



**1Q 2016 STATUS REPORT OF THE  
CHICAGO PROCUREMENT REFORM  
TASK FORCE**

**April 15, 2016**



# **1Q 2016 STATUS REPORT OF THE CHICAGO PROCUREMENT REFORM TASK FORCE**

**April 15, 2016**

The Procurement Reform Task Force (PRTF) was announced in May 2015 and tasked with developing recommendations to make procurement and contract management at the City and its sister agencies more uniform, efficient and cost effective, while increasing accountability. Its goal was to distinguish successful practices, identify areas for improvement and promote a greater level of uniformity across City government and each participating sister agency. A report, issued on November 17, 2015, detailed findings and recommendations for reforming the procurement policies and practices. The recommendations were intended to further current efforts to ensure that the policies and practices of the City and sister agencies support competition, efficiency, transparency, integrity, and uniformity in procurement.

The Participating Members of the PRTF respectfully submit the first quarterly report detailing the steps taken on the recommendations. The Department of Procurement Services, the Department of Innovation and Technology, and the procurement and information technology divisions of six of the City's sister agencies – Chicago Housing Authority, Chicago Park District, Chicago Public Schools, Chicago Transit Authority, City Colleges of Chicago, and Public Building Commission – have contributed to the development of this report.

The PRTF recommendations, developed in close collaboration with the Office of Inspector General, were intended to further current efforts to ensure that the policies and practices of the City and sister agencies support competition, efficiency, transparency, integrity, and uniformity in procurement. They outline actions to streamline operations, reduce redundancies, and enhance resource management across the City and its Sister Agencies.

The recommendations have been categorized into Immediate, Mid-Term, and Long-Term Recommendations. This status report reflects the advancement of the Immediate Recommendations and the assignment of the Mid-Term recommendations. Subsequent quarterly status reports will reflect the ongoing progress on all of the recommendations. The recommendations reflect a cross-section of procurement issues that impact both the vendor community as well as efficiencies within each government agency.



## **Procurement Reform Task Force- 1Q 2016 Quarterly Report April 15, 2016**

**Recommendation # 1. Create a Committee of the Participating Members' CPOs to rule on certain administrative decisions, address obstacles to coordination, and ensure best practices across the City and its sister agencies.**

**Recommendation # 2. Charge the CPO Committee with addressing the Task Force recommendations, tracking their implementation, and issuing quarterly progress reports.**

In December 2015, the CPO Committee of the PRTF was established. The meeting was hosted at the City of Chicago Department of Procurement Services (DPS) and attended by the CPOs of all Participating Members (CCC, CHA, Parks, CPS, CTA and PBC). The focus of the meeting was to determine an action plan for implementing the recommendations. To ensure ongoing progress towards reporting milestones, the Participating Members have maintained a biweekly meeting schedule. Each Immediate Term (1Q2016) recommendation was assigned a lead agency to manage the data collection, analysis, and draft agency consensus/implementation plan.

On January 13, 2016, Chicago City Council passed an ordinance for an intergovernmental agreement for all Participating Members to work cooperatively to implement recommendations identified in the November 2015 report. Each of the Participating Members have signed off on the IGA and established a similar agreement at their organization.

The IGA and related Sister Agency agreements stipulate that the PRTF will deliver quarterly status reports to the Mayor, an annual progress report to City Council, and participate in a public hearing of City Council to discuss the Annual Report. In addition, the City's Inspector General will make an annual independent evaluation of progress.

To facilitate the work of the CPO Committee, a PRTF SharePoint site was created as a repository for shared information among all of the Participating Members.

**Recommendation # 3: Establish minimum standards by which all Participating Members will publish their anticipated sole source awards, receive public and vendor feedback, and make decisions about whether a solicitation is necessary.**

In a survey of the Participating Members, it was determined that only the City and CPS publicly post sole source notices online in advance of any approval of a contract award. Further, only the City and CPS have a review committee that makes a recommendation to its CPO regarding sole source awards.

Requiring that proposed sole source awards be posted online in advance of approval of a sole source award in order to allow vendors the opportunity to comment on whether other vendors can supply the good or service provides the agency with a solid control over the improper use of sole source procurements. Additionally, creating a Non-Competitive Review Committee that reviews the appropriateness of a sole source award would reduce, if not eliminate, the possibility that sole source awards would be improperly awarded.

Therefore, it is the recommendation of the CPO Committee that each of the Participating Members begin to post their proposed sole source procurements online and create a Non Competitive Review Committee before the end of the 3rd quarter of 2016. It is further recommended that the Participating Members follow the procedures outlined below:

## *Policy*

All sole source procurements (“Sole Source”) will require a Justification for Non-Competitive Procurement Application (“Application”) and approval by the Non-Competitive Review Committee (“NCRC”) prior to award.

All proposed Applications will be posted on the Agency’s public website for a period of three (3) weeks. During this period, the public will be invited to comment and/or object and make a substantive claim that the procurement is not a Sole Source.

All public comments and/or objections will be provided to the NCRC. The NCRC will take into consideration the justification and supporting documents from the using department requesting the Non-Competitive Award, as well as the justification of the vendor and all public comments when reaching its decision. If the NCRC approves the Application, then the Procurement Department will prepare a Sole Source contract for the vendor and route the recommendation for approval. If the NCRC rejects the Application, then the Application will be returned to the user department for a resubmission as a competitive procurement.

## *Procedures*

1. User departments must create a request/requisition and submit a complete justification package to be considered by the NCRC.

User departments should be highly cognizant that the entire sole source process may take 8 to 12 months and should prepare accordingly; the fact that an existing contract is about to expire is not sufficient justification for approval by the NCRC.

2. Justification packages must include, at a minimum, the following requirements:
  - Application
  - Justification detailing the rationale and necessity for the procurement as well as the estimated cost and term of the agreement/contract
  - Signed funding memo (if applicable)
  - Scope of work
  - Complete, written justification from the vendor (on vendor letterhead) detailing the reasons why they are considered the exclusive and unique provider solely capable of supplying the goods/services
  - Required Compliance plan
  - Insurance Certificate, if applicable
  - Ownership Disclosure
  - List of user department's personnel participating in the NCRC meeting
  - If applicable, a current and valid price quotation for the goods and/or services, on the vendor's letterhead
  - Any applicable grant agreements or other benchmark information the user department deems relevant to its request
3. Applications will be publicly posted on agency website for a minimum of three (3) weeks.
4. If there are public objections and/or comments, those objections/comments will be forwarded to the NCRC to be considered as part of their review.
5. After a minimum of three (3) weeks, the Application is removed from the Agency’s website.

6. NCRC convenes to review and approve or reject the Application.
7. Approved Applications are scanned to Agency's internet site.
8. Rejected Applications are returned to the user department for resubmission as a competitive procurement.
9. A copy of the approved justification package will be forwarded to the appropriate Procurement personnel for processing.

**Recommendation #4: Hire or secure pro bono services from a law firm to:**

**a. Identify contract provisions that could be subject to standardization across Participating Members' templates, and draft uniform contract templates incorporating the required terms of the Participating Members, including contract duration and number of renewals.**

**b. Where appropriate, standardize solicitation documents issued by Participating Members and the documents required in response.**

Pro bono services have been secured from Clark Hill PLC to identify contract provisions that could be subject to standardization across Participating Members' templates, and draft uniform contract templates incorporating the required terms of the Participating Members, including contract duration and number of renewals.

Work on standardizing the templates has already started. All Participating Members have provided Clark Hill with their boilerplate construction, commodities, work services, and/or professional services contract templates. Clark Hill has substantially completed creating master templates for commodities and professional services contracts, and has started work on the master template for construction contracts. Clark Hill has also made a preliminary determination that a master template for work services contracts may not be useful because it appears that only two or three of the Participating Members have work services contracts.

In addition to the master templates, Clark Hill is developing "Additional Provisions" templates for each of the Participating Members to incorporate those provisions that are specific to a Participating Member and should not or cannot be included in the master templates. These templates will supplement the master templates; both types of templates will be formatted so that material can be easily removed, depending on what is needed for a particular contract.

The bulk of the remaining work to create standardized commodities, professional services, and construction templates consists of:

- developing the master construction template
- developing all Participating Agencies' Additional Provisions templates
- formatting all of the templates, including making the master templates generic, with appropriate blanks for each Participating Member to fill in its agency name

Once Clark Hill has a complete set of suggested templates, the Participating Members will provide feedback and evaluate adoption of the new templates.

**Recommendation #5: Charge the Chicago Government IT Coordination Committee, which consists of the CIOs of the Participating Members, with identifying the procurement-related systems that can be shared and developed jointly and developing a schedule for implementation.**

The IT Coordination Committee (ITCC) conducted an inventory of all operating systems, software, and other technology platforms currently used by the Participating Members to implement any procurement-related functions, including notation of the function served, the service provider, and contract period. In addition, the ITCC recorded any necessary procurement-related functions not currently being met by, or challenges associated with, these technology platforms, as well as any additional desired, but not required, functions or services requested by the Participating Members. In conducting this inventory, the groundwork has been established for developing an approach to development of a universal or shared procurement system.

In concert with Long Term Recommendation #28 (Implementation of a universal procurement system), the ITCC will further review the current systems used by each agency, determine the best design for a shared procurement system, and develop an implementation path to achieve that design. The end result may be a universal system or a shared component system, utilizing pieces from various agencies or new technology altogether.

The steps in this process include: inventory of procurement-related systems (completed, Q1 2016), review of systems for joint implementation/sharing (Q2 2016) and development of implementation path (Q3 2016).

**Recommendation #6: Post all contracts, vendors, and subcontractors on agency websites in a user-friendly and searchable format.**

The City, Chicago Park District, and Chicago Housing Authority utilize the City's contract web portal to link to individual contract portals. Chicago Public Schools and the Public Building Commission has a directly outward-facing contracts site. Long term initiatives include a uniform web portal, which will have all contracts available from all Agencies. This long term initiative has been assigned to the ITCC. To fulfill the short term recommendation, City Colleges has developed a web portal for recent Board-approved contracts to be publicly accessible and searchable. Chicago Transit Authority will utilize the Regional Transit Authority (RTA) portal to post contracts until the consolidated web portal is available.

Working towards a streamlined, permanent solution, the ITCC has conducted an inventory of all contracts, subcontracts, vendors, notices of award, prequalified pools and members, and debarred vendors. In addition, the ITCC surveyed how contracts and vendors were organized and/or classified by each Participating Member; for example, by contract type, subject matter area, or dollar amount. Finally, we determined how each Participating Member organized this information publicly; for example, using the City's Open Data Portal or its own website, and what mechanism was used to upload and store documents for public viewing.

While each agency currently posts this information on their individual websites, the approach to meeting this recommendation is to have all agencies post this information on the City's Open Data Portal. Next steps will be to further review how all contracts are classified to determine if a streamlined organizational structure can be created within the City's Open Data Portal, assess if automated uploads can be used across all agencies, and evaluate how each agency can utilize the Open Data Portal to publicly share this information.

The steps in this process include: inventory of contracts, vendors, etc. (Q1 2016), review of contract classification/organization, assessment of automatic document upload and evaluation of Open Data Portal utilization (Q2 2016).

**Recommendation #7: Create an easily accessible website for vendors and the public that provides a single location for: all of the Participating Members' current procurement opportunity listings and other procurement-related information such as the buying plan, notices of award, and prequalified pools; a list of all debarred vendors; and all current contract and vendor databases.**

An inventory was conducted of all procurement-related information and documents currently provided to the public by each Participating Member. In addition to standard information such as contracts, vendors, and prequalified pools, this included other information such as buying plans, public calendars for hearings, trainings, or other procurement-related events, affidavits and certification forms, FOIA requests, proposal requests, and online auctions.

In addition to conducting an inventory of information and documents provided, a review of each agency's website was conducted to examine presentation and user experience. Using information from this initial canvass, a prototype of a website has been developed that can serve as a starting point or one-stop shop for all procurement users for Participating Agencies. Next steps involve review of the website prototype by the full ITCC team.

In the interim, the CPO Committee has created a page on the City of Chicago website that contains a single location for links to all City of Chicago and Sister Agency procurement information specified in this recommendation. The information is contained on the PRTF website ([www.cityofchicago.org/prtf](http://www.cityofchicago.org/prtf)), but a more user-friendly and easily searchable URL ([www.chicagoprocurement.info](http://www.chicagoprocurement.info)) is in the process of being procured. Content includes:

- Overview of the Procurement Reform Task Force
- PRTF Reports
- Media releases updating the status of the work of the PRTF
- Links to Participating Member:
  - buying plan (consolidated)
  - upcoming contracting opportunities
  - awarded contracts
  - debarred vendors
  - shared outreach event calendar

**Recommendation #8: Establish minimum disclosure requirements for subcontractors and require posting subcontractor information online.**

The Participating Members' current disclosure requirements were assembled and reviewed. All Participating Members have the same or similar solicitation documents, including the Economic Disclosure Statement, Contractor's Affidavit, and M/W/DBE Compliance Schedules requesting primes and subcontractors to disclose subcontractor information such as ownership information, financial information, number of years in business, and delinquencies.

However, information regarding fraudulent activities, debarment, suspension, and other disciplinary actions by government agencies are not typically required of subcontractors but instead are mainly required of contractors and included in "flow down" contract provisions in prime contractors' contracts. Additionally, not all agencies post their contracts online with this disclosure information included.

The CPO Committee recommends that Participating Members include uniform minimum language in solicitation documents and flow down contract provisions requiring contractors to certify that neither they have violated, nor do they have any knowledge of their subcontractors having violated, any state, federal, or local laws, rules or regulations or any City or sister agency code or policy and have not been subject to any debarment, suspension, or other disciplinary action by any government agency.

Additionally, if at any time the contractor becomes aware of such information, it must immediately disclose it to the Agency. Participating Members can choose to go beyond the minimum language if they wish or if they are required to do so by their governing rules and regulations. Further, this uniform minimum disclosure language must be posted online in the solicitation documents and contracts of the City and sister agencies.

The CPO Committee reviewed the feasibility of requiring subcontractors to complete the same forms and documents as prime contractors but determined that this approach would be overly burdensome for both primes as well as agency staff to review the documentation, and would substantially lengthen the timeframe for contract execution and project start.

The key deliverable for this recommendation is new, standard certification language to be added to specific solicitation documents and contracts utilized by the Participating Members. The recommended language is as follows:

*The Contractor certifies to the best of its knowledge and belief that it, its principals and any subcontractors used in the performance of this contract, meet the Agency requirements and have not violated any City or sister agency policy, codes, state, federal, or local laws, rules or regulations and have not been subject to any debarment, suspension or other disciplinary action by any government agency. Additionally, if at any time the contractor becomes aware of such information, it must immediately disclose it to the Agency.*

It is recommended that the Participating Members include the above language to solicitation templates and documents; specifically, the EDS, Contractor's Affidavit, and Compliance Schedules.

**Recommendation #9: Establish minimum standards for conducting due diligence of vendors before entering into a contract.**

All Participating Members' Economic Disclosure Statements (EDS) were compared to assess where they differed. It was determined that the only differences in self-certification requirements – whether in a Participating Member's EDS, Ethics Code, or contract language – are based on the differing statutory requirements governing each Participating Member.

Each Participating Member also shared the additional due diligence it performs on a vendor before contracting with that vendor. In addition to the self-certification relied on in the EDS, each Participating Member performs a check of its own debarment list, at minimum. Many of the Participating Members also check federal and state no-contracting lists and whether a firm is in good standing with the Secretary of State. Only the City performs an internet search background check on vendors and checks whether a vendor owes debt to the City.

The CPO Committee is determining the feasibility for all agencies to perform the following proposed minimum due diligence of vendors before entering into a contract:

- Check federal, state, City, and sister agencies' no-contracting or debarment lists;
- Check whether the vendor is registered and in good standing with the Illinois Secretary of State;
- Check whether the vendor owes a debt to the City; and
- Perform a search engine background check.

**Recommendation #10 – Establish uniform rules governing resolicitation of contracts due to significant changes in scope or value.**

Many of the Participating Members lack written rules prohibiting significant modification of a contract, limiting the amount of time a contract can be extended, and/or increasing the value of a contract.

Pursuant to the recommendation, all Participating Members will adopt the following policies regarding contract changes:

- All Change Orders and Contract Amendments shall be within the general scope of the contract and cannot represent cardinal changes to the contract. A cardinal change is a major deviation from the original purpose of the work or the intended method of achievement, or a revision of contract work so extensive, significant or cumulative that, in effect, the contractor is required to perform very different work from that described in the original contract. The procurement administrator shall review and verify that the changed work is not a cardinal change to the contract. In the event the change will be a cardinal change to the contract, the work must be publicly solicited as a separate contract and cannot be undertaken as a change to a current contract.
- Additional time and/or funding:
  1. To the extent that the vendor agrees to maintain current contract terms, conditions and pricing:
    - a. Contracts that require additional time and funding. To avoid any gaps in service or materials the contract term shall not be extended more than one calendar year and additional funding shall not exceed 50% of the original contract value.
    - b. Contracts that require additional funding, but not time, due to unanticipated increased usage, can increase funding, as needed, to meet the original term of the contract; however, under no circumstances can this increase exceed 50% of the original contract value.
    - c. Contracts that require additional time, but not funding, can be extended for a period of time commensurate with the remaining funding, however, under no circumstances can the extension exceed 1 year.

**Recommendation #11: Evaluate the consistency of MBE/WBE/DBE certifications accepted by Participating Members.**

All Participating Members accept certifications from a variety of agencies, with some accepting certifications from agencies that others do not. These certifying agencies utilize different criteria for certification. Because each agency accepts a different set of certifications, utilization numbers cannot be aggregated across Participating Members.

All Participating Members provided the list of all the certifications they accept for MBE, WBE, and DBE credit. Members expressed the goal to maximize minority, women, and disadvantaged participation while balancing the need to ensure local businesses are utilized and preserve the integrity of participation programs with a rigorous certification process.

Each Participating Member also shared the process required to change the certifications accepted by their respective Boards or Agencies.

In order to make a final recommendation, the CPO Committee is tasking all Participating Members to conduct an analysis on participation credit that is received for firms that are certified by agencies outside of the City of Chicago and Cook County. Once this analysis is completed, a coordinated approach will be developed to determine which certifying agencies' certifications the Participating Members will accept for MBE, WBE, and DBE credit.

**Recommendation #12: Implement uniform criteria and processes for evaluating Good Faith Efforts regarding requests for waivers of MBE/WBE/DBE goals that are currently being developed and will be recommended by the Government Procurement Compliance Forum.**

All Participating Members utilize contract-specific MBE/WBE/DBE goals. In order to show that a bidder/respondent has documented and made good faith efforts in meeting the contract goals, the bidder/respondent must present a MBE/WBE/DBE compliance plan (Schedule D) demonstrating how they plan to meet these goals. A Schedule D outlines the MBE/WBE/DBE plan for the contract. If a bidder/respondent claims that they cannot meet the goals, they must document their good faith efforts in seeking to meet the goals.

All Participating Members worked to craft language and checklists to use in the contracting process. Members worked on various drafts and received input from numerous stakeholders, from the federal government to local assist agencies.

A template checklist was developed in order to guide Participating Members regarding what they should consider as part of good faith efforts. This list is not exclusive or exhaustive but is a useful resource and will be considered the minimum standard for Participating Members to evaluate good faith efforts. Additionally, a good faith efforts Vendor Guide was created in order for the vendor community to understand the contract requirements. Participating Members will be able to use this Vendor Guide as a useful tool for bidders/respondents and outreach efforts.

Some of these key actions to demonstrate a bidder's good faith efforts include:

- Soliciting through reasonable and available means at least 50% of MBEs and WBEs certified in the anticipated scopes of subcontracting of the contract
- Must solicit MBEs and WBEs at least seven (7) days prior to the date bids are due
- Take appropriate steps to follow up initial solicitations with interested MBEs or WBEs
- Advertise the contract opportunities in media and other venues oriented toward MBEs and WBEs
- Provide interested MBEs or WBEs with adequate information about the plans, specifications, and requirements of the contract in a timely manner
- Negotiate in good faith with interested MBEs or WBEs that have submitted bids
- Not reject MBEs or WBEs as being unqualified without sound reasons based on a thorough investigation of their capabilities
- Make efforts to assist interested MBEs or WBEs in obtaining bonding, lines of credit, or insurance

- Make efforts to assist interested MBEs or WBEs in obtaining necessary equipment, supplies, materials, or related assistance or services
- Effectively use the services of the City; minority or women community organizations; minority or women assistance groups and other organizations to provide assistance in the recruitment and placement of MBEs or WBEs

Participating Members intend to incorporate the items from the template checklist into their contracts regarding good faith efforts.

**Recommendation #13: Require a written, publicly posted protest process for each Participating Member.**

Protest processes are a tool of accountability in government procurement. They provide the opportunity for a stakeholder in the procurement process to raise allegations of irregularities or violations that may have tainted the process, and they give agencies another avenue to ensure integrity and transparency in their purchasing.

The majority of Participating Members have an established protest process, but three Participating Members have no written process, handling concerns on a case-by-case basis. As to those Participating Members that have an established process, there is considerable overlap, but details and deadlines may vary.

In-depth research was completed via a Participating Member survey by the CPO Committee, which identified the key elements of the bid protest process:

- Protests allowed – Pre-evaluation, Bid Result
- Pre-Bid Protest Timing
- Evaluation Protest Timing
- Bid Results Timing
- Adjudicator Role
- Pre-Bid Protest Actions
- Pre-Award Protest Actions
- Adjudication Decision Actions
- Timing of Interested Party Conference
- Timing of Final Determination Following Protest

Following discussion as to how these elements could be made uniform for the Bid Protest Process, all on the CPO Committee agreed to standardize to align with the City’s terms and policy approach. The terms are summarized here:

<b>Bid Protest Actions</b>	<b>Term</b>
Protests Allowed - Pre-Bid, Evaluation, Bid Result	All
Pre-Bid Protest Timing	5 working days
Evaluation Protest Timing	10 working days
Bid Results Timing	10 working days
Adjudicator Role	CPO
Pre-Bid Protest Actions	Postponement
Pre-Award Protest Actions	Suspension
Adjudication Decision Actions	Corrective
Timing of Interested Party Conference	Any time before final determination
Timing of Final Determination Following Protest	30 working days after last submission made

With the exception of the Chicago Transit Authority (CTA), which has a Federal requirement for final review, all Participating Members will adopt the uniform terms and develop or update internal policies to document the process. Some Participating Members may require Board approval.

**Recommendation #14: Examine whether Participating Members should support a change in state law to eliminate the newspaper notice requirement for contract solicitations.**

Since most, if not all, of the Participating Members have been advertising in the newspapers for many decades, a shift away from newspaper advertising would require a considerable marketing effort for a few years to properly inform the vendor community of this change in purchasing operations. While it is likely that cost savings could be realized in outlying years, there would be significant costs incurred for initial marketing efforts in the immediate term..

Resource needs for such a project will require IT, marketing, and procurement personnel from the City and sister agencies, all of which are being dedicated to what the CPO Committee believes are more impactful initiatives. The CPO Committee’s current recommendation is to continue to advertise in local newspapers.

**Recommendation #15: Establish a process for information-sharing and collaboration among Participating Members on personnel matters such as professional development efforts and recruitment.**

Given the current market conditions in the Chicago area and the relatively low salaries in the public sector, it is difficult to attract and retain a diverse workforce, which is very much needed in order to maintain a high level of performance.

The challenges regarding personnel matters and especially those regarding talent management were discussed among all Participating Members.

The CPO Committee is now determining the most effective way for all agencies to share the following information regarding personnel matters:

- job descriptions for the different positions in the organization chart
- the list of all open positions to facilitate more transfer from one sister agency to another
- the list of all the upcoming trainings planned by each sister agency to offer the possibility for other sister agency employees to join and participate

In order to implement these first steps toward a more comprehensive common talent management system, we will leverage the Procurement Reform Task Force SharePoint platform, which is already operational.

## Exhibit A

### Procurement Reform Task Force - Recommendations

#### Immediate Recommendations (end of Q1 2016)

#	Recommendation	Lead Agency
1	Create a Committee of the Participating Members' CPOs to rule on certain administrative decisions, address obstacles to coordination, and ensure best practices across the City and its sister agencies.	City
2	Charge the CPO Committee with addressing the Task Force recommendations, tracking their implementation, and issuing quarterly progress reports.	City
3	Establish minimum standards by which all Participating Members will publish their anticipated sole source awards, receive public and vendor feedback, and make decisions about whether a solicitation is necessary.	CTA
4	Hire or secure pro bono services from a law firm to: (a) Identify contract provisions that could be subject to standardization across Participating Members' templates, and draft uniform contract templates incorporating the required terms of the Participating Members, including contract duration and number of renewals and (b) Where appropriate, standardize solicitation documents issued by Participating Members and the documents required in response.	City
5	Charge the Chicago Government IT Coordination Committee, which consists of the CIOs of the Participating Members, with identifying the procurement-related systems that can be shared and developed jointly and developing a schedule for implementation.	ITCC
6	Post all contracts, vendors, and subcontractors on agency websites in a user-friendly and searchable format.	CCC
7	Create an easily accessible website for vendors and the public that provides a single location for: all of the Participating Members' current procurement opportunity listings and other procurement-related information such as the buying plan, notices of award, and prequalified pools; a list of all debarred vendors; and all current contract and vendor databases.	ITCC
8	Establish minimum disclosure requirements for subcontractors and require posting subcontractor information online.	CHA
9	Establish minimum standards for conducting due diligence of vendors before entering into a contract.	City
10	Establish uniform rules governing resolicitation of contracts due to significant changes in scope or value.	CTA
11	Evaluate the consistency of MBE/WBE/DBE certifications accepted by Participating Members.	PBC

12	Implement the uniform criteria and processes for evaluating Good Faith Efforts regarding requests for waivers for MBE/WBE/DBE goals that are currently being developed and will be recommended by the Government Procurement Compliance Forum	PBC
13	Require a written, publicly posted protest process for each Participating Member.	CCC
14	Examine whether Participating Members should support a change in state law to eliminate the newspaper notice requirement for contract solicitations.	CPD
15	Establish a process for information-sharing and collaboration among Participating Members on personnel matters such as professional development efforts and recruitment.	CPS

### Mid-Term Recommendations (end of Q4 2016)

No	Recommendation	Lead Agency
16	Establish uniform standards based on best practices for approval of noncompetitive awards, including small purchase, emergency, and sole source.	CTA
17	Develop a common electronic Economic Disclosure Statement system that: allows for the submission of uniform information for all Participating Members' vendors and subcontractors; integrates disclosures and certifications into Participating Members' procurement databases; automates conflict checks and due diligence; and can be updated in real time.	ITCC
18	Establish a process for the use of joint pre-qualified vendor pools that recognizes the different statutory requirements applicable to Participating Members.	City
19	Develop best practices for routine audits of procurement functions and contract awards, and evaluate use of shared services to perform this function.	City
20	Require each Participating Member to create a comprehensive procurement manual for its staff that is user-friendly and available to the public.	CCC
21	Codify and provide training to Participating Members' employees on procurement rules and regulations, including appropriate authority, prohibited communications, and reporting obligations.	City
22	Develop universal programming for vendor outreach and training.	City
23	Develop uniform, minimum contract close-out procedures for use by all Participating Members.	PBC
24	Develop minimum standards for project managers and other on-site review personnel to ensure vendor compliance.	PBC
25	Establish a process for information-sharing among Participating Members regarding poor performance, noncompliance, or wrongdoing of a vendor.	CPD

26	Seek to establish reciprocal debarment among Participating Members through the use of a debarment review board or another mechanism as permitted by law.	CHA
27	Establish uniform practices, where permitted by law, to expand preferences for local vendors and support a workforce development or similar contract award preference.	CPS

**Long-Term Recommendations (2017 and beyond)**

#	Recommendation
28	Implement a universal procurement system that serves as a single point of entry for posting and responding to all Participating Members' procurement opportunities, and as a central repository for all contract and vendor information.
29	Identify compliance functions that can be shared among Participating Members, including MBE/WBE compliance activities, and establish a joint compliance field team.
30	Secure a <i>pro bono</i> study regarding the financial impact of the City's risk shifting contractual provisions.
31	Evaluate the benefits of center-led or consolidated procurement among the Participating Members.