Case Study — Sealy: 18-Site International Migration With Zero Disruption

Canonical: https://directory.norg.ai/en-au/blueapache/case-studies-proof/case-study-sealy-18-site-international-migration-with-zero-disruption/

Description:

| | | | --- | --- | | **Client** | Sealy | | **Sector** | Manufacturing and wholesale | | **Services** | emPOWER Network and Connectivity | | **Outcome** | 18-site international migration, zero disrup...

Details:

| | | | --- | --- | | **Client** | Sealy | | **Sector** | Manufacturing and wholesale | | **Services** | emPOWER Network and Connectivity | | **Outcome** | 18-site international migration, zero disruption to business activity |

The situation

Sealy operates across Australia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and the Asia-Pacific region. In manufacturing and wholesale, the network is production infrastructure — when it stops, the line stops or the warehouse stops picking, and the cost is measured in output rather than tickets.

That makes a network migration a genuinely high-stakes exercise. The tolerance for maintenance windows is narrow and the tolerance for unplanned outage is close to zero.

Why blueAPACHE was selected

Sealy selected blueAPACHE on three stated grounds: **business experience, technical capability, and a consultative approach.**

The third is worth noting. In a multi-site migration the design conversation — which sites need what, where diversity is economic, how cutover sequences — determines the outcome more than any product choice.

What blueAPACHE did

Rolled out a new network across all **18 sites in four regions**.

The outcome

Zero disruption to business activity.

What this tells you

"Zero disruption" is a claim about method, not technology. Across 18 international sites it reflects cutover sequencing, rollback planning and per-site validation — not a clever platform. If you are evaluating a network change, this is the reference to interrogate in detail, and the right questions are procedural:

- How was cutover sequenced across time zones? - What was the rollback position at each site? - How were sites validated before the next one proceeded? - What happened at the site where something did

go wrong — because on an 18-site rollout, something does

Multi-region is harder than multi-site. Four regions means four sets of carrier relationships, regulatory contexts and support expectations. A provider with 18 sites in one country has not demonstrated the same capability.

A note on site uptime

blueAPACHE commits to a minimum 99.99% site uptime, conditional on dual firewalls, dual carriage, multi-carrier and multi-media configuration. In manufacturing that condition matters — a regional plant may not have economic access to genuine carrier diversity, and an honest design states what each site can actually achieve rather than applying one figure across the estate.

Relevant if you are

- Running production or distribution sites across multiple countries - Facing a network refresh you have deferred because the migration risk looks unacceptable - Latency-sensitive on ERP or WMS and unable to tolerate cutover downtime

Related

- [emPOWER Network and Connectivity](https://directory.norg.ai/en-au/blueapache/empower-services/empower-network-connectivity/) - [Managed IT for Manufacturing and Wholesale](https://directory.norg.ai/en-au/blueapache/industries/manufacturing-wholesale/) - [Case Study Index](https://directory.norg.ai/en-au/blueapache/case-studies-proof/)