

Latest ACD301 Test Objectives & ACD301 Test Guide Online



P.S. Free & New ACD301 dumps are available on Google Drive shared by It-Tests: https://drive.google.com/open?id=1O54HHFi5_DVX2QGksiOoKoQg5FdGYMMX

If you still desperately cram knowledge and spend a lot of precious time and energy to prepare for passing Appian certification ACD301 exam, and at the same time do not know how to choose a more effective shortcut to pass Appian Certification ACD301 Exam. Now It-Tests provide you a effective method to pass Appian certification ACD301 exam. It will play a multiplier effect to help you pass the exam.

Appian ACD301 Exam Syllabus Topics:

Topic	Details
Topic 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Application Design and Development: This section of the exam measures skills of Lead Appian Developers and covers the design and development of applications that meet user needs using Appian functionality. It includes designing for consistency, reusability, and collaboration across teams. Emphasis is placed on applying best practices for building multiple, scalable applications in complex environments.
Topic 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Extending Appian: This section of the exam measures skills of Integration Specialists and covers building and troubleshooting advanced integrations using connected systems and APIs. Candidates are expected to work with authentication, evaluate plug-ins, develop custom solutions when needed, and utilize document generation options to extend the platform's capabilities.
Topic 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Project and Resource Management: This section of the exam measures skills of Agile Project Leads and covers interpreting business requirements, recommending design options, and leading Agile teams through technical delivery. It also involves governance, and process standardization.
Topic 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Proactively Design for Scalability and Performance: This section of the exam measures skills of Application Performance Engineers and covers building scalable applications and optimizing Appian components for performance. It includes planning load testing, diagnosing performance issues at the application level, and designing systems that can grow efficiently without sacrificing reliability.

>> Latest ACD301 Test Objectives <<

High-quality Appian Latest ACD301 Test Objectives and High Pass-Rate ACD301 Test Guide Online

The clients can download our products and use our ACD301 study materials immediately after they pay successfully. Our system will send our ACD301 learning prep in the form of mails to the client in 5-10 minutes after their successful payment. The mails provide the links and if only the clients click on the links they can log in our software immediately to learn our ACD301 Guide materials. As long as the clients buy our ACD301 training quiz they can immediately use our product and save their time.

Appian Lead Developer Sample Questions (Q24-Q29):

NEW QUESTION # 24

For each requirement, match the most appropriate approach to creating or utilizing plug-ins Each approach will be used once.

Note: To change your responses, you may deselect your response by clicking the blank space at the top of the selection list.

Answer:

Explanation:

NEW QUESTION # 25

You are taking your package from the source environment and importing it into the target environment.

Review the errors encountered during inspection:

What is the first action you should take to Investigate the issue?

- A. Check whether the object (UUID ending in 7t00000i4e7a) is included in this package
- B. Check whether the object (UUID ending in 18028931) is included in this package
- C. Check whether the object (UUID ending in 25606) is included in this package
- D. Check whether the object (UUID ending in 18028821) is included in this package

Answer: A

Explanation:

The error log provided indicates issues during the package import into the target environment, with multiple objects failing to import due to missing precedents. The key error messages highlight specific UUIDs associated with objects that cannot be resolved. The first error listed states:

"TEST_ENTITY_PROFILE_MERGE_HISTORY": The content [id=uuid-a-0000m5fc-f0e6-8000-9b01-011c48011c48, 18028821] was not imported because a required precedent is missing: entity [uuid=a-0000m5fc-f0e6-8000-9b01-011c48011c48, 18028821] cannot be found..." According to Appian's Package Deployment Best Practices, when importing a package, the first step in troubleshooting is to identify the root cause of the failure. The initial error in the log points to an entity object with a UUID ending in 18028821, which failed to import due to a missing precedent. This suggests that the object itself or one of its dependencies (e.g., a data store or related entity) is either missing from the package or not present in the target environment.

Option A (Check whether the object (UUID ending in 18028821) is included in this package): This is the correct first action. Since the first error references this UUID, verifying its inclusion in the package is the logical starting point. If it's missing, the package export from the source environment was incomplete. If it's included but still fails, the precedent issue (e.g., a missing data store) needs further investigation.

Option B (Check whether the object (UUID ending in 7t00000i4e7a) is included in this package): This appears to be a typo or corrupted UUID (likely intended as something like "7t000014e7a" or similar), and it's not referenced in the primary error. It's mentioned later in the log but is not the first issue to address.

Option C (Check whether the object (UUID ending in 25606) is included in this package): This UUID is associated with a data store error later in the log, but it's not the first reported issue.

Option D (Check whether the object (UUID ending in 18028931) is included in this package): This UUID is mentioned in a subsequent error related to a process model or expression rule, but it's not the initial failure point.

Appian recommends addressing errors in the order they appear in the log to systematically resolve dependencies. Thus, starting with the object ending in 18028821 is the priority.

NEW QUESTION # 26

An existing integration is implemented in Appian. Its role is to send data for the main case and its related objects in a complex JSON to a REST API, to insert new information into an existing application. This integration was working well for a while. However, the customer highlighted one specific scenario where the integration failed in Production, and the API responded with a 500 Internal Error code. The project is in Post-Production Maintenance, and the customer needs your assistance. Which three steps should you take to troubleshoot the issue?

- A. Analyze the behavior of subsequent calls to the Production API to ensure there is no global issue, and ask the customer to analyze the API logs to understand the nature of the issue.
- B. Send a test case to the Production API to ensure the service is still up and running.
- C. Send the same payload to the test API to ensure the issue is not related to the API environment.
- D. Ensure there were no network issues when the integration was sent.
- E. Obtain the JSON sent to the API and validate that there is no difference between the expected JSON format and the sent one.

Answer: A,C,E

Explanation:

Comprehensive and Detailed In-Depth Explanation:

As an Appian Lead Developer in a Post-Production Maintenance phase, troubleshooting a failed integration (HTTP 500 Internal Server Error) requires a systematic approach to isolate the root cause—whether it's Appian-side, API-side, or environmental. A 500 error typically indicates an issue on the server (API) side, but the developer must confirm Appian's contribution and collaborate with the customer. The goal is to select three steps that efficiently diagnose the specific scenario while adhering to Appian's best practices. Let's evaluate each option:

A . Send the same payload to the test API to ensure the issue is not related to the API environment:

This is a critical step. Replicating the failure by sending the exact payload (from the failed Production call) to a test API environment helps determine if the issue is environment-specific (e.g., Production-only configuration) or inherent to the payload/API logic.

Appian's Integration troubleshooting guidelines recommend testing in a non-Production environment first to isolate variables. If the test API succeeds, the Production environment or API state is implicated; if it fails, the payload or API logic is suspect. This step leverages Appian's Integration object logging (e.g., request/response capture) and is a standard diagnostic practice.

B . Send a test case to the Production API to ensure the service is still up and running:

While verifying Production API availability is useful, sending an arbitrary test case risks further Production disruption during maintenance and may not replicate the specific scenario. A generic test might succeed (e.g., with simpler data), masking the issue tied to the complex JSON. Appian's Post-Production guidelines discourage unnecessary Production interactions unless replicating the exact failure is controlled and justified. This step is less precise than analyzing existing behavior (C) and is not among the top three priorities.

C . Analyze the behavior of subsequent calls to the Production API to ensure there is no global issue, and ask the customer to analyze the API logs to understand the nature of the issue:

This is essential. Reviewing subsequent Production calls (via Appian's Integration logs or monitoring tools) checks if the 500 error is isolated or systemic (e.g., API outage). Since Appian can't access API server logs, collaborating with the customer to review their logs is critical for a 500 error, which often stems from server-side exceptions (e.g., unhandled data). Appian Lead Developer training emphasizes partnership with API owners and using Appian's Process History or Application Monitoring to correlate failures—making this a key troubleshooting step.

D . Obtain the JSON sent to the API and validate that there is no difference between the expected JSON format and the sent one:

This is a foundational step. The complex JSON payload is central to the integration, and a 500 error could result from malformed data (e.g., missing fields, invalid types) that the API can't process. In Appian, you can retrieve the sent JSON from the Integration object's execution logs (if enabled) or Process Instance details. Comparing it against the API's documented schema (e.g., via Postman or API specs) ensures Appian's output aligns with expectations. Appian's documentation stresses validating payloads as a first-line check for integration failures, especially in specific scenarios.

E . Ensure there were no network issues when the integration was sent:

While network issues (e.g., timeouts, DNS failures) can cause integration errors, a 500 Internal Server Error indicates the request reached the API and triggered a server-side failure—not a network issue (which typically yields 503 or timeout errors). Appian's Connected System logs can confirm HTTP status codes, and network checks (e.g., via IT teams) are secondary unless connectivity is suspected. This step is less relevant to the 500 error and lower priority than A, C, and D.

Conclusion: The three best steps are A (test API with same payload), C (analyze subsequent calls and customer logs), and D (validate JSON payload). These steps systematically isolate the issue—testing Appian's output (D), ruling out environment-specific problems (A), and leveraging customer insights into the API failure (C). This aligns with Appian's Post-Production Maintenance strategies: replicate safely, analyze logs, and validate data.

Reference:

Appian Documentation: "Troubleshooting Integrations" (Integration Object Logging and Debugging).

Appian Lead Developer Certification: Integration Module (Post-Production Troubleshooting).

Appian Best Practices: "Handling REST API Errors in Appian" (500 Error Diagnostics).

NEW QUESTION # 27

You have 5 applications on your Appian platform in Production. Users are now beginning to use multiple applications across the platform, and the client wants to ensure a consistent user experience across all applications.

You notice that some applications use rich text, some use section layouts, and others use box layouts. The result is that each application has a different color and size for the header.

What would you recommend to ensure consistency across the platform?

- A. Create constants for text size and color, and update each section to reference these values.
- **B. In the common application, create a rule that can be used across the platform for section headers, and update each application to reference this new rule.**
- C. In each individual application, create a rule that can be used for section headers, and update each application to reference its respective rule.
- D. In the common application, create one rule for each application, and update each application to reference its respective

rule.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Comprehensive and Detailed In-Depth Explanation:As an Appian Lead Developer, ensuring a consistent user experience across multiple applications on the Appian platform involves centralizing reusable components and adhering to Appian's design governance principles. The client's concern about inconsistent headers (e.g., different colors, sizes, layouts) across applications using rich text, section layouts, and box layouts requires a scalable, maintainable solution. Let's evaluate each option:

* A. Create constants for text size and color, and update each section to reference these values:Using constants (e.g., `cons!TEXT_SIZE` and `cons!HEADER_COLOR`) is a good practice for managing values, but it doesn't address layout consistency (e.g., rich text vs. section layouts vs. box layouts).

Constants alone can't enforce uniform header design across applications, as they don't encapsulate layout logic (e.g., `a!sectionLayout()` vs. `a!richTextDisplayField()`). This approach would require manual updates to each application's components, increasing maintenance overhead and still risking inconsistency. Appian's documentation recommends using rules for reusable UI components, not just constants, making this insufficient.

* B. In the common application, create a rule that can be used across the platform for section headers, and update each application to reference this new rule:This is the best recommendation. Appian supports a "common application" (often called a shared or utility application) to store reusable objects like expression rules, which can define consistent header designs (e.g., `rule!CommonHeader(size:`

`"LARGE", color: "PRIMARY")`). By creating a single rule for headers and referencing it across all 5 applications, you ensure uniformity in layout, color, and size (e.g., using `a!sectionLayout()` or `a!`

`boxLayout()` consistently). Appian's design best practices emphasize centralizing UI components in a common application to reduce duplication, enforce standards, and simplify maintenance-perfect for achieving a consistent user experience.

* C. In the common application, create one rule for each application, and update each application to reference its respective rule:This approach creates separate header rules for each application (e.g., `rule!`

`App1Header`, `rule!App2Header`), which contradicts the goal of consistency. While housed in the common application, it introduces variability (e.g., different colors or sizes per rule), defeating the purpose. Appian's governance guidelines advocate for a single, shared rule to maintain uniformity, making this less efficient and unnecessary.

* D. In each individual application, create a rule that can be used for section headers, and update each application to reference its respective rule:Creating separate rules in each application (e.g., `rule!`

`App1Header` in App 1, `rule!App2Header` in App 2) leads to duplication and inconsistency, as each rule could differ in design. This approach increases maintenance effort and risks diverging styles, violating the client's requirement for a "consistent user experience." Appian's best practices discourage duplicating UI logic, favoring centralized rules in a common application instead.

Conclusion: Creating a rule in the common application for section headers and referencing it across the platform (B) ensures consistency in header design (color, size, layout) while minimizing duplication and maintenance. This leverages Appian's application architecture for shared objects, aligning with Lead Developer standards for UI governance.

References:

* Appian Documentation: "Designing for Consistency Across Applications" (Common Application Best Practices).

* Appian Lead Developer Certification: UI Design Module (Reusable Components and Rules).

* Appian Best Practices: "Maintaining User Experience Consistency" (Centralized UI Rules).

The best way to ensure consistency across the platform is to create a rule that can be used across the platform for section headers. This rule can be created in the common application, and then each application can be updated to reference this rule. This will ensure that all of the applications use the same color and size for the header, which will provide a consistent user experience.

The other options are not as effective. Option A, creating constants for text size and color, and updating each section to reference these values, would require updating each section in each application. This would be a lot of work, and it would be easy to make mistakes. Option C, creating one rule for each application, would also require updating each application. This would be less work than option A, but it would still be a lot of work, and it would be easy to make mistakes. Option D, creating a rule in each individual application, would not ensure consistency across the platform. Each application would have its own rule, and the rules could be different. This would not provide a consistent user experience.

Best Practices:

* When designing a platform, it is important to consider the user experience. A consistent user experience will make it easier for users to learn and use the platform.

* When creating rules, it is important to use them consistently across the platform. This will ensure that the platform has a consistent look and feel.

* When updating the platform, it is important to test the changes to ensure that they do not break the user experience.

NEW QUESTION # 28

You are deciding the appropriate process model data management strategy.

For each requirement, match the appropriate strategies to implement. Each strategy will be used once.

Note: To change your responses, you may deselect your response by clicking the blank space at the top of the selection list.

Answer:

Explanation:

Explanation:

* Archive processes 2 days after completion or cancellation. # Processes that need to be available for 2 days after completion or cancellation, after which are no longer required nor accessible.

* Use system default (currently: auto-archive processes 7 days after completion or cancellation). # Processes that remain available for 7 days after completion or cancellation, after which remain accessible.

* Delete processes 2 days after completion or cancellation. # Processes that need to be available for 2 days after completion or cancellation, after which remain accessible.

* Do not automatically clean-up processes. # Processes that need remain available without the need to unarchive.

Comprehensive and Detailed In-Depth Explanation: Appian provides process model data management strategies to manage the lifecycle of completed or canceled processes, balancing storage efficiency and accessibility. These strategies-archiving, using system defaults, deleting, and not cleaning up-are configured via the Appian Administration Console or process model settings. The Appian Process Management Guide outlines their purposes, enabling accurate matching.

* Archive processes 2 days after completion or cancellation # Processes that need to be available for 2 days after completion or cancellation, after which are no longer required nor accessible:

Archiving moves processes to a compressed, off-line state after a specified period, freeing up active resources. The description "available for 2 days, then no longer required nor accessible" matches this strategy, as archived processes are stored but not immediately accessible without unarchiving, aligning with the intent to retain data briefly before purging accessibility.

* Use system default (currently: auto-archive processes 7 days after completion or cancellation) # Processes that remain available for 7 days after completion or cancellation, after which remain accessible: The system default auto-archives processes after 7 days, as specified. The description

"remain available for 7 days, then remain accessible" fits this, indicating that processes are kept in an active state for 7 days before being archived, after which they can still be accessed (e.g., via unarchiving), matching the default behavior.

* Delete processes 2 days after completion or cancellation # Processes that need to be available for 2 days after completion or cancellation, after which remain accessible: Deletion permanently removes processes after the specified period. However, the description "available for 2 days, then remain accessible" seems contradictory since deletion implies no further access. This appears to be a misinterpretation in the options. The closest logical match, given the constraint of using each strategy once, is to assume a typo or intent to mean "no longer accessible" after deletion. However, strictly interpreting the image, no perfect match exists. Based on context, "remain accessible" likely should be

"no longer accessible," but I'll align with the most plausible intent: deletion after 2 days fits the "no longer required" aspect, though accessibility is lost post-deletion.

* Do not automatically clean-up processes # Processes that need remain available without the need to unarchive: Not cleaning up processes keeps them in an active state indefinitely, avoiding archiving or deletion. The description "remain available without the need to unarchive" matches this strategy, as processes stay accessible in the system without additional steps, ideal for long-term retention or audit purposes.

Matching Rationale:

* Each strategy is used once, as required. The matches are based on Appian's process lifecycle management: archiving for temporary retention with eventual inaccessibility, system default for a 7-day accessible period, deletion for permanent removal (adjusted for intent), and no cleanup for indefinite retention.

* The mismatch in Option 3's description ("remain accessible" after deletion) suggests a possible error in the question's options, but the assignment follows the most logical interpretation given the constraint.

References: Appian Documentation - Process Management Guide, Appian Administration Console - Process Model Settings, Appian Lead Developer Training - Data Management Strategies.

NEW QUESTION # 29

.....

Our ACD301 vce dumps offer you the best exam preparation materials which are updated regularly to keep the latest exam requirement. The ACD301 practice exam is designed and approved by our senior IT experts with their rich professional knowledge. Using ACD301 Real Questions will not only help you clear exam with less time and money but also bring you a bright future. We are looking forward to your join.

ACD301 Test Guide Online: <https://www.it-tests.com/ACD301.html>

- ACD301 New Braindumps Questions ☐ ACD301 Sample Exam ☐ ACD301 Latest Test Dumps ☐ Open “www.practicevce.com” and search for ☐ ACD301 ☐ to download exam materials for free ☐ ACD301 New Braindumps

Questions

- [illegible]

BTW, DOWNLOAD part of It-Tests ACD301 dumps from Cloud Storage: https://drive.google.com/open?id=1O54HHFi5_DVX2QGksiOoKoQg5FdGYMMX