

ACD301 Reliable Exam Book | Exam ACD301 Vce



2025 Latest TestKingIT ACD301 PDF Dumps and ACD301 Exam Engine Free Share: <https://drive.google.com/open?id=1Ce50PPGW1QDqLkUzdVLdx0qs0UCZ8rX1>

The example on the right was a simple widget designed Reliable ACD301 Pdf to track points in a rewards program, The pearsonvue website is not affiliated with us, Although computers are great at gathering, manipulating, and calculating raw data, humans prefer their data presented in an orderly fashion. This means keying the shots using a plug-in or specialized New ACD301 Exam Question software application, As is most often the case, you will need to expend some effort to deploy security measures, and when they are deployed, you will incur a level of administrative Valid ACD301 Exam overhead and operational inconvenience, and may also find that there is an impact to network performance.

Appian ACD301 Exam Syllabus Topics:

Topic	Details
Topic 1	<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 2	<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 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Platform Management: This section of the exam measures skills of Appian System Administrators and covers the ability to manage platform operations such as deploying applications across environments, troubleshooting platform-level issues, configuring environment settings, and understanding platform architecture. Candidates are also expected to know when to involve Appian Support and how to adjust admin console configurations to maintain stability and performance.
Topic 4	<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.

Unparalleled ACD301 Reliable Exam Book & Leading Offer in Qualification Exams & Correct Exam ACD301 Vce

Therefore, you have the option to use Appian ACD301 PDF questions anywhere and anytime. ACD301 dumps are designed according to the Appian Lead Developer (ACD301) certification exam standard and have hundreds of questions similar to the actual ACD301 Exam. TestKingIT Appian Lead Developer (ACD301) web-based practice exam software also works without installation.

Appian Lead Developer Sample Questions (Q14-Q19):

NEW QUESTION # 14

You are required to configure a connection so that Jira can inform Appian when specific tickets change (using a webhook). Which three required steps will allow you to connect both systems?

- A. Give the service account system administrator privileges.
- B. Create an integration object from Appian to Jira to periodically check the ticket status.
- C. Create a Web API object and set up the correct security.
- D. Create a new API Key and associate a service account.
- E. Configure the connection in Jira specifying the URL and credentials.

Answer: C,D,E

Explanation:

Comprehensive and Detailed In-Depth Explanation:

Configuring a webhook connection from Jira to Appian requires setting up a mechanism for Jira to push ticket change notifications to Appian in real-time. This involves creating an endpoint in Appian to receive the webhook and configuring Jira to send the data.

Appian's Integration Best Practices and Web API documentation provide the framework for this process.

Option A (Create a Web API object and set up the correct security):

This is a required step. In Appian, a Web API object serves as the endpoint to receive incoming webhook requests from Jira. You must define the API structure (e.g., HTTP method, input parameters) and configure security (e.g., basic authentication, API key, or OAuth) to validate incoming requests. Appian recommends using a service account with appropriate permissions to ensure secure access, aligning with the need for a controlled webhook receiver.

Option B (Configure the connection in Jira specifying the URL and credentials):

This is essential. In Jira, you need to set up a webhook by providing the Appian Web API's URL (e.g., <https://<appian-site>/suite/webapi/<web-api-name>>) and the credentials or authentication method (e.g., API key or basic auth) that match the security setup in Appian. This ensures Jira can successfully send ticket change events to Appian.

Option C (Create a new API Key and associate a service account):

This is necessary for secure authentication. Appian recommends using an API key tied to a service account for webhook integrations. The service account should have permissions to process the incoming data (e.g., write to a process or data store) but not excessive privileges. This step complements the Web API security setup and Jira configuration.

Option D (Give the service account system administrator privileges):

This is unnecessary and insecure. System administrator privileges grant broad access, which is overkill for a webhook integration. Appian's security best practices advocate for least-privilege principles, limiting the service account to the specific objects or actions needed (e.g., executing the Web API).

Option E (Create an integration object from Appian to Jira to periodically check the ticket status):

This is incorrect for a webhook scenario. Webhooks are push-based, where Jira notifies Appian of changes. Creating an integration object for periodic polling (pull-based) is a different approach and not required for the stated requirement of Jira informing Appian via webhook.

These three steps (A, B, C) establish a secure, functional webhook connection without introducing unnecessary complexity or security risks.

Reference:

The three required steps that will allow you to connect both systems are:

A . Create a Web API object and set up the correct security. This will allow you to define an endpoint in Appian that can receive requests from Jira via webhook. You will also need to configure the security settings for the Web API object, such as authentication method, allowed origins, and access control.

B . Configure the connection in Jira specifying the URL and credentials. This will allow you to set up a webhook in Jira that can send requests to Appian when specific tickets change. You will need to specify the URL of the Web API object in Appian, as well as any

credentials required for authentication.

C . Create a new API Key and associate a service account. This will allow you to generate a unique token that can be used for authentication between Jira and Appian. You will also need to create a service account in Appian that has permissions to access or update data related to Jira tickets.

The other options are incorrect for the following reasons:

D . Give the service account system administrator privileges. This is not required and could pose a security risk, as giving system administrator privileges to a service account could allow it to perform actions that are not related to Jira tickets, such as modifying system settings or accessing sensitive data.

E . Create an integration object from Appian to Jira to periodically check the ticket status. This is not required and could cause unnecessary overhead, as creating an integration object from Appian to Jira would involve polling Jira for ticket status changes, which could consume more resources than using webhook notifications. Verified Reference: Appian Documentation, section "Web API" and "API Keys".

NEW QUESTION # 15

Your client's customer management application is finally released to Production. After a few weeks of small enhancements and patches, the client is ready to build their next application. The new application will leverage customer information from the first application to allow the client to launch targeted campaigns for select customers in order to increase sales. As part of the first application, your team had built a section to display key customer information such as their name, address, phone number, how long they have been a customer, etc. A similar section will be needed on the campaign record you are building. One of your developers shows you the new object they are working on for the new application and asks you to review it as they are running into a few issues. What feedback should you give?

- **A. Ask the developer to convert the original customer section into a shared object so it can be used by the new application.**
- B. Create a duplicate version of that section designed for the campaign record.
- C. Provide guidance to the developer on how to address the issues so that they can proceed with their work.
- D. Point the developer to the relevant areas in the documentation or Appian Community where they can find more information on the issues they are running into.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Comprehensive and Detailed In-Depth Explanation: The scenario involves reusing a customer information section from an existing application in a new application for campaign management, with the developer encountering issues. Appian's best practices emphasize reusability, efficiency, and maintainability, especially when leveraging existing components across applications.

* Option B (Ask the developer to convert the original customer section into a shared object so it can be used by the new application): This is the recommended approach. Converting the original section into a shared object (e.g., a reusable interface component) allows it to be accessed across applications without duplication. Appian's Design Guide highlights the use of shared components to promote consistency, reduce redundancy, and simplify maintenance. Since the new application requires similar customer data (name, address, etc.), reusing the existing section—after ensuring it is modular and adaptable—addresses the developer's issues while aligning with the client's goal of leveraging prior work. The developer can then adjust the shared object (e.g., via parameters) to fit the campaign context, resolving their issues collaboratively.

* Option A (Provide guidance to the developer on how to address the issues so that they can proceed with their work): While providing guidance is valuable, it doesn't address the root opportunity to reuse existing code. This option focuses on fixing the new object in isolation, potentially leading to duplicated effort if the original section could be reused instead.

* Option C (Point the developer to the relevant areas in the documentation or Appian Community where they can find more information on the issues they are running into): This is a passive approach and delays resolution. As a Lead Developer, offering direct support or a strategic solution (like reusing components) is more effective than redirecting the developer to external resources without context.

* Option D (Create a duplicate version of that section designed for the campaign record):

Duplication violates Appian's principle of DRY (Don't Repeat Yourself) and increases maintenance overhead. Any future updates to customer data display logic would need to be applied to multiple objects, risking inconsistencies.

Given the need to leverage existing customer information and the developer's issues, converting the section to a shared object is the most efficient and scalable solution.

References: Appian Design Guide - Reusability and Shared Components, Appian Lead Developer Training - Application Design and Maintenance.

NEW QUESTION # 16

You are asked to design a case management system for a client. In addition to storing some basic metadata about a case, one of the

client's requirements is the ability for users to update a case. The client would like any user in their organization of 500 people to be able to make these updates. The users are all based in the company's headquarters, and there will be frequent cases where users are attempting to edit the same case. The client wants to ensure no information is lost when these edits occur and does not want the solution to burden their process administrators with any additional effort. Which data locking approach should you recommend?

- A. Use the database to implement low-level pessimistic locking.
- B. Allow edits without locking the case CDI.
- C. Add an `@Version` annotation to the case CDT to manage the locking.
- D. Design a process report and query to determine who opened the edit form first.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Comprehensive and Detailed In-Depth Explanation:

The requirement involves a case management system where 500 users may simultaneously edit the same case, with a need to prevent data loss and minimize administrative overhead. Appian's data management and concurrency control strategies are critical here, especially when integrating with an underlying database.

Option C (Add an `@Version` annotation to the case CDT to manage the locking):

This is the recommended approach. In Appian, the `@Version` annotation on a Custom Data Type (CDT) enables optimistic locking, a lightweight concurrency control mechanism. When a user updates a case, Appian checks the version number of the CDT instance. If another user has modified it in the meantime, the update fails, prompting the user to refresh and reapply changes. This prevents data loss without requiring manual intervention by process administrators. Appian's Data Design Guide recommends `@Version` for scenarios with high concurrency (e.g., 500 users) and frequent edits, as it leverages the database's native versioning (e.g., in MySQL or PostgreSQL) and integrates seamlessly with Appian's process models. This aligns with the client's no-burden requirement.

Option A (Allow edits without locking the case CDI):

This is risky. Without locking, simultaneous edits could overwrite each other, leading to data loss—a direct violation of the client's requirement. Appian does not recommend this for collaborative environments.

Option B (Use the database to implement low-level pessimistic locking):

Pessimistic locking (e.g., using `SELECT ... FOR UPDATE` in MySQL) locks the record during the edit process, preventing other users from modifying it until the lock is released. While effective, it can lead to deadlocks or performance bottlenecks with 500 users, especially if edits are frequent. Additionally, managing this at the database level requires custom SQL and increases administrative effort (e.g., monitoring locks), which the client wants to avoid. Appian prefers higher-level solutions like `@Version` over low-level database locking.

Option D (Design a process report and query to determine who opened the edit form first):

This is impractical and inefficient. Building a custom report and query to track form opens adds complexity and administrative overhead. It doesn't inherently prevent data loss and relies on manual resolution, conflicting with the client's requirements. The `@Version` annotation provides a robust, Appian-native solution that balances concurrency, data integrity, and ease of maintenance, making it the best fit.

NEW QUESTION # 17

You have created a Web API in Appian with the following URL to call it: `https://exampleappiancloud.com/suite/webapi/user_management/users?username=john.smith`. Which is the correct syntax for referring to the username parameter?

- A. `httpRequest.formData.username`
- B. `httpRequest.users.username`
- C. `httpRequest.queryParameters.users.username`
- D. `httpRequest.queryParameters.username`

Answer: D

Explanation:

Comprehensive and Detailed In-Depth Explanation: In Appian, when creating a Web API, parameters passed in the URL (e.g., query parameters) are accessed within the Web API expression using the `httpRequest` object. The URL

`https://exampleappiancloud.com/suite/webapi/user_management/users?username=john.smith`

includes a query parameter `username` with the value `john.smith`. Appian's Web API documentation specifies how to handle such parameters in the expression rule associated with the Web API.

* Option D (`httpRequest.queryParameters.username`): This is the correct syntax. The `httpRequest`.

`queryParameters` object contains all query parameters from the URL. Since `username` is a single query parameter, you access it directly as `httpRequest.queryParameters.username`. This returns the value `john`.

`smith` as a text string, which can then be used in the Web API logic (e.g., to query a user record).

Appian's expression language treats query parameters as key-value pairs under queryParameters, making this the standard approach.

* Option A (`httpRequest.queryParameters.users.username`): This is incorrect. The users part suggests a nested structure (e.g., users as a parameter containing a username subfield), which does not match the URL. The URL only defines username as a top-level query parameter, not a nested object.

* Option B (`httpRequest.users.username`): This is invalid. The httpRequest object does not have a direct users property. Query parameters are accessed via queryParameters, and there's no indication of a users object in the URL or Appian's Web API model.

* Option C (`httpRequest.formData.username`): This is incorrect. The httpRequest.formData object is used for parameters passed in the body of a POST or PUT request (e.g., form submissions), not for query parameters in a GET request URL. Since the username is part of the query string (?
username=john.smith), formData does not apply.

The correct syntax leverages Appian's standard handling of query parameters, ensuring the Web API can process the username value effectively.

References: Appian Documentation - Web API Development, Appian Expression Language Reference - httpRequest Object.

NEW QUESTION # 18

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

Answer: C

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.

