CITY OF ATLANTA
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL
SHANNON K. MANIGAULT
INSPECTOR GENERAL

INDEPENDENT PROCUREMENT REVIEW DIVISION

Independent Procurement Review Report

TO: Atlanta City Council

DATE: November 29, 2023

The purpose of this report is to communicate the results of the following solicitation.

Background

The Department of Customer Service issued a Request for Proposals for the project and scope shown below. Requests for Proposals are typically evaluated based on a variety of evaluation factors including price, understanding of scope and objectives, and expertise. This project was not previously cancelled.

Solicitation#	RFP-S-1230072
Project Name:	ATL311 Customer Relationship Management (CRM) System
Estimated Dollar Amount:	$1,400,000
Term:	One year with three one-year renewal options
Recommended Awardee:	Accenture LLP
DOP Responsive Bidders:	3Di, Inc. Accenture LLP Cloud Navigator, Inc. Incapsulate LLC SDI Presence Stack Nexus, Inc. Think Development System, Inc. Three-Twelve Staffing and Consulting LLC RockITdata LLC Catalyst Consulting Group, Inc.
All Bidders:	3Di, Inc. Accenture LLP Cloud Navigator, Inc. Incapsulate LLC Rock Solid Technology SDI Presence Slalom Stack Nexus, Inc.

	Think Development System, Inc. Three-Twelve Staffing and Consulting LLC RockITdata LLC Catalyst Consulting Group, Inc.

Observations and Responses

Initiation

Observation 1: Five addenda were issued that modified the pre-proposal conference date, extended the due date three times, and responded to 222 questions.

IPro does not require a response from DOP for this observation.

Evaluation

Observation 2: The recommended awardee failed to disclose a state tax lien within the last five years as required by DOP's Financial Disclosure form.

> DOP Response: If the proponent had disclosed the tax lien, Risk stated that they would have provided the same score but would have entered a note on the scoring summary sheet for the user agency's consideration.

Observation 3: The recommended awardee provided a subcontractor utilization form with a total of 15% SBE participation. The participation listed is lower than the Office of Contract Compliance (OCC) SBE required goal of 25%. OCC provided 15 points although the proposed awardee did not meet the SBE participation goal.

> DOP Response: Based on the observation in which the SBE Minority / Diversity Participation Goal of 25% SBE was not fully achieved by the proponent, the following Office of Contract Compliance considerations were applicable in deeming the proponent responsive and awarding the fifteen (15) evaluation scoring points: The proponent demonstrated acceptable documentation of Good Faith Outreach Efforts (GFE) as described as part of the Appendix A guidance and instructions, to identify, contact, contract with, or utilize businesses, specifically SBE's, as subcontractors or suppliers on the contract.

Observation 4: Calculation errors in DOP's evaluation scoring matrix resulted in differences of up to 350 points for individual maximum possible weighted scores for proposal elements. The four proposals that were fully evaluated had percentage differences ranging from approximately 47% to 59%. Miscalculations present the risk the most qualified proponent would not be recommended for award.

Table 1: DOP Evaluation Calculations and IPro Recalculations

Proponent	DOP Evaluation	IPro Recalculation	Difference	Percentage Difference
Proponent 1	625	955	330	52.80%
Proponent 2	575	890	315	54.78%
Proponent 3	520	765	245	47.12%
Proponent 4	470	745	275	58.51%

Source: DOP Evaluation Matrix and IPro analysis

These miscalculations did not change the rankings of the proposed awardees that DOP shared with the user agency (UA).

> DOP Response**:** Although the miscalculations did not change the rankings of the proposed awardees, it was discovered that the miscalculations in the scoring matrix occurred due to a technical deficiency in the formula in the Excel spreadsheet. The formula has been corrected and an updated scoring matrix has been attached.
>
> The Department of Procurement has since implemented a new evaluation scoring matrix and methodology that provides a near statistical impossibility of achieving a tied score, reduces the number of errors in calculations and provides a wider spread between proponent's scores.

Award

Observation 5: Before the Request for Information (RFI) process, the recommended awardee and one of its representatives communicated with the Office of the Mayor and with the UA about the ATL311 digital transformation project. During the RFI process, the mayor, members of the mayor's cabinet, and members of the UA met with the proposed awardee to discuss project implementation. After the meeting, during the RFI period, members of the UA and the recommended awardee communicated expressing excitement about working together.

This matter has been referred to the Compliance Division.

> DOP Response: The Office of the Mayor, Members of the Mayor's Cabinet and members of the User Agency will be advised by the Department of Procurement (DOP) to refrain from any procurement discussions regarding this service and any future services during the sourcing period. Should any communication be required, the Department of Procurement and the Department of Law should be engaged in all such communication and if necessary, obtain approval from both DOP and Law.
>
> Also, according to the City of Atlanta's Procurement and Real Estate Code Section 2-1188(b) (Invitation for Bid) and 2-1189(b) (Request for Proposal), both are considered formal procurements and will subsequently result in an award (2-1188(k) and 2-1189(g). In the Required Submittal forms for all formal solicitations, the blackout period states on Form 2, Page 7 ("The blackout period begins with the advertisement of the synopsis and

shall remain in effect until execution of the contract, or the solicitation is cancelled and will not be resolicited, whichever comes first. During the blackout period, all questions pertaining to this solicitation must be directed to the Department of Procurement's assigned Procurement Professional or the appropriate Supervisor. Offeror or any representative, agent or other person acting on behalf of Offeror is prohibited from contacting any other City agency, employee, representative, or elected or appointed official regarding questions about this solicitation. Violations of this section will result in Offeror's disqualification.") Unlike an IFB and an RFP, which are formal solicitations, an RFI does not result in an award or the execution of a contract. It is only a Request for Information to acquire information from the vendor community in a specialized or unique field, prior to soliciting a formal bid or proposal.

The review yielded no additional findings.

Methodology

The Independent Procurement Division reviews the following stages of the procurement process:

- Initiation
- Solicitation
- Responsive Review
- Evaluation
- Award

In accordance with Atlanta City Charter Article 8, Section 8-107, and Section 2-1604 of the Atlanta Code of Ordinances, 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; must review all cooperative purchase agreements and piggyback contracts with an aggregate value greater than $1,000,000; and may conduct discretionary reviews of any value.