



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-1220311
Estimated Dollar Amount:	\$3,000,000 - \$5,000,000
Type of Procurement:	Request for Proposals
Contract Description:	Noise Insulation Program Design Services at Hartsfield Jackson Atlanta International Airport
Requesting Department:	Department of Aviation
All Proponents:	CHASM Architecture, LLC
DOP Responsive Proponents:	CHASM Architecture, LLC
Recommended Awardee:	CHASM Architecture, LLC

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.	An evaluator's Ethics Form is incomplete and lacks a reference to the associated project.	The project name will be added to the Evaluator's Ethics Form to complete the file.
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. 	The evaluation criteria were not readily accessible to view due to a broken link.	DOP will make it a practice to check hyperlinks before the solicitation is released.
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	N/A
Submittal	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).	DOP received one submittal for this solicitation.	No response required.

Review Area	Risk/Criteria	Results	DOP Response
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. 	The vendor failed to provide secondary contact information on the Vendor's Contact Directory Form (Form 4), as required.	DOP form's instructions state that the secondary contact is required where applicable. It may be understood that the secondary contact was not deemed applicable in accordance to the Proponent.
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) A member of the user agency's Noise Insulation Program communicated with the proponent during the solicitation and evaluation phase regarding an employment opportunity for a relative, thus creating an appearance of impropriety. (2) The proponent failed to disclose litigation within the last five years specifically related to payment to subcontractors, as required by the Contractor Financial Disclosure Form (Form 3). 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) DOP was not made aware of the conversation until IPRO's findings; however, it has not been conclusive that this is relevant to the solicitation. DOP provides training and advice during a solicitation regarding the blackout period. The blackout period prohibits the user agency team and proponents from engaging in conversations about the specific pending solicitation (2) DOP did not find evidence that the Supplier was terminated, suspended or debarred; therefore, did not identify the response to be inaccurate or a reason to deem the Supplier "non responsible". The User Agency is also in agreement of this recommendation.
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. Not applicable for RFPs. 	No findings identified	N/A

Review Area	Risk/Criteria	Results	DOP Response
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