



## 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-1220141
Estimated Dollar Amount:	\$2,473,996.71
Type of Procurement:	Request for Proposal
Contract Description:	Parking Operations and Management Services
Requesting Department:	Department of Aviation
All Proponents:	ABM LANIER-HUNT AIRPORT PARKING ATL LAZ - Hudson - G-Force JV SP Plus Red Bridge Joint Venture
DOP Responsive Proponents:	ABM LANIER-HUNT AIRPORT PARKING ATL LAZ - Hudson - G-Force JV SP Plus Red Bridge Joint Venture
Recommended Awardee:	SP Plus Red Bridge Joint Venture

### 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 three addenda for this solicitation to reschedule the pre-proposal conference, answer proponent's questions, and extend the proposal due date.	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 bidder's compliance with those required documents.</li> <li>• Unclear or inconsistent responsiveness determinations could be a red flag of bid manipulation.</li> </ul>	<p>DOP received three submittals for this solicitation and deemed all proponents responsive.</p> <p>However, IPro found that a responsive proponent indicated that the financial statements were audited by a certified public accountant but did not provide a letter from a certified accountant or accounting firm.</p>	<p>DOP's determination for responsiveness included reviewing Form 3 and three years of financials. The missing validation from a certified public accountant was not determined to be a sufficient reason to deem the supplier to be non-responsive. The financials were forwarded to Risk for an in-depth review and assessment. Risk determined that the information was sufficient for evaluation.</p>
<b>Conflict of Interest</b>	<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>	No findings identified	N/A
<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> <li>• 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.</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>	<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>	No findings identified	N/A