



Independent Procurement Review Report

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.

Solicitation#	RFP-S-1210120
Estimated Dollar Amount:	\$18,000,000.00
Type of Procurement:	Request for Proposal
Contract Description:	ATL Customer Experience Program
Requesting Department:	Department of Aviation
All Proponents:	ABM-ALL N 1 Security Services, Inc. 1ATL JV One-ATL Aviation Group ATL Customer Experience Atlanta Customer Experience JV
DOP Responsive Proponents:	ABM-ALL N 1 Security Services, Inc. 1ATL JV One-ATL Aviation Group ATL Customer Experience
Recommended Awardee:	ABM-ALL N 1 Security Services, 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	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	This project was previously cancelled under three solicitations, FC-10488, RFP-1190015, and RFP-S-1200152.	No response required
Advertisement/ Addenda	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).	No findings identified	N/A

Review Area	Risk/Criteria	Results	DOP Response
Responsive Review	<p>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.</p> <p>Unclear or inconsistent responsiveness determinations could be a red flag of bid manipulation.</p>	<p>DOP received five proposals for this solicitation and deemed four of them responsive. IPRO found two discrepancies in one of the proposals deemed responsive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> IIREA form notarized by notary public on a different date than signed by the authorized officer. Form 3 Financial Disclosure Forms were notarized by notary public on a different date than signed by the authorized officer. 	<p>DOP Response</p> <p>The Dept did not note this notary error. It did not result in any change in the outcome of the results of the solicitation. We have begun discussions with the State regarding waiving technicalities in Illegal Immigration Reform and Enforcement Act Forms.</p>
Conflict of Interest	<p>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.</p>	<p>No findings identified</p>	<p>N/A</p>
Evaluation	<p>DOP procedures require procurement staff to compile the evaluation scores, including those from risk management and contract compliance.</p> <p>Public procurement practice states that any arithmetical errors should be corrected, and scores should be recorded in grids/matrices (NIGP).</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>The scaling matrix had two minor scoring errors: a data entry error in the calculation of OCC scores and one in the scoring of the cost proposal for one proponent. DOP corrected these errors. These corrections did not affect the outcome of the award.</p>	<p>No response required</p>
Cancellation	<p>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.</p>	<p>No findings identified</p>	<p>N/A</p>
Award	<p>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)</p>	<p>No findings identified</p>	<p>N/A</p>