



## Independent Procurement Review Report

### Why We Did This Review

In accordance with Atlanta City Charter Article 8, Section 8-107, 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.

Solicitation#	RFP-S-1220130
Estimated Dollar Amount:	\$1,100,000 - \$1,4500,000
Type of Procurement:	<b>Request for Proposals</b>
Contract Description:	Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act Adult and Dislocated Worker Career Services
Requesting Department:	<b>WorkSource Atlanta</b>
All Proponents:	Arbor E&T, LLC d/b/a Equus Workforce Solutions Martin Luther King Sr Community Resources Collaborative The Good Lord's Mobile Welding Service
DOP Responsive Proponents:	Arbor E&T, LLC d/b/a Equus Workforce Solutions Martin Luther King Sr Community Resources Collaborative
Recommended Awardee:	Arbor E&T, LLC d/b/a Equus Workforce

### TABLE OF FINDINGS

Review Area	Risk/Criteria	Results	DOP Response
<b>Evaluation Team</b>	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
<b>Solicitation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>Evaluation criteria that are too vague or subjective can allow for manipulation of the scores.</li> </ul>	No findings identified	N/A
<b>Advertisement/ Addenda</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing the solicitation criteria to favor a particular proponent is a red flag of potential bid rigging (International Anti-Corruption Resource Center).</li> <li>Too many addenda could indicate unclear specifications or unclear scope of work, which could also favor a particular proponent.</li> </ul>	DOP issued five addenda for this solicitation to answer proponents' questions, extend the proposal due date, and modify the Required Submittals Forms.	No response required
<b>Submittal</b>	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
<b>Responsive Review</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DOP procedures require findings to be recorded on a responsive checklist which identifies specific submittal requirements for the project and identifies a proponent's compliance with those required documents.</li> <li>• Unclear or inconsistent responsiveness determinations could be a red flag of bid manipulation.</li> </ul>	No findings identified	N/A
<b>Conflict of Interest</b>	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.	The recommended awardee submitted financial disclosure statements indicating that it had not been party to litigation or tax liens; however, IPro found the proponent failed to disclose two county tax liens filed in June 2017.	DOP defers to Risk Management to analyze the financial strength of a company. Although the recommended awardee had two county liens against it, neither was in the state of Georgia. Risk Management's analysis of the proponent's financial strength resulted in a score of 8.0 out of 10.0. Based on Risk Managements review and the IPro findings, DOP will notify the user agency of the liens and will support its final decision for award.
<b>Evaluation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DOP procedures require procurement staff to compile the evaluation scores, including those from risk management and contract compliance.</li> <li>• Public procurement practice states that any arithmetical errors should be corrected, and scores should be recorded in grids/matrices (NIGP).</li> </ul>	No findings identified	N/A
<b>Cancellation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Transparency International states that effective record-keeping of decisions and reasons for cancellation promotes accountability and transparency.</li> </ul>	No findings identified	N/A
<b>Award</b>	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)	No findings identified	N/A