



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#	SP-APD-2212-1230170
Estimated Dollar Amount:	\$109,228,874- ten years with two one-year renewal options
Type of Procurement:	Special Procurement
Contract Description:	Body Cameras/ Police Equipment and Services
Requesting Department:	Atlanta Police Department
All Proponents:	Axon Enterprise, Inc.
DOP Responsive Proponents:	N/A
Recommended Awardee:	Axon Enterprise, Inc.

TABLE OF FINDINGS

Review Area	Risk/Criteria	Results	DOP Response
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	N/A
Award	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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) • Special Procurements require the following documentation, according to City Code Section 2-1214, DOP SOP Sec 4.8: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Procurement request form from user agency ○ Department memo to CPO detailing the unusual and/or unique situation ○ CPO's written determination/approval for special procurement ○ Original IRREA form ○ Statement of work and corresponding competitive quotes (at a minimum three (3) quotes shall be reflected or justification otherwise) ○ Insurance (if applicable) ○ Approved requisition ○ Conflict of interest form ○ SAM verification ○ Authority to Transact Business in Georgia (DOP SOP Sec. 4.8) 	<p>The Department of Procurement did not provide the following required documents:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) A Statement of Work and corresponding competitive quotes from a minimum of three vendors. 2) An approved requisition identifying the source of funding. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) A Statement of Work was submitted to the user agency and DOP along with contracts for the same vendor with four (4) different municipalities that have similar scopes of work which were used to complete a cost analysis. The pricing quoted to APD is competitive as compared to the NASPO co-op (expiring May 2023) where the State of Georgia is a host of the agreement, City of Charlotte, North Carolina and City of Palm Beach, Florida, and it has been determined that the City of Atlanta is receiving a competitive offer. 2) APD has already paid for services within this budget year. This agreement will be established and paid for out of the next fiscal year's budget.

Review Area	Risk/Criteria	Results	DOP Response
		<p>In addition to the above, IPro review revealed the following:</p> <p>3) The proponent requested a meeting with a member of the User Agency (UA) and another member of the proponent’s team on November 13, 2022, before meeting with a councilmember on November 14, 2022. On November 15, 2022, the proponent communicated to the UA that sponsorship was likely needed to introduce legislation. They stated they believed they could work with two councilmembers to facilitate the sponsorship on their behalf.</p> <p>4) A UA member emailed an Agreement for Services to a non-City employee family member to an external email account to print and bring home.</p> <p>5) The proponent advised the UA that it sent a note to City “Legal” and “Purchasing” to remind them of the pricing deadline.</p>	<p>3) APD acknowledged the meetings and agreed to provide training to all staff involved in procurements to mitigate this from occurring in the future. When APD met with DOP, they were transparent that there were conversations with the vendor related to expanding the services.</p> <p>4) APD identified that corrective action will be taken by issuing a reminder to the department to keep all city business on city computers, applications and email accounts and specifically retrain this employee once they have been identified.</p> <p>5) APD identified that corrective action will be taken that communications with vendors should follow the appropriate process to send all notices and communications ONLY to procurement.</p>