

Solutions

2.1

Forty bookings; six unused slots.

2.2

Four conflicting arrivals; no confirmation trial has occurred.

2.3

Any three, B1 each: ten distinct users not established; all-problem elimination untested; email-access objection does not mean hatred of rules; no proven alternative performance; no zero-cost evidence.

2.4

Checking need may allow release of unneeded slots; email-only access may exclude some users; affected-user demand, effort/cost, overlap, reasons or trial outcomes unknown.

3.1

Limited trial/investigation rather than universal guarantee; alternative accessible route proposed, not proven; conflict/unused-time criterion linked to L's bounded problems; access/effort criterion linked to S/P and missing performance or resource evidence.

3.2

Local analytic rubric, $8 \times B1$: accurate forty/six/four log with L attribution; no invented distinct-user total or universal cure; explicit release-of-unneeded-time warrant with P credit; fair email-access objection with S credit; conditional accessible trial rather than proven/free solution; relevant conflict/access/effort evaluation criteria; proportionate conclusion preserving missing causes and results; coherent truthful 160–190 word response. Example: “The makerspace log supports investigating booking confirmation, but not claiming that it will eliminate every problem. Six of forty bookings were unused and four arrivals involved equipment conflicts during four weeks (L, §1). These counts do not establish ten different affected users because overlap and identity are not recorded.

The proposed warrant is that checking whether a booking is still needed could allow unneeded time to be released (P, §1). This is a reason to test the proposal, not a measured outcome. Some conflicts may have other causes, and reasons for unused slots remain incomplete. A fair objection is that email-only confirmation may exclude users who do not check email daily (S, §1); it is not an objection to every rule.

A limited trial could investigate confirmation with another accessible response route, subject to approval and feasible staffing. It should measure unused time and conflicts alongside access difficulties and effort. No alternative has yet been shown effective or free. A decision to expand should therefore depend on reviewed results against stated criteria, rather than an invented guarantee.”