



Does your **OpenText support model** still fit your estate?

A practical **20-question self-check** for teams running business-critical OpenText environments

OpenText estates rarely become harder to support because something has gone wrong. More often, it is because the **environment has grown: more integrations, more change and more of the business depending on it**. The support model created three or five years ago may still be the one wrapped around the estate today, even though the estate itself has moved on.

Think of this as a chance to step back and look at the estate with fresh eyes. The questions focus on the areas that are often hardest to see when you are dealing with them every day.



Answer each question with **Yes**, **No** or **Not sure**.



Count your **No** and **Not sure** answers as you go. They do not necessarily mean there is a problem, but they may point to an area worth reviewing.

1. Estate complexity

- ☐ Can you list every integration connected to your OpenText environment and identify who owns each one?
- ☐ Do you know which customisations may need attention before the next upgrade?

2. Knowledge and documentation

- ☐ If a new administrator joined next month, is there enough documentation for them to understand and run the estate?
- ☐ Are the reasons behind important configuration decisions recorded, rather than only the settings themselves?

3. Platform ownership

- ☐ Is one named person accountable for the overall health of the estate, rather than only their individual area?
- ☐ When an issue crosses the application, database and infrastructure layers, is it clear who coordinates the response?

4. Database support

- ☐ Do you have dependable access to people who understand the database supporting the OpenText platform?
- ☐ Is database performance reviewed alongside the application, rather than separately?

5. Incident handling

- ☐ Is there one clear route for raising an incident that crosses technical or supplier boundaries?
- ☐ Are recurring incidents reviewed to identify the underlying cause, rather than repeatedly applying the same fix?

6. Upgrade readiness

- ☐ Are upgrades and patches planned to an agreed schedule, rather than delayed until there is an urgent reason to act?
- ☐ Do you know which settings historically need resetting after an upgrade?

7. Backup and recovery confidence

- ☐ Has a complete restore been tested during the last twelve months?
- ☐ Do you know how long recovery is likely to take in practice, rather than only the target recovery time?

8. Supplier coordination

- ☐ Where several suppliers support different layers, is anyone accountable for the overall outcome?
- ☐ When suppliers disagree about the cause of an issue, is it clear who decides?

9. Key-person dependency

- ☐ Could the estate continue to operate normally if your most knowledgeable team member were unavailable for a month?
- ☐ Can at least two people carry out each routine critical task?

10. Business criticality

- ☐ Do you know which business processes would stop or be disrupted if the platform became unavailable?
- ☐ Does the current support arrangement reflect how important the platform has become to the business?



0–3: Well covered.

The support model is keeping pace with the estate.

It is still worth repeating this check each year, and after any major upgrade, organisational change or change in the supporting team.

9–14: The support model may be falling behind

The environment may have grown beyond the support arrangement originally built around it.

A structured review could help you identify the most important gaps before the next upgrade, major change or unexpected incident.

4–8: A few areas to strengthen

There may be some gaps, often around documentation, ownership or cover rather than the technology itself.

These are usually manageable areas to improve, although they can also be the easiest to keep putting off.

15 or more: The estate may be relying heavily on individual knowledge

The environment may be operating well day to day, but too much could depend on a small number of people remaining available.

The immediate priorities are likely to be clearer ownership, stronger documentation and more dependable cover across the estate.

Most OpenText estates sit somewhere in the middle. That is completely normal. Environments often evolve faster than the support model around them.

Where to start

If your answers clustered in one area, start there rather than trying to fix everything:

- **Documentation and key-person dependency** – Start by recording the routines that are currently understood but not written down.
That might include monthly tasks, the order in which jobs must run, known workarounds or the steps used to resolve recurring issues.
When important knowledge lives only in someone's head, it is difficult for the wider team to rely on it.
- **Ownership and supplier coordination** – Agree who is responsible for the overall outcome, rather than only who owns each technical layer.
Many recurring issues sit in the gaps between teams, technologies and suppliers.
- **Upgrades, backup and incident handling** – These areas can remain unnoticed while everything is working normally.

They are worth reviewing before an urgent situation reveals the gaps for you.

Talking it through



NUCA SYSTEMS

Nuca Systems supports teams running business-critical OpenText estates across the OpenText environment, database and supporting infrastructure.

We work alongside internal teams, helping to improve operational cover, clarify ownership and reduce the risks that build up as an estate evolves.

If it would be useful, we can help you review the areas you have highlighted and identify the most practical next steps. That could be a focused piece of support, a light-touch starting point or something more structured, depending on what your estate needs.

info@nucasystems.com | nucasystems.com

Nuca Systems Ltd, Specialist Managed Services for OpenText Estates.
Platform administration • Business administration • Database administration