



To: APOs and CUPOs

AUD #26-04

CC: Jim Barnaby, Deputy Commissioner, State Purchasing Division
Mary Chapman, Deputy Division Director

From: Audits, State Purchasing Division

Date: July 31, 2025

Re: Audit of Open Market Purchases – POs issued in May 2025

Background

Section 1.3.4.5 of the Georgia Procurement Manual (GPM) provides that state entities “may elect to go to the open market to identify a source of supply for the needed good or service (if) the APO/CUPO determines an open market purchase is the appropriate purchasing method under Tier 4 of the Order of Precedence.” When the competitive bidding rules are applicable, under normal circumstances, this election may only be made when no source of supply exists from a:

1. Mandatory statewide contract (Tier 1 of the Order of Precedence)
2. Existing state entity contract (Tier 2 of the Order of Precedence)
3. The statutory source of supply (Tier 3 of the Order of Precedence)

When purchasing from the open market, “the state entity may not split reasonably foreseeable or related purchases into two or more transactions to circumvent the requirement that any purchase of \$25,000 or more is based on competitive bidding.” Section 6.3.1.2 of the GPM states the purchase type of OMP should be used if “A state entity’s purchase made on the open market when not using a contract and the PO amount is less than \$25,000” Selecting the correct purchase type code of “OMP” for open market purchases allows accurate spend data to be collected by various staff, from contract managers, entity procurement staff, budget analysts, and auditors. The audit scope and methodology used in this audit are summarized in **Appendix A**.

Audit Summary

SPD Audits reviewed every PO coded as an open market purchase across the enterprise with a dollar amount of \$25,000 or greater. This sample included 55 POs that totaled \$6.9 million. These 55 POs represented 0.28% of all OMP POs for May 2025.

Audit Objectives

1. Determine if OMP POs were coded correctly.
2. For OMP POs miscoded, identify the correct purchase type.
3. Identify areas for improvement related to the coding of OMP POs.

Audit Issues

In May 2025, 19,652 POs totaling \$48.5 million were coded as an open market purchase (OMP). Of these POs, 55 POs were \$25,000 or more. These 55 POs totaled \$6.9 million, or 14% of all OMP POs amount issued in May 2025. SPD Audits reviewed these POs to determine if they were correctly coded as OMP.

SPD Audits found that 39 (71%) of the 55 POs sampled appeared to be incorrectly coded as OMP. These POs totaled \$2.9 million (42%) of the \$6.9 million POs reviewed. These 42 POs appeared to be miscoded for the following reasons. These POs are also summarized in **Table 1**.

1. Exempt (EXM) – these POs were related to services or products exempt from the State Purchasing Act or used an exempt NIGP code on the PO.
2. Statewide contracts (SWCC or SWCM) – these were POs to suppliers on either statewide convenience contracts (SWCC) or statewide mandatory contracts (SWCM). The statewide contract number was sometimes cited in the Contract ID field.
3. Intergovernmental Agreements (IGA) – these POs were related to grant awards from state entities, most often to local government entities, POs to GCI, or POs issued to other state entities. POs of this sort should be coded as IGA.
4. Construction/Public Works (CSN) – this PO falls under the Construction/Public Works Exemption section of the Georgia Procurement Manual (Section 1.3.6.1).
5. Sole Source (SS) - these POs appeared to be related to a sole source since the sole source posting on the Georgia Procurement Registry (GPR) was uploaded to the PO.

Table 1
Summary of OMP POs,
which appear to be miscoded – May 2025

Original Purchase Type Code	Correct Purchase Type Code	Description	Number of POs	PO Amount
OMP	EXM	Exempt	14	\$868,268
OMP	SWCM	Statewide Contract Mandatory	9	\$689,965
OMP	AC	Agency Contract	4	\$515,296
OMP	IGA	Intergovernmental Agreements	3	\$415,775
OMP	CSN	Construction/Public Works	4	\$204,455
OMP	SWCC	Statewide Contract Convenience	3	\$107,876
OMP	SS	Sole Source	2	\$65,442
Total			39	\$2,867,077
Sources: 1) PeopleSoft query TGM_oEPOo19D_PO_SPEND_BY_DATE; 2) BOR_OPOo19D_PO_LIST_BY_BU_DTL; 3) PO queries for Georgia Institute of Technology, Georgia State University, and Augusta University; and 4) PO data provided by the University of Georgia.				

Six of these POs were related to a solicitation or posting on the Georgia Procurement Registry (GPR). These events should have resulted in four agency contract POs and two sole source POs. For the remaining 16 POs, totaling \$4,022,052, we found the following:

1. Eight POs, totaling \$3,677,898 were correctly coded as OMP. These POs were conducted as procurements outside of the authority of the State Purchasing Act and not under the purview of the Department of Administrative Services (DOAS).
2. Two POs, totaling \$144,672 were cancelled.
3. Three POs, totaling \$101,306 were found to be non-compliant. One PO cited the use of a consortia contract but no consortia posting had been done on the Georgia Procurement Registry (GPR). One PO using a consortia contract was issued before the consortia posting was done on the GPR. One PO was for dental equipment which did not appear to be exempt from the State Purchasing Act and should have been awarded through a solicitation or other purchasing method permitted by the GPM.
4. Two POs totaling \$68,536, where the entity had corrected the purchase type code by the audit team reviewed the POs. One PO was changed to EXM for exempt and one PO was changed to EMER for emergency.
5. One PO, initially totaling \$29,640, was partially cancelled at the line level to reduce the PO by \$7,125 to \$22,515.

Recommendations


1. APOs and CUPOs should review all recent POs coded as OMP with a value of \$25,000 or more to determine whether the correct purchase type code has been used.
2. APOs/CUPOs should review PO data from this audit at the buyer level to ensure that staff is adequately trained and, where necessary, re-trained in the correct use of purchase type codes.
3. APOs/CUPOs should ensure staff review [Official Announcement 25-02](#) regarding the revised use of PO type codes and [SPD-AP016 Purchase Order Type Quick Reference Guide](#).
4. Since posting on the GPR allowed the state entity to demonstrate that they have satisfied the competitive bidding requirements, the resulting one-time POs with values more than \$24,999.99 should include the event ID in the PO header or the PO reference field. Additionally, APOs and CUPOs should remind their procurement staff that POs should always be sourced from an event, where possible, so event IDs can easily be referenced on POs and POs to the event from which they emanate.

Appendix A

Audit Background, Scope and Methodology

July 31, 2025
Page 1 of 1

This audit is of purchase orders (POs) issued in May 2025 - PO dates between May 1, 2025, through May 31, 2025. The PO dates were current as of the date the PO queries were run, which was the first week of June. The PO queries come from different financial systems. Except for the Georgia Institute of Technology, which uses Workday, all other audited state entities use PeopleSoft for their financial system. It is not the same instance of PeopleSoft since each instance is configured differently. The objective of the audit was to audit POs issued or dispatched. Since the PO queries are run from different financial systems, the terminology used to indicate the PO status varies. For TGM entities, the PO life cycle consists of the following steps:



Only those POs in the stage of dispatched or complete were included in this audit. Phases, before dispatched, represent the internal approval process a state entity uses before the PO is sent to the supplier. For the TGM entities, this is known as dispatched. Complete is the status used when the PO is closed and can no longer be modified or use.