



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-1220072
Estimated Dollar Amount:	\$2,988,000.00
Type of Procurement:	Request for Proposals
Contract Description:	Landscape Maintenance and Debris Control at Hartsfield-Jackson Atlanta International Airport
Requesting Department:	Department of Aviation
All Bidders:	Ed Castro Landscape, Inc. Mainscape, Inc. City Green Services, LLC Creek Boys Lawn Services Pro Cutters Landscapes, Inc. Russell Landscape, LLC Rubber Boots Lawn Care Service Simply Beyond Expectations, LLC WCC Landscaping & Maintenance
DOP Responsive Bidders:	Ed Castro Landscape, Inc. Mainscape, Inc.
Recommended Awardee:	Ed Castro Landscape, 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	No response needed
Solicitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 solicitation was previously cancelled under solicitation RFP-S-1210266.	No response needed
Advertisement/ Addenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	No response needed

Review Area	Risk/Criteria	Results	DOP Response
Submittal	<p>The city code and DOP policy and procedures provide guidance for the receipt of competitive sealed bids.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bidders must provide sealed bids via the ATLCLOUD electronic procurement system, no later than 2:00 P.M., ET on date specified in the advertisement or addenda. • Bids shall be received without alteration or correction except as authorized by the CPO. (City Code Sec. 2-1188). 	No findings identified	No response needed
Responsive Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>In its review, IPro identified omissions in proponents' submittals that were also identified by DOP (outside of its Responsiveness Checklist and communicated Bases for Determination of Non-Responsiveness) and waived as minor technicalities, including those pertaining to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Office of Contract Compliance (Appendix A) • IIREA (Form 1) • Authority to Transact Business in GA • Ethics Pledge (Form 7) • Contractor Disclosures (Form 2) • Contractor Financial Disclosures (Form 3) <p>In addition, IPRO found the following discrepancies in the proponents' submittals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A non-responsive proponent failed to provide References (Form 5) as required by the solicitation. 2. A non-responsive proponent failed to provide Exhibit 2 of the cost proposal as required by the solicitation. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The supplier included four (4) references and the required details in a separate attachment. 2. The solicitation requires A.1 of Exhibit 1 for evaluation of the monthly and annual cost. Cost requested in Exhibit A.2. is requested as additional information on behalf of the User Agency and is inconsequential for evaluation.
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>	No findings identified	No response needed

Review Area	Risk/Criteria	Results	DOP Response
Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	No findings identified	No response needed
Cancellation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	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)	No findings identified	No response needed