



# Request for Proposals 2026-021 Learning Management System

---

## Addendum No. 2 Issue Date: April 17, 2026

Responding Offers on this project are hereby notified that this Addendum shall be made a part of the above-named RFP document.

The following items add to, modify, and/or clarify the RFP Documents and shall have the full force and effect of the original Documents. This Addendum shall be acknowledged by the Offeror in the RFP document.

### ***End of Add/Delete Section***

#### ***Delete: 5.2 Proposal Format that states;***

***The total length of the proposal should be no more than 30 pages, 8½ x 11 size paper with an 11-point minimum text size. Charts and graphs may be 10 points. All required forms are exempt from the page limit and must be submitted under the section identified below. Only one (1) complete proposal should be electronically submitted. The maximum document upload size is 20 MB***

## Questions/Answers Section

1. What is the exact, verified count of active municipal employees who will require persistent access to the LMS?

**At this time, approximately 1200. Over the last 12-month period we had the same amount of unique users completing courses. We don't anticipate any significant growth over the contract term.**

2. How many external contractors, temporary workers, or municipal volunteers will require temporary credentialing within the system annually?

**Approximately 600, if the capability exists in the solution**

3. What is the anticipated peak concurrent user load (e.g., during mandatory annual countywide compliance or OSHA rollouts)?

**Approximately 1200**

4. What is the total volumetric size of historical data (in Gigabytes or Terabytes) currently stored within the legacy NEOGOV Learn environment?

**Unknown**

5. How many distinct SCORM or xAPI modules are currently utilized, and what is their average file size?

**Unknown. Since our current LMS doesn't allow large file sizes we were limited in what we uploaded to the system. Some of our larger size videos are between 1.5 and 2.5 GB. These are their original size and are not compressed or processed for an LMS.**

6. Are there specific departmental cohorts (e.g., law enforcement, water utility) that require isolated, multi-tenant segmentation within the broader LMS architecture?

**No department needs isolated segmentation at this time.**

7. What is the average duration, resolution, and bit-rate of the high-definition safety videos the county intends to host?

**The system shall support upload and playback of video files with an average duration of up to 30 minutes, a resolution of 1920×1080 (1080p HD), and a bitrate of up to 8 Mbps**

8. Does the current Tyler Technologies Munis ERP environment natively support Bulk/Batch RESTful API endpoints, or will the integration rely on legacy flat-file (CSV/SFTP) exports?

**Unknown**

9. Regarding the NEOGOV HRIS integration, what specific demographic fields, position classifications, and reporting hierarchies must be synchronized continuously?

**The County is seeking a solution that provides integration options to automatically provision new users into the LMS from existing County systems. The new LMS solution will determine which fields drive reporting hierarchies and other required data structures. The integration should support a one-way data sync from the County's existing systems — Active Directory/SSO, Munis, or NEOGOV — into the new LMS. The County does not anticipate or require any data to be written back to any of these source systems. Vendors are asked to describe their available integration methods and how their platform supports this type of one-way synchronization.**

10. Will the M-Star platform need to push compliance completion statuses bidirectionally back into Tyler Munis for payroll or certification stipend processing?

**See number 9**

11. Are there legacy regional K-12 Student Information Systems (like Infinite Campus) that will require future integration via LTI Advantage?

**No**

12. Does the county utilize a secondary Customer Information System (CIS) or Customer Relationship Management (CRM) platform for citizen interactions that requires webhook alerting from the LMS?

**No**

13. Will the incumbent vendor (NEOGO) provide a full SQL database dump, or must historical data be extracted programmatically via their legacy reporting interface?

**Unknown**

14. Does the county possess an existing data dictionary mapping the tables and schema within NEOGOV Learn?

**No formal data dictionary is available; the vendor will be expected to work with the County during the discovery phase to map and validate the data prior to migration.**

15. Are there any proprietary, non-standard course authoring formats currently in use that cannot be cleanly exported to SCORM/xAPI?

**No. All existing course content was created outside of NEOGOV Learn using external authoring tools and uploaded into the platform. The County does not have any content built natively within NEOGOV Learn, and therefore does not anticipate any proprietary format conflicts during content migration.**

16. Will the county require a parallel run phase (operating the legacy system alongside M-Star) prior to the definitive cutover?

**Yes. The County's current contract with NEOGOV Learn runs through August 2026. The County anticipates operating both systems in parallel as needed through that period to ensure a smooth transition and validate that data, content, and user access have been successfully migrated prior to full cutover. Vendors should account for this overlap in their proposed implementation timeline.**

17. Who will serve as the primary internal project manager and single point of contact during the 8-week implementation sprint?

**The County will provide a primary internal project manager and single point of contact during implementation.**

18. Does the county utilize a formal Change Advisory Board (CAB) that must approve all integration testing prior to the final go-live?

**No**

19. Does the county have a documented preference for specific third-party safety compliance catalogs (e.g., OSHA 10/30, NCCER)?

**No**

20. How many internal "Subject Matter Experts" will require specialized Train-the-Trainer instruction on the platform's authoring tools?

**Approximately 5-10**

21. Will the county require MGRM to provide state-certified, virtual safety instructors for highly specialized public works training, or will all instructors be internal staff?

**All instructors will be internal staff.**

22. Is there a requirement to integrate live, virtual instructor-led training (VILT) via Microsoft Teams or Zoom directly into the LMS interface?

**There is no requirement for this functionality.**

23. Does the county require digital badging to be interoperable with external, portable backpack standards (e.g., Open Badges)?

**No. The County does not require digital badging to be interoperable with external portable backpack standards such as Open Badges. Any badging functionality is intended for internal recognition and acknowledgment of training accomplishments within the LMS platform.**

23. If a vendor's commercial cyber liability policy does not independently meet the \$1,000,000 threshold, is an overarching commercial umbrella policy acceptable to the county?

**Currently, our Terms and Conditions, including insurances are set and should be accepted as is.**

24. Is proof of insurance required strictly upon contract execution, or must a preliminary Certificate of Insurance be submitted with the initial proposal package?

**Acknowledgement of the necessity is satisfactory for submittal purposes.**

25. Is the budget for this procurement funded through recurring annual operational expenditures (OpEx) or a one-time capital expenditure (CapEx)?

**All annual spending is open to annual approval. This procurement is funded through the County's normal operating budget.**

26. Is the county willing to leverage the pre-vetted pricing, terms, and conditions established under the North Carolina 920S State Term Contract to expedite implementation?

**At this time the county has decided to seek out an independent contract.**

27. Is the county open to a multi-year (e.g., 3-year or 5-year) subscription agreement to lock in pricing and avoid annual escalations?

**Currently, this is being presented as a two year contract with three, one year renewals.**

28. Does the county have a hard deadline by which the legacy NEOGOV Learn license expires, necessitating an expedited, non-negotiable cutover date?

**Yes, August 2026**

29. How many years and/or records of training history, including completions and certificates, does the County require to be migrated to the new LMS?

**We want all the records, but this can be as simple as a PDF of each learner's current record of completions and certificates under their account for them to reference, up to importing specific names of courses and dates of completion for future searches. The main objective is for each employee to have their record; we are open to how each system manages those historical records.**

31. Of the total user population, how many users do you anticipate will be actively enrolled in or completing training in a typical month?

**Average for the last 12 months is approximately 460 unique learners completing assignments on a monthly basis. The range per month was from 171 to 1093.**

32. Would it be acceptable to adjust the cost items and/or the unit/basis columns in Appendix A to align with our pricing methodology?

**We would prefer the format be as presented. One may submit using a different format but there is a risk we can't measure on an equal basis.**

33. Data Migration, requires migration of various data types from the current NEOGOV Learn system. Please provide an approximate volume of historical data to be migrated, such as the number of user records, total number of course completions, and total number of courses.

**Unknown volume; it depends on what records are able to migrate over. We want all the records of current users, but this can be as simple as a PDF of each learner's current record of completions and certificates under their account for them to reference, up to importing specific names of courses and dates of completion for future searches. The main objective is for each employee to have their record; we are open to how each system manages those historical records.**

34. Integration Requirements, also mentions 'Third-party training content providers.' Can the County provide a list of specific third-party training content providers for which integration is required or desired, to assist Offerors in assessing compatibility and proposing relevant integration strategies?

**Unknown, the County doesn't currently have a third-party content provider. The need for one will depend on the Offerors available content.**

35. What is the total number of user accounts to be migrated, including both active and inactive/historical users?

**We have 3330 learners in the system with approximately 1200 of those being active users.**

36. How many years of training history are expected to be included in the migration?

**As much as possible. This can be as simple as a PDF of each learner's current record of completions and certificates under their account for them to reference, up to importing specific names of courses and dates of completion for future searches. The main objective is for each employee to have their record; we are open to how each system manages those historical records.**

37. Approximately how many total training completion and certification records exist in the current system?

**A quick search shows 55165 completed courses.**

38. What is the approximate number of active enrollments and recurring assignments?

**Unknown, we have approximately 10 courses for onboarding/new hires, along with another 10-20 compliance recurring assignments, depending on the department.**

39. How many groups, departments, and organizational hierarchy levels exist in the current system?

**We have 40 departments with no employee groups or other divisions. We have supervisors listed for all users.**

40. Do certifications carry expiration dates that must be preserved in the new system?

**We do not track next due date in the current LMS, but would have a handful of courses that we would like to move to that process in the new LMS.**

41. Are there custom user profile fields beyond standard attributes that need to be mapped?

**No**

42. Are there manually entered external or offline training records (e.g., conferences, in-person sessions) that must be included?

**No**

43. Are actual certificate documents (PDFs) expected to be recreated in Totara, or is migration of the underlying completion records sufficient?

**Migration of the underlying completion records sufficient?**

44. Are there multiple organizational instances or sub-organizations within NEOGOV Learn?

**No**

45. Is user account data fed from an HRIS or HR system (e.g., NEOGOV HR, Munis)?

**To be determined during implementation of what will be covered by Active Directory and what would need to be integrated from NeoGov HR and Munis. We would like for the systems to integrate at go-live so new users will not have to be entered manually until a future integration date.**

46. What data export capabilities does NEOGOV Learn currently support (e.g., CSV export, API access)?

**Yes, CSV export, unknow API access**

47. Requirement states: "Vendor shall provide comprehensive training for all groups of County users". Can this be accomplished with a "train the trainer" exercise for appropriate personnel during the implementation phase?

**Yes**