

DECISIONFLOW

Development Decision Log & Release Notes

Implementation trade-offs, unresolved choices and release history

Document code	DEV-05
Version	2.0
Status	Final Public Portfolio Edition — Implementation Baseline
Baseline date	14 July 2026
Author	Min Thu Kyaw
Role	AI Product Manager

Evidence transparency: Actual implementation evidence is separated from targets, proposed release actions, and the illustrative DEV-06 continuity bridge. Later commercial outcomes are not presented as actual results.

Document Control

Purpose	Document the Develop phase for Development Decision Log & Release Notes.
Primary audience	Hiring managers, product leaders, engineering stakeholders, and pilot reviewers.
Evidence classification	Verified implementation fact / implementation-derived assessment / target / proposed next action.
Source limitation	Implementation status is grounded in the authored implementation baseline and public repository references supplied for the case study.
Change control	Publication rule: retain evidence labels unless content is replaced by documented real-world observations.

Evidence Links

- [Low-Fidelity Prototype](#)
- [High-Fidelity Prototype](#)
- [MVP Frontend Repository](#)
- [MVP Backend Repository](#)

Contents

1. Decision Governance
2. Development Decision Register
3. Detailed Decisions
4. Unresolved Decisions
5. Release Narrative
6. Known Limitations
7. Review Triggers
8. Ownership and Approval

Decision Governance

This register continues the Plan-phase Product Decision Log. It preserves implementation reasoning so future changes do not erase why the MVP was built this way. A decision must be revisited when customer evidence, AI quality, security requirements, cost, or technical constraints materially change.

Release-note honesty — Version labels below are a proposed portfolio narrative unless matching Git tags or production releases are verified. Do not present them as published releases without repository evidence.

Development Decision Register

ID	Decision area	Decision	Rationale	Status
DD-001	Release source of truth	Use the supplied frontend and backend repositories as the implementation references; prototypes remain design evidence.	Avoid deploying an older mock/prototype generation.	Approved in principle
DD-002	Supported input	Ship pasted text and UTF-8 TXT only for pilot.	Matches implemented secure parsing and reduces scope.	Recommended
DD-003	Reviewed extraction model	Persist original AI output and a separate human-reviewed version.	Preserves provenance and makes human edits authoritative.	Recommended
DD-004	Criteria weights	Use integer percentages totaling 100.	Creates one consistent UI/API/database/AI contract.	Recommended
DD-005	Comparison method	Use a transparent weighted matrix; label AI-proposed scores separately if used.	Prevents synthetic averages from being misrepresented.	Recommended
DD-006	Finalization	Require explicit selected option and accepted recommendation version; preserve immutable snapshot.	Creates an auditable decision record.	Recommended
DD-007	Reopen behavior	Do not mutate finalized core data; create a revision or duplicate.	Protects historical integrity.	Recommended
DD-008	AI fallback	Allow conservative fallback only when visibly labeled and reviewed.	Maintains availability without false provenance.	Recommended
DD-009	Session architecture	Prefer HttpOnly secure cookies for external pilot.	Reduces local-storage token exposure.	Open engineering decision
DD-010	Team collaboration	Defer roles, invitations and shared review.	Keeps pilot aligned to individual decision owner.	Approved scope
DD-011	Language scope	Ship only reviewed UI languages and separately validate AI input languages.	Avoids unsupported quality claims.	Open scope decision
DD-012	Raw-source retention	Use a short documented default with user deletion path.	Reduces privacy risk.	Open policy decision
DD-013	Analytics privacy	Track metadata, counts and stage events only; never source or decision content.	Supports learning without exposing sensitive content.	Recommended
DD-014	Pilot gate	No uncontrolled external release until P0 integrity, transparency, security and E2E gates pass.	Protects users and portfolio credibility.	Approved recommendation
DD-015	Product scope and metric reframe	Keep organizational decision memory as the long-term vision; define v1.0 as an individual decision-support product and use	Aligns the Concept/Plan vision with the actual MVP without measuring unbuilt collaboration.	Approved lifecycle alignment

ID	Decision area	Decision	Rationale	Status
		individual workflow metrics.		

Detailed Decisions

DD-001 — Release source of truth

Decision: Use the supplied frontend and backend repositories as the implementation references; prototypes remain design evidence.

Rationale: Avoid deploying an older mock/prototype generation.

Status: Approved in principle

DD-002 — Supported input

Decision: Ship pasted text and UTF-8 TXT only for pilot.

Rationale: Matches implemented secure parsing and reduces scope.

Status: Recommended

DD-003 — Reviewed extraction model

Decision: Persist original AI output and a separate human-reviewed version.

Rationale: Preserves provenance and makes human edits authoritative.

Status: Recommended

DD-004 — Criteria weights

Decision: Use integer percentages totaling 100.

Rationale: Creates one consistent UI/API/database/AI contract.

Status: Recommended

DD-005 — Comparison method

Decision: Use a transparent weighted matrix; label AI-proposed scores separately if used.

Rationale: Prevents synthetic averages from being misrepresented.

Status: Recommended

DD-006 — Finalization

Decision: Require explicit selected option and accepted recommendation version; preserve immutable snapshot.

Rationale: Creates an auditable decision record.

Status: Recommended

DD-007 — Reopen behavior

Decision: Do not mutate finalized core data; create a revision or duplicate.

Rationale: Protects historical integrity.

Status: Recommended

DD-008 — AI fallback

Decision: Allow conservative fallback only when visibly labeled and reviewed.

Rationale: Maintains availability without false provenance.

Status: Recommended

Unresolved Decisions

Decision needed	Recommended MVP choice	Owner needed
Session transport	HttpOnly secure cookie with CSRF controls.	Backend/security
Password recovery	Implement before external pilot.	Product + backend
Raw transcript retention	Short default and explicit deletion.	Product/privacy
Supported UI languages	Only reviewed languages.	Product/design
AI input languages	English first unless benchmark proves more.	AI/product
Hard delete	Keep internal/admin until audit and retention decisions are complete.	Product/backend
Pilot participant type	Individual decision owners; no collaboration expectation.	Product/research

Release Narrative

Working label	Evidence status	Main capability	Known limitation
0.1 Prototype	Public design evidence	Low-fi flow and IA.	No backend behavior.
0.3 High-fidelity prototype	Public design evidence	Polished interaction and visual direction.	Mocked data/auth; not production.
0.5 Integrated MVP	Implementation-derived current state	Connected frontend, backend, persistence and AI workflow.	Persistence, trust, quality and security gaps.
0.9 Release candidate	Illustrative assumed completion	P0 integrity, AI transparency, security, tests, analytics and deployment gates resolved.	Core individual workflow only.
1.0 Controlled launch	Illustrative launch scenario	Production-ready core workflow enters measured commercial release.	Collaboration, integrations and enterprise capabilities remain roadmap.

Known Limitations

- Actual MVP baseline remains single-user-per-record with no shared workspace roles or reviewers.
- Production v1.0 core launch scope remains paste and TXT only.
- DEV-06 assumes reviewed extraction, weight persistence, comparison methodology, finalization, E2E tests, deployment and AI benchmarks are completed.
- PDF/DOCX, collaboration, integrations, SSO, enterprise administration and multilingual AI remain post-launch.
- Multilingual UI selection does not prove multilingual AI quality.

Review Triggers

- Pilot users cannot complete the workflow or do not repeat it.
- AI unsupported-claim or omission rates exceed agreed thresholds.
- Provider cost or latency materially exceeds budget.
- Security/privacy review changes the acceptable session or retention model.
- Pilot users require team collaboration or unsupported file formats to receive value.
- A new model/provider materially improves quality, cost or data control.

Ownership and Approval

Area	Accountable Accountable role	Approvals
Product scope and acceptance	Product Manager	P0 scope, pilot and final release.
Frontend and UX	Frontend/design owner	Interaction, accessibility and supported browser scope.
Backend/data	Backend owner	Persistence, transitions, migrations and deletion.
AI quality	AI/backend owner	Prompt/model version, benchmark and fallback.
Security/privacy	Technical/security owner	Session, secrets, retention and incident process.
Quality/release	QA/engineering owner	CI, E2E, staging smoke and defect gates.

Evidence and References

Source	Use in this document
Implementation-derived baseline	DECISIONFLOW_MVP_DEVELOPMENT_PHASE.md, baseline date 14 July 2026.
Low-fidelity prototype	https://minthukyawdev-droid.github.io/decision-flow/
High-fidelity prototype	https://minthukyawdev-droid.github.io/decisionflow-hifi-prototype/
Frontend repository reference	https://github.com/minthukyawdev-droid/decisionflow-webapp
Backend repository reference	https://github.com/minthukyawdev-droid/decisionflow-api
Plan-phase package	DecisionFlow Plan Phase Document Set, version 1.0.

Interpretation rule — Targets, proposed metrics, future releases, and pilot thresholds are not reported as achieved results. Actual results must be added only after executing the relevant test or study.