



ExitNintex

EXPOSURE REPORT

Your Nintex Exposure Report

Which 2026 deadlines apply to you, what breaks if you wait, and the order in which to respond.

CONTENTS

1. How to use this report
2. The short version
3. Which product, which risk
4. Every deadline that matters
5. What actually breaks: dependency map
6. Exposure by process type
7. Remediation sequencing
8. Decision checkpoints
9. Sources & verification

01 How to use this report

This report establishes three things: whether the 2026 retirement affects you, what specifically fails if you do nothing, and the order in which to respond.

Work through it in sequence. Section 3 identifies your exposure by product. Section 5 maps what actually depends on the retiring engine — this is where most teams discover scope they had not accounted for. Section 7 converts that into a sequenced plan with time markers.

Before you begin: confirm which Nintex products are actually deployed in your tenant. Many organisations run more than one, and licence records are frequently out of date. An administrative scan of the tenant is more reliable than procurement records.

02 The short version

- **Microsoft removes the SharePoint 2013 workflow engine from all existing Microsoft 365 tenants on 2 April 2026.** There is no extension path and no supported way to keep it running.
- **Nintex Workflow and Nintex Forms for Office 365 reached end of support on 31 December 2025.** No further patches, security updates, or troubleshooting.
- **Not every Nintex product is affected.** Which one you run determines whether this is an emergency or a planning exercise.
- **There is no one-click migration to any platform,** including Nintex's own modern products. Content tools move data; workflow logic and forms are rebuilt by hand.
- **The realistic constraint is rebuild-and-test capacity,** not the data move. Scope must be reduced before it is estimated.

03 Which product, which risk

Product	Status	What it means for you
Nintex Workflow for Office 365 SharePoint Online · 2013 engine · add-in model	HARD STOP	Built on the SharePoint 2013 workflow engine and the SharePoint Add-In model, both being retired. End of support passed on 31 Dec 2025; the engine is removed on 2 Apr 2026. Dependent workflows then fail permanently and simultaneously.
Nintex Forms for Office 365 SharePoint Online · add-in model	HARD STOP	Depends on the SharePoint Add-In model that Microsoft is retiring. Affected on the same timeline as Workflow for Office 365 and must be rebuilt on the target platform's form technology.
Nintex for SharePoint (on-premises) SharePoint Server 2016 / 2019	TIME-LIMITED	Does not stop on 2 Apr 2026, but inherits SharePoint Server's lifecycle: extended support for 2016 and 2019 ends 14 July 2026. After that you operate on an unsupported platform with no security patching.
Nintex Automation Cloud / K2 Nintex's modern platforms	NOT THIS DEADLINE	Does not run on the retiring 2013 engine. This schedule does not force a move. Any migration decision here is driven by commercial or technical fit, not by the retirement.

Nintex's own position on running past support: once Microsoft withdraws support, these workflows “become security vulnerabilities and compliance liabilities.” — [Nintex](#), [Microsoft end-of-support guidance](#)

04 Every deadline that matters

Date	Event	Source
2 Apr 2024	SharePoint 2013 workflow engine switched off for newly created tenants.	Microsoft
1 Nov 2024	SharePoint Add-Ins blocked for new tenants, as the add-in model is retired.	Microsoft
31 Dec 2025	Nintex Workflow and Forms for Office 365 — end of support. No patches, security updates, or vendor troubleshooting.	Nintex
2 Apr 2026	Hard stop. The 2013 workflow engine is removed from all existing Microsoft 365 tenants, including Government and DoD clouds. Dependent workflows fail permanently; historical definitions become viewable only as raw XML.	Microsoft
14 Jul 2026	SharePoint Server 2016 and 2019 extended support ends, increasing pressure on hybrid and on-premises estates.	Microsoft

Dates are Microsoft- and Nintex-controlled and can change. Confirm against the primary sources listed at the end of this report before making commitments based on them.

05 What actually breaks: dependency map

Scope is routinely underestimated because the dependency chain extends past the workflows themselves. Each item below should be inventoried explicitly.

Dependency	Failure mode on 2 April 2026
Running workflow instances	In-flight instances terminate. Approvals mid-cycle are lost; there is no supported drain-down mechanism after removal.
Workflow definitions	No longer executable or editable. Retained definitions are readable only as raw XML, which is usable for documentation but not for migration tooling.
Nintex Forms (add-in based)	Form rendering breaks with the add-in model. Both layout and any embedded rules must be rebuilt.
List and library triggers	Item-created and item-changed triggers stop firing. Downstream processes silently stop rather than erroring visibly.
Scheduled workflows	Cease running. Because they are unattended, failure is often noticed only when a downstream report is wrong.
Integrations and web service calls	Any external system called from workflow actions stops receiving data. Partner-facing integrations may fail without notification to either side.
Document generation	Template-driven document creation stops. Contract, offer-letter, and statement generation are common casualties.
Notifications and reminders	Escalation chains stop. SLA breaches accumulate without alerting.

Audit trails

Workflow history stops being written. Where history is relied on for regulatory evidence, this creates a compliance gap that must be addressed before cutover, not after.

Practical step: for each dependency above, record the business owner, the systems downstream of it, and whether failure would be visible immediately or silently. Silent failures are the highest-risk category and should be migrated first.

06 Exposure by process type

Not all workflows carry equal consequence. Prioritise by business impact rather than by technical complexity.

Process area	Typical impact	Consequence of failure
Procurement & purchase approval	SEVERE	Purchase orders stall; supplier payment terms breached; spend controls bypassed through manual workarounds that then evade audit.
Finance & invoice processing	SEVERE	Payment runs delayed; month-end close disrupted; approval evidence missing from the audit trail.
HR onboarding & offboarding	SEVERE	Access provisioning fails on joiners; more critically, offboarding fails to revoke access, creating a live security exposure.
Compliance & policy attestation	SEVERE	Attestation cycles lapse; regulatory evidence gaps that are difficult to reconstruct retrospectively.
Contract lifecycle	HIGH	Renewal and expiry reminders stop; auto-renewals proceed unreviewed.
IT service requests	HIGH	Request queues stop routing; work reverts to email with no SLA tracking.
Document review & publishing	MODERATE	Review cycles stall; controlled documents drift out of currency.
Internal notifications	MODERATE	Generally tolerable in the short term; often a retirement candidate rather than a migration candidate.

07 Remediation sequencing

The sequence below assumes a standing start. Compress it if you are already underway, but do not reorder it: each stage removes scope or risk from the next.

Window	Action	Why this order
Weeks 1–2	Tenant-wide inventory of all workflows, forms, and their last-run dates	Every subsequent estimate depends on real counts. Assumed scope is almost always wrong.
Weeks 3–4	ROT triage and business owner sign-off on retirement candidates	Removing dead workflows is the single largest lever on cost and timeline, and it is free.
Weeks 5–7	Complexity scoring and dependency mapping of survivors	Identifies the hard minority that will consume most of the effort.

Weeks 8–10	Target platform selection and per-workflow mapping	Cannot be done credibly until complexity and constraints are known.
Weeks 11+	Rebuild in waves, highest-impact and silent-failure processes first	Protects the business against the worst outcomes if the schedule slips.
Final 6 weeks	Parallel running, UAT, cutover, and decommissioning	Parallel running is the only reliable way to achieve a zero-downtime cutover.

Do not leave in-flight instances to the deadline. Long-running approvals opened close to 2 April 2026 will not complete on the legacy engine. Establish a cut-off date after which new instances start only on the target platform.

08 Decision checkpoints

Four decisions determine the shape of the programme. Make them explicitly and record them.

1. **Retire or migrate?** Applied per workflow, with business owner sign-off. The default should be retire; migration requires justification.
2. **One target platform or several?** A single platform is simpler to govern; a split lets long-running and non-linear processes go to an engine designed for them.
3. **Rebuild faithfully, or re-architect?** Faithful rebuilds are faster but import existing technical debt. Re-architecting costs more up front and generally produces a better long-term result.
4. **Who maintains the result?** If the answer is citizen developers, that constrains platform choice and design patterns considerably more than most selection processes acknowledge.

SOURCES & VERIFICATION

- Microsoft — SharePoint 2013 workflow retirement schedule · support.microsoft.com
- Microsoft — Retirement of SharePoint Add-Ins · learn.microsoft.com
- Microsoft — Power Automate limits & configuration (30-day run limit) · learn.microsoft.com
- Nintex — Microsoft end-of-support guidance · nintex.com
- Nintex — Workflow & Forms for Office 365 end-of-life announcement · community.nintex.com
- Practitioner reporting — [r/sharepoint](#), [r/MicrosoftFlow](#), Power Platform Community, practitioner essays

Deadline dates are set by Microsoft and Nintex and can change — confirm against the primary pages before acting. Effort and cost figures are planning estimates, not guarantees. Pricing drawn from review sites and vendors is reported, not verified.