CITY OF ATLANTA
Office of the Inspector General
Shannon K. Manigault
Inspector General
inspectorgeneral@atlantaga.gov
Independent Procurement
Review Division

Independent Procurement Review Report

Solicitation#	RFP-S-1210268
Estimated Dollar Amount:	$1,200,000
Type of Procurement:	Request for Proposals
Contract Description:	On-Call Commercial Real Estate Consultant
Requesting Department:	Department of Aviation
All Proponents:	Stantec Consulting Services Inc Jones Lang LaSalle Americas, Inc.
DOP Responsive Proponents:	Stantec Consulting Services Inc Jones Lang LaSalle Americas, Inc
Recommended Awardee:	Jones Lang LaSalle Americas, Inc

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.

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.	No findings identified	N/A
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).	DOP received two proposals for this solicitation.	No response required

Review Area	Risk/Criteria	Results	DOP Response
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.	The proponent not recommended for award failed to disclose on the Contractor Disclosure and Declaration Form (Form 2) that it was awarded a contract with the city within the last three years.	Stantec Consulting Services, Inc. did not identify existing contracts with the City of Atlanta; however, it was noted in the responsive review that the form was not completed properly, and determined to not be cause for deeming the Supplier "non responsive as allowable within COA Procurement policy. (The CPO has authority to waive a technicality or informality in a bid or proposal, in accordance with O.C.G.A. 36-91-20 and other applicable state law.)
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.	DOP made a data entry error on the collaborative scoring matrix. While this error did not impact the outcome of the award or ranking of proponents, the collaborative scoring matrix should not allow the contract specialist to enter calculation results.	DOP did not identify an error on the collaborative scoring matrix at the time of scoring. During a retrospective review of the spreadsheet, DOP acknowledges that the error identified with the formula resulted in the wrong calculation; however, the calculation with the corrected formula did not affect the outcome of recommendation for award. To mitigate this from occurring going forward, DOP is increasing the oversite of scoring validation and is seeking automation of manual processes related to calculations of scores.
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.	No findings identified	N/A

Review Area	Risk/Criteria	Results	DOP Response
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)	DOP included in the contract file a project initiation package (trigger package) dated February 11, 2015 and submitted by the former Aviation General Manager. DOP policy and procedures require all procurement requests to be initiated through a letter or memorandum from the Department Head.	DOP identified that in the transition of the project from one Contract Specialist to another, the wrong trigger package was sent to IPRO. The correct trigger package was provided to DOP timely and has been forwarded to IPRO.