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# Executive Summary

This report takes into consideration the decisions made during the development of the deliverable.

# Revision Table

| **Revision Number** | **Date** | **Description** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1.0 | Monday 26, May 2025 | Final draft |

# Introduction

This report analyzes the fourth deliverable of the Acme-ANS project, focusing on the requirements that required some examination.

# Contents

The only significant decision I had to make during development was adapting my application based on feedback from my lab professor. Although the issue stemmed from a previous submission—specifically, the requirements definition—he brought it to my attention during the follow-up for the fourth delivery. The relevant requirement was:

***R8: Operations by technicians on maintenance records:***

* *List their maintenance records.*
* *Show the details of the maintenance records, including the tasks involved.*
* *Create, update, and publish maintenance records. Please note that to publish a maintenance record*, it cannot contain any unpublished tasks and must include at least one published task.

While I was demonstrating my application, he noticed that some unpublished maintenance records were linked to unpublished tasks. He explained that this was inconsistent: if a task hasn't been “saved”—that is, published—it shouldn't already be part of a maintenance record. For instance, it wouldn't make sense for a task that can still be deleted or modified to already be associated with a record. On the contrary, he pointed out that only published tasks should logically be linked to maintenance records.

**Actions Taken:** Although I initially believed that the restriction on published tasks only applied when publishing a record, I chose to follow his reasoning. As a result, I modified the application so that a technician updating a maintenance record can only link tasks that have already been published.

# Conclusions

I corrected my initial misconceptions and improved the underlying logic. At first, I misunderstood how maintenance records should interact with tasks, but my lecturer’s clarification helped me adjust these relationships appropriately. This experience underscored the importance of fully understanding the requirements and accurately defining the system’s functionality, ultimately leading to a more coherent and reliable application.
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