





1.1) High level project plan – Piloting municipality Overstrand

- Milestones leading up to 1 July 2015
 - Phase 1 Budgeting Module
 - Development: End Sept 2014.
 - UAT: End Oct 2014
 - Go-live: Beginning November 2014
 - Phase 2 Transactional Posting Levels
 - Development: End Dec 2014
 - UAT: Jan May 2014
 - Go-live: End May





- Phase 3 Reporting & Web Portal Development
 - Development of reports (From Feb 2015 onwards)
 - UAT: From Feb 2015 onwards (as and when)
 - Go-live: 1st July 2015
- SAMRASplus environment roll out of web portal
 - Development: End October
 - UAT: End Feb 2015
 - Web Portal Go-Live: End March 2015
- Phase 4 Go-live
 - Go-live full SCOA Compliant framework





- Milestones subsequent to 1 July 2015
 - Reporting in the new SCOA framework (continuous until finalised by NT)
 - Continued Modernisation of SAMRAS
- Significant amendments and changes to milestones
 - Initially the budgeting module was only going to be rolled out in Jan. 2015. Due to Overstrand needing to budget by 1st November, SAMRAS has adjusted the time lines.

1.2) Challenges and inhibiting factors

- Time for testing with Overstrand
- SAMRAS has committed to rolling out the programmes earlier in order for Overstrand to have more time for testing.





1.3) Municipal Pilot involvement and readiness

- Overstrand is fully involved. Time line actions have been met.
- No remedial action is required at this point





2) Risk Management

2.1) High level project plan – Piloting

- General risks
 - Time is always a risk. Due to normal pressures of the municipals day to day operation.
 - Other municipalities wanting to go-live 1st July 2015.
- Responses in mitigating against the risk
 - Time lines will need to be tightly managed. SAMRAS to engage the municipality on providing resources to assist.
 - Overstrand is the priority. SAMRAS to manage their time and resources and not over commit
- Need for an additional meeting with NT outside SCOA ICF
 - For piloting site not at this time.





3) SCOA Elements

3.1) SCOA classification framework, segments and project documentation

Any specific matters identified in setting up SCOA classification framework not raised with NT SCOA Project Team

Documentation and data files do not always agree. Case in point is the segment pre-fix.

Agenda Item 4: - SCOA Tables and Detail Documents (dated 8/1/2014)

- Page 5 Costing: Code structure to be 'Prefix CX'.......
- Page 6 Function: Code structure to be 'Prefix 'FC'.......
- Page 9 Fund: Code structure to be 'FX'.....
- Please compare this to the latest import file and filter on Column 'D' for:-
- COST: Col.P=Prefix-C. Col.O acc nrs are 'C024......' [and not 'CX' in either case]
- FUNCTION: Col.P=Prefix–FX. Col.O acc nrs are 'FX017....' [BUT THIS IS SUPPOSED TO MEAN 'FUND' – SHOULD BE 'FC']
- FUND: Col.P=Prefix–F. Col.O acc nrs are 'F024.....'
 [and not 'FX' in either case]





3) SCOA Elements

3.1) SCOA classification framework, segments and project documentation

- What is expected from the NT SCOA Project Team and PT
 - Feedback on changes as and when they are done!!!
 - Daily reports sent to all the vendors and pilot sites
 - Do not wait for the next meeting.
 - We need to apply changes and cannot delay the process





4.1) Vendor Community / Current clients

- User groups held to date by vendor
 - WC: 18th June; 20th Aug; 10th Sep.
 - KZN: 14th May; 8th Sep.
- Involvement of non-piloting municipalities
 - SCOA workshops have been presented at the User Group. Attendance
 has been very good. A few municipalities have requested that they run
 in parallel with the pilot municipality.
- Was the NT SCOA Project Team and PT's invited
 - User Group's belong to the municipalities. Invites are sent by them. Too
 my knowledge NT and PT are invited. Have not attended all the
 workshops.





- Aspects (agenda items) of SCOA communicated to user group
 - SCOA NT Segments
 - NT spread sheets
 - Project Plan
 - System Enhancements
 - Implications & work to be done on the Municipality side
 - Key SCOA staff required on the Municipality side
 - Q&A
- Number of municipalities and officials in attendance
 - CTN: Per UG average of 37. Representing 13 mun.
 - DBN : Per UG average of 22. Representing





- General response from non-piloting municipalities
 - Good feedback. The workshops held seemed to be an eye-opener for them.
 - Overall acceptance of SCOA and eagerness to implement from various municipalities.
 - Other clients want to be part of the testing process
 - Some customers have chosen to wait until no. 99 because of feedback they seem to be getting in the market.
- High Risk Factors
 - Municipalities not attending UG. To the best of our knowledge, according to the attendance registers, these municipalities have not attended the last 2 vital SCOA workshops
 - ❖ Baviaans Willomore & Steytlerville; Blue Crane; Ikwezi; Kannaland; Lejweleputswa; Mhlathuze (Water Board); Mier; Naledi Vryburg; Naledi De Wetsdorp.



- Non-return of documentation & confirmation of responsible officials for SCOA project
- Not all PT's attending the relevant User Group Workshops and interacting with Vendor. UG's advised to please include all PT's relevant to their clients.
- Need for an additional meeting with NT outside SCOA ICF
 - Yes. To discuss intervention with non-committing municipalities



5) Technical Matters

5.1) Municipal accountability cycle – Matters of importance

- Budgeting
 - The development of the budgeting module is in testing phase
- In-year reporting framework
 - Testing will be done but cannot be live until 01 July 2015.
- Annual financial statements
 - Available on current system without notes. Will be part of our modernisation development



5) Technical Matters

5.2) Matters raised with NT SCOA Project Team

Matters raised with NT SCOA Project Team: Resolved/Unresolved The following matters have been raised and await feedback:

SAM0001 – Function FX/017 & 018 are for housing core and non core.

SAM0002 – Line 33 in Excel- under assets & liabilities: points to property rates. There is no opening balance item on this control.

SAM0003 – Functional excel Files and csv files not same format.

SAM004 – In the region segment there is no adding of own items. – NT have advised that this be raised by the Pilot Site.



5) Technical Matters

5.3) Data / SQL Update

- Responses and feedback if any
 - Our data structures are in place
 - Upload and import module is complete





6) Lessons Learnt

6.1) Vendors are requested to share any valuable lessons learnt with the SCOA ICF as part of the SCOA implementation plan

- Non-committing municipalities will be a huge risk.
- Bi-lateral communication between SAMRAS and all clients of paramount importance
- Escalating of non-committing municipalities to relevant PT.



