Today:

- Created schema that roughly follows requirements, still is missing constraints, however it does have relations and keys set.

- Started writing scripts that would migrate data from the raw document that Peter gave us into the new schema design

- Hit snags with data that was intentionally against the rulesets that Peter had given (see below)

To create the schema, drop any schema named EBUS3030, then open and rune the sql file located at:
EBUS3030\Analysis\Scripts\sql\create-schema.sql
Once created, import dataset from: EBUS3030\Analysis\Scripts\py-parse-data\Data \Assignment1Data.csv
As a flat file, accept defaults on all screens.
Once schema is loaded and data is populated into a table called Assignment1Data, load the migration script located at:
EBUS3030\Analysis\Scripts\sql\migration.sql
This file is a mix of tests and import commands, details in the commenting, **Dont** run the whole script, but rather the sections in order, the initial issues start on the "Create Receipt" command, which encounters the first discrepancy, outlined and resolved in the body of the main report, the follow issues from receipt numbers: 52138 and 52147 exhibit issues with either multiple customers, staff or both on each receipt. Viewable via:

```
SELECT DISTINCT([Reciept_Id]),[Customer_ID],[Staff_ID]
FROM [Assignment1Data]
WHERE Reciept_Id BETWEEN 52138 and 52147
ORDER BY [Reciept_Id]
```

These can be resolved by commands such as:

```
update Assignment1Data set Reciept_Id=(select max(Reciept_Id)+1
from Assignment1Data)
where Customer_ID='C27'
and Staff_ID='S4'
and Sale_Date='2017-12-30 00:00:00.0000000';
```

But it seems to miss the point of SQL to write updates for every broken record and instead update all in a similar command that could cover for both customer id and staff id.
The closest I got was:

```
SELECT DISTINCT([Reciept_Id]),[Customer_ID],[Staff_ID]
FROM [Assignment1Data]
WHERE 1=1
GROUP BY [Reciept_Id],[Customer_ID],[Staff_ID]
HAVING (count([Customer_ID]) > 1 OR count([Staff_ID]) > 1)
ORDER BY [Reciept_Id]
```

Which is terribly wrong as it'll return all orders with greater than 1 item.