



ExitNintex

MODEL · COST & EFFORT

Migration Cost & Effort Estimator

Build a defensible number for leaving Nintex — effort bands, worked scenarios, sensitivity analysis and licensing.

Planning model · Reviewed July 2026 · Calibrate to your own estate

CONTENTS

1. How the model works
2. Variables and definitions
3. Effort bands
4. Testing and non-rebuild effort
5. Licensing: model it separately
6. Hidden and often-missed costs
7. Worked scenarios: 100 / 500 / 1,000 workflows
8. Sensitivity analysis
9. Your worksheet
10. Sources & verification

01 How the model works

The dominant cost of a Nintex migration is the effort to rebuild and test workflow logic and forms by hand. The data move is comparatively predictable and comparatively cheap. This model builds a defensible number from that premise.

Total cost has three components, and they should be estimated separately because they behave differently:

1. **Rebuild and test effort** — driven by surviving workflow count and complexity mix. One-time.
2. **Programme overhead** — discovery, mapping, content migration, project management, training. Roughly proportional to the above.
3. **Licensing** — recurring, structured differently per platform, and best modelled over three years.

Triage before you estimate. Estimating on the raw inventory rather than the post-triage count inflates every figure below, often by a third or more. Complete triage first, then return to this model.

02 Variables and definitions

Variable	Definition
Raw count	Every workflow found by a full tenant scan, including archived sites.
Surviving count	Workflows remaining after retirement and consolidation. This is the number that drives cost.
Complexity mix	The split of survivors across Simple, Medium and Complex bands.
Rebuild hours	Hours to rebuild one workflow on the target, including unit test.
Test multiplier	Additional effort for regression, UAT and compliance validation.

Overhead rate	Discovery, mapping, content migration, PM and training, as a percentage of rebuild effort.
Blended rate	Cost per hour across internal and partner resources.
Execution volume	Monthly workflow runs — the key input to consumption-based licensing.

03 Effort bands

Calibrate these against your own first ten rebuilds; treat them as starting points rather than fixed rates.

Band	Characteristics	Hours (range)	Planning mid-point
SIMPLE	Linear path, few conditions, no custom form, no custom code, single or no integration.	4 – 8	6
MEDIUM	Branching logic, one custom form, one or two integrations, some conditional validation.	12 – 24	18
COMPLEX	Parallel branches, state machine or loop-back, custom code, document generation, or run duration beyond 30 days.	30 – 80+	55

The complex band dominates. In most estates complex workflows are 10–15% of the surviving count but 40–50% of total rebuild effort. Estimating with an average rate rather than a banded mix will understate cost substantially.

04 Testing and non-rebuild effort

The band hours above include unit testing only. Add the following.

Activity	Typical addition	Notes
Regression and UAT	+25–40% of rebuild	Higher where legacy behaviour is undocumented and must be discovered.
Compliance validation	+5–10%	Applies only to audit-dependent processes; can be significant in regulated sectors.
Discovery and inventory	3–6 weeks fixed	Largely independent of estate size.
Mapping and platform selection	4–6 weeks fixed	Runs partly in parallel with discovery.
Content migration	1–3 weeks	Highly parallelisable; rarely on the critical path.
Project management	10–15% of total	Higher with multiple business units or a split target.
Training and enablement	2–4 weeks	Three audiences: users, process owners, administrators.

For planning purposes, a combined overhead of **+20%** on rebuild-and-test effort is a reasonable single figure for a large estate, with +30% where the estate spans many business units.

05 Licensing: model it separately

Rebuild effort is one-time; licensing recurs and is structured very differently by platform. Model three years at real volumes.

Platform	Typical structure	What to watch
Microsoft Power Automate	Per-user or per-flow plans, layered on existing Microsoft 365 entitlements.	Premium connector requirements; whether processes need per-flow licensing at scale.
Nintex Automation Cloud	Consumption- and user-based, with caps on workflow executions and document generations, plus overage charges.	High-frequency simple workflows can be disproportionately expensive when billed per execution.
Nintex on-premises / K2	Server-based licensing, which has long carried caps on workflow and form counts and on document generation.	Caps are not new to the cloud model — verify current entitlement counts against actual usage.
Specialist BPM	Often server or named-user based; flat-rate structures exist.	Confirm behaviour at your peak volume, not average.
SharePoint-resident	Frequently flat-rate per tenant or per site.	Confirm limits on records or transactions.

Correction worth noting: it is inaccurate to characterise legacy Nintex licensing as flat and unlimited. Nintex licensing has long capped workflows, forms and document generations. What changes in the modern cloud model is the metering basis — per execution with overage — rather than the existence of caps. Model your own volumes; treat published figures as reported ranges.

06 Hidden and often-missed costs

- **Document generation capability** — frequently a separate product or module on the target.
- **Premium connectors** — integrations that were free on the legacy platform may be licensed on the target.
- **Environment provisioning** — development and test environments carry their own licence cost.
- **Parallel running** — both platforms are licensed simultaneously during cutover waves.
- **Business owner time** — real cost, rarely budgeted, and the most common cause of UAT delay.
- **Governance tooling** — centre-of-excellence tooling, DLP policy management and monitoring.
- **Post-cutover support** — elevated support load for roughly one quarter after each wave.
- **Archive retention** — retaining legacy definitions and history for audit purposes.

07 Worked scenarios

Three estates, using mid-point band hours and a +20% overhead. Complexity mix is held at a typical 55 / 30 / 15 split of survivors.

Scenario A — 100 raw workflows

Line	Count	Hours each	Subtotal
Surviving after triage (–35%)	65		
Simple	36	6	216
Medium	19	18	342
Complex	10	55	550
Rebuild and test	65		1,108
Overhead (+20%)			+222
Total effort			≈ 1,330 hours

Scenario B — 500 raw workflows

Line	Count	Hours each	Subtotal
Surviving after triage (–35%)	325		
Simple	179	6	1,074
Medium	97	18	1,746
Complex	49	55	2,695
Rebuild and test	325		5,515
Overhead (+20%)			+1,103
Total effort			≈ 6,618 hours

Scenario C — 1,000 raw workflows

Line	Count	Hours each	Subtotal
Surviving after triage (–35%)	650		
Simple	358	6	2,148
Medium	195	18	3,510

Complex	97	55	5,335
Rebuild and test	650		10,993
Overhead (+20%)			+2,199
Total effort			≈ 13,192 hours

Multiply total hours by your blended rate for a cost range, then add three-year licensing separately.

08 Sensitivity analysis

Using Scenario B (500 raw), showing which assumptions actually move the number.

Change	Total effort	Difference
Baseline (35% retired, typical mix)	6,618 h	—
Triage removes 50% instead of 35%	5,091 h	–23%
Triage removes only 20%	8,146 h	+23%
Complex band is 25% of survivors, not 15%	8,470 h	+28%
Complex band is 8% of survivors	5,443 h	–18%
Overhead at 30% rather than 20%	7,170 h	+8%

Two variables dominate: how much you retire, and how large the complex band turns out to be. Both are established in triage and complexity scoring — which is why estimating before those steps produces numbers that cannot be defended.

09 Your worksheet

Line	Count	Hours each	Subtotal
Raw inventory count		—	—
Retired / consolidated		—	—
Surviving count		—	—
Simple			
Medium			
Complex			
Rebuild and test subtotal		—	

Overhead (20–30%)	—	—
Total effort (hours)	—	—
× blended rate	—	
Estimated delivery cost	—	—
+ 3-year licensing (target platform)	—	—
+ hidden costs (section 6)	—	—
Total programme cost	—	—

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.