

Treatment Advocacy Center

The cheaper rebuild they didn't choose

Moving off Sage Intacct across the June 30 year-end, ahead of the audit

Sage Intacct → QuickBooks Online Advanced | Comprehensive case study

**4 days**

early: final load July 23 against a July 27 plan

6,381

transaction records in the migration window at assessment

2 passes

an 11-month first load, then a final load

1 day

from final load to client sign-off

Treatment Advocacy Center was leaning toward rebuilding its books in QuickBooks Online from last year's audited trial balance, with history left in spreadsheets. It chose a full transaction migration instead. SaaS Direct moved the full FY26 year and July 2026 activity in two passes and delivered four days ahead of plan.

CLIENT





EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Rebuild or migrate, ahead of the audit

Treatment Advocacy Center (TAC) wanted off a Sage Intacct subscription held by its former outsourced accountants, and onto QuickBooks Online Advanced before its audit. The move would span its June 30, 2026 year-end, and the audit would test that year, so whatever it moved had to carry the full year's activity, not just an opening position.

A CPA referred by TAC's auditors offered a lower-cost rebuild from the audited trial balance. TAC chose a full transaction migration from July 1, 2025 instead. SaaS Direct loaded it in two passes and delivered the final load on July 23, four days ahead of plan; the client signed off the next day.

The project had problems, and this document names them: extraction depended on the former accountants enabling access, historical data changed after extraction, we left QuickBooks Online on the wrong fiscal year, and TAC's donor restriction dimension had no direct place to go.

CONTENTS

- 01** The client and starting position
- 02** The core problem
- 03** Designing the migration
- 04** How the engagement ran
- 05** Obstacles and how we resolved them
- 06** Validation
- 07** Timeline and outcome
- 08** What made this work

STARTING POSITION

FROM

Sage Intacct

- Subscription held by the former accountants
- GL, AR and AP; departments and projects
- Donor restrictions tracked as a dimension
- Bill.com for payables
- Audit expected in mid-August



TO

QuickBooks Online Advanced

- FY26 and July 2026 at transaction level
- Original invoice and bill types preserved
- Departments as classes; projects migrated
- Open AR and AP as of June 30, 2025
- Signed off one day after final delivery

The client and starting position

Treatment Advocacy Center is a national nonprofit based in Alexandria, Virginia, founded in 1998, working to eliminate barriers to treatment for people with serious mental illness, funded almost entirely by contributions and grants.

Its finance function is small. Payables ran through Bill.com, and credit card activity was imported from Nexonia. In Intacct, TAC used GL, AR and AP with department and project dimensions, and tracked donor restrictions in a dimension of their own. The Intacct subscription was the one its former outsourced accountants had used; TAC planned to discontinue it after the move.

INTACCT COMPANY PROFILE

ITEM	AT ASSESSMENT
Intacct modules in use	General Ledger, Accounts Receivable, Accounts Payable
Currencies	US dollars only
Chart of accounts	146 accounts
Customers / vendors	486 customers; 431 vendors
Dimensions	39 departments; 26 projects; donor restrictions
Transaction volume	6,381 transaction records from July 1, 2025 to assessment
Deadline	Audit expected in mid-August 2026

Counts are from the pre-project complexity assessment of the Intacct company.

WHAT TAC NEEDED

Off the old firm's subscription

A system of its own, so the Intacct subscription could be discontinued.

Current year intact

Every FY26 transaction in QuickBooks Online, not re-keyed or summarized.

Done before the audit

Go-live no later than July 30, ahead of an audit expected in mid-August.



The core problem

For a small nonprofit, rebuilding from the audited trial balance looks sensible: the prior year is closed, the numbers are audited, and a CPA can key opening balances quickly. TAC was leaning that way in early May, on cost and because its financials are not very complex.

The catch is the calendar. The move was planned for July 2026, just after the June 30 year-end, and the audit would test the year that had just closed. In our assessment, an opening-balance rebuild would have put a single starting position in QuickBooks Online and left a full year of invoices, bills, payments and journals to be rebuilt by manual entry, without the links between each invoice and its customer and each bill and its vendor.

Any organization that changes systems around a year-end, with an audit of that year still ahead, faces the same choice. An opening-balance rebuild is cheaper at the start, but the cost comes back as re-keyed activity and a thinner audit trail for the year being audited.

IS THIS YOUR SITUATION?

- ☒ You are changing systems around a fiscal year-end
- ☒ An audit will test a year you have not yet moved
- ☒ Someone has proposed rebuilding from last year's audited trial balance
- ☒ Your current system sits on a subscription you do not control

If two or more apply, the choice between rebuild and migration is the decision that matters, not the software.



SECTION 03

Designing the migration

Six alternatives were considered and set aside, three before the project started and three during it.

OPTION CONSIDERED	WHY IT WAS SET ASIDE
CPA rebuild from the audited June 30, 2025 trial balance, history in Excel	Lower cost. In our assessment, links between invoices and customers and between bills and vendors would not carry over, and a full year of activity would be rebuilt by manual entry before the audit.
Opening balances only, with SaaS Direct	Offered as the lower-cost option in the fixed quote. Full history was chosen because it preserves original transaction types and drill-down.
Historical package for years before July 2025	Offered as an add-on, not taken. TAC keeps its own records for prior years, and invoice detail also lives in Bill.com.
First cutoff at March 31, 2026	May was already closed, so the first load moved to May 31 to reduce the volume left for the final load.
Deleting inactive duplicate vendors and customers	Some inactive records could have transactions tied to them, and records cannot be deleted once in QuickBooks Online. Instead, only records with transactions in the migration period came across, with a "-1" suffix where names clashed.
Entering transactions in QuickBooks Online during the freeze	Declined while the final migration ran. New activity was tracked outside both systems until the freeze ended on July 27.

Chosen: full transaction history from July 1, 2025, in two passes

Open AR and AP as of June 30, 2025, then every transaction from July 1, 2025 with its original type. The first pass ran through May 31, 2026 and was delivered July 13 for review; the final load, extracted after the last working day in Intacct, added June 1 to July 17 activity and later edits and was delivered July 23. Departments became classes, projects were migrated, and the chart of accounts migrated as-is, with renaming left for after go-live.

NOT MIGRATED

Before July 1, 2025

Prior years

Kept in TAC's own records; open AR and AP carried in at June 30, 2025

MIGRATED INTO QUICKBOOKS ONLINE

July 2025 to May 2026

First pass

Delivered July 13 for review

June 1 to July 17, 2026

Final load

Plus later edits; delivered July 23

How the engagement ran

1

Complexity assessment

Before quoting, we profiled the Intacct company: counts, structure and dimensions. The result was a fixed-fee quote with two options, opening balances only or full transaction history.

2

Extraction package and discussion points

The extraction package went to the client June 16 with written discussion points on duplicates, inactive records, unneeded accounts and aging differences. It was re-issued June 23 on May 31 data and reviewed with the client on June 25.

3

Decisions in writing

On July 2 the client confirmed each design decision in writing: which records to carry, how to treat unneeded accounts and how to handle duplicate names.

4

Two passes and a freeze

First load delivered July 13. July 17 was the last working day in Intacct and the final extraction ran July 18. The freeze held until July 27, and the final load was delivered July 23.

5

Post go-live guidance

After go-live we answered the client's follow-up questions in writing, including how to track donor restrictions and fiscal-year settings in QuickBooks Online.

COMMERCIAL STRUCTURE

Paid complexity assessment, then a fixed-fee quote with two options: opening balances only, or full transaction history. Milestone billing tied to client sign-off on the extraction package and approval of the QBO test environment.



Obstacles and how we resolved them

Five things went wrong or needed a decision. How a vendor handles those is a better guide than a clean story, so here they are in full.

Extraction access sat with the former accountants

Intacct extraction runs through custom reports. The client's own admin rights could not enable them; the former outsourced accountants, who administered the subscription, had to.

Resolution. Enabled May 26, about a week after we raised it. The assessment findings followed the next day.

The first cutoff moved

The agreed scope put the first cutoff at May 31, with March 31 as a fallback if May was not closed. The first extraction package used March 31 data.

Resolution. Once the client confirmed May was closed, the package was re-issued on May 31 data. The extraction package date shifted by three days; the freeze and final delivery dates held.

Historical data changed after extraction

After the first extraction, adjustments were made to historical data in Intacct, which created reconciliation differences during validation.

Resolution. Flagged on July 9. TAC stopped editing pre-cutoff periods, the changes were picked up in the final load, and the client signed off on the final trial balance and schedules on July 24.

We left the wrong fiscal year in QuickBooks Online

QuickBooks Online was set to a January to December fiscal year, so the FY26 trial balance showed the wrong period. The client caught it on final delivery.

Resolution. Corrected to July to June the same day. The client re-ran the FY26 trial balance and confirmed it matched.

Donor restrictions had no direct QuickBooks Online equivalent

Intacct tracked donor restrictions in a dimension of their own. QuickBooks Online has no standard field for it.

Resolution. Not migrated. After go-live we set out two workarounds in writing, locations or custom fields, with the limits of each.

Validation

Checks on each load

- ✓ Trial balance, Intacct against QBO, at June 30, 2025
- ✓ Balance sheet at each fiscal year-end
- ✓ Income statement at each fiscal year-end
- ✓ AR and AP agings at June 30, 2025 and at each cutoff: May 31 and July 17, 2026
- ✓ Final load: FY26 trial balance for July 1, 2025 to June 30, 2026, re-run after the fiscal-year fix

On the first load, TAC sampled transactions between Intacct and QuickBooks Online and confirmed it was ready to proceed. On the final load, its accountant reviewed the trial balance and related schedules before signing off.

Differences between the Intacct AP and AR agings and the trial balance were explained by the client in the discussion points: timing of credit card activity imported from Nexonia, and an auditor deferred-revenue entry reversed in July.

MIGRATED

July 1, 2025 through July 17, 2026 at transaction level with original types; open AR and AP as of June 30, 2025; chart of accounts as-is; customers and vendors with transactions in the period; departments as classes; projects; terms.

NOT MIGRATED

Years before July 2025 were not migrated and no archive was purchased; TAC keeps its own records. Employee data, custom fields and the donor restriction dimension were outside the migration.



Timeline and outcome

April 16	First discovery call
May 8	TAC orders the complexity assessment
May 26	Custom reports access enabled
May 27	Assessment findings and fixed quote
June 1	Full transaction history chosen
June 2	Agreement signed
June 16	Extraction package and discussion points
June 25	Revised package reviewed with client
July 2	Design decisions confirmed in writing
July 13	First pass delivered
July 17	Last working day in Intacct
July 23	Final load delivered (plan: July 27)
July 24	Client sign-off
July 27	Freeze ends; live in QuickBooks Online

Outcome

TAC is running its books in QuickBooks Online Advanced with FY26 and July 2026 at transaction level, delivered inside its July 30 go-live commitment and ahead of the audit. The client signed off on the final trial balance and schedules one day after delivery and later put the experience in writing. Donor restrictions were not migrated; we set out two workarounds in writing after go-live.



What made this work

● Making the rebuild trade-off explicit

Before TAC committed, the cost of an opening-balance rebuild was set against what it would lose for the year being audited.

● A fixed quote with options

The assessment produced two priced options, so TAC chose the scope knowing the price of each.

● Cutting the first load at the last closed month

Moving the first cutoff to May 31 left about seven weeks of new activity for the final load.

● A client who answered fast

Design decisions came back in writing, often the same day, which kept a small team's project on schedule.

● Owning our mistake

When the fiscal-year setting was wrong, it was fixed the same day and the trial balance re-run.

Weighing a rebuild from your audited trial balance?

Talk to us before you decide. We will show you what a transaction migration keeps that an opening-balance rebuild loses.

saasdirect.com | +1 888 706 7227

 SaaS Direct

SaaS Direct Technologies, Inc. is an official Intuit partner that moves mid-market finance teams off NetSuite, Sage Intacct, Dynamics GP and Sage 100/300 onto QuickBooks Online, QuickBooks Enterprise and Intuit Enterprise Suite. Big Four-trained team; 15,000+ migrations since 2016.