



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-C/DOT/ 2211-1230184
Estimated Dollar Amount:	\$2,327,095.25 - one two-year term with no renewal options
Type of Procurement:	Special Procurement
Contract Description:	Group AA3- Traffic Communications Projects
Requesting Department:	Department of Transportation
All Proponents:	Lumin8 Transportation Technologies, LLC
DOP Responsive Proponents:	N/A
Recommended Awardee:	Lumin8 Transportation Technologies, LLC

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) 	1) The UA stated it obtained quotes from three vendors, and DOP stated it had information for two vendors. The procurement file contained no documentation reflecting vendors contacted to obtain the statement of work and corresponding competitive quotes, nor any correspondence containing or attaching substantive responses from vendors.	1) DOP provided an email to IPRO on 3/21/23 which included a document titled "RFP Email." This email was sent to vendors by ATL-DOT. ATL-DOT personnel noted that the vendors were bcc'd on the email to maintain transparency ensuring all vendors received the same information at the same time. The link included in the email contained the solicitation documentation. A third quote was mistakenly omitted from DOP's original submission to IPRO as it was not located in the responses folder.

Review Area	Risk/Criteria	Results	DOP Response
		2) An approved requisition was not submitted.	2) DOP provided an email to IPro on 3/21/23 which included a document titled "Budget Change." This document shows evidence that funding for this action is available. ATL-DOT finance personnel noted that the approved requisition will be included in the legislative package