective can allow for manipulation of the scores.</li> </ul>	No findings identified	N/A
<b>Advertisement/ Addenda</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing the solicitation criteria to favor a particular proponent is a red flag of potential bid rigging (International Anti-Corruption Resource Center).</li> <li>Too many addenda could indicate unclear specifications or unclear scope of work, which could also favor a particular proponent.</li> </ul>	No findings identified	N/A
<b>Submittal</b>	The city code provides that the city shall select no less than three submittals solicited from an RFP that it deems as the most responsible and responsive; provided, however, that if three or fewer offerors respond, the requirement shall not apply (City Code Sec. 2-1189).	(1) The awardee submitted Letters of Intent from two subcontractors in support of its OCC participation goal that document the subcontractors' intention to work with an entity who is not the awardee.	(1) The subcontractor utilization form lists the two subcontractors in support of OCC participation. The letters of intent were vetted by OCC and no discrepancies were noted. The bid tab does not include the proponent (Miller

Review Area	Risk/Criteria	Results	DOP Response
		(2) There were fewer than three submittals for this solicitation.	Electrical) on the letter of intent as a bidder so it is assumed that the proponent's name listed may have been noted in error or the companies may be a subcontractor under Miller Electrical.  (2) No response required
<b>Responsive Review</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DOP procedures require findings to be recorded on a responsive checklist which identifies specific submittal requirements for the project and identifies a bidder's compliance with those required documents.</li> <li>• Unclear or inconsistent responsiveness determinations could be a red flag of bid manipulation.</li> </ul>	No findings identified	N/A
<b>Conflict of Interest</b>	The city's standards of conduct prohibit employees from having financial conflicts of interests. Contracts must be awarded and administered free from improper influence or the appearance of impropriety.	No findings identified	N/A
<b>Evaluation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DOP procedures require procurement staff to compile the evaluation scores, including those from risk management and contract compliance.</li> <li>• Public procurement practice states that any arithmetical errors should be corrected, and scores should be recorded in grids/matrices (NIGP).</li> <li>• According to the International Anti-Corruption Resource Center, bids that are too close together (less than 1%) or too far apart (more than 20%) could be indicators of collusive bidding. Not applicable for RFPs.</li> </ul>	No findings identified	N/A
<b>Cancellation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Government Accountability Office states that the use of standard language such as "in the best interest of the city" without a specific justification for cancellation could be a fraud indicator.</li> <li>• Transparency International states that effective record-keeping of decisions and reasons for cancellation promotes accountability and transparency.</li> </ul>	The user agency recommended DOP cancel the previous solicitation, IFB-C-1220004, due to the lapse of time since receiving the bids and the escalation of costs in the industry.	No response required
<b>Award</b>	A contract file should include all project items, to confirm that each phase of the procurement was facilitated appropriately and audit-ready (DOP SOP Sec. 3.18)	No findings identified	N/A