

Why We Did This Review

In accordance with Atlanta City Charter Chapter 6, Section 2.603, our office is authorized to 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.

Independent Procurement Review Report

FC#	FC-1190564
Estimated Dollar Amount:	
Type of Procurement:	Request for Proposals
Contract Description:	Solid Waste and Wastewater Disposal Services
Requesting Department:	Department of Public Works
All Proponents:	AMP Consulting R&M Atlanta Disposal Services Georgia Waste Systems, Inc.
DOP Responsive Proponents:	
Recommended Awardee:	Cancelled

TABLE OF FINDINGS

Review Area	Risk/Criteria	Results	Resolved/Remaining
Evaluation Team	DOP procedures require evaluators to possess the necessary and appropriate experience needed to evaluate the proposals or offerors submitted to the city.	The contracting officer did not seek CPO approval of recommended evaluators as required by DOP standard operating procedures.	No response needed
Solicitation	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.	No findings identified	No response needed
	 Evaluation criteria that are too vague or subjective can allow for manipulation of the scores 		
Advertisement/ Addenda	Changing the solicitation criteria to favor a particular proponent is a red flag of potential bid rigging (International Anti-Corruption Resource Center).	DOP issued 3 addenda.	No response needed
	Too many addenda could indicate unclear specifications or unclear scope of work, which could also favor a particular proponent.		
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).	No findings identified	No response needed

Review Area	Risk/Criteria	Results	Resolved/ Remaining
Responsive Review	 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	No response needed
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	No response needed
Evaluation	 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. 	N/A	N/A
Cancellation	 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. 	Solicitation was cancelled because all proponents were deemed non-responsive.	No response needed
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)	N/A	N/A