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: August 14, 2024

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

Background

The Department of Aviation requested 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/PS/DOA/2305/1230325
Project Name:	On-Call Marketing Media Buying Agency
Estimated Dollar Amount:	$2,000,000
Term:	Three years with two one-year renewal options
Recommended Awardee:	Conquer, LLC
DOP Responsive Bidders:	Conquer, LLC
All Bidders:	Capital Hill Medial Group, Inc. Conquer, LLC L Insight Group 2, LLC Pivotpath, LLC Sociallyin, Inc. Vincent J. Patrick Marketing & Communications, Inc. WeUs Them, Inc.

Observations and Responses

Solicitation

Observation 1: DOP did not provide the project team meeting sign-in sheet.

> DOP Response: Upon IPro's findings, DOP provided the project team meeting calendar invitation since the Organizer was not available to provide the sign-in sheet.

Responsive Review

Observation 2: The authorized representative of the proposed awardee signed the IIREA form (Form 1) the day before the notary's signature. This form states the dates of these signatures must be the same.

> DOP Response: DOP considered the date of the proposed awardee a minor error. This minor error was not material and did not change the outcome of the evaluation/recommendation. DOP will continue to emphasize the importance of completing/dating forms during pre-conference meetings with suppliers.

Observation 3: The Financial Responsibility Review (Form 3) requires proponents to submit Attachment A attesting to the financial condition of the entity on their company letterhead and to include signatures from the top three executives of the company. The proposed awardee provided one signature from the company's president.

> DOP Response: Risk Management evaluated Form 3 and deemed the proponent responsive. DOP will continue to emphasize the importance of completing/providing forms during pre-conference meetings with suppliers.

Observation 4: The Contract Specialist provided "x"s instead of initials as required by the Financial Responsibility Review (Form 3) to indicate submission of required documents. The Contract Specialist provided no signature to indicate responsiveness on the Form 3 for the proposed awardee as required by the form.

> DOP Response: Upon review of the IPro observation, the signed Financial Responsibility Review Form has been updated by the DOP staff member to indicate responsiveness and has been submitted to IPro.

Observation 5: The solicitation requires each offeror to provide three references. The offeror provided one of the three references for itself. The other two references provided were for its designated subcontractor.

> DOP Response: DOP considers a combination of three references sufficient to meet the requirement. DOP will continue to emphasize the importance of completing forms and providing required information during pre-conference meetings with suppliers.

Observation 6: DOP noted "Yes" for SAM.gov exclusion on the Responsive Review Checklist for the proposed awardee, however no documentation of the SAM.gov search was provided.

> DOP Response: Upon IPro's finding, the SAM.gov exclusion status has been provided to IPro.

Observation 7: DOP noted "Yes" for Authority to Transact Business in Georgia on the Responsive Review Checklist for the proposed awardee, however no documentation was provided.

> DOP Response: Upon IPro's finding the Authority to Transact Business in Georgia has been provided to IPro.

Evaluation

Observation 8: Calculation errors for line items in the evaluation scoring matrix incorrectly added 500 points to the total possible weighted score of 1000. This miscalculation did not change the rankings of the proponents.

> DOP Response: In response to IPRO observation, the miscalculation was corrected to show the total possible weighted score to equal 1000 and has been provided to IPRO.

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.