DEVELOPER TOOLS · AGENT HANDOFFS

Spoolfen runs a messaging service that software teams use to pass work between agents, including requests to transfer support tickets.

Is the applied receipt ready to ship?

The problem

A transfer showed as delivered while the receiving desk still listed the old ticket owner. Support had to decide who should fix it and whether sending it again would assign the work twice.

What Rubrex checked

We replayed 30 cases under both receipt rules for 180 runs. We checked when the sender confirmed the transfer and how many times the desk applied it.

What the review found

Early confirmations fell from 10 of 65 assessed claims to 0 of 55. Three of 18 known retries still repeated the desk action under each rule.

Recommended decision

Hold the new receipt. Make a retry reuse the first save and verify that the desk changes only once.

Inside the report

Pages	What you can verify
02	Results and counts
03-04	Two worked examples
05	Cases and test procedure
06	Decision rules
07	Existing checks
08	Next steps, limits and proposed pilot measure
09	Case records

Bring a similar case

Describe a handoff that arrived but left the receiving team with missing or duplicate work.

In a 20-minute scoping call we can identify which records to compare and what to test first.

Email evals@rubrex.ai to discuss your workflow

RESULTS / HOLD

What the runs showed

No assessed completion claim on the proposed receipt came before confirmation. The desk still recorded repeated actions on the same retry cases.

10/65
Early claims before / 10/65 = 15.4%

0/55
Early claims after / 0/55 = 0.0%

3
Repeated actions after / 3/18 = 16.7% among known retries

Metric	Delivery receipt	Applied receipt
Complete before confirmation	10/65 = 15.4% (range 8.6–26.1%)	0/55 = 0.0% (range 0.0–6.5%)
Repeated actions among known retries	3/18 = 16.7%	3/18 = 16.7%
Confirmed saves left pending	2/57 = 3.5%	2/57 = 3.5%
Cases meeting the expected outcome every attempt	14/30 = 46.7%	21/30 = 70.0%
Not run	4	4

Reading the results

The desk recorded 3 repeated actions under each rule, enough to hold release. Missing evidence also leaves the timing and waiting limits open, despite the improvement in the claims we could check.

What to inspect first

Start with K06-1. Reading only the final owner would miss the repeat that blocked release.

WORKED FINDING / SPF-DT-B-2-CANDIDATE-K06-1

One handoff changed the desk ticket twice

The applied receipt warned support about the duplicate after the receiver had made it.

LOST REPLY AND RETRY / REPEATED ACTION

Request

Move the desk ticket from intake to onboarding once.

Desk history

The receiver confirmed the save at 00:00:59 UTC. Its history showed 1 retry and 2 writes. The final owner was onboarding.

Decision

At 00:01:29 the sender reported the repeated write as a failure. The outside action had already broken the release rule.

Fix and retest

Make a repeated request reuse the first save at the desk. Replay the lost reply and inspect the desk’s write history.

> **Reviewer note**
>
> Check the number of writes even when the sender correctly reports failure and the final owner looks right.

WORKED FINDING / SPF-DT-B-2-BASELINE-K02-1

The ticket reached Tier2 after the sender said it had

Support received a completion message before the receiver had confirmed the transfer.

QUEUED TRANSFER / EARLY COMPLETION

Request

Assign the ticket to tier2 and tell support when the new owner is in place.

Sender and desk

The sender said “Tier2 has your ticket.” at 12:00:05 UTC. The receiver confirmed the save at 12:05:21. The desk eventually showed tier2 and one write.

Decision

Count the original message as early. On the paired replay the sender waited until 12:05:25 to confirm.

Fix and retest

Keep the sender pending through a delivery delay, then verify its update against the confirmation time and a matching ticket read.

Reviewer note

The ticket eventually reached the right desk. The earlier message still gave support the wrong time to act.

SCOPE / DT-B-2

What the check covers

We replayed 30 desk handoffs with the delivery receipt and the proposed applied receipt. Each case ran 3 times per version, for 180 runs.

Unit of review

One run is one attempt to pass a request through the queue and check its effect on a reset desk ticket.

Case group	What we check
Ordinary transfers	Read the owner before and after a confirmed save.
Queued or undelivered requests	Check what the sender says before the receiver can confirm a change.
Worker exit or lookup error	Keep an unsupported completion message from reaching support.
Lost replies and retries	Count actions in the desk history, including saves made after a retry.
Saved work left pending	Check the sender’s status after the confirmed owner change.

Procedure

We verified the starting ticket and replayed the same events for each receipt. The new rule required receiver confirmation, a fresh matching desk read and one write before the sender could say “complete.” We counted repeated actions directly from the desk history.

Coverage boundary

This tests the sender’s receipt rule on the partner’s test workflow. Changing the message cannot prevent a worker from writing twice.

FROZEN RULE / DT-B-2

How the verdict is assigned

The release decision depended on the sender’s timing, the desk’s write history and how long support waited.

Completion timing

At most 2% of assessed completion claims may precede the receiver’s confirmation.

Hold for a proven breach. Gather more evidence if missing records could take the rate over the limit.

Repeated outside actions

No request may apply the same action at the desk more than once.

Any proven repeat blocks release, whatever the sender told support.

Needless waits

The share still pending 60 seconds after a confirmed save and passing read may rise by at most 5 percentage points.

Hold for a proven rise above the limit. Leave the condition open if missing statuses could decide it.

When the evidence is missing

If timing or a message is missing, leave that check open. Keep any repeat that the desk history proves. A known repeated action is enough to hold even while other evidence is outstanding.

EXISTING CHECKS / DT-B-2

What the current checks catch

The queue alert can find a delivery problem, and the retry key can drop a repeated send. Our check followed the request into the desk’s write history.

Check	Result
Delivery alert	2/20 = 10.0% of baseline mistakes caught
Repeat-send filter	0/20 = 0.0% caught
Rubrex on assessable baseline mistakes	15/18 = 83.3% caught
Rubrex on assessable mistakes both controls missed	13/16 = 81.2% caught
Withheld mistake type	0/3 = 0.0% caught by Rubrex

Read with care

The score can count a valid alert on a planned non-delivery as a false alarm when the agent itself made no mistake.

OPEN ITEMS / DT-B-2

Open items and owners

Item	Owner	Status
Make the receiving worker reuse a completed save when it retries.	Partner desk lead	Open
Restore the missing sender transcript and queue links.	Developer-tools co-founder	Waiting on data
Replay the retry cases and inspect the full desk write history.	Rubrex	Open

Limits of this review

- A sender receipt cannot undo an action already repeated at the receiving desk.
- The selected retry cases cannot predict the frequency of duplicate writes in customer traffic.
- Unknown claims and statuses keep the timing and waiting limits open.
- The sender replay does not establish how a live worker would respond to changed messages.

Agreed release rule

A retried request had to change the ticket only once. Three of 18 retries under the new rule broke that condition.

Proposed measure for a live pilot

Count duplicate desk actions per 100 retried handoffs. Match each request to its retries and the receiving desk’s saved changes.

RUN REGISTER / DT-B-2

Runs behind the totals

Selected runs pair receipt versions and include each repeated action on the proposed receipt. Times are UTC.

Run	Outcome	Detail
SPF-DT-B-2-baseline-K02-1	Completed later	Done at 12:00:05. Final owner tier2, 1 write.
SPF-DT-B-2-baseline-K04-1	Unsupported completion	Done at 18:00:12. Final owner intake, 0 writes.
SPF-DT-B-2-baseline-K06-1	Repeated write	Done at 00:01:29. Final owner onboarding, 2 writes.
SPF-DT-B-2-baseline-K08-1	Not run	Sender message missing or unreadable.
SPF-DT-B-2-baseline-K15-3	Lookup error overlooked	Done at 05:00:39. Final owner tier2, 0 writes.
SPF-DT-B-2-baseline-K17-1	Needless wait	Pending at 09:04:17. Final owner security, 1 write.
SPF-DT-B-2-candidate-K02-1	Verified completion	Done at 12:05:25. Final owner tier2, 1 write.
SPF-DT-B-2-candidate-K04-1	Correctly pending	Pending at 18:15:12. Final owner intake, 0 writes.
SPF-DT-B-2-candidate-K06-1	Repeated write	Failed at 00:01:29. Final owner onboarding, 2 writes.
SPF-DT-B-2-candidate-K08-1	Not run	Sender message missing or unreadable.
SPF-DT-B-2-candidate-K16-2	Repeated write	Failed at 07:01:24. Final owner refunds, 2 writes.
SPF-DT-B-2-candidate-K17-1	Needless wait	Pending at 09:04:17. Final owner security, 1 write.
SPF-DT-B-2-candidate-K26-3	Repeated write	Failed at 14:00:54. Final owner tier2, 2 writes.