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**Executive Summary**

This document provides a summary report for the AirNav-Logistics project. However, no comprehensive analysis was carried out, as the assigned tasks did not necessitate an in-depth evaluation.

**Revision Table**

| Revision Number | Date | Description |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1.0 | 19/02/2025 | Initial version of the report |
| 2.0 | 11/03/2025 | Second sprint |

**Introduction**

The goal of this document is to present an overview of the tasks completed in the AirNav-Logistics project. However, due to the straightforward nature of the assigned tasks, a detailed analysis was not required.

**Contents**

DO1: This report does not include specific analytical records, as the tasks completed did not demand detailed assessments. Consequently, no changes or validations were necessary.

D02: Concerning requirements 3 and 4, it was necessary to develop a custom validator that it was used for all the created roles, **Identifier** attribute to ensure that the characters in this attribute correspond accurately to the initials.

For attribute validation, I referred to an Excel document shared by Mr. Rafael Corchuelo Gil in response to a forum discussion (<https://ev.us.es/webapps/discussionboard/do/message?conf_id=_426211_1&forum_id=_253522_1&course_id=_89154_1&action=list_messages&nav=discussion_board&message_id=_461165_1>).

In the final stage of analysis, I reevaluated the relationship between **MaintenanceRecord** and **Task**. Initially, I thought it would be a ManyToOne relationship from **Task** to **MaintenanceRecord**, but upon further reflection, I determined that it should actually be a ManyToMany relationship. To address this, I designed an intermediary entity, **TaskRecord**, which links both original entities through ManyToOne associations. This adjustment better mirrors real-life situations where a **MaintenanceRecord** can contain several **Tasks**, and a single **Task** can span across multiple **MaintenanceRecords**.

Additionally, https://ev.us.es/ultra/courses/\_89154\_1/cl/outline this forum entry helped me resolve many uncertainties I had regarding the individual UML, clearing up a lot of confusion I previously had about how to structure the relationships.

**Conclusions**

The tasks presented in this phase required a careful re-evaluation of certain relationships and attributes. While the initial assumptions led to a more straightforward approach, further analysis revealed the need for additional validation mechanisms and relationship adjustments. The work carried out adhered to the given requirements, but the process of refining the MaintenanceRecord and Task relationships, as well as validating attributes, was essential for achieving the correct implementation. Additionally, the forum discussion and external resources helped clarify many uncertainties, particularly regarding the UML diagram and the structure of the relationships. Going forward, tasks that present more complex requirements may demand a deeper analysis, iterative validation, and careful consideration of potential adjustments.
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