



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#	RFP-S-1230028
Estimated Dollar Amount:	\$1,200,000
Type of Procurement:	Request for Proposals
Contract Description:	On-Call Property and Facility Management at HJAIA
Requesting Department:	Department of Aviation
All Proponents:	POSolutions, Inc. Red Rock Global, LLC Rain to Drought Water Restoration & Mitigation, LLC
DOP Responsive Proponents:	POSolutions, Inc.
Recommended Awardee:	POSolutions, Inc.

TABLE OF FINDINGS

Review Area	Risk/Criteria	Results	DOP Response
Evaluation Team	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
Solicitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Evaluation criteria that are too vague or subjective can allow for manipulation of the scores. 	No findings identified	N/A
Advertisement/ Addenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changing the solicitation criteria to favor a particular proponent is a red flag of potential bid rigging (International Anti-Corruption Resource Center). Too many addenda could indicate unclear specifications or unclear scope of work, which could also favor a particular proponent. 	No findings identified	N/A
Submittal	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).	The notarization seal on the recommended awardee's Form 1 (Illegal Immigration Reform and Enforcement Act Form) is illegible.	DOP did not assess the lack of clarity of the notary seal as a reason to deem the proposal nonresponsive.

Review Area	Risk/Criteria	Results	DOP Response
Responsive Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Unclear or inconsistent responsiveness determinations could be a red flag of bid manipulation. 	No findings identified	N/A
Conflict of Interest	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
Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DOP procedures require procurement staff to compile the evaluation scores, including those from risk management and contract compliance. • Public procurement practice states that any arithmetical errors should be corrected, and scores should be recorded in grids/matrices (NIGP). • 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. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Department of Procurement (DOP) Standard Operating Procedure requires that Office of Contract Compliance (OCC) and Enterprise Risk Management (Risk) perform evaluations that are independent of DOP (SOP 4.4.4.2). The procurement file contained no OCC or Risk evaluations for two proponents deemed non-responsive by DOP; the file contained only an evaluation for the sole proponent that DOP deemed responsive. 2) The recommended awardee failed to complete Form 3 (Contractor Financial Disclosure) and was given an opportunity to correct the errors found in its submission (financial institution letters of reference). A second proponent who also failed to complete Form 3 (Contractor Financial Disclosure) was deemed non-responsive and was not given an opportunity to correct its proposal omission (Authority to Transact Business in Georgia, a publicly available document). 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) OCC and Risk's evaluation and scoring were done independently. The scores and evaluation from OCC and Risk can be found in a folder labeled "recommendations." 2) The supplier completed Form 3; however, documentation was requested at the advice of Risk and the Deputy CPO, for the newly revised financial submission requirements.

Review Area	Risk/Criteria	Results	DOP Response
Cancellation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Transparency International states that effective record-keeping of decisions and reasons for cancellation promotes accountability and transparency. 	The solicitation was previously cancelled, due to the receipt of non-responsive proposals.	N/A
Award	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