When the dashboard and reality disagree

A public summary of three investigations in my fleet-tracking business.

1 **Claim** 2 **Observation** 3 **Decision and check**

THE PROBLEM

A plausible description can hide an operational gap. Device status, vendor references and architecture documents need to be checked against the system they describe.

MY CONTRIBUTION

Compared documented claims with device observations, reference snapshots and production checks. Separated observations from hypotheses and identified follow-up checks for the affected decisions.

THREE FINDINGS

01 **Device behavior:** the existing audit reports transmission stopping near 3.60 V while local buffering continued. Loss of contact was not sufficient evidence of complete power-off.

02 **Reference completeness:** mirrored parameter lists contained fewer entries than live expansions. A source could be valid and still incomplete.

03 **Architecture drift:** checks against six documents identified stale targets, absent columns, an incorrect connection mechanism and outdated service status.

WHAT THIS CHANGES

Review battery interpretation before replacing hardware; refresh affected reference data; correct operating documentation. Follow-up checks should track voltage, source revisions and selected system observations.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

These findings summarize the existing historical audit. Raw logs and commands are not included or independently re-run here. Battery capacity and the internal cause of transmission loss remain unresolved. No savings or reliability improvement is claimed.

HENRY NAWROCKI

henry@sztanski.com / henrynawrocki.com