

CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

OFFICE OF THE CITY AUDITOR

Follow-up review of the audit of the
Procurement Services Department (08/09-01)

Report #09/10-05

August 25, 2010



City Auditor's Office

Memorandum

No: 09/10-09

Date: August 25, 2010

To: Mayor John P. "Jack" Seiler
Vice-Mayor Romney Rogers
Commissioner Bruce G. Roberts
Commissioner Charlotte E. Rodstrom
Commissioner Bobby B. DuBose

From: John Herbst, CPA, CGFO
City Auditor

Re: Follow-up review of the audit of the Procurement Services Department

The City Auditor's Office has performed a follow-up of our *Operational Audit of the Procurement Services Department (Report #08/09-01)*. Our review procedures consisted of staff inquiries and limited analysis of documentation provided by management. We did not perform substantial tests of evidence supporting the replies from staff responsible for resolving audit findings and recommendations. City administration has the ultimate fiduciary responsibility to make sure that all known operational deficiencies are addressed and public resources are managed in the most efficient manner.

According to the Comptroller General of United States:

“Auditing is essential to government accountability to the public. Audits and attestation engagements provide an independent, objective, nonpartisan assessment of the stewardship, performance, or cost of government policies, programs, or operations, depending upon the type and scope of the audit.

Audit recommendations are well researched solutions to deficiencies noticed during the audit. Implementation of recommendations results in improvements in processes and controls. Not implementing recommendations allows the known deficiencies to continue resulting in waste or operational inefficiencies.”

In our initial report, we made 11 recommendations related to our audit findings and 14 auditor comments that represent opportunities for improvement. To date, 8 (73%) of the audit finding recommendations have been implemented. In addition, 9 (64%) of the auditor comments have been implemented. The remaining recommendations and auditor comments are either open or in-process. We will continue monitoring these items until resolution.

The attached report illustrates the status of each of the recommendations and auditor comments.

We are asking that the Commission direct the City Manager to expedite implementation of the remaining recommendations and auditor comments.

cc: Allyson Love, Acting City Manager
Ted Lawson, Assistant City Manager
Kirk Buffington, Director of the Procurement Services Department

Finding- 1

Finding/Condition- The CAO determined that 98 of 320 (31%) authorized Direct Purchase users could create and also approve their own requisition authorizations (RAs) and purchase requisitions. We also determined that the Direct Purchase list of authorized users includes numerous terminated former employees.

Auditor Recommendation- The City Manager should require the PSD Director to develop a policy:

1. That prohibits an employee who has the authority to create purchase requisitions and requisition authorizations from also having the ability to approve their own purchase requisitions and requisition authorizations.
2. To annually recertify each employee's access privileges for each software program used by Procurement Services to assure that access is restricted to those who need it to perform current job duties.

Management Response- Management concurs: Policy will be reflected in the PSD manual, and shall be implemented within the Direct Purchase and BuySpeed purchasing software. **TIME:** thirty (30) days from report

On an annual basis PSD shall implement an audit/review of each employee whom has access to the Procurement software programs

Follow-Up Action – Amendment to Procurement Manual

Status - CLOSED

Implementation Date- June 1, 2009

Finding-2

Finding/Condition- The City of Fort Lauderdale has an informal bid protest/dispute resolution process that is not communicated to vendors and does not include an organizationally independent review of the protest.

Auditor Recommendation- The City Manager should require the Director of PSD to:

1. Obtain Commission approval for amending the Code of Ordinances and creating a formalized bid protest procedure.
2. Include the bid protest procedures in the bid documents.
3. Include a bond requirement and timeline for filing a bid protest.

Assign an Assistant City Manager to hear bid protests who is independent of PSD and the department making the purchase.

Management Response-

1. Management concurs, with exceptions: A Bid Protest Policy and Procedures shall be written and presented to the Commission for their review and approval. TIME: Sixty (60) days from report
2. Once reviewed and approved the policy shall be included in the City's solicitation documents.
3. At this time Management does not recommend the requirement for a bid protest bond. The bond, if required, may prevent small businesses, with legitimate issues, from filing any protest.
4. The policy will reflect the assignment of an Assistant City Manager to review the bid protest.

Follow-Up Action – Discussions/evaluations on this matter are currently being discussed between the PSD and the CMO.

Status – CLOSED

Implementation Date- Anticipated to go before the City Commission for review at the September 7, 2010 conference meeting.

Finding-3

Finding/Condition- The CAO found that CFL erroneously paid \$69,175 in Federal Excise taxes on gasoline purchased from our secondary gasoline suppliers for the last three fiscal years. As a governmental entity, CFL is entitled to an exemption from these taxes. Furthermore, the Florida sales tax exemption number in the General Terms and Conditions document was incorrect and the Federal Excise Tax number was no longer valid

Auditor Recommendation- The City Manager should require the Director of PSD to:

1. Immediately provide all the existing fuel vendors with a completed Federal Excise Tax exemption certificate.
2. Establish a written procedure to require the Fleet Services Procurement Specialist to provide all new fuel vendors (including emergency purchases) with a copy of the exemption certificate.
3. Revise the General Terms and Conditions document to update the Florida Sales Tax exemption number and remove the reference to the former/invalid Federal Excise Tax exemption number and replace it with language about providing fuel vendors with CFL's exemption certificate.

The City Manager should also require the Finance Director to:

1. Establish a procedure and fix responsibility with appropriate staff to verify that CFL is not paying Federal Excise taxes on all fuel purchases.

Prepare and file a refund claim with the IRS to recover the \$69,175 in Federal Excise Taxes that has been erroneously paid to our fuel suppliers since FY05/06.

Management Response- Management concurs, with the following notations of what has already been accomplished:

1. All existing fuel vendors have been provided with a Federal Excise Tax Exemption Certificate
2. This policy addition will be reflected in the Department's Policy and Procedure Manual
3. The General Terms and Conditions are being revised to reflect the suggested changes. TIME: thirty (30) days from report
4. FINANCE: The Finance Director has instructed the Treasurer to prepare and file the appropriate forms requesting a refund from the IRS.

Auditor Note: Recommendation 1 regarding providing exemption certificates to all existing fuel vendors was implemented effective 12/18/08.

City of Fort Lauderdale
City Auditor's Office
Procurement Services Department Follow-up Audit
08/24/2010

Follow-Up Action – Implemented

Status – CLOSED

Implementation Date- #1 Implemented June 2009; #2 Implemented March 2009; Item #3 Implemented November 2008; Item #4 Finance has submitted the forms to the IRS- In Process.

City of Fort Lauderdale
City Auditor's Office
Procurement Services Department Follow-up Audit
08/24/2010

Finding- 4

Finding/Condition- The CAO determined that CFL's Municipal Code Chapter 2, Article V, Division 2 regarding purchasing does not incorporate all of the relevant sections of the Florida Statutes. The Florida Statutes in the table below are identified as being applicable to the CFL's purchasing function, but are not referenced in the code.

Florida Statutes x-ref	Description	Applicable to CFL	Included in Purchasing Ordinance
218.80	Public Bid Disclosure Act –all local government permits or fees payable by the contractor must be disclosed by the unit of government in bidding documents or RFP; prohibits local governments from halting construction for non-payment of fees that were not disclosed.	Yes	No
255.0525	Advertising requirements for competitive bids or proposals: construction project projected to cost more than \$200,000 shall be publicly advertised at least once in a newspaper of general circulation in the county where the project is located at least 21 days prior to the established bid opening and at 5 days before pre-bid conference. Projects projected to cost more than \$500,000 should be advertised at least 30 days prior and 5 days before pre-bid conference. Disclosure of bid opening location, date and time requirements must be disclosed in bid or proposal advertisement.	Yes	No

Auditor Recommendation- The City Manager should require the Director of PSD to revise the Procurement Manual and consider proposing a revision to the CFL Code of Ordinances to include by reference all applicable sections of the Florida Statutes that relate to the procurement function.

Management Response- Management concurs, however it should be noted that the two instances referenced above, are both applicable to construction bidding, and historically these solicitations have been bid by the Public Works and Engineering Department. However, the Department Manual will reflect references and cross-checks to the applicable Florida State Statutes. TIME: thirty (30) days.

As the PSD prepares changes to the Code, as referenced in other parts of this report, the department will work with the City Attorney's Office, to reflect these references where appropriate.

City of Fort Lauderdale
City Auditor's Office
Procurement Services Department Follow-up Audit
08/24/2010

Follow-Up Action – Procurement Manual has been updated to incorporate relevant references to Florida Statutes in appropriate sections. Code amendments are currently being reviewed between PSD and CMO.

Status- Partially complete

Implementation Date - March 2010 for Procurement Manual.

Finding- 5

Condition- The CAO determined the Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) dated 2/26/07, prepared by All Hands Consulting, has not been tested and has the following limitations:

1. The Operational Capability section, which describes the method by which the department will be able to provide operational capability for essential functions within 12 hours, is still pending.
2. Validation of external communications capabilities at all alternate facilities has not been verified.
3. The COOP kit containing purchase orders, contracts, vendor lists, and other information and documents critical to PSD's ability to function outside of City Hall is stored on site at City Hall.
4. The plan does not include procedures for processing of payments by Accounts Payable (AP) to ensure compliance with Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) requirements for reimbursements in a disaster/emergency situation.

Auditor Recommendation- The City Manager should require the Director of PSD to:

1. Coordinate testing of their portion of the COOP in cooperation with the EMD to determine if the plan is viable and executable prior to an actual emergency.
2. Coordinate with the EMD to complete the Operational Capability section of the COOP to ensure that critical functions are achievable within 12 hours of plan activation.
3. Coordinate with the EMD and develop a policy that would require annual testing of the COOP Communications Plan and validate external communications at alternate facilities.
4. Establish a secure site away from City Hall to locate the COOP kit.

Coordinate with the Director of the Finance Department to review the purchasing component of the COOP in an attempt to proactively incorporate FEMA reimbursement requirements from an emergency purchasing perspective.

Management Response- Management Concur: PSD will begin working with both Emergency Management and the Finance Department to coordinate testing and develop a policy to achieve the above recommendations: TIME: on-going

Follow-Up Action – The updated COOP Plan is partially complete. There is an outstanding issue regarding the actual testing of the optional work site that is currently being evaluated.

Status- Partially complete

Implementation Date- Implementation anticipated for October 2010.

Finding- 6

Condition- The CAO determined that there have been times when a requisition is approved by the Finance Department prior to funds being available at the character level, resulting in the user department going over the appropriated budget amount.

Auditor Recommendation- The City Manager should develop a policy that would require the Finance Director to review and approve a requisition prior to the application of a funds control override that results in overspending of the appropriated budget amount at the character level.

Management Response- The Finance Department has enhanced the review and approval process for requisitions in requiring "special authorization" be obtained from the Finance Director when the appropriated budget will be overspent at the character level. The Controller will act in the Finance Director's absence to ensure timely processing.

Follow-Up Action – Certain circumstances allow the Controller's designee to override at the character level (i.e. Budget amendment has not posted to FAMIS). Otherwise, Controller will authorize overspending for particular circumstances.

Status- CLOSED

Implementation Date- November 2009

Finding- 7

Condition- The CAO determined that the purchase requisition and associated pre-encumbrances in FAMIS were not entered before the bids were evaluated. This condition was noted for 1 of 9 (11%) Invitations to Bid (ITB), and for 5 of 8 (63%) Requests for Proposal (RFP).

Auditor Recommendation- The City Manager should require the Director of PSD to ensure that all requisitions be prepared and approved and pre-encumbrances posted to FAMIS prior to the bid being posted to BidSync

Management Response- Management concurs: The exceptions referenced above represent a total of 14 out of 295 competitive solicitations. PSD agrees that the internal control referenced is important and valuable to the critical budgeting process. The PSD will revise the policy to require that the City Manager approve the release of any competitive solicitation if pre-encumbrances have not been posted to FAMIS.

Follow-Up Action – Instructions have been incorporated in the Procurement Manual informing departments that requisition pre-encumbrance is required before their Procurement Specialist will prepare their solicitation. Additionally the Buyspeed Online system is programmed so that requisitions must be approved by the Finance Department (Accounting) before they are forwarded to Procurement.

Status – CLOSED

Implementation Date- June 2009

Finding- 8

Condition- The CAO determined that the City Municipal Code, Section 2-182, relating to purchases of supplies and contractual services requires that three (3) competitive bids be obtained by mail or by telephone whenever the total cost does not exceed \$25,000.

This is in conflict with Section 2-180, which states that when the estimated cost shall exceed \$10,000, written and sealed bids are required and the bid is awarded to the lowest and best responsible bidder

Auditor Recommendation- The City Manager should require the Director of PSD to review the CFL Code of Ordinances and suggest revisions that would resolve the conflicts between Sections 2-180 and 2-182 by more clearly defining the purchasing and contracting requirements for supplies and contractual services.

Management Response- Management Concur. See Management Response to Finding 4 above.

Follow-Up Action – Revisions to the code are currently being reviewed between PSD and the CMO.

Status – OPEN

Implementation Date- TBD

Finding- 9

Condition- The CAO determined that Conflict of Interest Statements are not required to be completed by personnel involved in the procurement process.

Auditor Recommendation- The City Manager should require the Director of PSD to develop a policy that would require Conflict of Interest Statements be completed by key personnel involved in the procurement process.

Management Response- Management concurs: PSD employees, as members of the National Institute of Governmental Purchasing (NIGP), subscribe to the Institute's Code of Ethics; however, PSD will require each PSD employee, involved in the procurement process, to sign a Conflict of Interest statement at time of each employee's annual review. *Additionally, each PSD employee will execute a Conflict of Interest Statement for each competitive solicitation in which they are involved. Other departmental personnel involved in the process, shall also be required to acknowledge and sign a Conflict of Interest statement, depending on their level of involvement; i.e.,*

members of selection and evaluation committees. *PSD will also review the current requirements regarding departmental personnel involved in the informal quote process and establish a policy requiring that those employees also acknowledge and sign a Conflict of Interest Statement. . TIME: on-going*

Follow-Up Action – Instructions regarding this items, have been included in the Procurement Manual and are being followed by Committee members and Procurement Specialists.

Status - CLOSED

Implementation Date- June 2009 for Committee members and May 2010 for Procurement Specialists.

Finding- 10

Condition- The CAO determined that the procedures for proprietary purchases are not consistently followed. Our testing revealed the following:

- 8 of 16 (50%) of items tested did not have a Proprietary Quotation Form approved by the Department Director or designee.
- 11 of 16 (69%) of items tested did not have price documentation included.
- 6 of 17 (35%) of items tested did not have a statement of justification included.

Auditor Recommendation- The City Manager should require the Director of PSD to:

1. Create a policy that would require that procedures for proprietary purchases be applied to: contract renewals, maintenance and service agreements, software upgrades and leases.
2. Revise the format of the quarterly Contract Renewal report for service maintenance agreements to separate proprietary renewals from those, which were initially competitively bid. To further enhance the usefulness of the Contract Renewal report a comment box should be added to provide explanatory language to justify the reason for the proprietary renewal.

Management Response-Management Concur: however, in some cases where the Proprietary Quotation form was not completed, the department head had instead written and presented, via PSD, a City Commission item explaining the justification and need for a particular proprietary purchase. It should also be noted, that any proprietary purchase exceeding \$10,000, including software and maintenance agreements and contract renewals, requires City Commission approval, with the

City of Fort Lauderdale
City Auditor's Office
Procurement Services Department Follow-up Audit
08/24/2010

exception of those proprietary purchases made entirely with grant funds.

This has already been accomplished, as the last quarterly report reflected those contracts, which were proprietary

Follow-Up Action – Policy included in Policy manual. Quarterly reports currently reflect no contracts that are proprietary. All proprietary contracts are presented to the City Commission as Motion for Discussion (MD) items.

Status – CLOSED

Implementation Date- June 2009

Finding- 11

Condition- The City Commission is not involved with reviewing the bid specifications for Requests for Proposals (RFPs).

Auditor Recommendation- The City Manager should require the Director of PSD to revise the department's procedure to provide the Commission with copies of bid specifications for RFPs > \$100,000 after an RFP has been issued but prior to bid award.

Management Response- Management Concur: TIME: thirty (30) days

Follow-Up Action – The Commission is given copies of all RFP's over \$100,000 for their review prior to award.

Status – CLOSED

Implementation Date- June 2009

Auditor Comment-1

Condition- The City's Code of Ordinances, Section 2-174 (d) currently separates procurement for Public Works from PSD. As a result, Public Works has developed its own purchasing system with separate purchase order numbers. We can find no compelling reason why the responsibility for all purchasing should not be invested solely in the PSD, which has the necessary skills, training and expertise to administer purchasing in a manner consistent with the applicable city policy, ordinances and Florida Statutes.

Auditor Recommendation- The City Manager should propose a change to the Code of Ordinances to consolidate all purchasing activities in the PSD.

Management Response- Management will begin an analysis of the impact of this change to the organizational structure

Follow-Up Action – Discussions are on-going between Procurement Services, Public Works and ACM's, to determine the best way to accomplish this utilizing our current systems.

Status – OPEN

Implementation Date- TBD

Auditor Comment-2

Condition- The CAO determined that towing fees were posted to revenue subobject N907, index code PMM010101 however, these permit fees do not directly support PSD like a program user fee. To enhance financial reporting, these fees should be captured in FAMIS under a non-departmental index code with the other general revenues of the City.

Auditor Recommendation- The City Manager should require the Finance Director to direct the Treasurer to record the revenue received from West Way Towing, Inc in the same index code as the other general revenues of the City. Furthermore, to ensure consistency and completeness in the receipting, recording and monitoring of revenues, the Treasury division should account for all contract revenues

Management Response- The Finance Director has instructed the Treasurer to transfer FY2009 revenue posted from PMM010101 Procurement, subobject N907 Towing Fees to FIN040301 Other GF Revenue, subobject N907 Towing Fees and all future revenue will be posted to FIN040301 Other GF Revenue, subobject N907 Towing Fees.

Follow-Up Action – See Management response.

Status – CLOSED

Implementation Date- October 2009

Auditor Comment-3

Condition- The CAO determined that 1 of 8 (13%) Procurement Specialists did not take an absence, vacation or sick leave, for at least one full week in FY07/08. One Procurement Specialist was excluded from the testing because he started on 11/5/07; therefore he was not an employee for the full fiscal year

Auditor Recommendation- The City Manager should require the Director of PSD to establish a policy to have each Procurement Specialist take at least one continuous week of vacation every year.

Management Response- Management notes the comment, and will effectuate a policy that will require each Procurement Specialist to take at least one week of annual leave, with the understanding that as conditions change, i.e., loss of an employee, natural disaster, commission priority, an employee may not be able to take leave. Ultimately, service to the citizens must be the first priority.

Follow-Up Action – All Procurement staff have taken at least one week of continuous vacation in a calendar year 2009.

Status – CLOSED

Implementation Date- On-going

Auditor Comment-4

Condition- The CAO determined that the performance measures included in the FY07/08 Annual Operating Budget for the PSD were accurately calculated. However, the performance measures could be improved to include the four elements of the Balanced Scorecard approach: customer, internal processes, learning & growth, and financial. Four of the six (67%) measures are financial and 2 of 6 (33%) relate to internal processes. Incorporating these four elements in the performance measurement would enable the PSD to better measure departmental effectiveness as it relates to the City's Vision.

Examples of this would be:

- **Customer** - Perform customer satisfaction surveys for internal and external customers and report results in annual performance measures.
- **Internal Processes** - Include the number of bid award recommendations accepted by the City Commission, estimated average number of days to process requisitions, purchase orders (PO,s), RFP's etc., number of protests filed and number of protests upheld.
- **Learning & growth** - Include performance measures related to training provided to staff regarding p-card, the bid solicitation process, and outreach provided to Women and Minority Business Enterprises.
- **Financial** - Include performance measures pertaining to average monthly amount spent on p-cards, % total expended on p-cards, and number of POs and total yearly amount.

Auditor Recommendation- The City Manager should require the Director of PSD to evaluate the appropriateness of the six current performance indicators, which are primarily focused on financial measures of efficiency. Emphasis should be placed on identifying additional indicators that PSD must meet or exceed to satisfy its stakeholder's needs, such as customer satisfaction, throughput, turnaround times and commitment to learning and continuous improvement. These additional measures should also be incorporated into the Annual Budget (target vs. actual).

Management Response- Management concurs: PSD will review performance measures as described, and incorporate them, where and when appropriate into the budget process.

Follow-Up Action – The PSD continues an ongoing review of performance measures (i.e. customer satisfaction survey). By October 2010, PSD shall have completed the internal customer survey.

Status – On-going

Implementation Date- TBD

Auditor Comment-5

Condition- The CAO determined that PSD does not have a policy to require the Procurement Specialists to be rotated every 3 years to reduce the risk of employee/vendor procurement fraud. PSD has divided the City into 26 departments/divisions for the purpose of assigning Procurement Specialists to a specific department/division. Seven Procurement Specialists are assigned to the 26 departments/division, 3 such employees have been employed in the PSD for more than three years. We excluded from testing the 4 Procurement Specialists that have been in the PSD for 3 years or less.

The CAO determined that of the 3 Procurement Specialists that have been in the PSD for more than three (3) years they have been assigned to the same departments/divisions as follows:

- 12 of 14 (86%) for more than 3 years
- 2 of 14 (14%) for less than 3 years.

We determined that one Procurement Specialist was assigned to one department/division for 12 years. Effective internal controls require rotating of job assignments to deter fraud/theft.

Auditor Recommendation- The City Manager should require the Director of PSD to develop a policy that would require Procurement Specialists to be rotated among the various departments/division at least once every 3 years

Management Response- Management concurs with the premise, but also has to maintain a level of service to every department within the City. Four procurement specialists were all hired within a year of each other, and therefore, rotation of assignments has been difficult. Additionally, at the same time, a long term Procurement Specialist retired. Generally, it takes a minimum of a year, of the Procurement Specialist working with the assigned departments to develop a comfort level and technical expertise to support the assigned departments. PSD will review assignments on an on-going basis, and will rotate, when the rotation and reassignment can be done, without impacting the service level to any department or to our citizens.

Follow-Up Action – Three Procurement Specialists were involved in department responsibility rotations in Calendar 2009 and two additional Procurement Specialists will be involved in department rotations in Calendar year 2010/2011.

Status – CLOSED

Implementation Date - TBD

Auditor Comment-6

Condition- PSD does not have an effective system in place to monitor and communicate problems with vendors to enhance future purchasing decisions. Furthermore, PSD does not have a vendor disqualification list. PSD management explained that problems with vendors may be documented through the use of the vendor complaint form, which is completed by the user department. The vendor complaint form is submitted to PSD to be included as written documentation in the contract file; however they are not used in a meaningful way to improve vendor performance.

Auditor Recommendation- The City Manager should require the Director of PSD to develop an Access or similar database, which includes all complaints and the actions taken to resolve these complaints to further enhance the documentation process. Additionally, once a complaint has been investigated by PSD, any actions necessary to resolve the problem should be communicated to all user departments throughout the City who work with that vendor.

Management Response- Management concurs; however the development of any database, Access or otherwise, will require resources that currently are not available, for both PSD and all using departments. The previously mentioned vendor complaint form is now available and accessible by all using departments, through the shared drive network.

Disqualification (suspension or debarment) are serious actions that should not be taken lightly. PSD has not, up to this point, been presented with appropriate evidence and documentation that would lead to the suspension or debarment of a vendor.

Follow-Up Action – See Management response above. Additionally, a database has been created in a shared folder titles “Vendor Performance reports” which allows City Staff to access and review forms currently on file.

Status – CLOSED

Implementation Date - On-Going. Shared folder implemented on June 2009.

Auditor Comment- 7

Condition- The CAO determined that PSD conducted a survey of its internal customers in 2004. The survey respondents were generally satisfied with the operation of the PSD; however, they expressed dissatisfaction with the low purchasing dollar thresholds. PSD has not performed a customer satisfaction survey since 2004, but has indicated that they will be performing another survey in FY08/09 of its internal customers.

Auditor Note: The CAO also noted that PSD has not performed a survey of external vendors.

Auditor Recommendation- The City Manager should require the Director of PSD to:

1. Perform an annual customer satisfaction survey of both internal customers and external vendors;
2. Summarize the results of the survey and develop an action plan to address those items of greatest significance.

Management Response- Management concurs: An internal customer survey will be conducted before the end of the current FY. The results will be reviewed, and an action plan developed where appropriate.

Follow-Up Action – An internal customer survey has been developed and implemented.

Status – CLOSED

Implementation Date- July 2010.

Auditor Comment- 8

Condition- The PSD requires user departments to obtain three (3) written or verbal quotes for goods/services, with the exception of goods/services purchased using established contracts. The PSD prefers that departments obtain written quotes for purchases over \$5,000, however this is not mandatory.

Our testing revealed that 3 of 18 (16.7%) did not have proof of written quotes in the purchasing file. While not currently a formal requirement, the CAO believes that as part of an effective system of internal controls, written quotes should be obtained and kept on file for all purchases over \$5,000.

Auditor Recommendation- The City Manager should require the Director of PSD to develop a policy requiring all purchases greater than \$5,000 to have written quotes or emails to:

- preserve the audit trail
- promote transparency, and
- enhance the integrity of the process.

Management Response- Management concurs: PSD intends to continue and roll-out the use of our e-procurement software (bidsync) to using departments for the purchase of goods and services exceeding \$5,000. The use of bidsync will preserve and electronic audit trail, promote transparency by use of the internet, and enhance the integrity of our small dollar purchasing process.

Follow-Up Action – More departments are utilizing the Bidsync software system to obtain their informal quotes. Purchase requisitions are monitored/reviewed by Procurement Specialists, to assure that written quotes are attached.

Status – CLOSED

Implementation Date- On-Going

Auditor Comment- 9

Condition- The CAO noted that written contracts are not required for one-time purchases resulting from an ITB, only a purchase order is used. It is PSD's policy to not require a written contract for a one-time commodity purchase.

Auditor Recommendation- The City Manager should require the Director of the PSD to include in the Procurement Manual a procedure for one-time purchases that are completed as the result of a bid solicitation.

Management Response- Management concurs, and has begun drafting a change to the manual.

Follow-Up Action – The Procurement Manual. Has been updated.

Status – CLOSED

Implementation Date- June 2009

Auditor Comment- 10

Condition- The CAO created a procurement questionnaire and solicited responses from comparable cities to determine what the "usual" procurement practices are relating to purchasing dollar thresholds, the bid solicitation process and staffing norms. The City purchasing thresholds are generally lower than other peer group cities as noted below and CFL purchasing policies differ in the following areas:

- 4 of 4 (100%) cities have formal bid thresholds of \$15,000 - \$50,000 compared to CFL's \$10,000 threshold
- 3 of 4 (75%) cities allow external parties to be a part of the evaluation committee with no strict guidelines that limit the number allowed.
- 2 of 4 (50%) cities have a policy prohibiting bidders and their lobbyists from having contact with members of the evaluation/selection committee prior to the official announcement of the award.

Auditor Recommendation- The City Manager should require the Director of PSD to consider proposing a revision to the CFL Code of Ordinances that would:

1. Increase the dollar threshold for when sealed bids are required and adjust all the

other thresholds accordingly.

2. Include a provision to periodically adjust the thresholds for inflationary factors.
3. Include a policy that the Director of PSD appoint a selection committee containing at least three members, whose duties include evaluation of proposers' responses, ranking of proposers, and recommending the top ranked proposer for award of a contract.
4. Include a policy prohibiting bidders and their lobbyists from having contact with PSD or members of the evaluation/selection committee prior to an award announcement.
5. Revise the purchasing code to require that price/cost be weighted at least 33% of the evaluation criteria for all competitive solicitations.

Management Response- Management concurs: See Management Response to finding 4 above. Our own survey conducted by PSD two years ago, showed that the City's thresholds were lower than many other agencies of comparable size and complexity. PSD currently works with the using departments in the formulation of the selection committees, but concurs with the Auditor recommendation that PSD should be the appointing party. The PSD currently has a document which is distributed to all members of the evaluation and selection committee, which advises against contact with vendor representatives during the evaluation process. PSD will incorporate this into the department's policy and procedures manual.

Follow-Up Action – Revisions are currently being reviewed/evaluated by PSD and the CMO.

Status – OPEN

Implementation Date- TBD

Auditor Comment- 11

Condition-The CAO determined that the PSD sets the majority of contracts for no more than a total of five (5) years, including the initial term and extensions. However, the contract could exceed 5 years in special situations such as where the vendor must invest a significant amount in capital or equipment to be able to provide services or when the availability of the good or service in the market place is scarce.

The CAO also determined that the City is a party to some contracts whose initial term is greater than 1 year

Auditor Recommendation- The City Manager should require the Director of PSD to consider proposing a revision to the Code of Ordinances that would:

1. Require the length of a contract not exceed four (4) years including the initial term and extensions.
2. Allow a contract term not to exceed five (5) years for those contracts in which the vendor has to make an upfront investment of at least \$50,000.
3. Incorporate into the Code of Ordinances language from Article 5.11 from the General Terms and Conditions document as follows:

"The obligation of the City for payment to a Contractor is limited to the availability of funds appropriated in a current fiscal period and continuation of the contract into a subsequent fiscal period is subject to appropriation of funds, unless otherwise authorized by law."

Management Response- Management concurs: PSD will begin the change to the length of contracts, with that release for bidding on or after July 1, 2009. Management believes that at times there may be an occasional exception to the policy of four years, and would request Commission approval of these exceptions prior to release of a formal solicitation.

Follow-Up Action – The Procurement Department has implemented changes into new solicitations and subsequent contracts. Code of Ordinance is currently being reviewed between PSD and CMO.

Status – Partially complete

Implementation Date- On-going

Auditor Comment- 12

Condition- The CAO determined the 2-page purchasing contract template could be improved with the provisions set forth in Florida Statutes 287.058, which are representative of best practice. The CAO reviewed the two-page standard contract template, the General Terms and Conditions Section 5.12, and Florida Statutes 287.058.

The CAO also determined that the right to audit clause in the General Terms and Conditions could be improved as follows: e.g. section 5.12 stating "The form of all records and reports shall be subject to the approval of the City's Internal Auditor" should be removed. Additionally, an enhanced right to audit clause regarding retention of records should be included with language stating "all books of account, reports and records relating to this contract should be retained for the duration of the contract and for three years after the final payment under this Agreement, or until all pending audits, investigations or litigation matters relating to the contract are closed, whichever is later."

Auditor Recommendation- The City Manager should require the Director of PSD to:

1. Include similar language from Florida Statutes 287.058 regarding provisions of contract documents, for example:

- a. A provision that bills for fees or other compensation for services or expenses be submitted in detail sufficient for a proper preaudit and postaudit thereof.
- b. A provision dividing the contract into units of deliverables, which shall include, but not be limited to, reports, findings, and drafts, that must be received and accepted in writing by the contract manager prior to payment

2. Revise the General Terms and Conditions Section 5.12, Records/Audit to delete the statement "The form of all records and reports shall be subject to the approval of the City's Internal Auditor".

3. Revise the General Terms and Conditions Section 5.12, Records/Audit to include language similar to the following "all books of account, reports and records relating to this contract should be retained for the duration of the contract and for three years after the final payment under this Agreement, or until all pending matters are closed, whichever is later."

Management Response- Management concurs: PSD has been working in collaboration with the City Attorney's Office for the last few months in formulating a new contract template. The above suggestions will be incorporated into the new template, where appropriate, and with agreement of the City Attorney's Office. Revisions to the General Terms and Conditions are also being reviewed by the Attorney's Office, and the above will also be incorporated where appropriate.

City of Fort Lauderdale
City Auditor's Office
Procurement Services Department Follow-up Audit
08/24/2010

Follow-Up Action – All recommendations have been completed and changes made to Contract boilerplate and General Terms and Conditions.

Status – CLOSED

Implementation Date- June 2010

Auditor Comment- 13

Condition- The CAO also reviewed Section 2-181 of the City's Code of Ordinances and concluded that the absence of a formal contract is not in the best interest of the City. According to this section of the code " When the estimated cost of supplies and contractual services is twenty-five thousand dollars (\$25,000) or over, a contract for same may be awarded by the city commission to the lowest and best responsible bidder without formal contract."

Auditor Recommendation- The City Manager should require the Director of PSD to propose an amendment to the Purchasing Code to require a formal contract for all purchases greater than \$25,000.

Management Response- Management concurs: Although this exception is in the Code the PSD, as a rule, has made this a practice.

Follow-Up Action – Revisions to the Code are currently being reviewed between PSD and CMO.

Status – OPEN

Implementation Date- TBD

Auditor Comment- 14

Condition- The CAO noted that CFL does not have a procedure to have vendor financial statements reviewed and evaluated by the Finance Department when they are required as part of the solicitation process. A thorough financial evaluation of prospective vendors will help the City determine if a vendor has sufficient financial capacity to perform under the contract.

Auditor Recommendation- The City Manager should require the Finance Director to establish a procedure to have knowledgeable finance staff perform an analysis of the financial capacity of competing bidders.

Management Response- The Finance Director will seek the resources necessary to contract with local Certified Public Accountants to provide an analysis of the financial capacity for bidders or, in the alternative, will utilize available financial analyses to be provided by bidders in response to an RFP as a measure of financial capacity.

Follow-Up Action – Should the solicitation require a financial evaluation of the prospective bidders financial statements the Finance Director will assign staff to provide the review.

Status – CLOSED

Implementation Date- November 2009