CIVIC THREAD
SERVICES, CONNECTED

LINEO
A CLEARER WAY THROUGH

CUSTOMER JOURNEY / SERVICE BLUEPRINT

A clearer journey. A visible handoff.

A service-information and ownership model for Lineo.



S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6
Plan	**Book**	**Prepare**	**At the station**	**On board**	**Arrival**

Design question

Can the passenger and the service team see the same known status, the next responsible person and the next update?

Constructed example: both the current and proposed states are authored models. No real operator audit or passenger research is claimed. Open the interactive atlas ↗

01 / CURRENT MODEL

Where context can be lost

Service layer	S1 Plan	S2 Book	S3 Prepare	S4 At the station	S5 On board	S6 Arrival
PASSENGER ACTIONS	Compare routes and access information	Select service and enter contact details	Check email and planner for changes	Find the meeting point and explain the request again	Seek the next update from staff	Look for a follow-up route after a difficult trip
VISIBLE SERVICE	Answer route questions across channels	Explain ticket and assistance options separately	Respond to conflicting status enquiries	Look up the booking or call a colleague	Repeat information from local messages	Ask the passenger to repeat the story
BEHIND THE SCENES	Maintain separate timetable and access updates	Pass requests to another queue	Reconcile updates after they have been sent	Reassign responsibility through a manual conversation	Coordinate onward changes through separate channels	Reconstruct the case from separate messages
SYSTEMS / RECORDS	Journey planner; access pages	Booking record; separate request inbox	Email tool; planner; incident feed	Station list; telephone handoff	Crew messages; control updates	Contact form; case queue

Dashed rule: line of visibility between passenger-facing service and backstage coordination.

H1 information · H2 request acceptance · H3 follow-up

This is a constructed service model, not an observed process. Inspect each stage in the interactive atlas for ownership, risks and a proposed test.

01 / PROPOSED MODEL

Make ownership explicit

Service layer	S1 Plan	S2 Book	S3 Prepare	S4 At the station	S5 On board	S6 Arrival
PASSENGER ACTIONS	See route options and access context together	Review the journey and request details before confirming	Receive a dated update and a clear next action	Find a clear meeting point and the current request state	Hear a consistent update and how to get help	Receive a case reference and a named next-update commitment
VISIBLE SERVICE	Explain known limitations before booking	Explain what is confirmed and what awaits acceptance	Use the same known status and next-update time	Acknowledge the request and name the receiving team	Use the agreed message and flag unanswered questions	Explain what the case team will review
BEHIND THE SCENES	Assign one owner to keep the journey brief current	Send a structured request with a reference and accountable recipient	Approve one customer message from the verified operational source	Record acceptance or an unresolved exception before transferring ownership	Keep the request owner visible through a service change	Accept the case with context and track the promised update
SYSTEMS / RECORDS	Versioned journey brief; shared status feed	Booking record linked to request status	Shared event record with timestamp	Shared handoff record; exception queue	Shared status; linked request reference	Case record linked to journey and event

Dashed rule: line of visibility between passenger-facing service and backstage coordination.

H1 information · H2 request acceptance · H3 follow-up

This is a constructed service model, not an observed process. Inspect each stage in the interactive atlas for ownership, risks and a proposed test.

02 / RESPONSIBILITIES AT THE JOINS

Sending is not acceptance

HANDOFF / ROUTE	ACCEPTANCE EVIDENCE	IF ACCEPTANCE IS MISSING
H1 · One service message Operational information → Customer channels	Approved status, confirmed timestamp and next update supplied.	Keep uncertainty visible; retain the last confirmed status without inventing an ETA.
H2 · Acknowledge the request Sending service team → Receiving service team	Named recipient explicitly accepts the request and its current state.	Keep the sending owner accountable until acceptance or an agreed escalation.
H3 · Close the loop Journey support → Case resolution	Case reference, context, accountable owner and next update recorded.	Do not mark the issue resolved solely because a case was opened.

Service-change branch

A change during preparation, station arrival or travel activates H1 and H2 together: update the known message while retaining ownership of open requests.

Case follow-up

At arrival, H3 transfers the context into an accepted case. Opening a case and resolving its underlying issue remain separate states.

Uncertainty is a valid state.

Show what remains unconfirmed and when it will be reviewed. Do not invent an arrival time, accepted request or resolved case to complete the diagram.

03 / TEST THE PROPOSED MODEL

Six checks before implementation

STAGE / ACCOUNTABLE ROLE	PROPOSED TEST	OBSERVABLE CHECK
S1 · Plan Journey information lead	Ask a reviewer to find the same access limitation in both booking and information views.	Mismatches between the two views
S2 · Book Retail service lead	Submit a sample request and inspect the pending state before any recipient accepts it.	Requests with explicit pending/accepted status
S3 · Prepare Service information lead	Change the fictional service status once and compare all customer messages.	Channel agreement at the same timestamp
S4 · At the station Station service lead	Simulate an unaccepted handoff and check that it stays visible to the sender.	Handoffs with a named accepting recipient
S5 · On board On-board service lead	Introduce a fictional service change while a request is open; trace its owner.	Open requests retaining an accountable owner
S6 · Arrival Customer resolution lead	Create a sample case and verify the owner, status and update time are visible.	Cases with owner and next-update field

These are proposed checks, not measured results or targets. Validate actual roles, accessibility needs, service policies, systems and data permissions with the operator. This atlas does not define safety-critical operating procedures.