



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#	IFB-S-1220215
Estimated Dollar Amount:	\$500,000 Annually - Term: initial two (2) years with two (2) one (1) year renewal options
Type of Procurement:	Invitation For Bid
Contract Description:	On-Call POST Certified Officers
Requesting Department:	Department of Parks and Recreation
All Bidders:	Cloverhurst/Aaron JV, Metropolitan Security Associates, Force Security Inc.
DOP Responsive Bidders:	Cloverhurst/Aaron JV, Metropolitan Security Associates, Force Security, Inc
Recommended Awardee:	Cloverhurst/Aaron JV, Metropolitan Security Associates

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.	DOP rules require that evaluators follow the city's Standard of Ethical Conduct for Procurement and complete the evaluator ethics and commitment forms. One evaluator failed to provide a signed copy of the commitment form.	The solicitation was originally set to be evaluated by only one evaluator, as required for an Invitation for Bid. After the bids were received, the UA considered using two (2): however, due to time constraints, only used 1 (one).
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. 	No findings identified	N/A
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. 	DOP issued three addenda for this solicitation which: changed the pre-bid conference date, extended the date for bidders to ask questions, extended the bid due date (twice), revised the bid form, revised the instructions to the Bid Guarantee, and revised and replaced (Form 3) Bid Bond.	No response required

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	N/A
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>DOP received three bids for this solicitation and deemed all three bidders responsive.</p> <p>However, IPro identified that a prime contractor failed to provide the Secretary of State form authorizing the company to transact business in the State of Georgia.</p>	DOP found that the supplier was registered on the Secretary of State website and determined to waive the requirement as a minor technicality.
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
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. 	<p>A bid spread is the difference between the lowest and highest bids as a percentage of the lowest bid.</p> <p>The bid spread between the highest and lowest bidder is 26.67%. The bid spread between the lowest bid and the second lowest bid is 23.33%</p> <p>Bids this far apart could be an indication of collusive bidding.</p>	No response required
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	N/A
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	N/A