

100

*RFP 24-75386 - Maternal and Child Health Data System:
Cost Assumptions, Conditions, & Constraints*

RFP 24-75386 - Maternal and Child Health Data System: Cost Assumptions, Conditions, & Constraints

The following outlines the cost assumptions, conditions, and constraints that impact the prices presented on the Cost Schedules for the Maternal and Child Health (MCH) solution proposed by Dimagi. These are aligned with the core components outlined in the Cost Proposal Narrative.

Project Scope and Duration

Our pricing is based on a thorough interpretation of the requirements and activities laid out in Attachment K (Scope of Work) and Attachment O (Functional and Technical Requirements). This interpretation is reflected in our Technical Proposal and responses in Attachment O. Any significant change in scope beyond our proposed solution and approach may necessitate resource adjustments and ultimately impact our price. Our proposal assumes 18 months for DDI performance and an additional 6 months for Stabilization M&O before entering Steady State.

Staffing

Dimagi Staffing:

- Dimagi's staffing costs are based on the federal General Services Administration's (GSA) [Authorized Federal Supply Schedule Price List](#). The requested LOE in the Attachment D budget and Attachment M Resource documents provide a cost-effective approach to the proposed scope of work.
- Dimagi's standard work day consists of 8 hours per day for 5 days per week. Staff receive paid time off (PTO) of 30 days for vacation, holidays, and sick leave. Therefore, a normal work-year includes: (260 days – 30 days) = 230 billable days per year; daily rates calculated on a basis of 260 billable days in a year per U.S government standards. Dimagi's Full Time Equivalent (FTE) level of effort (LOE) for calendar year LOE, therefore, is based on 230 days per year, so 1.0 FTE = 230 days per year.

State & Data assumptions:

As stated in other parts of this proposal, Dimagi's subcontractors ("we") have worked with healthcare (including vital records), foster care, Medicaid, and other types of data that will be included in the interfaces. To ensure efficient and effective data interface execution, below are the assumptions/conditions/constraints that are expected given the timeline and pricing structure:

1. **Timely access to source systems:** We've worked with other agencies and IOT related to access and can navigate the details easily. However, we periodically experience some delays related to some systems. Therefore, we expect that access to each system will be straightforward and timely. In some cases, human users may have to access the system to query data either one-time (in the case of data profiling) or on-going (in the case that an automated process is problematic in some way). In other cases, a system user will be used to pull data.
2. **Access to available system documentation:** As we've worked with many other source systems, we understand how valuable documentation can be. Even if it is somewhat

outdated, major functions of database structures may be left unchanged. Therefore, we assume that documentation will be available and provided at the beginning of the project. This can include (but is not limited to): Entity Relationship Diagrams of databases, data dictionaries, business or technical requirements documents that spell out business rules, and recent enhancements/maintenance ticket information to describe recent changes. The best timeline scenario requires multiple tasks starting simultaneously. So more documentation up-front will help with the timeline.

3. **Access to system owners and key analysts:** What we have found over the years of working with various systems within the State of Indiana, is that documentation will only provide part of the information needed. Oftentimes, the meaning of some data items are dependent on interviews with the key State staff who have worked with the system. They can provide quick and easy explanations that may not be included in documentation. These explanations often provide key insights that speed up the integration process or provide information regarding why some data is the way it is. From that, Dimagi and its subcontractors can work collaboratively with State staff to identify the appropriate standardization or cleansing processes. Therefore, the key staff for each system must be available for important meetings. While we realize that this project will not be their only obligation, some amount of time should be carved out for this to be successful.
4. **Commonly understood data formats:** Dimagi and its subcontractors have worked with many systems with many different data formats. Therefore, a variety of data formats (as listed in Attachment O) have been included in the estimates for time and pricing. That said, we have experienced - with some organizations - where the format or other issues with the data creates an undue burden for processing or interpretation. This could be file format issues, data format issues within files, or other items. While Metamor Systems is adept at profiling the data in any system or files, it is dependent on common industry standards. Additionally, HL7 messages are generally standard based on the version used. However, additional and custom segments can be added to messages. While some amount of this type of customization is expected (and built into the timeline and pricing), we do not expect a huge amount of customization. If that becomes the case, some revision of the timeline may be necessary.
5. **Reasonable complexity of legacy data:** Data migration and conversion estimates assume the provided records estimates from Attachment K for My Healthy Baby, Visionlink, INSTEP, EARS over 5, 18, and 25 years respectively. The estimates for staff time anticipate a reasonable complexity of this data, including an expectation of the sources containing two to three tables for migration and conversion. If during requirements elaboration and data discovery the data reality poses extreme complexity, our team recommends revisiting the total desired scope to ensure well-resourced and on-time delivery of migration and conversion.
6. **Ease of transport for integration:** Dimagi's subcontractors have worked with other agencies and IOT related to network and other items to enable integrations and file transfers. Metamor Systems staff can be involved in the discussions of solutions to "transport challenges" (e.g., moving data from the cloud to the State network or moving data between agencies). However, we need IDOH, IOT, and other technology staff to be available in a timely manner to ensure that integration delays are minimized.

Other Costs

User Counts for Licenses

- Dimagi has priced the Annual CommCare Enterprise Subscription and Annual Dimagi Data Platform Subscription, based on the user assumptions outlined in the RFP of up to 26,000 users of different types. If the state significantly expands the number of users or reduces the expected number of users, these subscription fees may need to increase or could decrease as well. Dimagi would welcome discussing more specificity on the expected users, usage volume, etc.

Data Warehouse Compute Costs (Passthrough costs only):

- Dimagi has estimated compute costs for Snowflake to be used as the data warehouse to be \$75,000 a year based on the record count volume estimates provided in the RFP. *We have estimated this based on similar record volumes of another state, but these may be highly variable depending on the exact migrations and Dimagi's experience running data warehouses with other Statewide projects.* These are pass-through costs to purchase credits which are applied against consumption; credits can be carried over if unused for future State use or can be reduced based on more accurate estimates.

All other cost assumptions and justifications are outlined in the Cost Narrative.