



catawba county

MAKING. LIVING. BETTER.

ADDENDUM NO. 2

Issue Date: September 25, 2026

Request for Proposals – Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP)

Software and Implementation Services

RFP NO: 27-1004

To: All Potential Proposers

The Request for Proposals (RFP) is modified as set forth in this Addendum No. 2. The original RFP documents and any previously issued addenda remain in full force and effect, except as modified by this Addendum, which is hereby made part of the RFP. Proposer shall take this Addendum into consideration when preparing and submitting its Proposal. Catawba County is issuing this Addendum to provide RFP clarifications.

Questions/Clarifications:

1. **Question:** Would the County reconsider the requirement for a mailed hard copy and USB, and instead accept proposals by email, to help reduce environmental impact and avoid potential delivery delays?

Answer: The County has elected to receive sealed proposals to promote a fair, consistent, and transparent procurement process. A controlled opening of proposals helps maintain the integrity of the process and promotes public confidence that all proposals are handled in an impartial and transparent manner. Therefore, proposals will not be accepted by email.

2. **Question:** Please provide the number of financial users, categorized as follows:

- a. **Full Users (15 still apply?):** have access to all the features and functionalities of the system and can perform any task within their role.
- b. **Team Users:** Have limited access to view data and complete tasks like entering time, requisitions, or expenses. Some managers may also be team users if they only approve expenses or run reports, without performing accounting entries.

Answer: The total population using some portion of the system is 1250 (within their "role"). Of these, there are approximately 250 supervisors, 35 staff with some type of elevated privilege in Finance or HR, and 5 staff with system/application wide Admin privileges.

3. **Question:** What is your anticipated timeline for award?

Answer: The anticipated timeline for award is Early 2027.

4. **Question:** Does the project have an anticipated Go-Live target date? If a phased approach is preferred, is there a tentative schedule by module or department? Considerations may include fiscal and payroll calendars, testing, data migration, training, and resource availability.

Answer: The County will consider the recommended implementation timeline and approach proposed by the selected vendor.

5. **Question:** Has a budget range been identified for the current project? If so, is it possible to share a breakdown of estimated implementation cost, annual cost, and number of years?

Answer: The County has identified sufficient funding for this project but has not established a specific budget range. Vendors should provide their best and most competitive pricing based on the requirements outlined in the RFP.

6. **Question:** Has the County seen any product demonstrations in the last 12 months leading up to the release of this RFP? If so, which products have you seen?

Answer: The County has not seen any product demonstrations in the last 12 months.

7. **Question:** Would the County consider a standalone proposal for the Human Resources/Payroll Core components — including HR, Payroll, Timekeeping, Benefits, Recruiting/Onboarding/Offboarding, Performance, Learning, Position Control, HR Document Manager, Scheduling (workforce and public safety) and ESS/MSS—independent of the Financial ERP components, if the proposed HCM/WFM solution can integrate with the County's selected financial ERP?

Answer: No. The County is seeking a comprehensive, integrated ERP solution that includes the Human Resources/Payroll Core components identified in the RFP. The County will not consider standalone proposals for the HCM/WFM components independent of the Financial ERP components.

8. **Question:** If standalone HCM/WFM proposals are not accepted, can the County confirm that it will accept a proposal in which a financial ERP provider

serves as the prime contractor and an integrated HCM/WFM provider supplies HR, Payroll, Timekeeping and related workforce functionality?

Answer: The offered package needs to be a seamless integration from the counties' perspective. We intend to work with a single primary implementor. The proposal needs to be a fully integrated approach and not just two proposals combined. The prime contractor will take responsibility for the entire scope of the project.

9. **Question:** Will partnered/best-of-breed solutions be evaluated comparably to solutions in which Financial and HCM/WFM functionality are provided natively by a single software vendor, assuming the proposed solution satisfies all Core functional, integration and implementation requirements?

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 8.

10. **Question:** The Advertisement (Section 1) directs bidders to the Bid Notices page <https://catawbacountync.gov/county-services/purchasing/bid-notices/> for addenda, while Section 4.3 states addenda will be posted at <https://www.catawbacountync.gov/county-services/purchasing/proposal-notices/>. Which URL is authoritative for addenda postings for RFP 27-1004?

Answer: The web address is <https://catawbacountync.gov/county-services/purchasing/bid-notices/>.

11. **Question:** Responses to bidder questions are due September 25, 2026 at 5:00 PM, with proposals due October 7, 2026 at 3:00 PM — twelve days later — for a response requiring four completed workbooks including a full functional requirements matrix, pricing model, and monthly staffing plan. Given that answers may materially change scope assumptions (e.g., interfaces, conversion, pricing horizon), will the County consider extending the proposal due date by two to three weeks?

Answer: The proposal due date has been extended to October 21, 2026, at 3:00 PM ET. Please refer to Addendum No. 1 for the revised schedule.

12. **Question:** Section 2.3 states a current population of approximately 163,000 while Section 2.10 lists 168,248; Section 2.10 also lists total full-time staff as 1,098 but permanent employees as 1,254.45 FTEs. Will the County confirm the authoritative figures to be used for sizing and pricing assumptions?

Answer: The estimated population is approximately 170,000 according to the US Census Bureau. The estimated number of employees is 1250.

13. **Question:** Section 2.8 identifies Laserfiche (contract document storage/workflow and HR employee records/document management) as 'Replace.' Does the scope include migrating existing Laserfiche content (contracts and HR employee records) into the proposed ERP document management

capability, and if so, approximately how many documents/pages, of what types, and with what metadata must be migrated?

Answer: The scope of this project does not include migrating existing Laserfiche content into the proposed ERP.

14. **Question:** Section 2.8 lists approximately twenty applications as 'Integrate' or 'Consider Replacing and Integrate if Maintained.' Will the County provide a definitive interface inventory identifying, for each interface, the direction (inbound/outbound/bidirectional), frequency (real-time, daily, batch), data elements, current integration method, and whether the third-party vendor provides a documented API at no cost to the bidder? Will the County confirm that the County is responsible for obtaining third-party vendor cooperation and any third-party API or connector fees?

Answer: County would typically be responsible for interfacing with 3rd party software unless it is a 3rd party specifically brought on to provide some specific functionality of the ERP application. We would also expect all API costs to be included in the subscription or other pricing methodology.

15. **Question:** Section 2.9 provides only bandwidth, Global Protect VPN, and MS Active Directory. Will the County confirm its identity and access management requirements for the cloud solution — specifically whether SSO via Entra ID/SAML/OIDC and MFA are required, whether SCIM or AD-based user provisioning is required, and whether any state or federal compliance frameworks (e.g., HIPAA for Public Health/Social Services, IRS Publication 1075, CJIS for Sheriff-related data, PCI-DSS, SOC 2) must be evidenced for the hosting environment?

Answer: Yes to all.

16. **Question:** Section 2.10 does not state payroll operating parameters. Will the County provide the payroll frequency/frequencies and number of pay groups, the approximate number of earning, deduction, and benefit codes, the number of leave/accrual plans and accrual rules, the number of job classifications and pay grades/steps, and whether any FLSA/public-safety (e.g., 7(k)) or grant-funded labor distribution rules apply?

Answer: Catawba County processes payroll bi-weekly for 26 paychecks per year. We have 26 distinct pay groups, 162 earning codes, 70 deduction codes, and 200 benefit codes. Additionally, we have 4 leave accrual plans. We have 289 job classifications, and our salary plan has 33 pay grades, each with a minimum and maximum rate of pay; we do not utilize steps. Our Sheriff's Office takes advantage of the FLSA 7(k) exemption for law enforcement personnel.

17. **Question:** Section 2.10 reports 1,098 full-time staff, 65 part-time (.50–.90 FTE), 334 hourly PRN, 1,254.45 permanent FTEs, 1,200 current ERP users, and 900 future 'basic' users. For subscription licensing purposes, will the County

confirm the intended counts by license type (full/professional users, self-service/basic users, and total employee headcount to be paid through the system), and which figure bidders should use as the contractual license baseline?

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 2 and No. 12.

18. **Question:** Section 3.3 lists Cashiering as a core/required module, and Section 2.10 notes receipting is currently centralized with 35 cash registers/POS terminals and that departments do not have receipting software. Does the scope include decentralized departmental cashiering, payment hardware (receipt printers, scanners, card readers), merchant/gateway services, and PCI-DSS scope, or is the County procuring hardware and payment processing separately?

Answer: Cash receipt entry into Peoplesoft is centralized in the Finance Department; however, payments are received within each county department. The departments taking payments have POS terminals. The County currently procures hardware and payment processing. Current credit card processors are Velocity and CSG Forte. Ideally, the system would allow integration to eliminate duplicate entry.

19. **Question:** Section 3.3 lists Bid management only as an Expanded/optional component, while Section 2.8 lists PlanetBids (formal bid solicitation) as 'Consider Replacing and Integrate if Maintained.' Will the County confirm whether bid management pricing and functional responses are optional or expected, and clarify the same for the other 'Consider Replacing and Integrate if Maintained' applications (NeoGov, Power DMS, SharePoint, Velocity, DocuSign, Forte) — i.e., must bidders provide both replacement module pricing and interface pricing for each?

Answer: Bid management pricing is optional. All of these applications are currently handled outside of the ERP and by the County. If we had the opportunity to integrate or replace, then we would expect pricing to be listed as an add-on module. Otherwise, there is no expectation of pricing being included.

20. **Question:** Section 3.4 requires data conversion and migration, but the RFP does not state the volume, modules, or number of years of PeopleSoft history to be converted. Will the County specify, by functional area (GL, AP, AR, purchasing, fixed assets, projects/grants, HR, payroll), how many years of historical and transactional data are to be converted, the approximate record volumes, and whether any conversion from non-PeopleSoft sources (e.g., spreadsheets, OneDrive grant repository, When2Work) is in scope?

Answer: Three (3) years for all PeopleSoft modules (HR, Finance, and Budget), 500-600 GB total.

21. **Question:** Section 4.2 anticipates shortlisted vendor demonstrations and interviews in the first two weeks of November 2026. Will the County confirm whether demonstrations will be on-site or virtual, the number of days per vendor, whether the County will provide scripted demonstration scenarios and how far in

advance, and whether a configured (rather than standard) demonstration environment is expected?

Answer: The County has not determined the specific format or requirements for the demonstrations and interviews at this time. Details regarding the format, duration, demonstration scenarios, timing, and demonstration environment will be determined by the County and communicated to shortlisted vendors with sufficient advance notice to allow for appropriate preparation. For clarification, pursuant to Addendum No. 1 demonstrations and interviews will be scheduled in the first two weeks of December.

22. **Question:** Section 4.2 lists Contract Award and Contract Effective Date as 'TBA' and the RFP does not state a target project start or go-live date. Will the County provide its desired implementation start date, target go-live date(s) by phase, and any hard constraints (e.g., fiscal year end 6/30, calendar year-end payroll/W-2 cutover) that the proposed schedule and Attachment D monthly staffing plan must accommodate?

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 4.

23. **Question:** Section 4.4 states offers are valid for ninety (90) days after the proposal due date, while Contract Award and Contract Effective Date are listed as 'TBA' and demonstrations are anticipated in November 2026. If award extends beyond the 90-day validity period, will the County accept bidder-provided price escalation or re-confirmation terms, or does the County require pricing to be held firm until award regardless of date?

Answer: Section 4.4 is amended to change the proposal validity period from ninety (90) days to one hundred twenty (120) days after the proposal due date. Note, Addendum No. 1 revised the RFP schedule for demonstrations to occur in the first two weeks of December.

24. **Question:** Section 4.4 requires one original hard copy and one PDF on a USB thumb drive. Will the County confirm whether the required Excel attachments must also be printed in full in the hard copy (the requirements workbook may run to hundreds of rows), or whether a summary/index in the hard copy with the complete workbooks on the USB is acceptable?

Answer: Proposal responses must be submitted as one (1) original hard copy and one (1) electronic PDF copy on a USB thumb drive. The completed Excel Attachments and Executive Summary shall be included electronically on the USB thumb drive. The original hard-copy proposal should include a list or summary of the applicable Excel Attachments in lieu of printing the Excel Attachments in full.

25. **Question:** Section 5.1.1 requires that the 'System Software/Integrator must have implemented proposed software for three (3) similar organizations of similar size and complexity in the previous 5 years.' Will the County define 'similar size and complexity' (e.g., population, budget, employee count,

government type), confirm whether the three implementations must be fully live/completed within the last five years or merely started, and confirm whether references from a proposed implementation partner or from the software publisher may be used to satisfy this criterion for a teamed response?

Answer: In part, refer to Question/Answer No. 12. The County will not prescribe specific thresholds for budget, employee count, government type or other measures of “similar size and complexity.” Bidders should identify organizations they consider comparable to the County and provide sufficient information to demonstrate the similarity and relevance of the experience. For teamed responses, experience of the proposed software publisher and implementation partner may be provided, provided the bidder clearly identifies which entity performed the implementation and the nature and extent of its involvement.

26. **Question:** Section 5.1.2 and 5.1.3 assign 15% to 'Cost (value-based scoring).' Will the County disclose the cost scoring formula (e.g., lowest-cost-to-price ratio, normalized scoring, or subjective value assessment), the cost elements included in the evaluated total (one-time plus recurring over how many years, optional/expanded modules, third-party costs), and whether optional Expanded components are included in the evaluated cost?

Answer: The County will evaluate cost using a value-based approach, considering the total cost of the proposed solution. The total cost should be detailed in the proposal and include, but not limited to, one-time implementation costs, recurring costs, and applicable costs associated with optional or expanded components. Vendors should provide clear and detailed pricing for all components of their proposed solution.

27. **Question:** Sections 5.1.2 and 5.1.3 present identical criteria and weightings, but Section 5.1.3 also states finalists will be evaluated 'against the following criteria in order of preference.' Will the County confirm whether Round 3 scoring uses the stated percentage weightings, whether Round 3 scores replace or are combined with Round 2 scores, and how many bidders the County expects to shortlist for Round 3?

Answer: Proposals that meet the minimum criteria set forth in Section 5.1.1 will advance to the evaluation phase and will be scored in accordance with the criteria identified in Section 5.1.2. Following this evaluation and at the County's discretion, the County may invite one or more Proposers to participate in a virtual or in person interview and presentation. The County has not established a specific number of Proposers that will be invited to participate in interviews and presentations. Round 3 scores will not be combined with Round 2 scores.

28. **Question:** Section 5.1.3 states the County 'will make award(s)' and Section 5.2 permits negotiation with any Proposer. Does the County intend to make a single award for software and implementation services under one

contract, or does it reserve the right to make separate awards (e.g., software publisher and a different implementation partner)?

Answer: The County intends to make a single award for software and implementation services under one contract; however, the County reserves the right, at its sole discretion, to make separate awards for software and implementation services if determined to be in the best interest of the County.

29. **Question:** Section 6.1 requires bidders to 'respond in full to all RFP sections and follow the RFP format (section numbering, etc.)' while Section 6.3 limits the narrative file to 20 pages with a prescribed set of sections. Will the County confirm that a response organized per Section 6.3 plus the completed attachments satisfies Section 6.1, and confirm which materials are excluded from the 20-page limit (e.g., sample project plan, license/support agreements required by Section 7.6, key personnel resumes, references, and Attachment F)?

Answer: The Executive Summary should be limited to 20 pages. This page limit does not apply to the provided Excel attachments, license/support agreements, sample project plan, etc.

30. **Question:** Section 6.2 states that price information may under no circumstances be designated confidential, while Section 7.6 requires bidders to submit their license and support agreements for review. Will the County confirm whether submitted license/support agreements and rate cards may be marked 'Confidential' as trade secret under NCGS § 66-152(3), and confirm that proposals remain confidential until contract award per NCGS § 143-129.8?

Answer: The County must comply with applicable federal and state laws, including public record laws, subpoenas, and court orders requiring release of documents. If a third party makes a public records request for information declared and marked "confidential", Contractor must immediately determine if the record is protected and agree to indemnify County for all attorney fees associated with any legal action. Additionally, Contractor shall intervene in any lawsuit or declaratory judgment to determine whether the documents requested meet the requirements of law as a trade secret or confidential information.

31. **Question:** The RFP contains a broad indemnification obligation (Section 7.4) and a full-cost remediation and legal fee reimbursement obligation for data breaches (Attachment F, Reporting of Unauthorized Disclosures or Misuse of Data), but does not include any limitation of liability. Will the County accept a mutual limitation of liability (for example, capped at fees paid over a defined period, with customary carve-outs), and will the County confirm whether the breach remediation obligation in Attachment F is intended to be capped at the required cyber liability limits?

Answer: The County may consider a mutual limitation of liability based on insurance limits. Breach remediation is not intended to be capped at the cyber liability limits.

32. **Question:** Section 7.7 permits termination without penalty upon non-appropriation, and Section 7.5 addresses termination for uncured material breach. Will the County confirm whether it also intends to reserve termination for convenience, and confirm the treatment of prepaid subscription fees, work-in-progress implementation services performed but not yet invoiced, and any wind-down/data-extraction services upon termination under either clause?

Answer: The County does intend to reserve termination for convenience. If County exercises the termination for convenience provision or non-appropriation clause, undisputed prepaid subscription fees, work-in-progress implementation services performed but not yet invoiced, and any wind-down/data-extraction services would typically be paid by County up to the date of termination.

33. **Question:** Section 7.8 requires a Certificate of Insurance for commercial general liability, automobile liability, workers' compensation & employers' liability, and cyber liability 'with limits approved by County,' but only the cyber limits (\$1M/\$2M) are specified in Attachment F. Will the County state the required minimum limits for each remaining line, and confirm whether professional liability/errors & omissions coverage is also required?

Answer: The required minimum insurance limits are as follows:

- Commercial General Liability: \$1M per occurrence/\$2M aggregate
- Commercial Automobile Liability: \$1M
- Workers' Compensation & Employer's Liability: Statutory limits
- Professional Liability/Errors & Omissions (E&O): \$1M
- Cyber Liability: \$1M per occurrence/\$2M aggregate

34. **Question:** Section 7.9 states that 'No limitation or exception to this warranty provision will be acceptable' and that the Proposer will assume the liability of providing services and programming at no extra cost, while Section 7.6 invites bidders to submit their standard license/support agreements for consideration. Will the County accept a negotiated, commercially standard SaaS warranty and service-level remedy framework (including remedy limitations and exclusions for County-caused issues, third-party products, and County configuration changes), or is Section 7.9 non-negotiable as written?

Answer: Yes. The County will consider a negotiated license/support agreement, including commercially standard SaaS warranty and service-level remedy provisions. The County will give preference to terms that align most closely with the requirements of Section 7.9 and are most favorable to the County. Any proposed limitations, exclusions, or remedies will be subject to the County's review and negotiation.

35. **Question:** Section 7.10 states the successful Proposer will be the primary software company and will perform services using its own workforce and may not subcontract without prior County approval, while Section 3.2 expressly permits

bidders to partner with other vendors to cover the required software scope. Will the County confirm that a software publisher may propose a third-party implementation partner (and/or partner software vendors) as named subcontractors in the proposal, and that identifying them per Section 7.10 constitutes the required prior approval?

Answer: A software publisher may propose a third-party implementation partner (and/or partner software vendors) as named subcontractors in the proposal, and identifying them per Section 7.10 constitutes the required prior approval.

36. **Question:** Section 8 states Attachments A–D are 'multi-tab Excel electronic response files,' but Section 6.1 and Section 8 name Attachment A as a .docx file while Section 6.4 refers to it as 'Attachment A – Bidder Questionnaire.xlsx' (and to Attachments B/C/D as 'Pricing Workbook,' 'Requirements Workbook,' 'Staffing Workbook'). Will the County confirm the authoritative file names and formats for each attachment, and confirm whether native Word/Excel files must be included on the USB drive in addition to the single PDF copy required by Section 4.4?

Answer: The attachments listed in Section 8 are correctly named. “Bidder Forms” and “Bidder Questionnaire” are used interchangeably to refer to Attachment A. However, Attachment A is incorrectly identified as a .docx file. All attachments referenced in Section 8 or are Excel files (.xlsx).

37. **Question:** Attachment B instructs bidders to provide all one-time and recurring costs over the requested pricing horizon, but the base RFP does not state the intended contract term or pricing horizon. Will the County confirm the initial subscription/contract term, the number of renewal option periods, the total number of years for which recurring pricing must be quoted, and whether annual subscription uplift caps are required to be stated?

Answer: Contract term will be at least 5 years with the ability to renew for subsequent equal terms ongoing. Annual uplift caps are requested. If there will be material savings for longer contracts we would want understanding of that also.

38. **Question:** Attachment D requires realistic Client staffing estimates by role and month. Will the County confirm the County-side resources it intends to commit — specifically whether a full-time County project manager, functional leads per module, and dedicated technical/integration and testing resources will be backfilled and available — and confirm that the County will provide these resources as a condition of the proposed schedule? Note that Section 2.10 lists 'Number of IT users: 5' — will the County clarify whether this is the size of the IT department?

Answer: The County will have a dedicated project manager for the duration of the implementation. The County will provide resources as needed to

complete the project and ask potential vendors to outline the roles and support needed from County employees for implementation. The County has 5 IT users who work in the current ERP system.

39. **Question:** Attachment F states that the awarded Proposer will be required to sign the Data Security Agreement, yet Section 6.1 lists Attachment F as an item to be addressed in the proposal. Should bidders submit a signed Attachment F with the proposal, submit it unsigned with any exceptions noted, or simply acknowledge it? Will the County accept exceptions to Attachment F (for example, the requirement to name the County as an additional insured on a cyber liability policy, which many cyber carriers will not do, and the annual on-site inspection right for a multi-tenant SaaS data center)?

Answer: Bidders should not submit a signed Attachment F with their proposal. The form should be acknowledged, and any exceptions to Attachment F, or to any terms, conditions, requirements, or language contained within the RFP, must be clearly identified and submitted with the bidder's proposal. The County will review each proposed exception and determine whether it is acceptable or not.

40. **Question:** With regards to section 7.4, is the County open and willing to include caps on liability for direct damages? Is the County open to special, consequential, incidental, and the like, damages exclusions/waivers for the vendor?

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 31 and No. 39.

41. **Question:** With regards to cyber liability insurance, is the County willing to remove the requirement for the vendor to name Catawba County as additional insured?

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 39.

42. **Question:** Is the County willing to sign the software license terms directly with the third-party software provider and enter into a resell arrangement/purchase order for the third-party software resell, as well as a professional services agreement with the prime as a system integrator/reseller?

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 8.

43. **Question:** How many integrations does the agency need to be real-time data? API integrations are capable but can be costly so was curious if there were some integrations the agency would like to have as a CSV upload but still automated.

Answer: The County would like to understand all capabilities and costs of solutions if separate from the overall subscription pricing - .csv and/or other modern file formats are acceptable. The county would like a robust API. Decisions on batch versus real time will be based on cost.

44. **Question:** Can you expand on 900 Future ERP basic users and their full needs? What are you considering as etc following time entry, self-service? (only use time entry, employee self-service, etc.)

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 2 and No. 12 for user numbers. ERP systems offer different functionality. If you have digital timeclock or expense reporting features we may use them.

45. **Question:** How users are needing to have drill down capabilities and manipulate data in the finance ERP? It looks like it is suggesting 15 but assuming you will need more than that.

Answer: The County anticipates approximately 50 users to have drill down capabilities. The County is not clear what is being asked in the remaining part of the question.

46. **Question:** How users would you like to have access to an advanced budgeting tool for budget approvals, future forecasts, what if scenarios, capital improvement programs, or creating a budget book?

Answer: Approximately 5.

47. **Question:** How many FTEs will be using scheduling and shift management currently managed in Outlook Calendar (EMS, Library) and When2Work?

Answer: The County cannot determine a number at this time, as this will depend on the solution proposed by the bidder and the capabilities of the proposed system.

48. **Question:** What revenue streams are you processing credit card payments through Velocity? (i.e. tax, permits etc.)

Answer: County service fees.

49. **Question:** Learning Management (LMS) referenced in the attachment-c-requirements spreadsheet says “*System has the ability for departments to create and store their own department specific training programs.*” Does this refer to creating their own departmental “program content” or creating their own curriculum from a catalog of content provided by a LMS software vendor?

Answer: It pertains to both.

50. **Question:** Laserfiche is being replaced. Does the county want to convert and migrate all documents stored in Laserfiche? If so, can you provide the document types and approximate volumes for each type?

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 13.

51. **Question:** Would you like pricing separate from the technical proposal?

Answer: No, pricing should be submitted in the bid package.

52. **Question:** How many supervisors, managers, administrators will need access to the timekeeping system to make approvals, edits or run reports?

Answer: Approximately 225.

53. **Question:** How many time clocks should we include in our proposal?

Answer: We do not use timeclocks.

54. **Question:** Is it desired for the time clock to be Biometric Finger, Pin Number Entry, or HID proximity (Card Swipe)?

Answer: Refer to Question / Answer No. 53.

55. **Question:** Will Advanced scheduling be included as part of this scope of work? (typically for public safety scheduling). Advanced Scheduling is defined as employees who need to do Shift Swaps, Open shift alerts, or having scheduling rules in the system which automatically assign the correct employees to open shifts.

Answer: Yes.

56. **Question:** If Advanced Scheduling is needed, how many employees will need to be licensed for it?

Answer: Approximately 350.

57. **Question:** Please confirm if FMLA Case Management is required. Defined as the new time & attendance system automating the process of requesting FMLA leave, allowing employees to fill out required forms directly in the new Time & Attendance system, and tracking the open case, automatically alerting employees/managers when an employee is due back or running out of FMLA time.

Answer: Yes.

58. **Question:** Is it desired for employees to punch in/out from a computer or smart phone?

Answer: The county does not currently use timeclocks.

59. **Question:** Will any employees be allowed to either fill out their timesheets online, or have their timesheets auto populate based on their schedules? (These groups of employees would not punch in/out.)

Answer: All employees will be allowed to fill out their timesheets online.

60. **Question:** Is it desired for employees to request time off electronically at a computer or smart phone?

Answer: Yes; would like this to be optional if possible.

61. **Question:** Are employees allowed to Donate their leave to either a generic bucket or to a specific employee?

Answer: Yes.

62. **Question:** Is Single Sign On needed?

Answer: No, not at this time.

63. **Question:** Is Expense Tracking needed?

Answer: Yes.

64. **Question:** Section 4.5 of the RFP states that “[f]ailure to comply with any of the terms and conditions of this RFP will result in rejection of a proposal.” However, Attachment A’s Compliance Exceptions tab instructs Proposers to identify any exceptions. If a Proposer identifies exceptions in Attachment A, please confirm that the County will not automatically reject Proposer’s response.

Answer: The County will not automatically reject a proposal solely because the Proposer identifies an exception in Attachment A. Identified exceptions will be reviewed and considered by the County. However, the identification of an exception does not constitute acceptance by the County, and the County reserves the right to accept or reject any exception submitted.

65. **Question:** How many integrations does the agency need to be real-time data? API integrations are capable but can be costly so was curious if there were some integrations the agency would like to have as a CSV upload but still automated.

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 43.

66. **Question:** Can you expand on 900 Future ERP basic users and their full needs? What are you considering as etc following time entry, self-service? (only use time entry, employee self-service, etc.)

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 44.

67. **Question:** How many users are needing to have drill down capabilities and manipulate data in the finance ERP? It looks like it is suggesting 15 but assuming you will need more than that.

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 45.

68. **Question:** How many users would you like to have access to an advanced budgeting tool for budget approvals, future forecasts, what if scenarios, capital improvement programs, or creating a budget book?

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 46.

69. **Question:** Please confirm whether the minimum criterion requiring three implementations of the proposed software for organizations of similar size and complexity may be satisfied collectively by the software publisher, prime systems integrator, and disclosed subcontractors or partners, and identify the

characteristics the County will use to determine whether an organization is sufficiently similar.

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 25.

70. **Question:** Please provide the anticipated PeopleSoft migration scope, including modules and source environments, approximate record and attachment volumes, years of financial and payroll history required, open-transaction requirements, custom tables or objects, and the County's expectations for data cleansing and reconciliation responsibilities.

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 20.

71. **Question:** For each application identified as "Integrate" or "Consider/Integrate," please identify whether the interface is required for initial go-live, its direction and frequency, available API or file specifications, approximate transaction volume, and whether the County or selected vendor will be responsible for changes to the third-party system.

Answer: Bidders should assume that the identified integrations are required for initial go-live. However, the County is open to discussing a phased approach for implementing integrations, if necessary.

72. **Question:** Please identify the County's preferred phasing and target go-live constraints, including fiscal-year, calendar-year, benefits-enrollment, W-2, and payroll blackout periods that bidders should use when developing the project plan and staffing model.

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 4.

73. **Question:** Will the County issue common scripted demonstration scenarios, sample data, required roles, and time limits to all shortlisted vendors, and will demonstration scoring remain aligned with the published Round 3 evaluation weights?

Answer: Refer to Question / Answer No. 21.

74. **Question:** Section 8 states that Attachments A–D are multi-tab electronic response files and must be submitted as part of the bid response. Since some worksheets contain numerous tabs and extensive data that may not be practical to reproduce legibly in hard-copy format, will submission of the completed electronic files on the required USB drive satisfy this requirement, or must printed hard-copy versions also be included with the original proposal?

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 24.

75. **Question:** Are there any specific assembly requirements for the required printed proposal copy, such as binder, tab dividers, staple clipped loose leaf, double or singled sided?

Answer: There are no specific assembly requirements.

76. **Question:** Section 7.10 states that resumes of key personnel must be submitted for proposed subcontractors. Will these resumes count toward the Executive Summary page limitation? If resumes are required, does the County prefer that they be submitted as an appendix?

Answer: Resumes do not count toward Executive Summary page limit.

77. **Question:** If we are providing vendor agreements as a part of our submission, should they be provided as an appendix? Will this be outside of the page limit?

Answer: Yes, they should be provided as an appendix and do not count toward the Executive Summary page limit.

78. **Question:** If the pricing workbook is required to be printed, do we include it with the technical response, or does it need to be sealed separately?

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 51.

79. **Question:** May vendors include supplemental appendices beyond the Executive Summary and required attachments, and if so, will those be evaluated?

Answer: Yes. Vendors may provide supplemental appendices or supporting information; however, such materials should be provided in addition to, and should not replace, any of the required attachments or other information specifically requested in the RFP. Supplemental materials will not be considered a substitute for required responses or attachments.

80. **Question:** Attachment F (Data Security Addendum) is included as part of the solicitation. Is there any required bidder response, acknowledgement, completion, or execution associated with Attachment F that must be submitted with the proposal, or will Attachment F be addressed with the selected proposer during contract negotiations and award?

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 39.

81. **Question:** Section 4.2 lists the Contract Award and Contract Effective Date as "TBA" and does not include a target implementation start date or go-live date. Does the County have a target overall project duration or desired go-live date that bidders should use as a planning assumption for their proposed implementation timeline and the Attachment D staffing estimates?

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 4.

82. **Question:** Section 4.2 anticipates shortlisted vendor demonstrations and interviews during the first two weeks of November 2026. Please confirm the expected format (on-site or virtual), approximate duration per bidder, and the anticipated audience/attendees for these sessions.

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 21.

83. **Question:** Sections 5.1.2 and 5.1.3 present identical evaluation criteria and weighting for Round 2 and Round 3. Please confirm whether Round 3 scores are calculated independently using only information gathered during Round 3 due diligence, or whether Round 2 scores carry forward and are combined or averaged with Round 3 findings.

Answer: Round 3 scores will be calculated independently based on the information gathered during Round 3 due diligence. Round 2 scores will not carry forward and will not be combined or averaged with Round 3 scores.

84. **Question:** The Bidder Questionnaire (Attachment A, Vendor Information section) asks bidders to "Provide a list of completed contracts held with public entities within the last five (5) (or seven ??) years." Please confirm the correct look-back period — five years or seven years — for this contract history request.

Answer: The correct look-back period for this contract history request is five (5) years.

85. **Question:** Section 2.10 lists "Number of IT users" as 5. Please confirm what this figure specifically represents (e.g., total Technology/IT department headcount, or administrative/privileged users of a specific system), given the County's overall staff count.

Answer: 5 administrative/privileged users in IT.

86. **Question:** The Integrations tab of Attachment A notes that the BenefitSolver integration direction is "TBD if benefits will be chosen in BenefitSolver or Future ERP which may flip direction of integration." Has the County reached a decision on where benefits elections will be managed (BenefitSolver vs. the new ERP), or should bidders propose pricing/approach for both scenarios?

Answer: The better approach to this integration will be determined with the implementor. You are welcome to propose pricing/approach for both.

87. **Question:** Section 2.8 (p.9) designates several applications (e.g., Trimble, ArcGIS, BadgePass, NCIR, Code Red) as "Maintain," but these systems do not appear on the Integrations tab of Attachment A. Please confirm whether any of these applications require an interface/integration with the new ERP, or whether they are intended to remain fully standalone from the ERP solution.

Answer: Systems marked as "Maintain" are not anticipated to require an integration to the future ERP. We included them for context for vendors to understand the County's application environment.

88. **Question:** The Migrations tab of Attachment A specifies migration of the "most recent one" performance review per employee. Please confirm this is the full intended scope — i.e., that prior-year performance review history is explicitly out of scope for data migration.

Answer: Confirming the “most recent one” is the full intended scope.

89. **Question:** For migration items noted "w/ attachments" in Attachment A's Migrations tab (e.g., GL transactions, purchase orders, asset records, project transactions), can the County provide an estimate of total attachment volume (approximate file count and/or storage size) to help bidders scope the data conversion effort?

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 20.

90. **Question:** Several items in Attachment A's Migrations tab specify a rolling historical window (e.g., "3 years of detailed transactions," "3 years of line-item budgets," "3 years" of pay history). Please confirm whether this window should be measured from the proposal due date, contract execution, or the anticipated go-live date.

Answer: Current year of go live and two years prior.

91. **Question:** Attachment A's Migrations tab specifies "3 years of line-item budgets" for migration. Should this be interpreted as three complete fiscal years (fiscal year end 6/30 per Section 2.10, p.11), and should the current in-progress fiscal year's budget also be included in the migration scope?

Answer: Yes.

92. **Question:** The Table of Contents lists Section 7.11 as "NON-APPROPRIATION CLAUSE," duplicating the title already used for Section 7.7. However, the body text of Section 7.11 (p.23) is titled "NON-DISCRIMINATION." Please confirm that the Table of Contents entry is a typographical error and that Section 7.11's substantive content is the Non-Discrimination clause as written on page 23.

Answer: Yes, the Table of Contents contains a typographical error. Section 7.11 is the “NON-DISCRIMINATION” clause as written on page 23.

93. **Question:** Section 7.6 requires bidders to include their license and/or support agreements in the Proposal for review. Since Section 6.3 caps the Executive Summary at 20 pages and states that the page limit does not apply to "the provided Excel attachments," please confirm whether license/support agreements should be submitted as a separate, unlimited-page attachment outside the 20-page Executive Summary.

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 29.

94. **Question:** Section 7.8 states that insurance coverage limits, including cyber liability, will be "approved by County" without specifying amounts, while Attachment F specifies minimum cyber liability limits of \$1,000,000 per occurrence/claim and \$2,000,000 aggregate. Please confirm that the limits in Attachment F are the controlling minimum requirement for proposal purposes.

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 33.

95. **Question:** Section 6.1 references Attachment B – Pricing Forms.xlsx as a required component of the proposal. Please confirm that a separate Attachment B pricing workbook has been (or will be) posted for bidder download, as it was not identifiable within the posted RFP attachment package.

Answer: The RFP, all Attachments and any issued Addenda can be found on the County's website at <https://catawbacountync.gov/county-services/purchasing/bid-notices/>. The County will not be responsible for full or partial sets of Bidding Documents, including Attachments or any Addenda, obtained from any source other than the County's website.

96. **Question:** Section 2.4 states the County has used Oracle PeopleSoft for Financials, Supply Chain Management, and Human Capital Management for more than 25 years, without stating the specific version currently in production. Please confirm the specific version(s) of PeopleSoft FSCM and HCM currently in production, along with any known customizations or bolt-on modules, to help scope data conversion and interface complexity.

Answer: Current versions -

HCM – 9.2

FSCM – 9.2

PT – 8.62

The current PeopleSoft system is heavily customized. The work was done in-house and we can support the vendor to understand the data environment for extraction.

97. **Question:** Section 2.4 states that the County completed an ERP needs assessment prior to issuing this RFP. Is the detailed needs-assessment report or underlying requirements-gathering documentation available to bidders as a reference document, either during the Q&A period or upon contract award?

Answer: All information necessary to submit a proposal is included in the RFP. Bidders should provide their best response based on the requirements and information provided.

98. **Question:** Highest-Priority Operational Pain Points: Across finance, procurement, HR, payroll, reporting, and related processes, are there one or two areas where the current PeopleSoft environment or surrounding manual processes are creating the greatest operational burden for County staff today?

Answer: All information necessary to submit a proposal is included in the RFP. Bidders should provide their best response based on the requirements and information provided.

99. **Question:** Implementation and Change-Management Risk: Beyond the technical implementation itself, what does the County see as the biggest risk to

a successful ERP transition—data migration, user adoption, business-process change, integration complexity, staff capacity, or another area?

Answer: All information necessary to submit a proposal is included in the RFP. Bidders should provide their best response based on the requirements and information provided.

100. **Question:** Integration and Modernization Priorities: Of the many systems identified for replacement, consideration, or integration, are there particular interfaces or legacy dependencies that the County expects to be especially difficult or important during the first phases of implementation?

Answer: No.

101. **Question:** Does the County prefer to have either/or:

a. a centralized cashiering process where all payments are made through one software with real-time, bi-directional integration back to other software

b. decentralized where each department/software records their own payments and updates the financial system?

If the County would like to move to a centralized cashiering approach, can you list the applications that you would like the new cashiering application to take payments for?

Answer: Decentralized.

102. **Question:** Would the County provide us with the total number of users, including supervisors, that will be accessing only the new Cashiering/POS module? This would be based on receiving payments for the Financial A/R system, miscellaneous payments and any users associated with the answer above. (Note that read-only users and daily departmental revenue submitters are no charge.)

Answer: 10.

103. **Question:** Can the County list the current POS equipment and model you would like the Cashiering solution to integrate with or would the County like additional POS equipment to be included in the RFP response (receipt printers, scanners, cash drawers, check imaging/MICR devices, encrypted credit card swipe and EMV/chip/tap-to-pay devices)?

Answer: Velocity POS equipment: combination of iPP310 and Desk/1600 units. CSG Forte POS equipment: Verifone V400c with cables.

104. **Question:** What credit processors are the County currently using?

Answer: The requested information has been provided in the RFP.

105. **Question:** Would the County like the new cashiering solution to become the County's Online Customer Payment Portal? If so, what applications would the County like to take online payments for?

Answer: No.

106. **Question:** Would the County like the cashiering solution to create an Image Cash Letter (ICL) containing check images for deposit, and send it to your bank? If so, what bank?

Answer: Truist Bank.

107. **Question:** Does the County have a multi-check scanning process in place for recording checks and invoices in batch? If not, should this be included in the response? What is the annual volume that the County would scan using this process?

Answer: No.

108. **Question:** Does the County have scenarios where different departments/agencies need to submit end of day receipt summary information? If so, would the County like to automate that?

Answer: Yes.

109. **Question:** For cash receipting, what are your top five issues you experience? Of those five, which is most important and why?

Answer: All information necessary to submit a proposal is included in the RFP. Bidders should provide their best response based on the requirements and information provided.

110. **Question:** Please define the expected "ACFR builder" functionality. Does the County expect complete production of the ACFR, including narrative sections, statistical schedules, note disclosures, charts, page numbering, electronic review, and final publication, or only preparation of financial statements and supporting schedules?

Answer: Only financial statements and supporting schedules.

111. **Question:** Please provide the number and types of investments and debt obligations to be managed, including pooled investments, bank accounts, debt schedules, covenant tracking, market valuation, interest allocation, and required external data feeds.

Answer: County complies with NCGS 159-30 regarding investments and types allowed. County participates in the NC Capital Management Trust mutual fund, NCCLASS and NCIP local government investment pools. Additional

investment information as well as debt schedules can be found in the latest ACFR report at:

https://catawbacountync.gov/site/assets/files/2544/acfr_2025_final_revised_01_30_2026.pdf

112. **Question:** For TIN matching, debarment, OSHA, EEO, and other supplier-compliance checks, does the County expect automated third-party validation? If so, are there preferred data providers or government services?

Answer: This service would be ideal, although the County does not have a specific preferred provider or service.

113. **Question:** The current-state profile states that the County does not use NIGP or commodity codes, while several requirements depend on commodity codes for supplier registration, sourcing recommendations, duplicate-contract warnings, and reporting. Does the County intend to implement NIGP codes, another commodity taxonomy, or a County-defined structure?

Answer: Implementing NIGP codes would be ideal.

114. **Question:** Does “Grant Management” include pre-award opportunity identification and application development, or is the required scope primarily post-award setup, budgeting, compliance, cost allocation, reimbursement, reporting, and closeout?

Answer: The required scope is primarily focused on post-award activities.

115. **Question:** Contract Management: Please explain what types of phases you are looking for the Contract Management functionality to support?

Answer: See Attachment C of the RFP for minimum requirements.

116. **Question:** Does your organization have dedicated change management resources for leading overall change management efforts or are you relying on the vendor to assist you with the implementation of the change management strategy, communications, engagement, and training?

Answer: The County will lead change management and expect the vendor to assist by providing out of the box communication and training material and supporting the development of custom material as needed.

117. **Question:** Does the County have a preferred ERP to replace PeopleSoft?

Answer: No. The County does not have a preferred ERP solution. The purpose of this RFP is to evaluate available solutions and determine the best fit for the County’s needs.

118. **Question:** Is Plante Moran permitted to bid on this RFP?

Answer: No.

119. **Question:** Are there any restrictions to offshore resources? (We typically have a blended team of onshore and offshore.)

Answer: The requested information has been provided in the RFP on Page 17.

120. **Question:** Please confirm our understanding that Catawba County only has one union. How many total unionized employees, and what union-specific rules (e.g., pay, benefits, scheduling, seniority, bidding) must the HRIS support?

Answer: The County has no unions.

121. **Question:** How many total benefit plans does the County support? Please list all types of benefits that need to be supported (Medical, dental, vision, life, FSA, etc.)

Answer: Benefits plans include: Medical (2 plans), opt out medical, dental, vision (2 Plans), HSA, FSA, life insurances (multiple), critical care insurance, accident, short and long term disability.

122. **Question:** Do you have state sponsored retirement (savings) plans? If yes, how many plans? Is there a 3rd party system that will determine eligibility?

Answer: Yes. The County is a member of the NC Local Government Retirement System (LGERS). The County determines eligibility for LGERS membership.

123. **Question:** When is your Open Enrollment Period and the Effective Date for New Benefits?

Answer: Open enrollment period varies but is usually the end of April or early May with all benefit elections effective July 1st.

124. **Question:** Which Pay Cycles Do You Operate (Weekly, Bi-Weekly, Semi-Monthly, Monthly)?

Answer: Bi-weekly.

125. **Question:** Do you have any employees holding more than One Unique Job at a time?

Answer: Yes.

126. **Question:** What is the County's budgeting cycle (when does it begin and end)?

Answer: July 1 – June 30

127. **Question:** How many FEIN's does the County operate under?

Answer: One.

128. **Question:** Since Expenses and Procurement are in scope, do you have 2 different credit cards -- one for each function?

Answer: No.

129. **Question:** Does the County prefer implementation be performed by an SI or by the primary software company?

Answer: No preference. The County is open to either approach and will consider the option that best meets the needs of the County.

130. **Question:** Is there a project team that will be dedicated to the implementation?

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 38.

131. **Question:** Are there any other major projects, reorganizations, etc. occurring at the same time as the ERP implementation?

Answer: Nothing is currently scheduled.

132. **Question:** Are there any weeks or months during the year when certain project resources will be unavailable?

Answer: No defined periods. When the vendor and County agree on a timeline, key business activities will be considered.

133. **Question:** The scope calls out specific core/application software for Financials and HR/Payroll. However, the current application environment lists several items as '*Consider*' replacing. Should these items be priced out as optional or include where we see fit?

Answer: All items identified in the core list are required and should be included and priced as part of the proposed solution. For systems identified as "Consider" in the application listing, the County intends to replace those systems if the proposed solution provides the necessary functionality. However, the County may elect to maintain an existing system if the proposed solution does not provide a viable alternative. Vendors should identify and price any proposed replacement functionality accordingly.

134. **Question:** For data conversion and migration, there are functional areas listed as open or active and others 3 years. Is there an ultimate cap of number of years? i.e. 5

Answer: The number of years depends on the data as stated in the attachment. If something is listed as Open or Active, only transactions/data that are in that status are included as opposed to looking back at closed/completed transactions.

135. **Question:** Can the County give more details about vendor demonstrations, such as the logistics, scoring criteria, and percentage of total vendor score? Will shortlisted vendor demonstrations be based on a County-defined script? If yes, when will the demonstration scripts be provided?

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 21.

136. **Question:** Can the County give more details about vendor demonstrations, such as the logistics, scoring criteria, and percentage of total vendor score? Will shortlisted vendor demonstrations be based on a County-defined script? If yes, when will the demonstration scripts be provided?

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 21.

137. **Question:** Section 3.2 allows bidders to partner to cover Core modules. Section 7.10 states the successful proposer “will be the primary software company and will perform the services using their own workforce” and “shall not subcontract the project without the prior approval of the County.” Confirm whether a systems integrator may serve as the contracting prime with the software publisher as a named partner, or whether the software publisher must be the prime contractor.

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 8.

138. **Question:** Must the County contract for software subscriptions through the proposer as a single bundled award, or may the County contract software directly with the publisher (or an authorized reseller) and contract implementation services separately?

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 8.

139. **Question:** Attachment C uses Essential / Desired / Optional and Core / Expanded. Confirm that the base (Required) price must include only Essential-Core requirements, and that Desired-Core, Optional-Core, Expanded, and items marked “Remove” on the HR tab may be priced as Optional lines or omitted.

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 133. The required price must include the pricing for all requirements in the required area. The Essential/Desired/Optional listing is for the County’s use in evaluating the software fit. Any item marked as Remove will be omitted from review.

140. **Question:** For applications coded Consider / Interface (NeoGov, Power DMS, SharePoint, Velocity, PlanetBids, DocuSign, Forte), should proposers (a) include a Required interface price assuming the current system is retained, and (b) include any native replacement module only as Optional, with the County deciding replace-versus-retain after award?

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 133.

141. **Question:** Section 3.3 lists Recruiting and onboarding as Core software, while Section 2.8 codes NeoGov as Consider / Interface. Must proposers include a native applicant-tracking / recruiting module in the Core software fee, or is Core satisfied by retaining NeoGov and delivering the Attachment A NeoGov integration?

Answer: The County would like to consider other recruiting applications besides NeoGov. A proposal/price with and without NeoGov would be preferred, assuming the vendor has a delivered applicant tracking system.

142. **Question:** At go-live, is BenefitSolver the system of record for benefit plan setup and employee elections, with the ERP receiving elections and passing deductions to payroll, or must the ERP be the enrollment system of record?

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 86.

143. **Question:** Is a native ERP learning-management module required as the County-wide training system of record at go-live, or is Core limited to consuming training and certification records from the retained departmental LMS systems named in Section 2.8 and Attachment A (ACADIS, NCSW Learn, HealthStream, and Power DMS if retained)?

Answer: Yes, a native ERP LMM required at go-live.

144. **Question:** Confirm Laserfiche is to be retired at ERP go-live and that Core scope is the ERP-native repository for transaction, contract, and employee attachments — not a separate enterprise content-management platform — and that SharePoint, if retained, is used only for content the ERP does not store.

Answer: The county listed all software systems so that vendors could understand the network/application landscape. Laserfiche is not expected to be replaced by an ERP system. Artifacts will not be migrated from Laserfiche to the new ERP system. If the vendor offers records management it may be used for some documents going forward.

145. **Question:** Is production of the Annual Comprehensive Financial Report (ACFR) inside the proposed ERP required in the Core fee (fully replacing CCH ProSystem and Envision), and must Power BI be retired, or is Core met by ERP

inquiry/dashboards plus export of trial-balance and note data to a County-retained ACFR / BI tool?

Answer: Production of ACFR within the ERP is not required but preferred. Ideally, ERP dashboards would replace reliance on Power BI for trending.

146. **Question:** Is department workforce scheduling (EMS, Library, and similar shift scheduling currently performed in Outlook Calendar and When2Work) in Core implementation scope, or is Core limited to time entry, approval, leave, and payroll?

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 47.

147. **Question:** Does Core cashiering include replacing the County's 35 POS / cash-register devices and departmental over-the-counter hardware, or is Core limited to ERP miscellaneous billing, centralized receipting, and interfaces to Velocity, Forte, Truist lockbox, and Bank of America as listed in Attachment A?

Answer: Core limited to items listed in Attachment A.

148. **Question:** Section 2.8 marks jail, Trimble, Power DMS, and Fuel Master inventory as Maintain. Attachment C still lists inventory-management requirements as Core. Confirm inventory for parts, uniforms, fleet, and fuel remains in the retained systems, and that Attachment C inventory requirements are out of the Core fee unless proposed as Optional.

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 87.

149. **Question:** Confirm conversion is limited to the objects and history windows in Attachment A Migrations. Provide record counts for each object, or confirm proposers may use Section 2.10 operating metrics with a $\pm 25\%$ collar. Separately: must PeopleSoft source attachments listed as "w/ attachments" be migrated into the ERP, or is conversion of structured data plus a County-managed archive of historical images acceptable?

Answer: The county retains the right to negotiate additional migrations once they understand the capabilities of the chosen application. There are currently 120,000 financial and 84,000 HR documents within the history window. Yes, source documents within the history window are to be migrated.

150. **Question:** Is the implementation expected to convert the current Fund-Dept ID-GL Account-Project structure like-for-like, or is a chart-of-accounts / enterprise-structure redesign in Core scope?

Answer: No redesign. Requiring like-for-like structure.

151. **Question:** Is the 99.99% monthly availability statement in Attachment A a mandatory pass/fail requirement, or is the software publisher's published U.S.-hosted SaaS SLA acceptable provided data remain in the United States?

Answer: The County is requesting information regarding the vendor's SLA and minimum uptime commitment for the proposed cloud-based system. This isn't a pass/fail requirement that would disqualify an entire proposal.

152. **Question:** Confirm Addendum No. 1 controls the calendar (questions 21 Sep, answers 25 Sep, proposals 21 Oct 3:00 PM, demos first two weeks of December).

Answer: This is confirmation that Addendum No. 1 amends the RFP schedule as stated above.

153. **Question:** Is there a required first production go-live date (E.g., 1 July aligned to fiscal year-end 30 June)? May proposers use a phased Financials-then-HCM go-live? How many calendar days of post-go-live hypercare are included in Section 3.4 "Go-Live Support"? Must travel be inside the implementation fee or may it be estimated as T&E actuals?

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 4.

154. **Question:** Cloud software publishers generally contract for their subscription services under standard terms with respect to limitation of liability, warranty, and indemnification. Would the County be willing to discuss and negotiate these terms — Sections 7.4, 7.6, 7.9, and the Attachment F Data Security Addendum — with the selected vendor at the appropriate stage of the process? Relatedly, may bidders note proposed clarifications to these sections in the Attachment A Compliance Exceptions tab without the response being considered non-responsive?

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer 34.

155. **Question:** Scope of the "Replace" designation for Laserfiche, Power BI, and ACFR tooling. Section 2.8 designates Laserfiche, Microsoft Power BI, CCH ProSystem fx Engagement, and Envision as "Replace."

(a) For Laserfiche: is the replacement scope limited to ERP-related content (contracts, AP invoices, HR employee files, transaction attachments), or does the County expect the ERP to serve as its enterprise records management platform county-wide, including retention schedules, legal hold, and public records workflows? Approximately what document count or storage volume is intended to move?

(b) For Power BI: does the County intend to retire Power BI entirely as an enterprise analytics platform, or only for ERP financial reporting, retaining it for non-ERP data?

(c) For ACFR: does the County expect the proposed solution to generate the ACFR itself — statements, note disclosures, and audit workpaper support — or to provide the underlying data supporting ACFR preparation in a separate tool?

Answer: a) County retains the right to utilize all document management capabilities within the chosen application. There is no requirement to migrate past documents from Laserfiche.

b) Refer to Question/Answer No. 145.

c) Refer to Question/Answer No. 110.

156. **Question:** Time, attendance, and workforce scheduling. Section 2.8 designates Outlook Calendar (EMS, Library shift assignments) and When2Work as "Replace," but scheduling is not listed among the Core software components in Section 3.3, which lists Time Entry only.

(a) Is 24/7 shift scheduling — rotations, shift bidding, call-back, minimum staffing, and overtime equalization — required in the base bid, or should it be priced as an optional component?

(b) How many employees are in shift-scheduled operations, and across how many departments? Approximately 4 departments with 350 employees

(c) Are physical time clocks or badge-reader terminals required for any population (EMS, jail, facilities, Public Health)? If so, approximately how many devices and at how many sites, and should the bidder price the hardware?

Answer: a) Required in the base bid.

b) Approximately 4 departments with 350 employees.

c) Refer to Question/Answer No. 53.

157. **Question:** Cashiering, point of sale, and payment processing. Section 2.10 cites 35 cash registers/POS terminals under a currently centralized receipting model; Section 3.3 lists Cashiering as Core.

(a) Is cashiering hardware (receipt printers, cash drawers, scanners, card terminals) in scope for the bidder to propose and price, or will the County procure hardware separately?

(b) Does the County intend to move to decentralized departmental receipting as part of this project, and if so across approximately how many sites?

Answer: a) Refer to Question/Answer No. 18, No. 103 and No. 147.

b) Yes, approximately 6 site locations.

158. **Question:** The seven "Consider Replacing / Integrate if Maintained" applications. NeoGov, Power DMS, SharePoint (HR checklists/repository), Velocity, PlanetBids, DocuSign, and Forte carry a C/I designation. Attachment A

separately notes that the BenefitSolver integration direction is "TBD if benefits will be chosen in BenefitSolver or Future ERP."

(a) Will the County make these replace-versus-retain decisions before contract execution, or should bidders assume they are deferred into the project?

(b) For benefits specifically: should bidders assume open enrollment and life events are performed in the ERP, with BenefitSolver retained for COBRA and carrier connectivity, or that BenefitSolver remains the enrollment system of record?

Answer: a) Yes.
b) Refer to Question/Answer 86.

159. **Question:** Integration responsibility and method. Attachment A lists 16 integrations, all designated Core.

(a) Is the bidder responsible only for the ERP-side endpoint, with the County responsible for securing each third party's participation, API access, licensing, and any third-party development fees?

(b) Has the County confirmed that these systems — notably Bi-Tek, CureMD, SmartGov, Permitium, ACADIS, NCSW Learn, HealthStream, and Fuel Master — expose documented, supported APIs or agreed file interfaces? If specifications exist, may they be provided?

Answer: a) Yes.
b) Yes. We will work with final bidder to outline needed specifications and integrations.

160. **Question:** Pricing – Sizing data:

(a) Total W-2 headcount, including PRN and part-time.

(b) Number of pay cycles and their frequencies, and number of pay groups.

(c) Approximate number of active earnings codes, deduction codes, and leave/accrual plans.

(d) Whether the County processes retiree payroll or retiree benefit billing.

Answer: a) County processes approximately 1,700 W-2s annually
b) Refer to Question/Answer No. 16 and No. 124.
c) Refer to Question/Answer No. 16.
d) Yes (retiree separation allowance is processed through payroll, retiree benefits are collected through bank draft)

161. **Question:** Project budget. Has the County established a budget or appropriation range for this project, and is funding available across multiple fiscal years given the non-appropriation provisions in Sections 7.7 and 7.11? If a range or not-to-exceed figure can be shared, bidders can scope phasing and optional components to fit it, which improves the comparability of the proposals the County receives.

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 5.

162. **Question:** Project start, target go-live, and phasing. The RFP lists Contract Award and Contract Effective Date as TBA and states no target go-live.

(a) What contract effective date should bidders assume for the Attachment D staffing months and Attachment B Year 1?

(b) Is there a target go-live, or a date by which PeopleSoft must be retired — for example, a hosting or support contract expiration?

(c) Does the County prefer a fiscal-year-aligned financials go-live (July 1) with a calendar-year-aligned payroll go-live (January 1), or is the bidder free to recommend?

(d) Is the County open to a phased implementation (financials first, HCM and payroll second), or is a single go-live preferred?

Answer: Refer to Question/Answer No. 3 and No. 4.

163. **Question:** Attachment C response codes and modification pricing.

(a) The Availability/Response dropdown offers Y (native), R (with reporting tools), T (third party), M (with modification), F (future), and N (not available), but no code for functionality delivered through standard configuration. Should configurable-but-not-default functionality be answered Y with an explanatory comment, or M?

(b) Section 6.4 requires modification costs to be identified in the pricing workbook. Where multiple "M" responses would be satisfied by a single development effort, may bidders group them into named development items with a cost for each, rather than pricing each of the approximately 1,000 requirement lines individually? Alternatively, is a single configuration and extension allowance acceptable?

Answer: The yes response would apply to base functionality that is configured by the vendor or as-is out of the box. Anything marked Y is assumed to be included in the price. If there is additional cost, this should be clearly indicated. Costs for related development efforts for any modifications can be grouped together in the pricing. If they are grouped, please indicate all requirements being fulfilled in the description of that cost line item.

164. **Question:** Attachment A format discrepancy. Sections 2.9, 6.1, and 8 refer to "Attachment A – RFP for ERP Software and Implementation Services – Bidder Forms.docx" and to a "Technical and Bidder Hosting Requirements Form" contained within it. The attachment issued is an Excel workbook (Attachment A – Bidder Questionnaire.xlsx) containing Questionnaire, References, Compliance Exceptions, Integrations, and Migrations tabs. Please confirm that the issued .xlsx is the complete and correct Attachment A and that no separate .docx form or Technical and Bidder Hosting Requirements Form remains outstanding.

Answer: Technical and Bidder hosting requirements are addressed within the Questionnaire Tab of Attachment A. There is no separate Technical and Bidder Hosting Requirements Form.

165. **Question:** Submission format.

(a) Section 4.4 requires one electronic PDF copy on a USB drive, while Attachments B, C, and D are Excel workbooks that evaluators will likely need in native format. Should the USB contain a single consolidated PDF, a consolidated PDF plus native .xlsx files for Attachments A through D, or another combination?

(b) Section 6.3 limits the narrative to 20 pages and excludes the Excel attachments and the sample project plan. Please confirm the following are also excluded: key personnel resumes, the license and support agreements required by Section 7.6, architecture diagrams, the SOC 2 report or summary, and covers, tabs, and the table of contents.

(c) Section 6.1 directs bidders to follow RFP section numbering, while Section 6.3 prescribes a specific narrative structure. Please confirm that organizing the narrative per the Section 6.3 headings satisfies Section 6.1, and that a section-by-section restatement of the full RFP body is not expected.

Answer: a) The specific combination is not prescribed, provided the USB thumb drive contains the electronic PDF proposal and completed Excel Attachments in native format. The original hard-copy proposal may include a list or summary of the Excel Attachments rather than the full workbooks.

b) Yes, those are excluded.

c) Yes, a section-by-section restatement is not expected.

166. **Question:** Does the County need physical time clocks for time collection? If so:

- a. how many are required in total, and in addition to pin entry, how many of other reader types should be priced (can be intermixed): barcode, magnetic swipe, proximity, smartcard, or biometric?
- b. How many employees in total will log time using physical time clocks, as opposed to browser- or mobile-based time entry?

- c. Do you want to allow employees to use different methods interchangeably (for example, clock in via physical time clock and then clock out via mobile)?

Answer: The County does not currently use physical time clocks for time entry. Vendors may include time clocks and associated reader options as an optional/add-on component for future consideration.

167. **Question:** Section 2.8 lists "When2Work" as scheduling software the County intends to replace. For the department (EMS/9-1-1 population) does the County need scheduling capability beyond a standard HCM/ERP module, such as: rotating 24/7 shift patterns, minimum-staffing coverage alerts based on seniority, certification and credential expiration tracking, and compliance with work, union, and fatigue rules?

- a. What are the current pain points with the existing tool?
- b. Beyond EMS, does the scheduling replacement scope extend to other 24/7 public-safety operations, such as the Sheriff's Office, Detention/Corrections, and Fire if County-operated, or is it limited to EMS?
- c. What is the total #of public safety employees, with special scheduling requirements?

Answer: a) All information necessary to submit a proposal is included in the RFP. Bidders should provide their best response based on the requirements and information provided.

- b) It applies to other 24/7 departments.
- c) Approximately 320.

168. **Question:** Section 3.3's software scope table does not list scheduling as a Core or Expanded component. Beyond the public safety population, is shift-based workforce scheduling in scope for this procurement?

Answer: Yes.

169. **Question:** The RFP states: Vendors are encouraged to provide a sample project plan. The sample project plan will not count toward the page limit. Would Catawba prefer that the sample plan be included within the response or attached at the end as an appendix?

Answer: The sample plan can be attached as an appendix.

170. **Question:** Are you accepting multiple bids from same partner?

Answer: The RFP does not prohibit an implementation partner or software provider from participating in multiple proposals. We expect that each combination of software and implementation partner will only propose one

proposal for their recommended approach. Multiple proposals would only be accepted if there is a different combination of software and implementation partner. Each proposal must independently meet all requirements of the RFP and clearly identify the proposed team, roles, responsibilities, pricing, and solution.

171. **Question:** Can the Catawba team provide guidance on the anticipated number of distinct users in each of the categories described below?

- ERP Financials – Full Users: Finance administrators and operational Finance users who need functionality beyond self-service ERP. Examples: GL, AP, AR, billing, cash management, fixed assets, grants, projects, budget, and close staff; users who maintain financial setups, accounting structures, security, approval rules, reference data, or scheduled processes.
- ERP Financials – Self-service User: Users who need ERP reporting/inquiry access, including drill-down to related transactions; approve ERP transactions or workflows; enter or approve expenses; view, print, pay, or dispute bills; enter/approve project time; or manage project tasks, deliverables, issues, change orders, resources, or assignments. Examples: department managers, budget owners, grant managers, expense users, project team members, and report consumers.
- Procurement – Full User: Procurement administrators and operational Procurement users who need Purchasing, Sourcing, Procurement Contracts, Supplier Portal, or Supplier Qualification functionality. Examples: buyers, purchasing agents, sourcing specialists, procurement managers, contract administrators, supplier-management staff, and users who maintain suppliers, POs, sourcing events, contracts, procurement controls, security, or approval rules.
- Procurement – Self-service User: Users who create and manage self-service requisitions, approve procurement workflows, confirm receipt where applicable, or need essential-user contract access, including read-only contract access and deliverables management. Examples: department requesters, department managers, budget owners, grant managers, and contract stakeholders.

Answer:

- 20 Finance Full Users (Finance, Budget, IT)
- 50 Finance Self-Service (Departments)
- 10 Procurement Full Users (Finance/purchasing, IT)
- 50 Procurement Self-Service (Departments)

This Addendum consists of 34 pages in total.

END OF ADDENDUM