Service request handoff evaluation

Sentient Bridge by EONTACT | Fictional worked example | November 16, 2026

All people, instructions and records in this example are fictional. Prepared with AI assistance to show the form of an evaluation. It is not client work, a customer result, a deployed system or evidence of effectiveness at any organizational scale. It contains no protected implementation logic.

Conclusion

Begin with a recorded receipt and escalation check in the existing authorized system. The fictional log shows a gap in timely acknowledgment and in recording follow-up. It does not establish that dispatch capacity or software is the cause.

Question and scope

Why are some complete service requests still being chased after the daily handoff, and what should the owner change first?

One office handoff from a coordinator to a dispatcher, covering ten fictional eligible requests. Review stops at receipt and escalation. Scheduling quality, field work, safety procedures, costs and whole-business performance are outside this example.

Evidence supplied

N1 - Owner instruction: Complete requests, with any required owner approvals, are handed to the dispatcher at 3 p.m. The dispatcher records receipt by 4 p.m. on that same business day.

N2 - Owner instruction: At 4 p.m., the coordinator records an escalation to the owner for each request without recorded receipt. An escalation does not count as dispatcher receipt.

N3 - Owner instruction: Only the owner may approve a price or date exception. Pending exceptions remain with the coordinator. Existing authorized records remain the working system.

L1 - Fictional log: Ten eligible requests, all handed over at 3 p.m. Required information and any exception approvals were recorded before handoff. Each row is a separate fictional business day.

I1 - Owner account: The owner reports repeated telephone chasing. No time records, cost records or independent interviews were supplied.

What should be preserved

Keep the owner approval boundary, the dispatcher role, the daily handoff and the existing authorized records. The supplied log shows complete inputs and required approvals before handoff; this example provides no reason to replace those arrangements.

Fictional request log

All ten eligible requests were handed over at 3 p.m. Receipt is due by 4 p.m. on the same business day. Each row represents a separate day. An escalation note alone does not establish when escalation occurred.

ID	Recorded receipt	Receipt status	Escalation note
R01	3:20 p.m.	On time	Not needed
R02	3:35 p.m.	On time	Not needed
R03	Next day 9:10 a.m.	Late	Recorded
R04	3:50 p.m.	On time	Not needed
R05	3:10 p.m.	On time	Not needed
R06	No receipt recorded	Unknown	Not recorded
R07	3:45 p.m.	On time	Not needed
R08	4:25 p.m.	Late	Not recorded
R09	3:30 p.m.	On time	Not needed
R10	Next day 8:30 a.m.	Late	Recorded

Findings and limits

F1 - Six of ten requests have recorded receipt by 4 p.m.; three are late and one has no receipt recorded.

Evidence: L1: R01-R10. Limit: The missing record does not prove the dispatcher never received the request. Ten invented records cannot establish a real failure rate.

F2 - Two of the four requests without timely receipt have no escalation note.

Evidence: N2; L1: R03, R06, R08, R10. Limit: The other two have notes, but their escalation times were not supplied. Compliance with the 4 p.m. escalation time cannot be verified.

F3 - Repeated chasing is reported, but its time and financial impact are unmeasured.

Evidence: I1. Limit: Savings, lost revenue and staff workload cannot be calculated from the supplied material.

F4 - The records support testing receipt and escalation discipline before selecting new software.

Evidence: N1-N3; F1-F3. Limit: This is a recommendation. The evidence does not establish the underlying cause; staffing, workload and usability still need investigation.

Options

Option	Approach	Potential benefit	Tradeoff
A	Continue the current informal follow-up	No setup work	The receipt and escalation evidence gaps remain
B	Add an explicit receipt and escalation check to the existing system	Addresses the observed record gaps; preserves current roles	Requires owner approval, a daily check and a usable record
C	Investigate a replacement workflow tool	May offer reminders and reporting	Adds selection and migration effort; the need and cost benefit are unestablished

Recommended next step

Choose option B for a limited owner-approved trial, then use the resulting records to decide whether a wider change is justified. Confirm that the existing system can record the necessary fields before starting. If it cannot, return to the owner with that specific limitation.

1. Owner - Before trial

Approve receipt status, recipient, actual receipt time, escalation owner and escalation time fields; confirm the authorized system can hold them.

Completion evidence: Recorded approval and a usable example entry.

2. Coordinator and dispatcher - Before trial

Walk through normal receipt, missing receipt and an unapproved exception; confirm who records each event.

Completion evidence: Three walkthrough records reviewed by owner.

3. Coordinator - Next ten eligible requests

Check each request at 4 p.m.; record actual receipt or record escalation to the owner. Keep missing and late records visible.

Completion evidence: Ten dated records with receipt or escalation evidence.

4. Owner - After ten eligible requests

Review exceptions, late receipts, missing records and staff effort; decide to keep, revise or stop the trial.

Completion evidence: Written decision with reasons and any next scope.

Check the result

Proposed trial target: every one of the next ten eligible requests has either actual receipt recorded by 4 p.m. or escalation recorded at the 4 p.m. check. Report timely receipts separately from escalations, with missing records and staff effort visible. This target is a proposed acceptance measure; no trial has been performed and no improvement is claimed.

Walk through the proposed rules

The following paper walkthroughs apply the stated fictional rules to three cases. They check that the proposed instructions are understandable; they are not a live trial or independent validation.

Normal receipt

Dispatcher records receipt at 3:30 p.m.

Coordinator confirms the real receipt record at 4 p.m.; no escalation is needed.

No recorded receipt

At 4 p.m. there is no receipt record.

Coordinator records escalation to the owner at the check. Status remains awaiting receipt; receipt is not invented.

Unapproved exception

A request needs a date exception with no owner approval.

Coordinator retains it pending approval. It is excluded from the eligible handoff denominator and tracked separately.

Questions still requiring a decision or evidence

Why were three receipts late and one absent from the log? Ask the dispatcher and inspect workload before assigning a cause.

Were escalations actually made at 4 p.m.? Their timestamps are missing.

What is the authorized backup if the owner or dispatcher is unavailable? The owner must define it before the trial.

How much time does the existing follow-up consume, and how much would the new check add? Agree a simple measurement before estimating value.

Assessment completion

This fictional assessment answers the agreed question to the extent supported by its invented sources, identifies what remains unknown, and supplies options, an accountable next step and a checkable trial target. Implementation, actual improvement and independent validation remain unperformed.

The owner retains decision authority. The trial, further analysis and implementation would each require an appropriate agreement and authorization. No financial or operating outcome is guaranteed.